

# *Bringing Children Together*

## MAGNET SCHOOLS AND PUBLIC HOUSING REDEVELOPMENT

January 2009

By Philip Tegeler, Susan Eaton, and Westra Miller

*Charles  
Hamilton  
Houston* INSTITUTE FOR  
RACE & JUSTICE  
HARVARD LAW SCHOOL  
CAMBRIDGE, MA

**PRRAC**  
*Poverty & Race  
Research Action Council*  
WASHINGTON, DC

Supported by a grant from the Open Society Institute



## Table of Contents

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
| I.   | Introduction: linking school, housing and Justice Reinvestment policy .....   | 2  |
| II.  | The relationship between school and housing segregation .....   | 3  |
| III. | Current examples of public housing redevelopment and school reform efforts.....                                     | 10 |
| IV.  | Adapting HOPE VI and the public housing school reform model to promote racial and economic school integration ..... | 13 |
| V.   | Adapting the Magnet Schools Assistance Act to support public housing redevelopment.....                             | 15 |
| VI.  | Bringing together school, housing, and Justice Reinvestment policy in high poverty neighborhoods.....               | 17 |
| VII. | Conclusion .....  | 20 |

## Appendices

|             |   |    |
|-------------|---|----|
| Appendix A: | The “Opportunity Housing and Schools Act of 2009” ..... | 21 |
| Appendix B: | February 29, 2008 Conference Agenda .....               | 22 |
| Appendix C: | List of Conference Attendees .....                      | 24 |

## I. Introduction: linking school, housing, and Justice Reinvestment policy

This report grows out of a conference roundtable on public housing redevelopment, magnet schools, and Justice Reinvestment held on February 29, 2008, in Tampa, Florida. The roundtable was made possible through the financial support of the Open Society Institute (OSI).<sup>1</sup> It was organized and hosted by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC) and the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard Law School. The roundtable brought together the nation's leading magnet school developers and planners of HOPE VI and public housing redevelopment projects. The goal of the gathering was to collaboratively assess the feasibility of using these proven approaches — magnet schools and HOPE VI — simultaneously. The roundtable was also part of a series of strategic collaborative discussions<sup>2</sup> that explored the potential of deliberately linking housing and school policy in the wake of the Supreme Court's 2007 decision in *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District*.<sup>3</sup>

Our strategic discussion in Tampa focused on communities already targeted for “Justice Reinvestment” initiatives. This emerging movement makes strategic investments and seeks structural change in low-opportunity neighborhoods that have historically sent disproportionate numbers of their residents to prison and to where many formerly incarcerated people will return.<sup>4</sup> The guiding aspiration of the Justice Reinvestment movement is to reverse this cycle of incarceration through preventative programs, policies and practice in public safety, education, employment training, private sector

- 
- 1 The 2008 roundtable was funded by a grant from the Open Society Institute's Justice Reinvestment project, headed by Susan Tucker. We are also grateful for ongoing support from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, which has helped to support PRRAC's work on housing and education. This final report is also indebted to the insights of Deborah McKoy, Director of the Center for Cities and Schools at the University of California, Berkeley; Barbara Samuels, managing housing attorney at the ACLU of Maryland; and Michael Thompson of the Council of State Governments Justice Center.
  - 2 These meetings included a December 3, 2007 conference at the Annie E. Casey Foundation in Baltimore on “Housing Mobility and Education,” sponsored by PRRAC; a conference at the Center for Cities and Schools in Berkeley, California for policymakers, town and city planners and school officials on complementary housing revitalization and school improvement policies; and roundtables in Cambridge, Massachusetts and San Francisco, both sponsored by the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute, on next steps after the *Parents Involved* case.
  - 3 This June 28, 2007 Supreme Court decision limited school districts' power to take race into account in making school assignments. The court did not rule out consideration of race in student assignment. A majority of justices did recognize the ability of school districts to consider race under certain circumstances. An examination of housing policy to support school diversity is particularly relevant in light of this decision because Justice Kennedy, in his controlling opinion listed housing policy and planning as one potential avenue that could achieve diversity and avoid poverty concentration.
  - 4 For general information on Justice Reinvestment, see the website from the Justice Center of the Council of State Governments: <http://justicereinvestment.org/resources> The Justice Center provides technical assistance to several states where there has been demonstrated interest in pursuing strategies to reduce spending on corrections and reinvest the money in the neighborhoods to which most people return after prison.

investments, health-related services, improvements in food environments, and other efforts that connect residents to opportunities in the larger society. Linked school and housing desegregation efforts are particularly relevant to the emerging Justice Reinvestment movement because of the close relationship between incarceration, neighborhood poverty, racial isolation, and school composition. For example, Wichita District I, a focus of our discussion in Tampa, sends a disproportionate number of poor black residents to prison. It is also the site for a Justice Reinvestment demonstration effort and a large HOPE VI project. Combining these housing and Justice Reinvestment efforts could potentially transform neighborhood housing and the local schools into less racially isolated, poverty concentrated institutions. Concentrated poverty and segregation have long been linked to a series of negative outcomes, including incarceration and low graduation rates.<sup>5</sup> Lack of a high school education has long been a reliable predictor of future incarceration. Thus, systematically reducing the conditions of concentrated poverty and segregation offers a promising start toward increasing high school graduation rates and ultimately reducing incarceration rates. It was with this justification that we convened the conference in Tampa.

