

**THE REPORT OF
THE CENTURY FOUNDATION
TASK FORCE ON THE COMMON SCHOOL**

**DIVIDED
WE FAIL**

Coming Together through
Public School Choice

With Background Papers by Duncan Chaplin • Edward B. Fiske
William H. Freivogel • Richard Mial • David Rusk • Todd Silberman

THE CENTURY FOUNDATION PRESS

•

NEW YORK

The Century Foundation sponsors and supervises timely analyses of economic policy, foreign affairs, and domestic political issues. Not-for-profit and non-partisan, it was founded in 1919 and endowed by Edward A. Filene.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES OF THE CENTURY FOUNDATION

H. Brandt Ayers	Jessica Tuchman Mathews
Peter A. A. Berle	Alicia H. Munnell
Alan Brinkley, <i>Chairman</i>	P. Michael Pitfield
Joseph A. Califano, Jr.	Richard Ravitch
Alexander Morgan Capron	Alan Sagner
Hodding Carter III	Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr.
Edward E. David, Jr.	Harvey I. Sloane, M.D.
Brewster C. Denny	Theodore C. Sorensen
Charles V. Hamilton	Kathleen M. Sullivan
Matina S. Horner	David B. Truman
Lewis B. Kaden	Shirley Williams
James A. Leach	William Julius Wilson
Richard C. Leone	

Richard C. Leone, *President*

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS CATALOGING-IN-PUBLICATION DATA

Century Foundation Task Force on the Common School.

Divided we fail / the report of The Century Foundation Task Force on the Common School ; with background papers by David Rusk ... [et al.].

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-87078-476-5 (alk. paper)

1. Educational equalization--United States. 2. School choice--United States. I. Rusk, David. II. Title.

LC213.2 .C46 2002

379.2'6'0973--dc21

2002012620

Cover design and illustration by Claude Goodwin

Manufactured in the United States of America.

Copyright © 2002 by The Century Foundation, Inc. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, without the prior written permission of The Century Foundation.

FOREWORD

In 2002, the national debate about education has been focused on the issues related to the use of public money to support private and religious education. Would schools work better if parents “shopped” for them as consumers? Or, does the premise that the state has a responsibility to educate future citizens still hold true? The June Supreme Court decision in the Cleveland voucher case potentially cleared the way for struggles throughout the nation between opponents and advocates of such private funding mechanisms. Somewhat astonishingly, the president went so far as to liken the Court’s decision as similar in importance to the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* decision ending school segregation in the South. Education secretary Rod Paige went further to suggest that vouchers are part of “a new civil rights revolution” that could help liberate blacks along the lines of the *Brown* ruling. But for those who must grapple with the mission of improving education in those school systems with serious problems, it is not clear that these cases are similar.

The unequal character of elementary and secondary educational opportunity in the nation is scarcely likely to be redressed by the Court decision or by the generally modest grants (vouchers) envisioned to underwrite nonpublic schools. If our nation is serious about reinventing the goals of *Brown* for the twenty-first century, we will need to think a great deal more imaginatively than the simplistic notions of privatization and competition that underpin support for vouchers.

In the first place, the “promise” of vouchers is premised on the notion that they eventually will be used by a great many American elementary and secondary schoolchildren. As of this writing, however, vouchers are available to only one-tenth of one percent of public school students and therefore are a negligible factor in education policy (although they obviously have a disproportionate effect on the political

debate). Many questions about the potential for voucher systems to grow dramatically are, at this point, unanswered, particularly those relating to how vouchers could be expanded to a scale that was significant. Moreover, if, as many fear, vouchers wind up “creaming” the best students and most discriminating parents away from public schools, is it possible that their expansion will actually take us further away from the goals of *Brown*?

So far, experience with voucher programs hardly supports the comparison to *Brown*. In fact, in the years following that 1954 decision, private school vouchers were used as a means to circumvent desegregation. Most voucher schemes today make no conscious efforts to promote integration, and experience from other countries suggests vouchers will lead to more stratification by class and race, not less. In other words, despite the recent Court decision and the claims of voucher advocates, it is still reasonable to assume that the large-scale solutions to American education issues—if they are to come at all—will come within the framework of public school systems. And, that was the wise premise adopted by this Task Force.

The members of the Task Force accept the legitimate premise of voucher supporters—that it is unfair to trap poor children in failing schools—but recognize that large-scale solutions to America’s education issues will come from providing choice within the public school system, where 90 percent of American children are educated and where public policy measures can help ensure that choice promotes equal opportunity. At a time when our nation is more diverse than ever before, when education is more important than ever before, and public education is under attack as never before, the Task Force sets out a timely blueprint for restoring the American common school.

Education policy has long been part of the agenda of The Century Foundation. Our education task force reports include *Making the Grade*, which examined federal elementary and secondary education policy in the early 1980s, and *Facing the Challenge*, an analysis of school governance issues conducted in the early 1990s. In recent years, we have published Carol Ascher, Norm Fruchter, and Robert Berne’s *Hard Lessons: Public Schools and Privatization*; Richard Rothstein’s *The Way We Were? The Myths and Realities of America’s Student Achievement*; Gordon MacInnes’s white paper, “Kids Who Pick the Wrong Parents and Other Victims of Voucher Schemes”; and *Raising Standards or Raising Barriers? Inequality and High-Stakes Testing in Public Education*, edited by Gary Orfield and Mindy Kornhaber. Given the new attention

to school policy in Washington, the work of this Task Force is an especially timely addition to our efforts in this area.

In the future, we will be publishing a book by Joan Lombardi on the need to redesign child care to promote education, support families, and build communities; a book by Richard Rothstein and James Guthrie on school financing; and a collection of papers on low-income students in higher education.

The Task Force would not have been possible were it not for the leadership of Richard Kahlenberg, a Century Foundation fellow specializing in education issues. Author of *All Together Now: Creating Middle-Class Schools through Public School Choice* and editor of The Century Foundation's collection of essays, *A Notion at Risk: Preserving Public Education as an Engine for Social Mobility*, he provided both structure and substance to the work of a first rate group of national experts in the field. In fact, although The Century Foundation has sponsored numerous studies on a host of public policy topics over the years, few of those groups have matched this one in experience, intellect, and commitment.

The members of the Task Force benefited from the participation of a number of experts who shared their knowledge and insights with them. We thank Gordon Bruno, former executive director of the Connecticut Center for School Change, who spoke about interdistrict school choice; Ruy Teixeira, Century Foundation fellow, who reported on public opinion data relating to school integration and public school choice; Maree Sneed of the Washington law firm of Hogan & Hartson, who spoke about San Francisco's new efforts to promote socioeconomic integration; Sandra Feldman, president of the American Federation of Teachers, who discussed the role of teacher unions in promoting equity and integration; and Duncan Chaplin of the Urban Institute, who led a discussion about the relationship between integration by race and class. In addition, Edmund Gordon of Columbia University generously shared his research on how to raise minority achievement within economically and racially integrated schools.

We especially want to thank the Spencer Foundation, our collaborator on this project, for providing a grant to underwrite the case studies on integration in Cambridge, St. Louis, La Crosse, and Wake County. These papers enrich the report that follows and we are indebted to the authors. Finally, the Task Force had the good fortune to attract the time and attention of an extraordinary chairman, Lowell Weicker. A former governor of Connecticut and U.S. senator, he married a deep

understanding of education issues with uncommon sense about the policy environment in which change must take place. On behalf of the Trustees of The Century Foundation, I thank him and his colleagues for this important report.

Richard C. Leone, PRESIDENT
The Century Foundation
July 2002

CONTENTS

Foreword by Richard C. Leone	v
Members of the Task Force	xi
Executive Summary	3
Report of the Task Force	11
Additional Comments of Lowell Weicker	44
Additional Comments of John Degnan	45
Additional Comments of James Ryan	46
Background Papers	59
Trends in School Segregation by David Rusk	61
Estimating the Impact of Economic Integration of Schools on Racial Integration by Duncan Chaplin	87
La Crosse: One School District's Drive to Create Socioeconomic Balance by Richard Mial	115
Wake County Schools: A Question of Balance by Todd Silberman	141
Controlled Choice in Cambridge, Massachusetts by Edward B. Fiske	167
St. Louis: Desegregation and School Choice in the Land of Dred Scott by William H. Freivogel	209
Index	237
About the Background Paper Authors	249

MEMBERS OF THE TASK FORCE

LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR., *Chairman*
Former Governor and U.S. Senator, State of Connecticut

JOSEPH AGUERREBERE
Deputy Director, Education, Knowledge and Religion,
The Ford Foundation

RAMON CORTINES

ROBERT CRAIN
Professor Emeritus, Teachers College, Columbia University

JOHN DEGNAN
Former Attorney General, State of New Jersey; President,
The Chubb Corporation

PETER EDELMAN
Former Assistant Secretary, U.S. Department of Health and Human
Services; Professor of Law, Georgetown University Law Center

CHRISTOPHER EDLEY
Codirector, Harvard Civil Rights Project;
Professor of Law, Harvard Law School

KIM ELLIOTT
Communications Director, Citizens for Mark K. Shriver

JENNIFER L. HOCHSCHILD
Professor of Government, Departments of Government and
Afro-American Studies, Harvard University; Editor, *Perspectives
on Politics*

HELEN LADD
Professor of Public Policy Studies and Economics,
Duke University

MARIANNE ENGELMAN LADO
General Counsel, New York Lawyers for the Public Interest

LEONARD LIEBERMAN
Former CEO, Supermarkets General (Pathmark);
Chairman, The Fund for New Jersey

ANN MAJESTIC
Partner, Tharrington Smith
(representing Wake County [N.C.] School District)

DENNIS PARKER
Assistant Counsel, NAACP Legal Defense and
Education Fund

FELIPE REINOSO
State Representative, Connecticut General Assembly;
Principal, Bridge Academy (Bridgeport)

CHARLES S. ROBB
Former Governor and U.S. Senator, State of Virginia

DAVID RUSK
Former Mayor, Albuquerque; Author and Consultant

JAMES RYAN
Professor of Law, University of Virginia

JUDI SIKES
Schoolteacher, Cochrane Elementary School, Louisville

JOHN BROOKS SLAUGHTER

Former President, Occidental College; Former Chancellor, University of Maryland; Former Director, National Science Foundation; President and CEO, National Action Council for Minorities in Engineering, Inc.

DICK SWANTZ

Former Schools Superintendent, La Crosse, Wisconsin; Distinguished Lecturer, University of Wisconsin-LaCrosse, School of Education

WILLIAM TRENT

Professor of Educational Policy Studies, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

ADAM URBANSKI

Vice President, American Federation of Teachers; President, Rochester Teachers Association

AMY STUART WELLS

Professor, Teachers College, Columbia University

CHARLES V. WILLIE

Charles W. Eliot Professor of Education Emeritus, Harvard University

RICHARD D. KAHLENBERG, *Executive Director*

Senior Fellow, The Century Foundation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The past twenty years have seen an explosion in the education policy debate, with proposals ranging from raising academic standards to lowering class size; from improving teacher training to promoting after-school programs. But the current approach, shared in a bipartisan fashion, begins by largely taking off the table for discussion the central source of school inequality: economic and racial segregation. All of history suggests that separate schools for poor and middle-class children are inherently unequal. A child growing up in a poor family has reduced life chances, but attending a school with large numbers of low-income classmates poses a second, independent strike against him or her. While some look at the stubborn link between poverty and achievement and conclude that failure is inevitable, the members of the Task Force believe that poor children, given the right environment, can achieve at very high levels.

There exists today a solid policy consensus that school segregation perpetuates failure, and an equally durable political consensus that nothing much can be done about it. Education reformers take as a given that schools will reflect residential segregation by class and race and solutions are narrowly conceived to make separate schools more equal. We believe the current path is seriously flawed.

We fully recognize that the existing segregation of schools by class and race is not an accident, but is in some measure a reflection of political power. "Busing," defined as compulsory assignment to non-neighborhood schools in order to achieve a given racial balance, is a political non-starter. But there is another set of alternatives that avoids the politically unacceptable choice of compulsory busing on the one hand and the socially unconscionable alternative of school segregation on the other. The whole movement toward greater choice in public education represents an opportunity. If individual preferences are balanced against larger societal interests, the advent of choice can prove a boon

for integration, because it provides an opportunity to disentangle residential segregation and school assignment. Public school choice can help close the gap between the policy consensus on the need to integrate and political consensus against compulsory busing.

We believe school integration is imperative, both to promote equal opportunity and to forge social cohesion. Indeed, eliminating the harmful effects of concentrated school poverty is the single most important step that can be taken for improving education in the United States. Despite years of trying, educators have found it extremely difficult to make schools serving large numbers of low-income children provide high quality education. While such schools exist—the Heritage Foundation found twenty-one nationally—there are some eight thousand high-poverty schools that the U.S. Department of Education calls underperforming. There are no high-poverty school districts that perform at high levels. This is not simply a function of home environment. All students—middle class and poor—perform worse in high-poverty schools. One Department of Education study found that low-income children attending middle-class schools perform better, on average, than middle-class children attending high-poverty schools. Middle-class schools work, and that success has been replicated thousands of times over.

We are also reminded, in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks, of the critical role that American public schools can play in forging unity amidst diversity and teaching common democratic values. Americans invented “common schools”—schools educating children of all different incomes, races, and religious backgrounds under one roof—and today they must be reinvented to produce not only high-skilled workers but also active citizens, loyal Americans, and tolerant adults.

We must act soon, for the problem of economic and racial school segregation is getting worse, not better. American public elementary schools became more economically segregated in the 1990s, a trend that parallels the rise in economic segregation by residence between 1970 and 1990. The nation’s student population is two-thirds middle class (not eligible for federal subsidized lunches), yet one-quarter of American schools have a majority of students from low-income households.

Nearly fifty years after *Brown v. Board of Education*, more than 70 percent of American blacks attend majority-minority schools, up from 63 percent in the 1980–81 school year. Latinos, now the largest minority group in the United States, are even more segregated in schools than are

African Americans, with 76 percent of Latinos attending majority-minority schools. Given the projected growth in the minority student population, and the degree to which race drives economic segregation, research we commissioned finds that economic school segregation is likely to increase by 2025 in all but six states. We are becoming two Americas—one rich, one poor—and we will pay a steep price if we do nothing to address this crisis.

Nearly twenty years ago, *A Nation at Risk* warned of a “rising tide of mediocrity.” Policymakers responded with a number of initiatives, and today most of our nation’s schools are on good footing. But many are not, and almost invariably those schools that are identified as failing are ones struggling against the effects of economic segregation. We feel compelled to sound the alarm over the worsening economic and racial school segregation that members of both political parties have permitted. Opponents of public education have capitalized on the failure of segregated schools to argue for a system of private school vouchers that will only further undermine the power of schools to provide equal opportunity and social cohesion. The situation is dire. This is hardly the time for “all deliberate speed.” We will never fully compete educationally on the international stage unless we address the problem of segregation that is particularly prevalent in the United States.

We recommend that federal, state, and local governments adopt a policy goal of giving every child in America the opportunity to attend an economically and racially integrated school. Every education policy decision, from the funding of multibillion-dollar federal programs, to deciding where to draw a school boundary line, should seriously weigh whether the action will promote or hinder the central goal of integrated schools.

We acknowledge that there are serious obstacles to integration and recommend a series of policies to overcome each of six significant impediments.

- ◆ **TO OVERCOME LOGISTICAL CHALLENGES**—the geographical separation of low-income and middle-class children—we recommend, first, a policy of public school choice, accompanied by fairness guidelines. Within given geographic regions, parents can rank preferences among a variety of schools, each of which has a distinctive curricular theme or teaching approach. School officials then honor those choices with an eye to promoting integrated schools, a system now successfully employed in Cambridge, Massachusetts; Montclair, New Jersey; and elsewhere. The

idea is to draw zones large enough to be diverse, but small enough to avoid transportation difficulties. Alternatively, communities might promote integration using a system of public school choice that provides substantially greater funding to low-income children, with dollars traveling with students to new schools, thereby making low-income students attractive to middle-class communities. We also strongly advocate inclusionary zoning policies of the kind used in Montgomery County, Maryland, and a number of other communities to promote economic housing integration. So long as 75 percent of American students are assigned to neighborhood public schools, housing policy is school policy, and educators ignore that reality at their peril.

- ◆ **TO OVERCOME THE POLITICAL CHALLENGES**—the concerns middle-class families may have with integration—we point to the large body of research that suggests middle-class students perform successfully in integrated settings and that all children benefit from exposure to diversity. We advocate using proven incentives to lure low-income and middle-class families to integrated settings through choice rather than coercion. We note the powerful incentives for integration created by the accountability movement, for we will never reach the ambitious goals set so long as the system allows widespread segregation of students. And we note the existence of four key political constituencies—teachers, businesses, civil rights groups, and even the elderly—whose interests align directly with efforts to ameliorate the negative effects of economic and racial segregation.
- ◆ **TO OVERCOME NEW LEGAL CHALLENGES** against the use of race in student assignment, we advocate a policy that first seeks integration by socioeconomic status—an unquestionably legal tool—and reserves the “narrowly tailored” use of race for circumstances where employing economic criteria does not promote sufficient racial diversity.
- ◆ **TO OVERCOME JURISDICTIONAL CHALLENGES**—the separation of students by existing school district lines, particularly between cities and suburbs—we recommend that a mix of financial and legal levers be brought to bear. Evidence from longstanding state-funded programs in Missouri, Massachusetts, Connecticut, and elsewhere suggests that where states provide the right financial incentives, suburban districts will embrace cross-district integration. We also recommend that private foundations concerned about equal educational opportunity devote greater resources

to a new generation of state constitutional litigation that provides the most promising path for promoting integration across school district lines in a post-*Brown* era.

- ◆ **TO OVERCOME FINANCIAL OBSTACLES TO INTEGRATION**—the fact that middle-class families are unlikely to send their children to schools in poor neighborhoods unless those schools are well-funded—we advocate coupling new investment with integration in a manner that avoids the old integration versus spending debate. Either approach alone is likely to fail: we reject the view that integration can occur without education spending, just as surely as we reject the notion that spending without integration is sufficient. Low-income schools are caught in a vicious cycle: significant school improvement is unlikely to occur without a strong middle-class presence in the school; but financial investments must be made to lure middle-class families in the first place. We advocate taking both issues on at once: investing in schools—modernizing school facilities, reducing class sizes, improving teacher training—but in tandem with conscious policies to promote integration. More generous education spending is not a substitute for integration; it is a prerequisite.
- ◆ **TO OVERCOME WITHIN-SCHOOL OBSTACLES TO INTEGRATION**, particularly the tendency of integrated school buildings to resegregate into separate classrooms, we oppose the use of rigid tracking, which holds poor and minority children to a lower set of standards and serves as a self-fulfilling prophecy of failure. Instead, we advocate limited use of ability grouping, reserved for certain ages and certain courses, and consistent with civil rights protections.

To be successful, a number of groups have an important role to play in bringing about greater school integration, and the report of the Task Force contains specific and concrete recommendations for the federal government, state governments, local governments, and foundations.

We close the report with highlights from case studies commissioned by the Task Force. Each of these papers examines a school district that is successfully resisting the national trend toward resegregation: La Crosse, Wisconsin, which has the nation's oldest income integration program; Wake County, North Carolina, which incorporates the city of Raleigh and surrounding suburbs in a single district

that seeks to balance schools by income and achievement; Cambridge, Massachusetts, whose longstanding “controlled choice” program marries public school choice with integration; and St. Louis, Missouri, home to the nation’s largest inter-district integration program in which thousands of urban students choose to attend suburban schools, and some fifteen hundred suburban children attend urban magnet programs.

We recognize that promoting economically and racially integrated schools will not be easy, but just as voucher supporters doggedly try to change American education, district by district, those of us who support promoting equity in public education should engage the issue step by step. We believe it is possible for a small number of districts that are committed to integrated schools to lead the way. Building on one another’s successes and learning from mistakes, they can begin to create a new movement to make good, once and for all, on the radical promise of American public education. The obstacles are formidable, but the stakes are too high not to take action in the best interests of our children.

REPORT OF THE TASK FORCE

Nearly forty years ago, Alabama Governor George Wallace declared in his inaugural address, “Segregation today, segregation tomorrow, segregation forever.” Today, almost no American would embrace what was once the reigning ethos, but the everyday reality lived by millions of schoolchildren is not too far from Wallace’s vision. No longer segregated by law, our nation’s schools are increasingly segregated in fact—both by race and ethnicity and, increasingly, by economic class. Our nation made great strides to eradicate segregated schooling from the early 1970s to the mid-1980s, but since then we have seen increasing racial and economic segregation, and almost no one—from either political party—has articulated a clear plan for addressing this disastrous trend.

The past twenty years have seen an explosion of education policy debates, over issues ranging from raising academic standards to lowering class size; from improving teacher training to promoting after-school programs. But current discussions largely ignore the central source of school inequality: segregation by class and race. All of history suggests that separate schools, particularly for poor and middle-class children, are inherently unequal. A child growing up in a poor family has reduced life chances, but attending a school with large numbers of low-income classmates poses a second, independent strike against him or her. While some look at the stubborn link between poverty and achievement and conclude that failure is inevitable, the members of this Task Force believe that poor children, given the right environment in school, can achieve at very high levels.

There exists today a solid consensus among researchers that school segregation perpetuates failure, and an equally durable consensus among politicians that nothing much can be done about it. Education reformers take as a given that schools will reflect residential segregation by class and race and therefore any solutions are narrowly conceived to make separate schools more equal. We believe that this approach is seriously flawed.

We fully recognize that the existing segregation of schools by class and race is not an accident, but is in some measure a reflection of politi-

cal power. “Busing,” defined as compulsory assignment to non-neighborhood schools in order to achieve a given racial balance, is a political non-starter. But there is another set of alternatives that avoids the politically unacceptable choice of compulsory busing on the one hand and the socially unconscionable alternative of school segregation on the other. The whole movement toward greater choice in public education represents an opportunity. If individual preferences are honored in a way that serves larger societal interests, the advent of choice would prove a boon for integration, because it would provide an opportunity to disentangle residential segregation and school assignment. Public school choice can help close the gap between the policy consensus on the need to integrate and the political consensus against compulsory busing.

The first part of this report lays out why we believe school integration is the single most important step we can take to improve excellence and equity in education. The second part grapples directly with ways that the many obstacles to achieving integration might be addressed. The third part looks at what a number of individual communities are doing to promote more economically and racially integrated schools. In all, the report suggests some paths, grounded in real experience, toward restoring the integrated “common school”—envisioned by nineteenth-century educator Horace Mann as the “great equalizer”—for the twenty-first century.

THE IMPORTANCE OF SCHOOL INTEGRATION

The United States has a system of education that is working very well for some students and dismally failing others.¹ Low-income and minority twelfth-graders read at about the same level as more affluent and white eighth graders.² Students in well-off suburban jurisdictions such as Naperville, Illinois, and Montgomery County, Maryland, score near the top in international math and science exams, while students in low-income, urban districts such as Chicago and Rochester, New York, test at the level of students in developing countries such as Iran.³ Our schools, which Americans historically have looked to as an engine for social mobility, too often serve to perpetuate inequality.

Public officials, educators, and the media spend a great deal of time trying to address these disparities and promote greater equality of opportunity in education, but there is a stunning silence about what is known to be a leading cause of educational inequality: the degree to

which poor and middle-class American school children are taught in separate settings.

We believe that school integration is imperative to promote equal educational opportunity and to forge social cohesion; to promote individual achievement and to improve life chances; and to promote the community's collective need for unity and tolerance.

Equality of Opportunity

Of all the various strategies available, research suggests that the best method for improving education in the United States is to eliminate the harmful effects of concentrated school poverty. Despite years of trying, educators have found it extremely difficult to make schools serving large numbers of low-income children provide high-quality education. While such schools exist—the Heritage Foundation found twenty-one nationally—there are some 8,600 high-poverty schools that the U.S. Department of Education calls underperforming.⁴ There are no high-poverty school districts that perform at high levels.⁵ All students—middle class and poor—perform worse in high-poverty schools. One Department of Education study found that low-income children attending middle-class schools perform better, on average, than middle-class children attending high-poverty schools.⁶

By the same token, all children—middle class, poor, black, white, Asian, and Latino—achieve better in integrated, middle-class schools than they do in poverty-concentrated schools. Dozens of studies, dating back to the seminal 1966 Coleman Report, find that low-income children have higher levels of achievement, and/or larger achievement gains over time, when they attend middle-class schools than when they attend high-poverty schools.⁷ A 1999 Department of Education study, for example, found that “poor students in high-poverty schools are doubly at risk, with lower achievement levels than poor students in low-poverty schools.”⁸ The notion that all children perform better in middle-class schools than in poverty-concentrated schools, says Harvard's Gary Orfield, “is one of the most consistent findings in research on education.”⁹ Indeed, one reason that intergenerational white poverty is less prevalent than intergenerational black poverty is that poor, white children are much more likely than poor, African-American children to live in middle-class neighborhoods and attend good schools.¹⁰ Middle-class schools work, and that success has been replicated thousands of times over.

How important is school socioeconomic status to individual achievement? Some studies find it is as important as the income of the student's family and home environment.¹¹ Likewise, Robert Crain of Columbia has found that racial desegregation, when begun early, can result in a black achievement gain of roughly one grade level. His 1996 study of black test scores in thirty-two states found that the achievement gap on fourth-grade reading was largest in states such as New York and Michigan, where African Americans were most isolated, and smallest in Iowa and West Virginia, where blacks are more integrated.¹²

Low-income and minority children also have higher graduation and college attendance rates and better job prospects when they attend middle-class, integrated schools. For example, a 2001 study by University of Chicago researcher Jonathan Guryan found that school desegregation accounted for roughly half the decline in black dropout rates between 1970 and 1980, and had no effect on the dropout rate of whites.¹³ In 1996, University of California–Berkeley researcher Claude Fischer found that, controlling for individual ability and family home environment, attending a middle-class school reduced the chances of adult poverty by more than two-thirds (4 percent versus 14 percent).¹⁴

Why do children from all backgrounds do better in majority middle-class schools? Why does it matter whom you sit next to in class? A number of studies find that schools with a core of middle-class families are marked by higher expectations, higher-quality teachers, more-motivated students, more financial resources, and greater parental involvement. In short, virtually all of the essential features that educators identify as markers of good schools are much more likely to be found in middle-class than in high-poverty schools.