We held the conference in Tampa because it is home to the Hillsborough County school district. Educators in this well-regarded district use a combination of magnet schools and school choice techniques to maintain diversity in its schools. The county superintendent, Mary Ellen Elia, played a central role in our convening. She is a nationally respected magnet school planner. Other participants in the roundtable included leading planners and developers in HOPE VI public housing redevelopment, leading magnet school planners and administrators, civil rights and housing advocates, education researchers, and representatives from the Justice Reinvestment movement. A full list of attendees and the roundtable agenda is included in the Appendix.

The particular insights of this convening contribute directly to other efforts to combine school and housing policy in support of civil rights goals. To provide context for our findings on HOPE VI and magnet school development, we offer an overview of the research literature on the relationship between housing and schools.

## **II. The relationship between school and housing segregation**

Scholars and practitioners have long acknowledged the direct connection between housing discrimination and the segregation and economic isolation of children in our

---

5 Lance Lochner and Enrico Moretti. The Effect of Education on Crime: Evidence from Prison Inmates, Arrests and Self-Reports. Working Paper 8605, National Bureau of Economic Research, November, 2003.

nation's public schools.<sup>6</sup> Similarly, more than four decades of research documents that factors outside of the classroom – housing quality and concentrated poverty of neighborhoods being two of the most powerful ones – are reliable predictors of a child's performance in school and his long-term educational attainment.<sup>7</sup> Such awareness, however, has not yet engendered an abundance of on-the-ground efforts that seek to link housing and school policy or practice. Housing-related planning rarely even takes into consideration potential effects — say, segregation levels, overcrowding, etc. — on a community's public schools.<sup>8</sup> Similarly, education-related policies are often made in a “vacuum” with little to no effort to incorporate housing or community redevelopment actors into planning or into community based efforts that might, for example, provide supports for children during out of school time and help them fulfill their potential in the classroom.<sup>9</sup>

This brief overview begins by describing the relationship between housing/residential patterns and schooling opportunities. We then turn to the limited literature that both justifies the need to link policymaking and practice of both fields with the shared goal of enhance opportunity and improving life chances. Similarly, we review the limited literature on the challenges of combining school and housing policy to enhance opportunity in challenged communities. It should be noted that much of this literature was summarized previously by one of our conference presenters, Deborah McKoy and her colleague, Jeffrey Vincent, co-founders of the Center for Cities and Schools at the University of California at Berkeley.<sup>10</sup>

Generally speaking, research demonstrates that attempts to reduce school segregation or even to increase education opportunities without incorporating an understanding of

---

6 Generally, see Douglas Massey. “Origins of Economic Disparities: The Historical Role of Housing Segregation,” in Segregation: The Rising Costs for America. 39-81. (James H. Carr & Nandinee K. Kutty, eds. 2008); Xavier de Sousa Briggs. “More Pluribus, Less Unum? The Changing Geography of Race and Opportunity,” in The Geography of Opportunity. (Xavier de Souza Briggs, ed.) 2005.

7 For example, Clarence Stone, Kathryn Doherty, Cheryl Jones & Timothy Ross, “Schools and Disadvantaged Neighborhoods,” in Urban Problems and Community Development (Ronald F. Ferguson & William T. Dickens, eds., 1999.); Richard Rothstein, Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap. (2004).

8 Richard K. Norton. “Planning for School Facilities,” Journal of Planning Education and Research, Vol. 26, No. 4, 478-496. (2007). Heather Kinlaw, Deborah McKoy & Jeffrey Vincent. Promising Practices to Improve Schools and Communities: A Survey of Highly Collaborative and Comprehensive Education Reform Efforts. The Center for Cities & Schools. University of California, Berkeley. July, 2007.

9 Richard K. Norton. “Planning for School Facilities,” Journal of Planning Education and Research, Vol. 26, No. 4, 478-496. (2007); McKoy and Vincent. Deborah McKoy and Jeffrey Vincent. “Housing and Education: The Inextricable Link” in Segregation: The Rising Costs for America. (James H. Carr & Nandinee K. Kutty, eds.) 2008.

10 Deborah McKoy and Jeffrey Vincent. “Housing and Education: The Inextricable Link” in Segregation: The Rising Costs for America. (James H. Carr & Nandinee K. Kutty, eds.) 2008.

the implications of demographics and attempting to reverse housing segregation as well, threatens to produce impermanent and limited remedies.<sup>11</sup> As Clarence Stone and his colleagues point out in their 1999 paper, “. . . bad schools and decaying neighborhoods are a familiar and disheartening combination seemingly locked together.”<sup>12</sup> Thus emerges the pattern of oft-termed “bad” or “troubled” or “poor and failing” schools in high-poverty segregated neighborhoods and “good,” “high-achieving” schools in middle-income, disproportionately white communities. Concentrated poverty, thus, essentially creates overburdened schools where educators must contend with an array of challenges related to poverty – neighborhood violence, poor health, anxiety related to economic instability, incarceration of family members, and the list goes on.<sup>13</sup>