Middle-class parents are more likely to have the political savvy and pull to demand adequate financial resources from public coffers than low-income parents and often supplement these funds with private donations.¹⁵ Middle-class parents are in a position to be more active in schools (they are four times as likely to be members of the PTA than low-income parents) and insist on high standards.¹⁶ One national study found that the grade of A in a low-income school is the equivalent of the grade of C in a middle-class school.¹⁷

While students of all economic backgrounds add value to our schools, more-affluent classmates bring from home more academic knowledge, on average, which they share informally with classmates

every day. For example, middle-class children come to school with a vocabulary that is four times the size of low-income children, on average; so low-income children attending middle-class schools are exposed to and benefit from a much richer vocabulary in the classroom and on the playground.¹⁸ Likewise, middle-class children are about half as likely to engage in disruptive behavior in school as low-income children, in large measure because the life experience of middle-class students is more supportive of the notion that educational achievement will pay off.¹⁹

Moreover, as a consequence of the related environment and working conditions, high-quality teachers gravitate toward middle-class schools. Teachers in middle-class schools are more likely to teach in their field of expertise; more likely to have higher teacher test scores; and more likely to be experienced.²⁰ A great deal of new evidence confirms that teacher quality has a profound effect on student achievement.²¹

Conversely, the pervasive effects of inequality that stem from concentrated poverty help explain why traditional efforts that attempt to address inequality piece by piece often fail to make significant inroads. Much effort is placed, for example, in providing financial equity for low-income schools—a program that we support—but despite the expenditure of large amounts of compensatory spending in this nation and others, the results are mixed. Even in communities where high-poverty districts outspend more affluent districts, performance has been disappointing.²² Likewise, efforts to recruit high-quality teachers to economically segregated schools through bonuses often have been unsuccessful because they do not address the underlying working conditions that make teaching in such schools so difficult.²³ Teacher-seniority rules, which give experienced teachers priority in deciding which schools they will teach in, further complicate equity in teaching. It may well be that the *only* way that large numbers of low-income students will have access to consistent high-quality teachers is in integrated schools.

Segregation has a way of undercutting even good programs. For instance, class-size reduction is a smart policy, but in a segregated setting, the resulting increased demand for teachers has led middle-class schools to hire away the best teachers from low-income schools.²⁴ So, too, spending equalization is a sound policy, but in a segregated context, wealthy parents will supplement school spending with private donations, creating a new form of inequality.²⁵ Indeed, given the powerful influence of parents and peers, by definition, we cannot provide full educational opportunity in a segregated environment.

None of this discussion should be taken as a condemnation of individual low-income students, parents, or communities. For example, to observe that low-income parents, on average, are less likely to volunteer in the classroom reflects in some large measure the fact that low-income employees are less likely to have the flexibility to take time off work, and that low-income parents may be intimidated by educators who sometimes mistreat them. But segregation, for a variety of reasons, undercuts opportunity, and it must be addressed if this nation is to be serious about providing equal educational opportunity.

Social Cohesion

Integration is not just about test scores; it is about building character, promoting tolerance, and reducing social ignorance. We are reminded, in the wake of the September 11 terrorist attacks, of the critical role that American public schools can play in forging unity amidst diversity and teaching common democratic values. Americans invented “common schools”—schools educating children of all different incomes, races, and religious backgrounds under one roof—and today they must be reinvented to produce not only high-skilled workers but also active citizens, loyal Americans, and tolerant adults.

In 1948, Felix Frankfurter wrote that American public education is “the most powerful agency for promoting cohesion among heterogeneous democratic people . . . at once the symbol of our democracy and the most pervasive means for promoting our common destiny.”²⁶ Economically and racially integrated schools also have a much better chance of reinforcing important lessons about democracy and tolerance, while segregated schools often foster distrust of the “other.” An array of studies find that students who attend integrated schools are more likely to live integrated lives as adults and to be more tolerant.²⁷ Preventing balkanization through public schools is more important than ever, both because our nation is growing increasingly diverse and because the other major public institution that promoted economic and racial mixing—the military draft—has been eliminated.

Rising Segregation: The Need for Immediate Action

Integration will not happen by itself. While polls find Americans are more tolerant than ever, entrenched residential patterns persist, and

public inattention to the issue of segregation has taken its toll. Indeed, research shows that the problem of economic and racial school segregation is getting worse, not better. As David Rusk finds in his background paper for this Task Force, American public elementary schools became more economically segregated in the 1990s, a trend that parallels the rise in economic segregation by residence between 1970 and 1990. In the largest 100 metropolitan areas, economic school segregation increased in the 1990s in 55 metropolitan statistical areas, was stable in 14, and lessened in 12 (with data unavailable in 19). The nation's student population is two-thirds middle class (not eligible for federal subsidized lunches), yet one-quarter of American schools have a majority of students from low-income households.²⁸ Rusk also finds that while residential integration by race improved slightly during the 1990s, the segregation of black and white school children grew. He finds that declining residential segregation by race is disproportionately an adult phenomenon (integration by empty nesters and young, childless couples).

Rusk's alarming findings on the increasing economic and racial stratification of American schools dovetail with reports of the Harvard Civil Rights Project finding that more than 70 percent of American blacks now attend mostly minority schools, up from 63 percent in the 1980–81 school year.²⁹ The Civil Rights Project also finds that Latinos, now the largest minority group in the United States, are even more segregated in schools than are African Americans, with 76 percent of Latinos attending mostly minority schools.³⁰ Given the projected growth in the minority student population, and the degree to which racial segregation reinforces economic segregation, Rusk projects that economic school segregation will increase in all but six states by 2025. We are becoming two Americas—one rich, one poor—and we will pay a steep price if we do nothing to address this crisis.

The increase in residential segregation, which in turn drives school segregation, is compounded by two other factors. First is the decline in court-ordered busing. In a series of decisions in the early to mid-1990s, the U.S. Supreme Court cleared the way for districts across the country to end court supervision of desegregation efforts.³¹ With no new court orders in the offing, *Brown v. Board of Education* appears to have run its course. Second, it is possible that the accountability movement is unintentionally accelerating segregation. Parents look at test scores when deciding which school districts to live in, and since test scores reflect in some large measure the socioeconomic status of families, as opposed to the value that schools are adding, people with options may increasingly gravitate toward the most affluent districts.³²

Nearly twenty years ago, *A Nation at Risk* warned of a “rising tide of mediocrity.” Policymakers responded with a number of initiatives, and today most of our nation’s schools are on good footing. But many are not, and almost invariably those schools that are identified as failing are ones struggling against the effects of segregation. We feel compelled to sound the alarm over the worsening economic and racial school segregation that members of both political parties have permitted. Rather than recognize the problems segregation causes, opponents of public education have capitalized on its failures to argue for a system of private school vouchers, which only will undermine further the power of schools to provide equal opportunity and social cohesion. The situation is dire. This is hardly the time for “all deliberate speed.” We never will compete fully on the international stage educationally unless we address the problem of segregation that is particularly prevalent in the United States.³³

We recommend that federal, state, and local governments adopt a policy goal of giving every child in America the opportunity to attend an economically and racially integrated school. Every education policy decision, from the funding of multibillion-dollar federal programs to deciding where to draw a school boundary line, should weigh seriously whether the action will promote or hinder the central goal of integrated schools.

OVERCOMING CHALLENGES TO INTEGRATION: MOVING FROM THEORY TO PRACTICE

We fully recognize that accomplishing the goal of economically and racially integrated schools is not easy. There are very serious challenges—logistical challenges, political challenges, legal challenges, jurisdictional challenges, financial challenges, and challenges within the schools themselves. These obstacles must be addressed head-on.

Logistical Challenges: Residential Segregation

Segregation of schools reflects segregation of neighborhoods. The “neighborhood school,” a long-cherished American icon, is now a source of tremendous inequality, as advocates of vouchers implicitly

acknowledge when they decry the practice of “trapping poor kids in bad schools.” We recommend two complementary policies—public school choice with fairness guidelines and housing integration.

PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE. Public school choice—allowing parents a choice among a variety of schools rather than automatically assigning their children to the closest school—offers an attractive way, if properly structured, to meet parental preferences for their children while also promoting school integration. Fundamentally, greater choice moves us beyond a system in which schools necessarily reflect residential segregation.

There is some evidence that unregulated public school choice actually increases segregation, however, because the most motivated middle-class families work the system to their advantage.³⁴ Public school choice should not be used to create the equivalent of a private school system for affluent families; it should be used to promote the best system for all students. Private preferences must be tempered by considerations of the public interest.

Controlled choice, first conceived by Charles Willie, Michael Alves, and others, provides the appropriate balance.³⁵ Parents in a community are polled to find out what sorts of school options they would like for their children (a Montessori school; a computer theme?) and speciality schools are created to reflect those interests. Then families rank preferences among a number of public school options within a given geographic region. The choices take place in kindergarten, the beginning of middle school, and the beginning of high school, and are decided by lottery (no camping out to be first in line). The idea is to draw zones large enough to be diverse but small enough to avoid transportation difficulties. School district officials (not individual school principals) honor choices in a way that also promotes integration, by race and/or economic class. Free transportation is provided to all students. Preferences are given to siblings of current students and students who would be able to walk to school.

Unlike magnet schools, which normally are limited in number, controlled choice has the advantage of “magnetizing” all schools in a district and avoids the creation of a two-tiered system of special magnet schools versus regular schools. Unlike open enrollment, controlled choice ensures that choice will promote, rather than undercut, student integration.

Over time, popular schools that are over-chosen can have their programs “franchised” to under-chosen schools. Under most controlled choice plans currently in operation, 90 percent of families receive one of their first three choices.³⁶ In large districts, choice can take place within manageable subdistricts or zones. Plans can be phased in slowly to reduce disruption.

A variant of this idea is to “magnetize” low-income students themselves. Seattle schools use a weighted funding formula, which provides extra resources to low-income students, money that travels with the students in a system of public school choice. If properly designed, such a system might promote economic integration by encouraging wealthier schools to recruit low-income students. Experience suggests, however, that the funding premium for low-income children must be very high to be effective.³⁷

Public school choice necessarily means higher transportation costs for students, but they are worth paying. Over the years, opponents of integration have made great political hay over the fact that integration requires money to be spent on transportation rather than in the classroom. In fact, only a fraction of 1 percent of the nation’s education budget has gone toward transportation for desegregation—although during the height of the busing controversy, polls found most Americans believed the figure to be at least 25 percent of the budget.³⁸ The average cost to bus the 57 percent of public school students now transported at public expense is under \$500 per student.³⁹ Increasingly, schools are built near busy intersections, so nearby students are provided transportation for reasons of safety rather than distance. Even among children who live within one mile of their school, fewer than three in ten walk.⁴⁰ Plans to promote integration often will involve longer bus rides than current busing, but the most important point to keep in mind is that under a system of public school choice, some parents will be willing to make that tradeoff because the program at the end of the bus ride is compelling to them, while others will choose the school that is geographically closest.

The Task Force strongly believes that school choice should take place within the public school system. If the goal is economically and racially integrated schools that will promote equal opportunity and social cohesion, private school vouchers take us in precisely the wrong direction. Three features fundamentally distinguish private schools from public schools—their selectivity; their appeal to niche markets; and their independent nature—and each undermines the goals we seek to promote.

While public schools generally take all comers, private schools pride themselves on the ability to select students for admissions.⁴¹ Therefore, private school choice plans normally give the final choice to schools, not to parents. And where private schools are required by law to admit students by lottery, the number of schools willing to participate is severely limited.⁴² Private schools normally select for admission more affluent students, not because they have an animus against lower-income students, but because more privileged students are on average easier to teach. Voucher-type plans in Sweden, Chile, New Zealand, and the Netherlands have all increased social stratification.⁴³

Private schools also are designed by their very nature to “segment” the market, emphasizing difference rather than commonality. Most emphasize religious differences—some 84.3 percent of American students attending private schools attend religious schools⁴⁴—and some emphasize differences by nationality or race. As the late Albert Shanker of the American Federation of Teachers noted, with vouchers “you’ll end up with kids of different religions, nationalities and languages going off to different schools to maintain their separateness and I think we’d have a terrible social price to pay for it.”⁴⁵

Finally, private schools are, by their nature, “independent” schools—independent of democratically elected officials. Private schools cannot be required to teach democratic principles, or values such as tolerance; and even when they receive public funding, they are not bound by the U.S. Constitution. Though President George W. Bush places testing and accountability at the center of his effort to improve public schools, his plan for private school vouchers did not call for any testing of students.⁴⁶

HOUSING INTEGRATION. Alongside public school choice, the Task Force also recommends the adoption of policies to integrate neighborhoods themselves economically. So long as 75 percent of students attend neighborhood public schools, housing policy is school policy. Residential areas are becoming more and more economically segregated. This trend is not the immutable working of some “free market.” The National Association of Homebuilders acknowledges that “public policy dictates where development occurs.”⁴⁷ Unfortunately, many local jurisdictions adopt policies to exclude low-income households as much as possible.