Concentrated poverty is on the rise in the United States. From 1999 to 2005, the number of low income tax filers living in high poverty neighborhoods increased 40 percent or by 1.6 million people.<sup>14</sup> As the most recent report on concentrated poverty, from the Brookings Institution, emphasizes, “The concentration of poor people and families into economically segregated neighborhoods imposes additional costs and limitations on these residents and communities above and beyond the challenges associated with individual poverty.” The “wide-ranging” consequences of concentrated poverty, report author Alan Berube explains, include hindered educational opportunity, less private-sector investment, higher prices for goods, higher crime rates and negative health outcomes and a decline in home values which inhibits wealth building.<sup>15</sup>

- 
- 11 See, generally, Gary Orfield and Susan Eaton. Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education. 1996.
  - 12 Clarence Stone, Kathryn Doherty, Cheryl Jones & Timothy Ross. “Schools and Disadvantaged Neighborhoods,” in Urban Problems and Community Development (Ronald F. Ferguson & William T. Dickens, eds., 1999.); Richard Rothstein, Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap. 2004.
  - 13 William Julius Wilson. When Work Disappears. The World of the New Urban Poor. Vintage. 1997; Philip Kasinitz and Jan Rosenberg. “Missing the Connection: Social Isolation and Employment on the Brooklyn Waterfront,” Social Problems 43 (2) 1996: 180-197; Kathryn Neckerman and Joleen Kirschenman. “Hiring Strategies, Racial Bias and Inner-City Workers,” Social Problems 38(4). 1991; Robert Sampson and William Julius Wilson. “Toward a Theory of Race, Crime, and Urban Inequality,” in Crime and Inequality, (John Hagan and Ruth Peterson, eds.) Stanford University Press. 1995; Deborah Cohen. “Neighborhood Physical Conditions and Health,” American Journal of Public Health. 93 (3) 2003: 467-71; Jeanne Brooks-Gunn and Tama Leventhal. “Moving to Opportunity: An Experimental Study of Neighborhood Effects on Mental Health,” American Journal of Public Health. 93 (9) 2003: 1576-82; Robert Sampson. “The Embeddedness of Child and Adolescent Development: A Community-Level Perspective on Urban Violence,” in Violence and Childhood in the Inner City. (Joan McCord, ed.) 1997. Cambridge University Press. 61-64.
  - 14 Elizabeth Kneebone and Alan Berube. Reversal of Fortune: A New Look at Concentrated Poverty in the 2000s. The Metropolitan Policy Program. The Brookings Institution. August, 2008.
  - 15 Ibid.

The United States' long history of housing discrimination need not be recounted here.<sup>16</sup> Generally, though, our current patterns of racial isolation and poverty concentration in public schools, research clearly shows, stem from a web of confounded policies and practices in the arena of housing that stretch back over several decades.

Efforts to intervene and reverse the developing patterns of metropolitan segregation were greatly limited by the 1974 Supreme Court decision *Milliken v. Bradley*. This decision prohibited urban school districts from including their nearby suburbs in their school desegregation plans unless the city district could prove intentional discrimination.<sup>17</sup> This cut off a route toward desegregation and deconcentration of poverty, implied the suburbs were a “desegregation free” zone, sped up white flight from cities and essentially cemented in place the ubiquitous pattern of racial and economic segmentation that characterizes our metro areas today. Much evidence was presented at the *Milliken* case that linked suburban housing policy and racial discrimination to the growing concentration of poor African Americans in the city of Detroit. But in a 5-4 decision, the Supreme Court disagreed, with one Justice remarkably describing the causes of housing segregation in Detroit as “unknown and perhaps unknowable” (Stewart, J., concurring).<sup>18</sup> This conclusion contradicted an ever growing knowledge base. But, post-*Milliken* efforts to reduce segregation were, with a few notable exceptions, forced to operate within a judicial framework of non-engagement and political apathy. Meanwhile, a popular misconception seemed to prevail: That growing shares of black and Latino children attend segregated schools widely perceived as “bad” and the vast majority of white children attend well-functioning schools is somehow natural, a condition with no acceptable cure and no insidious cause.

Thus the “isolation” of geographically identifiable groups of people from mainstream opportunity was set in motion by historical discrimination and continues to be reinforced by well-documented present-day discrimination and government policy.<sup>19</sup> It has been and continues to be compounded by decisions of middle income people with children – in the absence of stable, integrated school choices – to move further and further away from racially changing communities and into more economically and racially homogenous communities.

---

16 For a recent summary and update, see [The Future of Fair Housing: Report of the National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity](#) (December 2008), available at [www.prrac.org](http://www.prrac.org)

17 *Milliken v. Bradley*, 418 U.S. 717, 756 n.2 (1974).