Over one hundred local communities, however, have enacted inclusionary zoning laws. These require that a modest proportion of

low- and moderate-income housing be an integral part of larger new housing developments. Private, for-profit homebuilders must comply, but usually receive various benefits, such as density bonuses, to make compliance profitable as well.

Since 1973, suburban Montgomery County, Maryland (outside Washington, D.C.), has had the nation's largest inclusionary zoning program. Its Moderately Priced Dwelling Unit (MPDU) law requires that private homebuilders sell or rent 10 percent of any new development of fifty or more units to eligible households in the lowest third of the income scale. Furthermore, another 5 percent of the units must be sold to or rented by the county's public housing authority. Even new developments with million-dollar homes have their proportion of "workforce" and "welfare-to-workforce" housing.⁴⁸

Over the past quarter of a century, private, for-profit homebuilders have built over 11,000 "MPDUs" as integral parts of middle-class housing developments. Some 2,800 are owned or rented by the public housing authority in low-poverty neighborhoods. As a result, Montgomery County, with almost 900,000 residents (41 percent minority), is one of the nation's most racially and economically integrated communities. If applied on a regional basis, through state policies and federal incentives, such a program also could overcome the large degree of segregation that occurs between jurisdictions.

What if MPDU-type laws had been in effect in major metropolitan housing markets for the past quarter of a century? In the six-county Chicago region, the nation's fifth most economically segregated, 1.8 million housing units were built. Even assuming that half of the new housing was in developments below the inclusionary threshold, a regionwide MPDU law still would have yielded about 90,000 new "workforce" housing units and another 45,000 "welfare-to-workforce" units. Ideally, such a supply of alternative housing for low-income families (mostly located in low-poverty suburbs) could have reduced the level of economic segregation by one-third and brought the poverty rate below 40 percent in the 183 very high-poverty census tracts in Chicago and immediate suburbs. Metrowide inclusionary zoning could have reduced economic segregation by one-quarter to one-third, for example, in Akron, Baltimore, Boston, Cincinnati, Columbus, Hartford, Louisville, Miami, and Norfolk-Virginia Beach. In regions with less-concentrated poverty and hotter housing markets, the results could have been even more impressive. Economic segregation could have been diminished by one-half in Jacksonville and in Minneapolis-

St. Paul; and by two-thirds or more in Atlanta, Portland, and Greater New York's mid-New Jersey suburbs. Hypothetically, inclusionary zoning policies could have eliminated totally any vestiges of economic segregation in booming Sunbelt areas such as Orlando and West Palm Beach. America may never eliminate poverty. Through inclusionary zoning, however, almost every American metropolitan area can diminish substantially or eliminate the concentration of poverty. Likewise, government sponsored housing trust funds provide a promising financing mechanism to increase the supply of affordable housing, and may promote indirectly the goal of economic residential integration.

Policies that give low-income families access to middle-class communities mean not only that low-income children will attend middle-class schools during the day, but also that they will be able to live in safer, more supportive middle-class communities at night. Evidence from Chicago's Gautreaux program and the federal Moving to Opportunity experiment suggests that the life chances of low-income children are raised significantly when they have the opportunity to live in integrated middle-class neighborhoods.⁴⁹ The two policies, public school choice and fair share housing, working in tandem, can make an important difference.

Political Challenges

Americans always have had twin goals for their education system: they want public schools to benefit their own children, providing them the skills necessary for success; and they want the schools to educate other people's children because we all benefit in a capitalist democracy when young people are educated to be productive workers and responsible citizens.⁵⁰ In a very real sense, public schools are meant to serve as the American counterpart to the European social welfare state. But sometimes the two goals are seen as competing tradeoffs: parents want equal opportunity for all children, but not if sacrifices are necessary for their own children. Is integration a zero sum game, in which gains by low-income children can be made only by limiting opportunities of the affluent? We think not.

NO COST IF ALL SCHOOLS ARE MIDDLE CLASS; AND BENEFITS FROM DIVERSITY. Social science research suggests that the academic achievement of low-income children will increase in middle-class integrated schools,

and the achievement of middle-class children will not decline. In the context of racial desegregation, a great deal of social science evidence confirms what even the strongest opponents of busing concede: white achievement did not decline.⁵¹

How is such a fortunate win-win scenario possible? For one thing, numbers matter. The effects of concentrated poverty appear to be nonlinear; roughly speaking, the effects are worst in schools above 75 percent low income, somewhat negative above 50 percent low income; and not harmful below the threshold of 50 percent low income, according to a number of studies.⁵² A student who is not academically engaged and is inclined to misbehave in a high-poverty school very well may become more academically inclined and less likely to act out in a more favorable learning environment. It is important to note that nationally, roughly two-thirds of students are affluent enough not to be eligible for free and reduced price lunch (185 percent of the poverty line); and 83.8 percent live above the poverty line.⁵³ For another, it is possible to “level up” in economically integrated schools because a long line of studies has found that middle-class and white children are less sensitive to schools, for better or worse, than low-income and minority children.⁵⁴

Far from being hurt, middle-class children will benefit from economic and racial integration. To function in a new workforce, children need to be exposed to those who are different than themselves. Moreover, there is growing empirical evidence to support the commonly held belief that all children benefit academically from exposure to people with different life experiences who challenge received wisdom.⁵⁵ There is also growing recognition among the public that diversity benefits all students. A 1999 Gallup poll found that 59 percent believed we should do more to integrate schools, up from 37 percent in 1988.⁵⁶ According to another poll, public school parents would choose a “good diverse school” over an “outstanding homogenous school” by a 67 percent to 26 percent margin.⁵⁷

CHOICE/INCENTIVES. Building choice into integration plans is necessary not only to overcome the logistical obstacles associated with residential segregation, but also to provide an important political attraction for the public. Today, we have an informal system of school choice, but it is limited largely to the wealthy. Providing greater public school choice would be popular and create a way to move beyond assignment that reflects residential segregation. By 75 percent to 21 percent,

Americans favor public school choice across district lines.⁵⁸ School boards also like public school choice because it avoids fights over redistricting when schools become overcrowded.

While busing for racial balance historically has been a tough political sell, it may be possible to combine growing support for the goal of integration and expanded public school choice. According to a 1998 Public Agenda survey, 76 percent of white parents opposed busing for racial balance but 61 percent of white parents and 65 percent of black parents supported “letting parents choose their top 3 schools, where the district makes the final choice, with an eye to racial balance.”⁵⁹

Choice programs are likely to be especially effective if they rely on innovative programs to encourage integration. The central features of magnet schools are special pedagogical approaches (Montessori schools, back to basics schools, progressive education, multiple intelligence schools) or special curricular themes (computers, performing arts, international, business, science). The idea is to create schools that would not appeal to most families, but would be very appealing to some, and to draw students from a much more diverse group of families than a neighborhood school serves. Today, more students attend such public schools of choice than attend private schools.⁶⁰ Other examples of innovative programs include:

- ◆ *Extended day schools for commuting workers.* Albuquerque has implemented a successful program to draw suburban families to urban schools by providing extended day schooling, which is appealing to commuters. Parents like sharing a ride to work with their children, having them located nearby, and having extended care until the end of the workday. By reserving one-half of the school for urban students and one-half for commuters, a nice economic mix has been achieved.⁶¹
- ◆ *Smaller schools or class size.* Some parents may be attracted to a smaller school, or one that has smaller class size, even if the school is located farther away. Middle-class children are attending schools in New York City’s District 4 and District 2 because they were offered small class sizes as an incentive.⁶²
- ◆ *High-quality child care in city.* In Chicago, school officials are offering high-quality child care at elementary schools as a way of drawing

middle-class families in and teaching them about what the elementary school has to offer down the line.⁶³

- ◆ *Special schools linked to urban institutions.* Our nation's cities disproportionately house the leading cultural resources—universities, museums, zoos, sports facilities, centers for the performing arts, libraries, and so on—and public schools affiliated with these institutions can be popular draws for students with special interests. In Hartford, for example, an interdistrict magnet affiliated with the University of Hartford drew 1,400 applicants for 275 slots this year.⁶⁴ Likewise, urban high schools can provide internships with urban employers that may prove attractive.

THE ACCOUNTABILITY DEBATE. The strong accountability movement in education has the potential to promote integrated schools. The recently passed No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 requires, for the first time that, after twelve years, states bring both poor and rich children to a level of educational proficiency.⁶⁵ It will be virtually impossible to make the enormous strides required for low-income students unless states do something very dramatic to address school segregation. In Wake County, North Carolina, for example, an ambitious achievement goal set by the district provided the imperative for sustaining an integration plan. More immediately, new federal education legislation providing a right for children to transfer out of public schools that are deemed failing for two consecutive years may prove a boon for integration if properly implemented because it divorces residence and school assignment.⁶⁶ (See the section on federal recommendations, beginning on page 35.) As we noted earlier, poorly implemented accountability plans have the potential to increase segregation to the extent that test scores become the determining factor by which middle-class parents choose school districts; but if policymakers react appropriately, the accountability movement just as well could serve as a positive spark to promote integration.

CONSTITUENCY GROUPS. Beyond generating general public support as outlined above, the effort to promote school integration must engage key stakeholders in the educational arena.

- ◆ *Teachers.* Teachers have been a driving force behind integration reform from La Crosse, Wisconsin, to Louisville, Kentucky.⁶⁷

Positioned on the front lines, teachers know that they can do their job better when students are not concentrated by income. The members of the Task Force are very encouraged by a presentation we heard from Sandra Feldman, president of the million-member American Federation of Teachers (AFT), on the role of teacher unions in promoting equity and integration at the Task Force's June 5, 2001, meeting. Feldman endorsed the idea of economically integrated common schools as "a moral idea" and "a big idea." We welcome her offer to consider finding an AFT district that supports the Task Force's recommendations and experiment with the best ways to make integration work. Similarly, Bob Chase, then president of the National Education Association, said that the Task Force's work "represents bold, important thinking. Reaching the ideal of the common school, which is integrated by class and race, will move us toward the essential goal of quality educational opportunity for all children."

- ◆ *Civil rights groups.* Civil rights organizations have been at the forefront in the fight for a just and integrated society and in the past have formed the backbone of those efforts to promote both economic and racial integration.
- ◆ *Business groups.* Business can be a key ally, and an influential ally, in the fight for quality integrated schools. In St. Louis, Raleigh, and elsewhere, businesses have been very supportive of integration. The business community knows that a healthy, integrated school system is essential to attracting adult workers to the region, and businesses realize that down the line, integrated schools produce more skilled employees. With an increasingly diverse workplace in coming years, businesses know they cannot write off growing segments of the population. More generally, the business community is interested in students being exposed to diversity in order to be competitive in a global environment.
- ◆ *Elderly and near elderly.* Seventy-five percent of Americans do not have children in the public school system.⁶⁸ Often these voters are considered opponents of good schools because they resist efforts to increase spending on public education, but they may well provide support for school integration. The elderly and those near-elderly with grown children (as well as those with children in

private schools, singles, and younger childless couples) can look more broadly at education policy than those with children in the public school system. While we believe it is in the parochial interest of parents to have their children attend quality, integrated schools, parents with school-aged children often can be a source of resistance to changes in student assignment. The elderly and near-elderly, by contrast, have an interest in what works generally in education to produce able employees who can help fund programs that keep seniors secure in retirement.

Legal Challenges

We believe it is important that public schools be integrated by both economic status and race. We recognize, however, that the law on school desegregation has changed dramatically over the past twenty years, and poses new challenges to race-conscious integration efforts. Where *Brown v. Board of Education* has required that students be assigned by race in order to eliminate the vestiges of past segregation, today the courts have released large numbers of districts from such requirements, saying that the job has been completed. Although the Supreme Court has not weighed in on the question of the constitutionality of race-conscious voluntary programs in grades K–12 in decades, there is a split among the circuit courts of appeals, with some suggesting that such efforts might themselves be illegal, and others permitting race-conscious programs.⁶⁹ Today, even the benign use of race must meet the strictest of constitutional standards.⁷⁰ By contrast, using economic criteria, such as eligibility for free and reduced price lunch, is subject to the most relaxed form of scrutiny and is presumptively constitutional.⁷¹

To comply with the new legal requirements, while honoring the importance of both economic and racial integration, we advocate leading with economic integration criteria, which is important in its own right and also will produce a fair amount of racial integration as a by-product.⁷² More than 80 percent of segregated black and Latino schools are poverty-concentrated, while only 5 percent of segregated white schools are.⁷³ Furthermore, in those jurisdictions that allow it, we advocate the use of race in student assignment when economic factors do not produce sufficient racial diversity in schools.⁷⁴ A number of

communities whose programs have been subject to legal attack for using race in student assignment now successfully pursue a strategy of relying primarily on economic status to integrate schools. These jurisdictions include Wake County, North Carolina; Charlotte, North Carolina; San Francisco, California; Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Arlington, Virginia. (For ways to define socioeconomic status, see Box.)