18 *Ibid.*

19 See generally, Douglas Massey & Nancy Denton. *American Apartheid*. 1998. Harvard University Press.; Thomas Sugrue, [The Origins of the Urban Crisis: Race and Inequality in Postwar Detroit](#). 2005. Princeton University Press; [The Future of Fair Housing](#) (supra note 16); Philip Tegeler, “The Persistence of Segregation in Government Housing Programs,” in Xavier de Souza Briggs, ed, [The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America](#) (Brookings Institution Press 2005)



Even during the 1990s — a time of declining shares of neighborhood concentrated poverty — <sup>20</sup> levels of concentration poverty *increased* in our public schools. This is because public school not only mirrors, but magnifies trends in the larger society.<sup>21</sup> Statistically, children of all racial groups are generally more segregated than adults are. And while some racial minority children might not live in technically high-poverty neighborhoods, they would still, in many cases, attend high-poverty schools. As of 2003, a typical black or Latino student attended a school where nearly half the students are poor. This is more than twice the share of poverty found in the school of a typical white student, where 80 percent of his or her classmates will also be white. More than 60 percent of Latino and African American students go to high-poverty schools where more than half the students are poor. <sup>22</sup>

Poverty per se is generally harsher for African American and Latino children of color precisely because poor black and Latino children are far more likely than white children to live in poor neighborhoods and also attend higher poverty schools.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, a 2008 study of 100 large U.S. metropolitan areas conducted by Dolores Acevedo-Garcia and her colleagues at the Harvard School of Public Health, clearly demonstrates that unlike the typical poor white child, the typical poor black and or Latino child lives in a “low opportunity” environment.<sup>24</sup> “The typical neighborhood environment is much worse for black and Latino children than for white children,” the researchers write. In this study, published in the journal *Health Affairs*, researchers found that Black and Latino children “consistently” live in more disadvantaged neighborhoods than white children, even the poorest white children.<sup>25</sup> What’s more, Acevedo-Garcia and her colleagues write, “a large fraction of black and Latino children consistently experience “double jeopardy” – that is, they live in poor families and in poor neighborhoods.”

---

20 For a discussion on the meaning of “concentrated poverty” and the measures, see, Alan Berube and Elizabeth Kneebone. [The Enduring Challenge of Concentrated Poverty in America](#). The Brookings Institution. October 2008.

21 Eaton, Susan. [The Children In Room E4: American Education on Trial](#). 2007. Algonquin; Cashin, Sheryl. [The Failure of Integration: How Race and Class are Undermining the American Dream](#). Public Affairs. July 2005.

22 Gary Orfield and Chungmei Lee. [Why Segregation Matters: Poverty and Educational Inequality](#). The Civil Rights Project. 2005.

23 Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, Nancy McArdle and Teresa Osypuk, et al. (2007). [Children Left Behind: How Metropolitan Areas are Failing America’s Children](#). Boston: Harvard School of Public Health, Center for the Advancement of Health. Available from [www.diversitydata.sph.harvard.edu](http://www.diversitydata.sph.harvard.edu).

24 The study analyzed neighborhood-level (census tract level) data for the 100 metropolitan areas with the largest child populations, which comprise 45 million children. Within each area, they looked at the distribution of children and poor children of racial and ethnic groups across neighborhoods with different levels of opportunity. This included rates of poverty, ownership rates, unemployment, and the share of adults without a high school diploma.

“White children,” the study concludes, “very rarely experience double jeopardy.”

“Residential segregation, the researchers write, “is at the root of racial and ethnic disparities in access to opportunity neighborhoods.”

Since 1966, scholars have documented the profound effect of concentrated poverty upon children and the school institution.<sup>26</sup> It is one of the most consistent findings in educational literature. With his 2005 book, *Class and Schools*, Richard Rothstein brought these decades old insights back into the public discourse, updated them and offered an array of “out of school” policy solutions for closing the much-lamented achievement gap.<sup>27</sup>

He writes: “Disadvantaged students’ low performance has many mutually reinforcing causes. We’re the most unequal society in the industrialized world; it would be silly to expect academic performance to be equal when nothing else is. Every industrialized society has achievement gaps. Ours are bigger because our economic system is more unequal.”<sup>28</sup>

One concrete example, here, is that lack of decent, affordable housing forces economically unstable families to move from neighborhood to neighborhood and from school to school. Research has repeatedly found that excessive moves have negative effects, not merely upon the child doing the moving and resettling and readjusting, but upon the smooth functioning of a school. Teachers face the challenge of incorporating children who may not be at the same level as other students or who are experiencing the difficult emotions associated with moving. Stable housing and stable, well-functioning schools can work in concert promise to ameliorate these well-documented challenges. High poverty schools have far higher student mobility rates than middle class schools, have a more difficult time attracting and retaining teachers and thus tend to employ less qualified teachers.<sup>29</sup>

Another presenter at our Tampa meeting, Professor Myron Orfield, has written extensively about the impact that poor, narrowly conceived planning and fragmented

---

25 Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, Teresa Osypuk, Nancy McArdle and David Williams. (2008). “Toward a Policy-Relevant Analysis of Geographic and Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Child Health.” *Health Affairs* 27(2), 321-333.

26 Coleman, James S. *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (1966)

27 Richard Rothstein, *Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap*. The Economic Policy Institute (2004).

28 Richard Rothstein. “What’s causing the gap? Who or what is to blame for lagging performance by minority students?” *The Los Angeles Times*. November 28, 2007.

29 For example, Brian Jacob, “The Challenges of Staffing Urban Schools with Effective Teachers,” in *The Future of Children* (2007). 129-53.

governmental structures have had upon job and educational opportunities and the conditions in cities and older working-class suburbs.<sup>30</sup> The work of Orfield and others, including former Albuquerque Mayor David Rusk<sup>31</sup>, have increased awareness of the link between land use, housing, suburban sprawl and declining opportunity. This research has invigorated interest in regional-based planning that brings together people from a variety of sectors and many different types of communities. The goal here is to reduce burdens of social problems, in part by breaking up concentrated poverty and by using land and government forces to create healthier, more prosperous, fairer regions.

Education has not always played a central role in such regionalization and “smart growth” movements, though in 2003, the Kellogg Foundation, in partnership with the Public Education Network and Smart Growth America launched a “Smart Schools Initiative.”<sup>32</sup> The stated goal of the initiative is to “bridge the movements for education equity and for smart growth. It aims to build healthier, more sustainable communities, especially for our most vulnerable children.” This is related to the concept of “smart growth” an emerging effort to make schools centers of communities. This also engenders cooperation between school and housing planners, educators and other government officials. Under this idea, schools are not just places of learning, but serve as community centers and venues for events that enhance life and improve public safety in neighborhoods. Such efforts can be seen in have focused upon creating new structures to make it easier for housing and school officials and planners to work together.<sup>33</sup> Broader efforts to link the school improvement and education equity movements with the movements for regionalism and “smart growth,” are surely compatible with efforts to implement HOPE VI and magnet school efforts in concert.

There are notable exceptions to the more typical arrangement in which school and housing officials plan and work separately. Some of these exceptions were discussed and analyzed at our Tampa meeting and are highlighted in later sections of this report. But taking the next step toward collaboration requires, too, being prepared for the inherent challenges of collaboration. Deborah McKoy and Jeffrey Vincent, who have helped to forge housing and school partnerships in California, point to a “structural disconnect” between the education and housing sectors. Specifically, McKoy and Vincent note, school boards often act autonomously from other municipal authorities.

---

30 Myron Orfield, *American Metropolitcs: The New Suburban Reality*. 2002.

31 David Rusk. *Inside Game, Outside Game: Winning Strategies for Saving Urban America*. 1999.

32 <http://www.smart-schools.org/documents/Overview.pdf>

33 U.S. Department of Education. 2000. *Schools as Centers of Community: A Citizen’s Guide to Planning and Design*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education; Also, Deborah McKoy and Jeffrey M. Vincent. “Housing and Education: The Inextricable Link,” in *Segregation: The Rising Costs for America*. (James H. Carr & Nandinee K. Kutty, eds.) Routledge. 2008.

Thus, there exist few, if any, governmental structures that might align housing and planning with school matters. Further, McKoy and Vincent point to a general “lack of understanding across disciplines” and “different administrative practices, development regulations and operational timelines. Education is predominantly a public resource; whereas housing development occurs primarily in the private sector, driven by market forces.” For example, they say, housing development can respond quickly to demand but school related matters must pass through layers of approval.<sup>34</sup>

“In the private sector, time is money, while in the public sector plans must go through mandatory approval processes that often take significant time,” McKoy and Vincent write.

Participants in the Tampa conference acknowledged these challenges. It was suggested that merging two well-established public, government policies and programs — magnet schools and HOPE VI — which have similar underlying missions, may provide a path around some of the old and newer roadblocks.

### **III. Current examples of public housing redevelopment and school reform efforts**

The federal HOPE VI program is the largest funding mechanism for new public housing development. It provides substantial monies for the redevelopment of “severely distressed” public housing. Under the HOPE VI program, developers typically work with Public Housing Agencies (PHAs) to demolish and rebuild low-income developments that have been identified as physically and socially distressed, and replace them with a new mixed-income development. Meanwhile, low-income “replacement units” are built both on and off the original site – in the past, usually not in sufficient number to accommodate all the families who have been relocated.<sup>35</sup>

Several HOPE VI developers have targeted local schools for reform (and rebuilding) as part of a larger neighborhood redevelopment effort to benefit the residents of the re-designed development.<sup>36</sup> Generally, however, government officials and developers have not made efforts to ameliorate the racial isolation and concentrated poverty experienced

---

34 Deborah McKoy and Jeffrey M. Vincent. “Housing and Education: The Inextricable Link,” in Segregation: The Rising Costs for America. (James H. Carr & Nandinee K. Kutty, eds.) Routledge. 2008.

35 In the past, the program has been criticized by many tenant advocates (including PRRAC) for its failure to replace all the public housing units that were demolished – and its failure to adequately relocate families either back on site or in less segregated areas throughout the city and region. Both of these deficiencies are likely to be addressed in the proposed HOPE VI reauthorization bill that is pending in Congress.