Is using socioeconomic status just a backdoor way of achieving a certain racial result? Hardly. As Duncan Chaplin's background paper for this Task Force makes clear, economic integration will produce a fair measure of racial integration, given the overlap between race and class, but the two factors also are distinct.⁷⁵ Moreover, integrating economically makes educational sense, independent of its impact on racial integration. Numerous studies suggest racial integration was most successful in raising student achievement when it also produced economic mixing.⁷⁶ The main reason that African Americans do better in racially integrated schools, most analysts have found, is that

There are many different ways for communities to seek "socioeconomic" integration. La Crosse, Wisconsin, uses eligibility for free lunch, which is set at 130 percent of the poverty line. Cambridge, Massachusetts, uses eligibility for free and reduced price lunch, at 185 percent of the poverty line. Wake County, North Carolina, uses two criteria: eligibility for free and reduced price lunch, and achievement based on standardized reading tests. San Francisco, by contrast, uses a more complex, seven-part definition, including socioeconomic status (has the student participated in free/reduced lunch, Calworks, or public housing?); academic achievement (has student scored below thirtieth percentile on Stanford 9?); mother's educational background (post-high school education?); student's language status (limited or non-English proficient?); quality of student's prior school (lowest ranking in California Academic Performance Index?); student's home language (other than English?); and residence in different geographic area. The Task Force believes individual jurisdictions will want to use their own methods to reflect local realities.

they benefit from being in an environment with middle-class children, who are on average more academically engaged and whose parents are more involved in the schools and demand high-quality teaching and curriculum. Those factors that make for a difficult learning environment in schools—high rates of student mobility, cutting classes, dropping out, committing acts of violence, and low levels of parental involvement—are all much more closely associated with class than race.⁷⁷ Says Gary Orfield, a leading proponent of racial desegregation, “educational research suggests that the basic damage inflicted by segregated education comes not from racial concentrations but from the concentration of children from poor families.”⁷⁸

Jurisdictional Challenges: Overcoming District Lines

Integration programs within district lines can accomplish a great deal because suburbs are much more economically and racially diverse than they used to be.⁷⁹ Nonurban schools enroll almost two-thirds of the nation’s poor students.⁸⁰ Likewise, in several southern states, county-wide school districts often include suburbs and cities within a single jurisdiction. Having said that, much segregation, particularly in the Northeast, occurs along school district lines (see Duncan Chaplin’s background paper to this report), so it is important to create incentives for cross-district integration between suburbs and urban areas. (Small towns and rural areas already have the most integrated schools in the country.)⁸¹ Some 300,000 students currently participate in interdistrict public school choice programs, over twenty times the number that use publicly funded vouchers (14,000).⁸² To encourage interdistrict programs, we believe two particular strategies are worth pursuing: employing financial and legal levers.

FINANCIAL LEVERS. One of the enduring lessons from existing interdistrict school choice programs is the importance of providing financial incentives to both suburbs and cities to encourage integration. In St. Louis, city students transferring to the suburbs were double-funded so that the city schools did not lose all their state funding for each student who transferred out, and suburbs received significant financial supplements. The program began in the early 1980s as a court-supervised desegregation program, but in the 1990s, as the courts were signaling a willingness to end court-ordered busing nationally, the

Missouri state legislature crafted a compromise, with the support of Republican suburban legislators, to continue the program. The financial incentives were key. Some suburban legislators also realize that social science research suggests that suburbs and cities are increasingly interdependent and that to be economically successful in the long run, suburbs need thriving cities.⁸³

More generally, we note that financial incentives played an important role in desegregating Southern schools in the 1960s and 1970s. Desegregation accelerated dramatically once Congress passed federal aid to education and conditioned the aid on making progress in desegregation. Even though federal funds account for less than 10 percent of total education spending, all jurisdictions are now heavily dependent on those funds.⁸⁴

LEGAL LEVERS. While the Task Force believes the primary vehicle for achieving greater equity and school integration must be the political process, historically the courts also have played an important role with regard to these issues, most notably in *Brown v. Board of Education*. As one Task Force member noted, “Imagine a world in which *Brown* had not been decided?”⁸⁵ Today, the most promising avenue is state court litigation seeking to require states to promote socioeconomic and/or racial integration to fulfill an affirmative obligation, found in many state constitutions, to provide equal educational opportunity.⁸⁶ All state constitutions make some mention of education, and to date courts in twenty states have recognized a right to an “equal” or “adequate” education.

Most of these state cases have focused on the adequacy or equity of educational spending, but in a groundbreaking 1996 decision, *Sheff v. O’Neill*, the Connecticut Supreme Court held that an equal education requires integration. The court noted that money alone was insufficient and that its earlier decision equalizing spending in *Horton v. Meskill* had not provided genuinely equal educational opportunity. Whereas *Brown v. Board of Education* reached only *de jure* segregation, *Sheff* held that *de facto* segregation is also unconstitutional as a matter of state law and established a right to integrated education that transcends district lines. Jurisdictional divides between cities and suburbs could not be used as an excuse for segregation. The decision has national implications, and efforts have already been made to replicate *Sheff* in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Rochester, New York.⁸⁷ This type of litigation can give legislatures the political cover to do what is right and constitutionally required.

The lawyers in *Sheff* have found that establishing the legal principle is only the first step; further litigation may be required to ensure court orders actually are carried out. We urge private foundations to provide financial support for both stages in the important legal effort to promote socioeconomic and racial integration through state constitutions.

Financial Obstacles

Too often, leading education reforms, from vouchers to standards, pass themselves off as costless. We make no such suspect claims about integration. We acknowledge that middle-class families are unlikely to send their children to schools in poor neighborhoods unless those schools are well-funded. To start with, improving the physical plant of schools in low-income areas is a precondition for integration. So too, middle-class families with options will not send their children to schools with poorly trained teachers. But there are remedies; for example, New York District 2's investment in teacher development and improved standards is worth emulating.⁸⁸ Likewise, part of the reason middle-class parents hesitate to send their children to integrated schools is a fear that the less-prepared children will slow down the instruction of the group. Providing early childhood education can help address this concern—and is, of course, important in its own right. There is a good deal of evidence that integration will raise student achievement in a cost-effective manner, more dramatically than compensatory spending in segregated environments—but significant investments must be made in order to achieve integration in a free society.

We advocate coupling new investment with integration in a manner that avoids the old integration versus spending debate. Spending large amounts of money on high-poverty schools, in Kansas City and elsewhere, has failed by itself to produce large achievement gains for the children attending those schools or to attract middle-class children.⁸⁹ On the other hand, efforts to simply force integration, without reducing class size or promoting spending equity, are likely to lead to middle-class flight. Low-income schools are caught in a vicious cycle: significant school improvement is unlikely to occur without a strong middle-class presence in the school, but financial investments must be made to lure middle-class families in the first place. We advo-

cate taking both issues on at once: investing in schools—modernizing school facilities, reducing class sizes, improving teacher training—but in tandem with conscious policies to promote integration. More generous education spending is not a substitute for integration; it is a prerequisite.

Fortunately, public opinion data suggests that the public supports spending more money on education when the expenditure is likely to achieve tangible results. By a margin of 73 percent to 7 percent, Americans say government is spending too little, not too much, on public education.⁹⁰ New investment, when coupled with integration, is likely to pay large achievement dividends and vindicate the public's support for greater expenditure.

Within-School Challenges: Avoiding Resegregation within Integrated Buildings

We acknowledge that integration, by itself, will not produce full equality of opportunity. Low-income and minority students perform far better in integrated schools than in poverty-concentrated schools, on average, but even in middle-class integrated school districts such as Shaker Heights, Ohio, and Evanston, Illinois, minority and low-income student achievement lags. While integration normally promotes changes in educational programs—because middle-class parents demand it—school assignment policies are necessary but not sufficient to the larger project of providing equal opportunity. We advocate two sets of policies to promote equity within integrated schools.

AVOIDING RIGID TRACKING AND BIASED DISCIPLINARY POLICIES. Even if school buildings are integrated, classrooms may become effectively resegregated, with economically advantaged and white children placed in higher tracks and low-income and minority children trending toward lower tracks, undercutting many of the benefits of integration. Completely eliminating all tracking, however, would appear to be a logistical nightmare for teachers and a political nonstarter for parents. Likewise, discipline policies must be administered fairly to protect against racial or economic bias, but at the same time, a strong sense of discipline and order must be maintained to enhance learning for all students. Many schools have evolved away from wholesale tracking, in which students are given an entirely different curriculum, in favor of

flexible ability grouping, in which students proceed at different paces over a similar curriculum. The Task Force recommends:

- ◆ Avoiding rigid tracking, which maintains student assignments despite different rates of growth. Ability groups should be re-evaluated continually so that “late bloomers” are permitted to accelerate.
- ◆ Ability grouping by different subjects so that a student who is fast in math and slow in reading is placed appropriately.
- ◆ Less ability grouping in earlier grades, even when used in later grades, along the lines employed by Japanese educators.⁹¹
- ◆ Less ability grouping in certain subjects (social studies, civics, physical education), even when used in other subjects (math, language arts).
- ◆ Enforcing civil rights laws to protect against racial bias in tracking or discipline policies. Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act strikes the right balance: it requires imbalances to be rigorously justified.
- ◆ Teacher training programs to instill high expectations of students from all ethnic and economic groups.
- ◆ Encouraging more students of color and low-income students to take advanced courses. Among the promising programs are Bob Moses’s Algebra Project; the College Board’s Equity 2000 program; and Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID).
- ◆ More research into cooperative learning that will facilitate achievement among all students in heterogeneous classes.

OTHER POLICIES TO PROMOTE EQUITY WITHIN INTEGRATED SCHOOL BUILDINGS. Other groups have spent far more time developing recommendations on the matter of within-school equity, and we particularly commend the work of the College Board’s National Task Force on Minority High Achievement, chaired by Edmund W. Gordon and Eugene H. Cota-Robles. The American Youth Policy Forum also has published an

excellent summary of research on this vexing question, entitled *Raising Minority Academic Achievement: A Compendium of Educational Programs and Practices*.⁹² Among the policies to consider:

- ◆ *Disaggregating test data by race and class.* In order to avoid schools hiding minority or low-income student underachievement under an average number, school success and failure should be judged not only on aggregate test data but also on the performance of key subgroups.
- ◆ *Supplemental programs for low-income/minority students.* Even if, in theory, students are provided equal opportunities in schooling, programs are needed to address differences in home environments. Edmund Gordon and Beatrice Bridglall appropriately call for “supplementary educational activities comparable to those which many affluent and academically sophisticated parents make available to their children.”⁹³ Within integrated schools, struggling students should be afforded the opportunity to take advantage of after-school and weekend tutoring programs. Quality preschool opportunities also should be made available. Finally, certain mentoring programs such as I Have a Dream have demonstrated success.
- ◆ *Study groups.* Edmund Gordon and A. Saa Meroe call for the creation of “high performance learning communities” to support positive peer influences toward achievement.⁹⁴ This approach is in line with research conducted by Uri Treisman among Asian-American math students, which found that forming supportive “study groups” may provide one avenue for successful academic achievement.⁹⁵

The Role of Federal, State, and Local Governments and Foundations

Promoting integrated public schools will take hard work, and there is an important role to play for federal, state, and local governments, as well as foundations.

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. Historically, the federal government has played an important part in promoting equal opportunity in education, from

enforcing school desegregation to funding compensatory education under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The federal government has a special role in promoting equity, under the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution, and it has a strong interest in promoting a system of public schools that helps forge national unity. Among the possibilities:

- ◆ *Improving accountability legislation.* Accountability is at the heart of the No Child Left Behind Act, reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The law provides that students trapped in failing schools for two consecutive years have a right to transfer to better public schools, which is an important principle, but it limits the transfer to schools within the student's district.⁹⁶ For children in districts where there may be no good public schools with room available, it is important that public school choice be extended beyond district lines. Accountability legislation also could be improved by adding to school report card ratings a "diversity index" so that schools would be ranked not only by the academic achievement of students but also by the degree of diversity in the school.
- ◆ *Make charter school funding contingent upon integration and support magnet school funding.* Because charter schools are schools of choice that can move us beyond segregated neighborhood patterns, they represent a special opportunity for integration. Recent research, however, suggests that charter schools are not serving that function, on the whole, and actually may be increasing segregation.⁹⁷ Existing federal funding for charter schools places a number of conditions on recipients. We believe funding also should be made contingent upon demonstrated efforts to promote integration. Extra funds should be provided to those charter schools that make concerted efforts specifically to promote integration. Likewise, federal funding for magnet schools has been instrumental in giving local communities the ability to promote school integration and should be increased.
- ◆ *Pay transportation costs for integration.* As noted earlier, transportation costs associated with integration are relatively minor, but can be a political lightning rod. If the federal government picked up the tab for transportation associated with integration, it would

address a major political obstacle faced by local governments, and incur a relatively small expense, which research suggests is a wise investment.

- ◆ *Pilot projects with research component.* The federal government is especially well positioned to conduct research in education and there is broad bipartisan support for this role. We recommend establishing a series of pilot programs in which districts conduct controlled studies to examine better the effects of integration and compensatory spending. New documented findings on the comparative cost/benefit ratio of integration and compensatory spending may well spur policymakers to invest federal resources in voluntary integration magnet programs, which now receive less than one-one hundredth the allocation provided to Title I.⁹⁸ In addition, further research would help establish more definitively the optimal economic mix of students to promote student achievement.