36 See, e.g., Jill Khadduri et al, Reconnecting Schools and Neighborhoods. Abt Associates. 2007.

by children in the local schools. Bringing together HOPE VI and other housing redevelopment programs with a magnet school policy emphasis designed to create diverse schools by drawing from a wide geographic area – both within and across school district lines – offers a promising way to provide high quality, racially and economically diverse educational opportunities for children who live in or near distressed public housing. Similarly, there are several examples across the country of intergovernmental and organizational partnerships that bring together school, community planning, and housing-related activities either for coordination and or more efficient provision of services.<sup>37</sup>

To date, the work that has begun to link public housing redevelopment and education has not been focused on school diversity as a goal. However, existing efforts to improve local schools as part of the housing redevelopment process point the way to future collaborations in support of housing and school integration. In particular, three recent studies have described successful efforts to tie school improvement strategies to neighborhood and public housing revitalization. Such efforts have not sought to alter the underlying demographics of the school, except to the extent that the housing revitalization plan might attract a more economically mixed group of residents. However, they offer an important first step for future housing-school collaborations that more deliberately take racial and economic diversity into account.

■ **Lister Elementary School, Tacoma, WA** (profiled in Martin D. Abravenel, Robin E. Smith, and Elizabeth C. Cove, Urban Institute, *Linking Public Housing Revitalization to Neighborhood School Improvement* (Annie E. Casey Foundation, 2006).

The authors highlight the Tacoma, WA Lister Elementary School and the Salishan HOPE VI development as an example of a successful linkage of school improvement and public housing redevelopment. At the time that Salishan was targeted for HOPE VI funds, 99 percent of children attending nearby Lister lived in the Salishan projects. The school had recently been rebuilt and was widely considered to be one of the better schools in Tacoma. School officials and public housing authorities came together to share information regarding the redevelopment schedule and family relocation process.<sup>38</sup> Lister Elementary itself has served as an attraction to both retain students displaced from Salishan and to

---

37 Testimony of Deborah McCoy to the National Commission on Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity (Chicago), at [www.prrac.org/projects/fairhousingcommission.php](http://www.prrac.org/projects/fairhousingcommission.php); Heather Kinlaw, Deborah McKoy & Jeffrey Vincent *Promising Practices to Improve Schools and Communities: A Survey of Highly Collaborative and Comprehensive Education Reform Efforts*. The Center for Cities & Schools. University of California, Berkeley. July 2007.

38 During a typical HOPE VI redevelopment, existing tenants are relocated to new housing, either in the neighborhood or in other parts of the metropolitan area. This type of collaboration with the school district to track families and children, follow up with student records, etc., is unusual.

draw families to the neighborhood. In addition, the school runs a small gifted program for students throughout the school district. However, although Salishan redevelopment is still in process, Lister's principal expects school demographics to remain unchanged due to the housing development's planned one-for-one replacement of low-income units.

■ **Jefferson Elementary School, St. Louis, MO** (profiled in Sandra M. Moore and Susan K. Glassman, Urban Strategies, *The Neighborhood and Its School in Community Revitalization: Tools for Developers of Mixed-Income Housing Communities.*)

Urban Strategies, a non-profit community development company affiliated with the McCormack Baron real estate development company, is dedicated to building the assets and resources to help families thrive in mixed-income housing. Urban Strategies' inclusion of neighborhood schools in community revitalization plans has been followed in St. Louis, Atlanta, Chicago, and O'Fallon, MO. In this report, the authors report on the success of McCormack Baron's Murphy Park development in St. Louis and the resulting transformation of the Murphy Park neighborhood into a growing community of residents with a range of income levels. By collaborating with the school district, a local foundation, and civic leaders, housing developers were also able to create a strategy for improving the program, staffing, and physical structure of the neighborhood school, Jefferson Elementary. Two key organizations were formed to support students moving from Jefferson to the public secondary school and to locate opportunities for potential partnerships within the community. These organizations guided the search for a new principal, who was able to live in an apartment within the development. According to the report, the close relationship between school leaders and housing development management helps to ensure that changes in a child's behavior or a parent's job loss can inform the services that the family receives as part of the HOPE VI supportive services plan.

■ **John A. Johnson Achievement Plus Elementary, St. Paul, MN** (profiled in Jill Khadduri, Heather Schwartz, and Jennifer Turnham, Abt Associates, Inc., *Reconnecting Schools and Neighborhoods* (Enterprise Community Partners, 2007).

The authors of *Reconnecting Schools* view "school-centered community revitalization" as combining five central goals: (1) improvement of a local school; (2) creation or maintenance of affordable, safe housing; (3) availability of quality child care and early education programs; (4) access to affordable health care; and (5) provision of workforce and economic development programs. Strategies for school-centered housing may include the development of new rental and homeownership units, cash transfers to assist in families' rent pay-

ments, training families regarding home improvement techniques, and low-cost mortgages and down payment assistance for families who purchase homes in the neighborhood.

At the John A. Johnson elementary school in the Payne-Phalen neighborhood of St. Paul, planners have used the “Achievement Plus” charter school model to set a new curriculum, run an onsite, multilingual family services center, and offer meeting and recreational space to the public. Parents who use the family services center have access to such supports as housing trust fund-sponsored rental assistance vouchers. The school is not affiliated with a large public housing redevelopment, but the neighborhood development company, along with partners in the school development, created a revolving loan fund to aid in the renovation or creation of housing for the families of children attending the school. As a result of the fund, 17 units were made available to families. In turn, residential stability for children at the elementary school has improved. In addition, children attending the school are beginning to see some improvement in their test scores.