STATE GOVERNMENTS. State governments can foster integration across district lines through the spending incentives cited earlier, including state funding for transportation and state magnet school grants. In addition, states should establish regional educational organizations to encourage interdistrict cooperation, along the lines of New York State's Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES) system.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND SCHOOL BOARDS. We believe that the best approach to integration is a full-fledged economic and racial balancing through controlled choice, but there are a number of smaller steps that also would be productive.

- ◆ *Siting and feeding new schools.* When building a new school, when changing boundaries to accommodate new growth, or when closing a school, school boards should consider the impact on integration in their decisions. School officials should avoid building additions on existing schools or using temporary facilities when doing so has the effect of perpetuating racial and economic isolation.
- ◆ *Preferred choice.* "Preferred choice" is a variation on controlled choice that has somewhat less potential to produce integration but may be more politically palatable in certain communities.

Under preferred choice, individuals rank preferences and administrators honor preferences in a way that promotes integration, but in any event, families are guaranteed a slot in their neighborhood school.

FOUNDATIONS. Private foundations have been central to the effort to fund public interest organizations that pursue litigation on behalf of integration and on behalf of spending equity and adequacy. We urge foundations to recommit themselves to state-level litigation on behalf of integration.

CASE STUDIES IN INTEGRATION

There are a number of communities already pursuing some version of what we recommend. Socioeconomic integration is being pursued in La Crosse, Wisconsin; Wake County, North Carolina; Cambridge, Massachusetts; San Francisco, California; South Orange-Maplewood, New Jersey; Manchester, Connecticut; Charlotte, North Carolina; St. Lucie, Florida; and Coweta County, Georgia.⁹⁹ Controlled public school choice is employed in dozens of communities, including Cambridge, Massachusetts; Charlotte, North Carolina; St. Lucie, Florida; Lee County, Florida; and Montclair, New Jersey.¹⁰⁰ Interdistrict integration plans are in place in St. Louis, Missouri; Boston, Massachusetts (Metco Program); Hartford, Connecticut; Rochester, New York; Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and Minneapolis, Minnesota.¹⁰¹ Inclusionary zoning policies to promote housing integration have been implemented in numerous jurisdictions, including Montgomery County, Maryland; Fairfax County, Virginia; Cambridge, Massachusetts; and Arlington, Massachusetts.

To support the Task Force's work, The Century Foundation, with the help of a grant from the Spencer Foundation, commissioned four in-depth case studies in integration in La Crosse, Wake County, St. Louis, and Cambridge. Highlights of those four studies are summarized below.

La Crosse, Wisconsin

La Crosse, Wisconsin, a town of 50,000 located on the banks of the Mississippi River, has the longest standing socioeconomic integration program in the nation. In the late 1970s, when Richard Swantz

became superintendent, there were two different high schools in the district: Logan, populated by low-income students, which had a limited, vocational curriculum and weaker graduation requirements; and Central, the white-collar school, which was considered far superior. To relieve overcrowding at Central, the board voted, five to four, to move some of the affluent students from Central to Logan. The change was hugely controversial, but over time, Logan was upgraded; at the insistence of the new parents, the curriculum was improved and test scores went up; and Central was not adversely effected.

In 1992, the elementary school enrollments were increasing rapidly, in part as a result of an influx of Hmong refugees from Southeast Asia. Many of the elementary schools had large concentrations of poor children, and two new schools were being built. The teachers and principals, pointing to the earlier success at the high school level, suggested that the students be assigned to the schools based on poverty, so that no school had less than 15 percent or more than 45 percent free-lunch students. Swantz said the board believed it was important to use economic status rather than race because the teachers said that the driving educational issue is class and because opponents would exploit a focus on race for political advantage.

The economic busing plan proved contentious, and several members of the school board were voted out of office. However, pro-integration forces fought back successfully, the community grew accustomed to the new arrangement, and the plan is still in place. With a few exceptions, the schools are economically balanced, and test scores have risen.

Looking back, school administrators are heartened that residents supported the concept of economically integrated schools and that children quickly adapted, but they wonder whether some of the initial resistance might have been stemmed if they had sought to accomplish integration through choice rather than redistricting. Observers continue to believe that in La Crosse, emphasizing economic integration was less controversial than a policy based on race would have been.

Wake County, North Carolina

Wake County, with a population of 630,000, has a unified school district that includes the city of Raleigh and surrounding suburban and rural areas. The system, which has 100,000 students, originally adopted

a voluntary racial integration plan, with a goal of making all schools within 15 percent above or below the district's minority total proportion of 30 percent. Under an extensive system of magnet schools, Wake County's schools became far more integrated than schools nationally.

In response to a Fourth Circuit decision striking down the use of race in student assignment in Virginia and Maryland, the county school board voted in January 2000 to end the minority goal and substitute a system that seeks to balance student populations by socioeconomic status and student achievement. Under the new plan, no school should have more than 40 percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch and no school should have more than 25 percent of students below grade level.

While Wake County's racial and economic integration efforts have not erased achievement gaps between economic and racial groups, integration appears to have improved the achievement of low-income and minority students. Wake County's system is considered far more successful than neighboring Durham, where city schools remain poverty-concentrated and are considered low-performing. Moreover, the school district's data on the impact of school poverty in Wake County track with national findings and "support the current policy that sets 40 percent as a target maximum percentage of low-income students that would be assigned to a school."¹⁰²

While there is some political opposition to the new socioeconomic balancing plan, no school board candidates who have run against socioeconomic integration have been elected. The business community's support of integration has been critical to the plan's political viability. Wake does face some logistical difficulties given the enormous size of the district (864 square miles in all), but the district's substantial success bodes well for the vast majority of districts that are much smaller in geographic size.

Cambridge, Massachusetts

Cambridge, Massachusetts, a diverse city of 100,000 that includes Harvard professors and low-income minority and white communities, was one of the first districts nationally to adopt a "controlled choice" system of student assignment. Originally designed to balance the student population by race, the school committee recently voted to integrate students primarily by family income.

In 1981, school officials, seeking to avoid the disturbances over busing in nearby Boston, sought to promote school integration through public school choice. Neighborhood schools were abolished, and now every student has the opportunity to apply to any of the fifteen K–8 schools in the district. (Cambridge has just one high school.) Under the plan, devised by Charles Willie, Michael Alves, and others, parents rank their choices when their children enter kindergarten and then a central administrator honors preferences with an eye to ensuring that the schools are also integrated, within plus or minus ten percentage points of the district average. Schools appeal to parents based on a pedagogical approach or special theme. The choice mechanism is also designed to provide new data each year to school officials about what schools are popular (overchosen) and unpopular (underchosen). In theory, officials then can take corrective action at unpopular schools (firing principals, reconstituting schools with a new, more attractive theme).

Over the years, the plan proved highly effective at reconciling integration and choice. All the schools have been racially diverse, and more than 90 percent of students attend one of their parents' first three choices. But in recent years, school officials began considering a significant change. Looking, again, across the river to Boston, they saw that the use of race in student assignment was vulnerable from a legal standpoint, and they found that integrating by race did not by itself prevent poverty isolation and its academic effects. While each school was racially balanced, some schools were predominantly middle class and others were predominantly poor, with the portion of students eligible for free and reduced-price lunch ranging from 20 percent to 80 percent. The other limitation was one of implementation: over the years, superintendents had not taken the hard steps of reconstituting underchosen schools; choice was not an automatically self-correcting process in which unpopular schools were upgraded.

In December 2001, the Cambridge School Committee, relying on local school data and national studies finding that all students do better in middle-class schools, voted six to zero to adopt a plan to balance the schools by socioeconomic status. In the first year, 2002–03, the goal is for each school to be within fifteen percentage points, plus or minus, the district average for free and reduced-price lunch eligibility (currently 48 percent). In subsequent years, the permissible range will be reduced to 10 percent, then 5 percent. The board also put in place a mechanism to ensure continued racial diversity. School officials

believe they are taking an innovative student-assignment program that has achieved racial diversity through choice and turning it into an even better program to raise student achievement.

St. Louis, Missouri

St. Louis, Missouri, has the largest interdistrict integration program in the nation with as many as 13,000 urban students attending suburban schools and another 1,500 suburban students attending urban schools. Initially part of a 1980s court-approved racial desegregation settlement, the plan was, in the late 1990s, voluntarily extended by state legislators to the surprise of many.

In the early 1970s, plaintiffs sued to overturn *de jure* segregation in St. Louis and the surrounding suburbs. In most jurisdictions around the country, suburban communities were not included in urban desegregation plans because they were not guilty of segregation; but St. Louis proved an exception to this rule because there was evidence that the suburbs and state were culpable parties. A federal judge threatened to consolidate St. Louis and suburban schools into a single district, but the state and suburban jurisdictions settled the suit, with an agreement to allow black students to transfer to suburban schools until between 15 percent and 25 percent of the student population was black. The state agreed to pay for transportation and for the entire cost of educating transfer students, and also to continue paying one-half the state aid to St. Louis schools for each student who left. Under the plan, black city students could choose to transfer to any of 122 schools in sixteen suburban districts. The scheme also provided funding for urban magnet schools to attract white suburban students.

The plan generally has been considered a success: urban students who attended suburban schools were exposed to strong teaching, college fairs, and an environment of high expectations; they did better academically at the high school level and had higher graduation rates and college attendance rates than students who remained behind in city schools that received compensatory spending. Some of the success may be attributed to “creaming,” but not all of it, as transfer students had lower entering test scores than urban students attending city magnets, yet performed better in the end.

When the state sought to end the program in the 1990s, it met resistance not only from the NAACP, but also from business leaders

and suburban legislators. Business cited research that the payoff was greater for the interdistrict transfer program than investing in traditional compensatory spending schemes in urban schools. And many state legislators from suburban areas supported continuation of the program because suburban schools had become financially dependent on the resources brought by transfer students. Adjustments were made in the program; most notably, parents now choose from a limited number of suburban options within a particular zone to reduce transportation costs. As of 2002, suburbs may opt out of the program, but so far, they appear interested in participating. Elements of the program are slated to continue until 2021.

CONCLUSION

We recognize that promoting economically and racially integrated schools will not be easy, but just as voucher supporters doggedly try to change American education, district by district, those of us who support promoting equity in public education should engage the issue step by step. Voucher proponents have made their plan to use public funds for private schools the nation's most widely discussed education initiative despite the fact that only 14,000 students currently participate in such programs.

We believe it is possible for a small number of districts that are committed to integrated schools to lead the way. Building on one another's successes and learning from mistakes, they can begin to create a new movement to make good, once and for all, on the radical promise of American public education. We need leadership that is inspired, courageous, and determined. The obstacles are formidable, but the stakes are too high not to take action in the best interests of our children.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF LOWELL WEICKER

I concur with all that has been stated by the Task Force and its executive director, Rick Kahlenberg. They deserve support and appreciation for all their hard work, deliberations, and conclusions. However, it is what none of us are saying, albeit understanding, that I would like to address at this point.

The nation's children deserve an unqualified commitment to excellence and equality in public education. It is not the job of policymakers to twist public education into a public/private pretzel in order to accommodate private beliefs and circumstances—all the while making available to such a system public funds.

If ethnic, racial, religious, or economic considerations are to be accorded different emphasis in a child's education, then that is best achieved in the private or parochial sector. The content and administration of public education must be blind to everything except delivery of excellent public education.

For too long leadership at all levels of government has been practicing *political* public education. Aside from being patently unfair, and arguably unconstitutional, this politicizing has tied the striving for excellence in public education into knots.

I appreciate the fact that it is parents who vote. But parents should appreciate that it is their *children* who must face a world ever changing. To send them out to deal with first-class opportunities and dangers equipped with second-class learning is dumb.

The very fact this Task Force is in being reaffirms the problem of educational isolation. And though its recommendations are exemplary, they are subordinated to an existing system of prejudices and politics. It is that system that has to end unconditionally.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF JOHN DEGNAN

While I enthusiastically endorse the contents and recommendations of this report, I wish to disassociate myself from its unduly negative commentary on the use of vouchers as a device to drive public school reform. I believe the viability of the “common school” would be the best public policy outcome. I also believe controlled choice designed to achieve socioeconomic and racial integration is a feasible approach toward that goal. However, I am not convinced that the politics of public education will allow such a solution to work. It is worth a try but in the event that my skepticism is validated, I would not want the negative commentary on vouchers to suggest that they might not be a viable alternative approach to force, through competition, a healthy and vibrant public school system.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS OF JAMES RYAN

While I wholeheartedly endorse the bulk of the Task Force report, I respectfully disagree with the Task Force's position regarding vouchers. A well-structured voucher plan, like a well-structured public school choice plan, can enhance opportunities for socioeconomic integration. Indeed, in urban areas where entire school districts are overwhelmingly poor, it will be difficult if not impossible to achieve meaningful socioeconomic integration if choice is limited to the public realm. Allowing students in urban districts the opportunity to attend private schools will not solve this problem completely, but it will ensure that more of these students end up in majority middle-class schools. There are risks involved in using vouchers, to be sure; voucher programs, if not regulated, could increase racial and socioeconomic stratification rather than decrease it. The same risks, however, attend public school choice. It is precisely for this reason that the Task Force recommends regulating public school choice, and it is for this same reason that I would recommend regulating voucher programs: to ensure that choice is used as a tool to promote rather than hinder socioeconomic integration. If we as a society want to do all that we can to assist poor students, we must transcend our ideological predispositions and work to create as many opportunities as we can for these students. Simply writing off vouchers because there are risks involved, while at the same time endorsing a program of public school choice that entails similar risks, artificially limits the opportunities available to poor students. I cannot support such a restriction.

NOTES

1. See e.g. David C. Berliner, "Averages that Hide the True Extremes," *Washington Post*, January 28, 2001, p. B3.
2. National Center for Education Statistics, *NEAP 1998 Reading Report Card for the Nation* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1999), pp. 44, 59.
3. David J. Hoff, "World-Class Education Eludes Many in the U.S.," *Education Week*, April 11, 2001, pp. 1, 14–15.
4. Samuel Casey Carter, *No Excuses: Lessons from 21 High-Performing High-Poverty Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Heritage Foundation, 2000). Maria Newman, "Federal Law on Failing Schools Has States Scrambling to Comply," *New York Times*, July 4, 2002, p. B1 (on 8,600 low-performing schools). More recently, the Education Trust released a study purportedly identifying 4,577 high-poverty or high-minority schools that achieve at high levels. See Craig D. Jerald, *Dispelling the Myth Revisited: Preliminary Findings from a Nationwide Analysis of "High-Flying" Schools* (Washington, D.C.: The Education Trust, 2001). Further analysis of the study's data, however, found that when a more meaningful definition of "high achievement" was applied, only one-half of 1 percent of high-poverty and high-minority schools had high scores in reading and math in two grades for two years running. See Richard Rothstein, "An Accountability Push and Fuzzy Math," *New York Times*, April 10, 2002, p. A21.
5. *Education Week*, in collaboration with the Pew Charitable Trusts, sought to identify a "solidly successful urban district, in which even extremely poor and minority children achieve at high levels," but concluded that "there are none." See "Quality Counts '98: The Urban Challenge," *Education Week*, January 8, 1998, p. 6.
6. Mary M. Kennedy, Richard K. Jung, and M. E. Orland, *Poverty, Achievement, and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services: An Interim Report from the National Assessment of Chapter 1* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1986), pp. 21–22. This particular study cites raw scores rather than growth in scores over time, which may reflect in some measure self-selection bias (low-income families who are determined to live in middle-class school districts may be particularly motivated). But most studies attempt to control for this and find that when measuring growth in achievement over time—the "value added" by the school—high-poverty schools continue to rank below middle-class schools. See e.g. Jay Mathews, "Testing Students, Scoring Teachers: Tennessee System for Gauging Results

Angers Some Educators but Gains Acceptance Elsewhere,” *Washington Post*, March 14, 2000, p. A7.

7. James S. Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966), p. 22. For a recent summary of studies over the last forty years, see Richard D. Kahlenberg, *All Together Now: Creating Middle Class Schools through Public School Choice* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001), pp. 25–37.

8. Stephanie Stullich, Brenda Donly, and Simeon Stolzberg, *Targeting Schools: Study of Title I Allocations Within School Districts* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1999).

9. Gary Orfield and Susan Eaton, *Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education* (New York: New Press, 1996), p. 53.

10. While one in twenty poor whites live in neighborhoods with more than 40 percent of residents living in poverty, one in three poor blacks do. David Rusk, *Inside Game/Outside Game: Winning Strategies for Saving Urban America* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999), p. 72.

11. See e.g. Esther Ho Sui-Chu and J. Douglas Willms, “Effects of Parental Involvement on Eighth-Grade Achievement,” *Sociology of Education* 69 (April 1996): 130, 135, 138 (in math and reading “the SES of a school had an effect on achievement that was comparable to the effects associated with the SES of a family”); Stephen Schellenberg, “Concentration of Poverty and Ongoing Need for Title I,” in Gary Orfield and Elizabeth DeBray, eds., *Hard Work for Good Schools: Facts Not Fads in Title I Reform* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Civil Rights Project, 1999), p. 130 (“the degree to which poor children are surrounded by other poor children, both in their neighborhood and at school, has as strong an effect on their achievement as their own poverty”).

12. Robert Crain study of state achievement gaps by segregation, cited in Megan Twohey, “Desegregation Is Dead,” *National Journal*, September 18, 1999, p. 2619. For a more recent confirmation of Crain’s studies on the relationship between racial segregation and student achievement, see Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, “Subverting Swann: First and Second Generation Segregation in Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools,” *American Educational Research Journal* 38, no.2 (Summer 2001): 215–52 (attending a racially isolated elementary school has a negative effect on black achievement).

13. Jonathan Guryan, “Desegregation and Black Dropout Rates,” NBER Working Paper 8345, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Mass., June 2001.

14. Claude S. Fischer et al., *Inequality by Design: Cracking the Bell Curve Myth* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996), pp. 83–84.

15. See e.g. William J. Fowler Jr., ed., *Developments in School Finance* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1995).

16. Paul Barton and Richard Coley, *America’s Smallest School: The Family* (Princeton, N.J.: Educational Testing Service, 1992), p. 37.

17. See Michael J. Puma et al., *Prospects: Final Report on Student Outcomes* (Cambridge, Mass.: Abt Associates, 1997), p. v.

18. Betty Hart and Todd R. Risley, *Meaningful Differences in the Everyday Experience of Young American Children* (Baltimore, Md.: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Co., 1995).

19. See e.g. Beatrice Birman et al., *The Current Operation of the Chapter 1 Program* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1987), pp. 92–93; Puma et al., *Prospects*, p. B3.

20. National Center for Education Statistics, *Teacher Quality: A Report on the Preparation and Qualifications of Public School Teachers* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1999), p. 17 (teaching out of field); John F. Kain and Kraig Singleton, “Equality of Educational Opportunity Revisited,” *New England Economic Review*, May–June 1996, pp. 87, 99, 107 (teacher test scores); and Laura Lipmann and others, *Urban Schools: The Challenge of Location and Poverty* (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1996), pp. 86–88, 96 (experience). Minority students are also less likely to have experienced teachers according to new research in North Carolina conducted by Helen F. Ladd and colleagues. See Debra Viadero, “Study: Teachers Seek Better Working Conditions,” *Education Week*, January 9, 2002, p. 5.

21. For a summary of studies, see Kati Haycock, “Good Teaching Matters,” *Thinking K–16* 3, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 3–13.

22. See e.g. Gary Orfield and Susan Eaton, *Dismantling Desegregation*, pp. 25, 83; Michael J. Puma et al., *Prospects*, pp. vi, 12. Experience abroad is also sobering. The Dutch system, for example, provides nearly twice as much money for low-income students, and has not produced positive results. See David Rusk, Dirk Frieling, and Leon Groenemeijer, *Inside Game/Outside Game: Segregation and Spatial Planning in Metropolitan Areas* (Amsterdam and Delft: ABF Stragie, March 2001), pp. 72–82.

23. Eric A. Hanushek, John F. Kain, and Steven G. Rivkin, “Why Public Schools Lose Teachers,” NBER Working Paper No. W8599, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Mass., November 2001. See also Viadero, “Study,” p.5.

24. See e.g. Randy Ross, “How Class-Size Reduction Harms Kids in Poor Neighborhoods,” *Education Week*, May 26, 1999, p. 30.

25. See e.g. Birman, *The Current Operation of Chapter 1*, pp. 94–95; Eric Brunner and Jon Sonstelie, “Coping with Serrano: Voluntary Contributions to California’s Local Public Schools,” paper presented to the National Tax Association’s Eighty-Ninth Annual Conference on Taxation, Boston, November 10–12, 1996, pp. 372–81.

26. *McCullum v. Board of Education*, 333 U.S. 203 (1948), 216 and 231 (Frankfurter, J., concurring).

27. See e.g. Amy Stuart Wells and Robert L. Crain, “Perpetuation Theory and the Long-Term Effects of School Desegregation,” *Review of Educational*

Research 64, no. 4 (1994): 531–55; Charles V. Willie and Jerome Baker, *Race Mixing in Public Schools* (New York: Praeger, 1973), p. 3; Jomills Henry Braddock II, Robert L. Crain, and James M. McPartland, “A Long-Term View of School Desegregation: Some Recent Studies of Graduates as Adults,” *Phi Delta Kappan* 66, no. 4 (December 1984): 260; Nancy A. Denton, “The Persistence of Segregation,” *Minnesota Law Review* 80 (April 1996): 822–23.

28. See National Center for Education Statistics, *Digest of Education Statistics, 1999* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000), table 379 (33.2 percent of students receive federally subsidized lunches). J. Anderson, *The Distribution of Chapter 1 Services* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 1993) (one-quarter of schools majority low income). The data in Duncan Chaplin’s background paper for this Task Force show a 45 percent subsidized lunch participation rate among districts reporting data (Table B.1). This number may be higher because of missing data (Chaplin estimates, based on census data, that the true eligibility rate is 36 percent) and because his data involve only elementary schools, where FARM data tend to be higher because parents are younger and less economically secure as a group than older parents.

29. Gary Orfield with Nora Gordon, *Schools More Separate: Consequences of a Decade of Resegregation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Civil Rights Project, July 2001), Table 9.

30. *Id.*

31. See *Board of Education of Oklahoma City v. Dowell*, 498 U.S. 237 (1991); *Freeman v. Pitts*, 503 U.S. 467 (1992); and *Missouri v. Jencks*, 115 S.Ct. 2038 (1995).

32. This is an emerging theme from the ongoing Understanding Race and Education Study by UCLA–Teachers College for which Amy Stuart Wells is the principal investigator.

33. William Julius Wilson, *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor* (New York: Knopf, 1996), p. 149.

34. See e.g. Jeffrey Henig, *Rethinking School Choice: Limits of the Marketplace Metaphor* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1994), pp. 165–66; Bruce Fuller and Richard Elmore, eds., *Who Chooses? Who Loses? Culture, Institutions and the Unequal Effects of School Choice* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1996), pp. 13–14, 189; Edward B. Fiske and Helen F. Ladd, *When Schools Compete: A Cautionary Tale* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2000).

35. See Charles Willie and Michael Alves, *Controlled Choice: A New Approach to School Desegregated Education and School Improvement*, Education Alliance Press and the New England Desegregation Assistance Center, Brown University, Providence, R.I., 1996.

36. See e.g. Peter W. Cookson, Jr., *School Choice: The Struggle for the Soul of America* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale University Press, 1994), pp. 61, 63; Henig, *Rethinking School Choice*, pp. 123–24.

37. For example, in Seattle, Washington, when poor children received 36 percent more funding than other students, middle-class schools did not treat this amount of money as sufficient incentive to recruit low-income children. See Kim Murphy, "Seattle's School Program Sets Off Marketing Frenzy," *Los Angeles Times*, April 9, 1998, p. A1. One recent study suggested that the cost of providing an adequate education to low-income children is more than double (139 percent more) than the cost of educating other children. See *Report of the Commission on Education Finance, Equity, and Excellence* (Thornton Commission), State of Maryland, November 9, 2001, p. 3.

38. "Backing the Bus," *New Republic*, February 24, 1982, p.7; Gary Orfield, *Must We Bus? Segregated Schools and National Policy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1978), p. 114.

39. *Digest of Education Statistics 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2001), Table 52. Even under St. Louis's plan, which involved interdistrict choice (longer distances), and, originally, allowed choice of any of 122 schools within sixteen suburban areas (as opposed to more limited choice within a given geographic zone), the cost per pupil was \$2000, which the business community believed to be a far better investment than compensatory spending in segregated schools. See the background paper by William Freivogel for this Task Force.

40. "Active Community Environments," U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Washington, D.C., May 2000.

41. Even Catholic schools, which are traditionally less selective than other private schools, often require admissions tests. At the high school level, 70 percent of Catholic schools require students to take an admissions test. See Anthony S. Bryk, Valerie E. Lee, and Peter B. Holland, *Catholic Schools and the Common Good* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1993), p. 128. Some 40 percent of Catholic elementary and secondary schools now have waiting lists. See Timothy Egan, "The Changing Face of Catholic Education," *New York Times Education Life*, August 6, 2000, p. 28.

42. In Florida, where the voucher statute included a requirement of lottery admission, just 7 percent of the state's private schools signed up to take part in the program even after state officials extended the deadline. Robert Sanchez, "Few Schools Joining Plan," *Miami Herald*, April 18, 2000, p. 1B, and Leslie Clark, "More Schools Willing to Use Vouchers," *Miami Herald*, May 23, 2000, p. 1A.

43. See Martin Carnoy, "National Voucher Plans in Chile and Sweden: Did Privatization Reforms Make for Better Education?" *Comparative Education Review*, August 1998, pp. 309, 318, 320, 333-36; Fiske and Ladd, *When Schools Compete*; Rusk, Frieling, and Groenemeijer, *Inside Game/Outside Game: Segregation and Spatial Planning*.

44. *Digest of Education Statistics, 2000* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, 2001), Table 60.

45. Albert Shanker, quoted in Sara Mosle, "What Really Matters in Education," *New York Times Magazine*, October 27, 1996, p. 56.