These examples of school reform in conjunction with housing redevelopment demonstrate the feasibility of linked school-housing programs in high poverty communities. However, they are each limited by an acceptance of the existing school demographics that are built upon decades of public and private housing discrimination and a web of policies and practices that severely limited housing choices for people of color. There is strong evidence that low income children are better served by mixed-income, racially diverse schools.<sup>39</sup> We believe that it is possible for planners, developers, government officials and educators to take an important next step to providing safe, stable housing that helps reverse the trend of low educational opportunity and attainment, which are linked to our crisis of mass incarceration.

#### **IV. Adapting HOPE VI and the public housing school reform model to promote racial and economic school integration**

The federal HOPE VI program is overdue for reauthorization. It has been continued through annual appropriations for the past few years, and additional policy requirements for the program are generally inserted into appropriations language with further detail contained in the annual Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) for the program. In 2006-2007, Congress began an effort to reauthorize the HOPE VI program, with

---

<sup>39</sup> For a recent summary of the research on school integration, see Harvard Civil Rights Project, “Statement of American Social Scientists of Research on School Desegregation,” (2006).

competing bills in the House and Senate. HR 3524, which was passed by the House, has a number of fair housing requirements, but does not mention education.

The Senate HOPE VI bill, S. 829, in contrast, has a strong focus on education, defining the goals of public housing reinvestment to include “excellent outcomes for families, especially children, *with an emphasis on excellent high-performing neighborhood schools and academic achievement*,” and to “sustainable connections between the revitalization of public housing communities and local schools and institutions of higher learning, as a means of supporting educational achievement by children and adults as part of a comprehensive self-sufficiency strategy.” The operative educational requirement of the Senate bill states:

each HOPE VI grant recipient shall establish, in partnership with the local schools and school superintendent, a comprehensive educational reform and achievement strategy, including objective standards and measures for performance, for transforming the neighborhood schools that serve the revitalized HOPE VI sites into high performing schools.

While the focus of the bill is on “neighborhood” schools and it does not mention racial or economic integration of schools, the language of the bill does not preclude such approaches. Another section of the bill notes the possibility of using “other local public schools, charter schools or other accredited schools, that serve the revitalized HOPE VI sites” to develop an educational strategy for children in the development.<sup>40</sup> Likewise, the comments of Senator Mikulski and other sponsors of the Senate bill are encouraging – Senator Schumer, for example, describes the education provisions of the bill “the kind of holistic approach that may be able to transform lives and futures, not just physical surroundings.”<sup>41</sup>

When the HOPE VI bill is raised again later this year, advocates should stress the importance of avoiding poverty concentration in the local schools adjoining the HOPE VI site – and the operative language of the bill should be opened to regional education strate-

---

40 Section 2(d)(3)(c) states: If a public housing agency certifies to the Secretary, with supporting documentation reasonably satisfactory to the Secretary, that the neighborhood schools that serve the revitalized HOPE VI sites are high-performing schools, or that there are schools other than neighborhood schools, such as other local public schools, charter schools or other accredited schools, that serve the revitalized HOPE VI sites, then the public housing agency, in lieu of the [above] requirements...shall establish a comprehensive educational achievement strategy, including objective standards and measures for performance, for students residing at the revitalized HOPE VI sites that involves a level of effort commensurate with the comprehensive educational reform and achievement strategy required....”

41 See US Senate Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, <http://banking.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?Fuseaction=Hearings.Detail&HearingID=6e2ef23a-296f-42a3-b06f-9202dedf6cd6>.



gies. Instead of focusing primarily on “neighborhood” schools, the bill should specifically encourage magnet schools and similar program to break down racial and economic isolation. Such language might include:

each HOPE VI grant recipient shall establish, *in partnership with the state department of education and local school superintendent*, a comprehensive educational reform and achievement strategy, including objective standards and measures for performance, for transforming the schools that serve the revitalized HOPE VI sites into high performing schools, *and encouraging where feasible the development of regional magnet school or interdistrict transfer opportunities to break down concentrated poverty and racial isolation in the schools serving the children in the HOPE VI development.*

## **V. Adapting the Magnet Schools Assistance Act to support public housing redevelopment**

Magnet schools are designed with specialized learning environments or other enhancements to attract a racially and economically diverse student body from inside and outside the neighborhood. Magnet schools provide one of the few voluntary incentives for racial and economic school diversity in our increasingly segregated metropolitan areas. A successful magnet-based school system has the potential to resist the kind of economic and racial separation that appears inevitable in districts and regions where school attendance is dictated by geographic location alone. Robust, long-standing research on the academic benefits of lower school poverty concentrations and the developmental and social benefits of decreased school racial isolation underscore the importance of this work. The recent Supreme Court decision in *Parents Involved in Community Schools v. Seattle School District* will make the development of magnet schools more urgent, because traditional methods of racially assigning students to avoid segregation may now raise constitutional concerns. The voluntary integration approach offered by regional magnet schools can achieve economic and racial diversity without assigning students by race.