46. Helen Dewar, "Senate Drops Vouchers from Education Bill," *Washington Post*, June 13, 2001, p. A12.

47. "Smart Growth: Building Better Places to Live, Work, and Play," National Association of Homebuilders, Washington, D.C., 2000, p. 8.

48. The policy was amended slightly in 2001 to lower the set-aside in downtown areas to 12.5 percent. See Theodore Kim, "Duncan Lowers Housing Quota," *Montgomery Gazette*, May 9, 2001, p. A18.

49. See e.g. Jens Ludwig, Helen F. Ladd, and Greg J. Duncan, "Urban Poverty and Educational Outcomes," in William G. Gale and Janet Rothenberg, eds., *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs, 2001* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001), pp. 147–201; James Rosenbaum et al., "Social Integration of Low-Income Black Adults in Middle-Class White Suburbs," *Social Problems* 38 (November 1991): 48–61; and Bruce Katz, "Improve Children's Education with Housing Vouchers," *Bergen Record*, October 20, 2000, p. L11. These studies are especially powerful because they control for self-selection bias by comparing equally motivated families, all of whom have applied for the housing lottery.

50. For example, higher high school graduation rates are associated with reductions in crime. See Lance Lochner and Enrico Moretti, "The Effect of Education on Crime," NBER Working Paper No. W8605, National Bureau of Economic Research, Cambridge, Mass., November 2001.

51. See e.g. David Armor, *Forced Justice: School Desegregation and the Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995), p. 71 ("virtually all studies of desegregation and achievement have found little or no change in achievement or other educational outcomes for white students"). See also Robert L. Crain and Rita E. Mahard, *Desegregation and Black Achievement* (Santa Monica, Calif.: RAND, October 1977), p. 2; and Christopher Jencks and Meredith Phillips, eds., *The Black White Test Score Gap* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1998), p. 26.

52. See e.g. Judith Anderson, Debra Hollinger and Joseph Conaty, *Poverty and Achievement: Re-examining the Relationship between School Poverty and Student Achievement* (Washington, D.C.: Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1992), pp. 2–5; Puma et al., *Prospects*, p. 12; Jonathan Crane, "Effects of Neighborhoods on Dropping Out of School and Teenage Childbearing," in Christopher Jencks and Paul Peterson, eds., *The Urban Underclass* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1991), p. 317; J. Douglas Willms, "Social Class Segregation and Its Relationship to Pupils' Examination Results in Scotland," *American Sociological Review* 51 (April 1986): 226; and Jonathan Crane, "The Epidemic Theory of Ghettoes and Neighborhood Effects of Dropping Out and Teenage Childbearing," *American Journal of Sociology* 5 (March 1991): 1241, 1227, 1236, 1240, 1231.

53. See *Digest of Education Statistics, 1999* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2000), Table 379 (33.2 percent of students receive federally subsidized lunches); and D'Vera Cohen, "Poverty Down, Income Steady in U.S. Survey," *Washington Post*, September 26, 2001, p. A18 (the Census Bureau puts the poverty rate for children at 16.2 percent in 2000).

54. Coleman et al., *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, pp. 297, 304–5, 22; E. D. Hirsch, *The Schools We Need and Why We Don't Have Them* (New York: Doubleday, 1996), p. 45; Victor Battistich et al., "Schools as Communities, Poverty Levels of Student Populations, and Students' Attitudes, Motives and Performance: A Multilevel Analysis," *American Educational Research Journal* 32 (Fall 1995): 627, 628, 631, 649; Nina S. Mounts and Laurence Steinberg, "An Ecological Analysis of Peer Influence on Adolescent Grade Point Average and Drug Use," *Developmental Psychology* 31 (1995): 919–20.

55. In the higher education context, for example, the University of Michigan's Patricia Gurin has provided empirical support for the widely held notion that diversity enhances academic learning. See Patricia Gurin, *Expert Testimony in the Cases Gratz v. Bollinger and Grutter v. Bollinger*, Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 1999.

56. "Gallup Poll Topics: Race Relations," November 1999, cited in Orfield with Gordon, *Schools More Separate*, p. 6.

57. Terry Moe, *Schools, Vouchers and the American Public* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 2001), p. 62.

58. *Id.*, p. 333.

59. Steve Farkas and Jean Johnson, *Time to Move On: African-American and White Parents Set an Agenda for Public Schools* (New York: Public Agenda, 1998), p. 41.

60. Lynn Schnaiberg, "More Students Taking Advantage of School Choice, Report Says," *Education Week*, September 22, 1999, p. 6 (citing report by Policy Analysis for California Education that 6.7 million students attend public schools of choice compared with 5.2 million attending private schools).

61. David Rusk, "The 'Segregation Tax,'" Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy Survey Series, Washington, D.C., October 2001, p. 9.

62. Sandra Feldman, Statement to the Task Force, June 5, 2001.

63. Jodi Wilgoren, "Chicago Uses Preschool to Lure Middle Class," *New York Times*, June 15, 2001, p. A1.

64. Carole Bass, "The Iron Sheff," *Fairfield County Weekly*, September 27, 2001, p. 10.

65. U.S. Department of Education, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Executive Summary, January 7, 2002, p. 1.

66. U.S. Department of Education, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Detailed Summary, January 7, 2002, p. 1.

67. See e.g. Andrew Trotter, "Teachers Propose Integrating Schools by Socioeconomic Status," *Education Week*, December 2, 1998.

68. Tom Zeller, "Calculating One Kind of Middle Class," *New York Times*, October 29, 2000, sec. 4, p. 5.

69. Compare *Eisenberg v. Montgomery County Pub. Schs.*, 197 F.3d 123 (4th Cir. 1999) cert. denied 120 U.S. 1420 (2000); and *Wessmann v. Gittens* 160 F.3d 790 (1st Cir. 1998) (striking down race-conscious plans) with *Brewer v. West Irondequoit*, 212 F.3d 738 (2nd Cir. 2000) (upholding use of race in approval of inter-district urban-suburban transfers designed to reduce racial and ethnic isolation) and *Hunter v. The Regents of the Univ. of Calif.*, 190 F.3d 1061 (9th Cir. 1999) cert. denied 531 U.S. 877 (2000) (holding that California had a sufficiently compelling interest in operating a research-oriented school dedicated to improving the quality of education and considering race in admissions).

70. See *City of Richmond v. J.A. Croson Co.*, 488 U.S. 469 (1989); *Adarand Constructors Inc. v. Peña*, 515 U.S. 200 (1995).

71. See e.g. *James v. Valtierra*, 402 U.S. 137 (1971); *Harris v. McRae*, 448 U.S. 297 (1980).

72. In jurisdictions where the lingering effects of past *de jure* segregation have not been fully eradicated, using race in student assignment is both appropriate and constitutionally required. We also support considerations of economic status in those jurisdictions.

73. Jack Balkin, "Is the 'Brown' Decision Fading into Irrelevance?" *Chronicle of Higher Education*, November 9, 2001.

74. To satisfy "strict scrutiny," the state's goal must be "compelling" and the means "narrowly tailored." Courts are split on the question of whether the educational benefits of racial diversity constitute a "compelling" justification, and, in any event, generally require, as a condition of "narrow tailoring," that race-neutral means be tried. See e.g. *Engineering Contractors Ass'n of South Florida v. Metropolitan Dade County*, 122 F.3d 895 (11th Cir. 1997).

75. Chaplin's paper finds that much depends on how socioeconomic integration is implemented. When integration occurs to the consolidated metropolitan statistical area (CSMA) level, a plan to integrate by income will achieve up to 80 percent as much black/white integration as it does poor/non-poor integration. On the other hand, balancing students economically to the existing district level results in a black/white dissimilarity reduction of 56 percent of the socioeconomic reduction.

76. See e.g. Crain and Mahard, *Desegregation Plans that Raise Black Achievement*, p. 29. For a summary of these studies, see Kahlenberg, *All Together Now*, pp. 35–36 and 93–95.

77. See e.g. Philip J. Cook and Jens Ludwig, "The Burden of 'Acting White': Do Black Adolescents Disparage Academic Achievement?" in Jencks and Phillips, *The Black-White Test Score Gap*, pp. 383, 386; Judith Rich Harris, *The Nurture Assumption* (New York: Free Press, 1998), p. 250; Gary Natriello and Aaron Pallas, "The Development and Impact of High Stakes Testing," in Gary Orfield and Mindy Kornhaber, eds., *Raising Standards or Raising Barriers?* (New York: Century Foundation Press, 2001); National Center for Education Statistics, *Dropout Rates in the United States: 1999* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, November 2000), pp. 6–7.

78. Gary Orfield, *Must We Bus?* p. 69.

79. See William H. Frey, "Melting Pot Suburbs: A Census 2000 Study of Suburban Diversity," Brookings Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy Census 2000 Series, Washington, D.C., June 2001. See also D'Vera Cohn and Sarah Cohen, "D.C. Region a Growth Capital," *Washington Post*, April 3, 2001, p. A1. (In Washington, D.C., metropolitan area, 74.8 percent of blacks live in the suburbs. In Atlanta, the figure is 78.5 percent. By contrast, in New York City, the figure is 6.8 percent.)

80. "Quality Counts," *Education Week*, January 8, 1998, p. 9.

81. Orfield with Gordon, *Schools More Separate*, p.1.

82. Jeffrey R. Henig and Stephen D. Sugarman, "The Nature and Extent of School Choice," in Stephen D. Sugarman and Frank R. Kemerer, eds., *School Choice and Social Controversy* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press, 1999), p. 29 (300,000 use interdistrict public school choice); Diane Ravitch, "The Right Thing: Why Liberals Should be Pro-Choice," *New Republic*, October 8, 2001, p. 35 (14,000 publicly funded voucher students).

83. See e.g. Bruce Katz and Joel Rogers, "Metropolitan Power," in Robert L. Borosage and Roger Hickey, eds., *The Next Agenda* (Boulder, Colo.: Westview Press, 2001), p. 195 (every \$1,000 gained or lost in per capita city income associated with at least a \$690 gain or loss in per capita suburban income).

84. The consensus on this point ranges from Diane Ravitch, *The Troubled Crusade: American Education 1945–1980* (New York: Basic Books, 1983), p. 167, to Gary Orfield, *Must We Bus?* p. 279.

85. David Rusk, October 31, 2001, Task Force meeting.

86. The leading articles on this topic are James E. Ryan, "Sheff, Segregation, and School Finance Litigation," *New York University Law Review* 74 (May 1999): 529–73; and James E. Ryan, "Schools, Race, and Money," *Yale Law Journal* 109 (November 1999): 249–316.

87. Although the court in *Sheff* relied on a combination of constitutional provisions—saying that the right to an equal education is "informed" by a fairly unusual constitutional provision against segregation—the basic reasoning in *Sheff* could be applied in states that lack Connecticut's segregation

clause. See Ryan, "Sheff," p. 546. The Minneapolis case was settled out of court, and the Rochester plaintiffs are appealing a negative decision, but advocates recall that *Brown* itself took many years of hard work to win, and then to enforce.

88. See e.g. Richard F. Elmore and Deanna Burney, "Investing in Teacher Learning: Staff Development and Instructional Improvement in Community School District #2, New York City," paper prepared for the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, August, 1997.

89. See e.g. Amy Stuart Wells and Robert Crain, *Stepping Over the Color Line* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997), pp. 98, 102 (contrasting the success of the St. Louis integration plan with the failure of the Kansas City compensatory spending plan).

90. Ruy Teixeira, "Critical Support: The Public View of Public Education," in Richard D. Kahlenberg, ed., *A Notion at Risk: Preserving Public Education as an Engine for Social Mobility* (New York: Century Foundation Press, 2000), p. 269.

91. James Fallows, "Strengths, Weaknesses, and Lessons of Japanese Education," *Education Digest* 57 (October 1991): 57.

92. Donna Walker James, Sonia Jurich, and Steve Estes, *Raising Minority Academic Achievement: A Compendium of Educational Programs and Practices* (Washington, D.C.: The American Youth Policy Forum, 2001).

93. Edmund W. Gordon and Beatrice L. Bridglall, "The Challenge of Reducing the High Incidence of Academic Developments in Minority Students," (in press).

94. Edmund W. Gordon and A. Saa Meroe, "Alternatives in the Acceleration of Academic Achievement: School Reform, Supplantation, and Supplementation," (in press).

95. Uri Treisman, "Studying Students Studying Calculus," *College Mathematics Journal* 23 (November 1992): 362-72.

96. U.S. Department of Education, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Executive Summary, January 7, 2002, p. 2.

97. See Amy Stuart Wells et al., "Charter Schools and Racial and Social Class Segregation: Yet Another Sorting Machine?" in Kahlenberg, *A Notion at Risk*, pp. 169-221.

98. Under current law, Congress is authorized to spend \$13.5 billion on Title I in FY 2002, rising to \$25 billion in FY 2007, compared to \$125 million annually for the Magnet Schools Assistance program See U.S. Department of Education, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, Detailed Summary, January 7, 2002, p. 120.

99. For discussions of La Crosse, Wake County, and Cambridge, see background papers prepared for this Task Force. See also Michael Fletcher, "Diversity's Future? Socioeconomic Criteria, Not Race, Used to Desegregate San Francisco Schools," *Washington Post*, March 18, 2002, p. A1, and San