The most important funding support for magnet schools comes through the U.S. Department of Education. The Magnet Schools Assistance Program (MSAP) is a competitive, discretionary federal grants program [most recently] authorized under the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 and administered by the US Department of Education. The program was conceived with the express purpose of aiding in both voluntary and court-ordered desegregation through the creation and operation of magnet schools.<sup>42</sup> Among its specific goals, MSAP seeks to ensure “the elimination, reduction, or preven-

---

42 See Elementary and Secondary Education Act, 20 U.S.C.A §§ 7231(a)-(b). (West 2008).

tion of minority group isolation in elementary schools and secondary schools with substantial proportions of minority students” as well as to support “the development and design of innovative educational methods and practices that promote diversity and increase choices in public elementary schools and public secondary schools and public educational programs.”<sup>43</sup>

Some state departments of education are also making funds available for magnet schools. In Connecticut, for example, the state is involved in the funding of over forty magnet schools to promote racial and economic diversity in the most segregated urban districts.<sup>44</sup>

### *A fair housing mandate for the Department of Education*

The federal Department of Education has an obligation to consider the impact of its programs on housing segregation and to take steps to promote fair housing, through Executive Order 12892 (“Leadership and Coordination of Fair Housing in Federal Programs: Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing”). This 1994 Executive Order created a “President’s Fair Housing Council” to encourage support of fair housing across multiple agencies (like the Department of Education) that have an impact on fair housing.<sup>45</sup> The Council and its member agencies are directed to:

review the design and delivery of Federal programs and activities to ensure that they support a coordinated strategy to affirmatively further fair housing. The Council shall propose revisions to existing programs or activities, develop pilot programs and activities, and propose new programs and activities to achieve its goals.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development is directed to provide technical assistance to the Council and to assist agencies “in the formulation of policies and procedures to implement this order.”<sup>46</sup>

### *Encouraging magnet schools near public housing redevelopment sites*

The federal magnet schools program presents an excellent opportunity for Department of Education to participate proactively in the efforts of the President’s Fair Housing Council. The current regulations governing the selection of grantees focus on the “effectiveness of [a local educational agency’s] plan to recruit students from different

---

43 §§ 7231(b)(1), (b)(3).

44 See, [www.sheffmovement.org](http://www.sheffmovement.org)

45 Exec. Order No. 12,892, 59 Fed. Reg. 2939 (Jan. 20, 1994)

46 See generally, [The Future of Fair Housing](#) (supra, note 16)

social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds into the magnet schools” but do not consider how the schools’ sites and the geography of the communities in which schools are located may contribute to this.<sup>47</sup>

Annual notices published in the *Federal Register* provide another opportunity to encourage coordination of HOPE VI and magnet school funding. In 2007, the last year of appropriations funding specified by statute, the Department of Education released a Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards which granted extra priority to applicants in four areas (entitled “Need for assistance,” “New/revised magnet programs,” “Selection of students,” and “Expanding capacity to provide choice”), and gave additional priority for magnet projects which help parents “maximize[e] the opportunity for students in low-performing schools to attend higher-performing magnet schools...and... reduce minority group isolation.”<sup>48</sup>

Given the program’s emphasis on reducing racial isolation, it would be consistent to further prioritize magnet school development for children in the most racially and economically isolated communities – in or near distressed public housing. Both the Department of Education regulations and annual funding notices for the Magnet Schools Assistance Program provide an efficient vehicle to prioritize funding for such schools. Language in future NOFAs should favor magnet school projects that “reduce racial and economic isolation for children living in a public housing development slated for major redevelopment through the federal HOPE VI program or similar program.”

## **VI. Bringing together school, housing, and Justice Reinvestment policy in high poverty neighborhoods**

The Justice Reinvestment movement has emerged as one of the more creative new approaches to addressing the multidimensional, pernicious effects of concentrated poverty. Mass incarceration is strongly associated with neighborhood poverty concentration. Specific city blocks are responsible for a grossly disproportionate share of repeat prisoners and state correctional spending. Recognizing this, planners and advocates who work with leaders on the state level, are developing creative ways to redirect state correctional funds currently targeted to what criminal justice experts term “million dollar blocks” – referring to correctional spending in neighborhoods that send

---

47 34 C.F.R. § 280.31(a) (2)(v) (2007). Similarly, the regulations require that projects be assessed for the quality of program design, including whether the magnet school will “foster interaction among students of different social, economic, ethnic, and racial backgrounds in classroom activities, extracurricular activities, or other activities.” 34 C.F.R. § 280.31(c)(2)(i) (2007).

48 Notice Inviting Applications for New Awards in Magnet Schools Assistance Program for Fiscal Year 2007, 72 Fed. Reg. 10,723 (Mar. 9, 2007).

highly disproportionate numbers of people to prison and to which formerly incarcerated people are most likely to return. The economic analyses and graphic displays of these neighborhoods demonstrate that the criminal justice system has become the strongest, most involved, most well-known government presence in these communities. This disproportionate investment in criminal justice has required tradeoffs in other areas of life, including health, housing and education.<sup>49</sup> In attempting to reverse this cycle, planners and advocates seek new alliances and partnerships that would help pave more paths to prosperity for children and teenagers in communities of concentrated disadvantage. The underlying theory of Justice Reinvestment is that specific neighborhood interventions – such as a regional magnet school – can be “funded” through future savings in state correctional budgets attributable to that neighborhood.

***Putting the redevelopment-magnet school concept into practice:  
a possible opportunity in Baltimore***

McCulloh Homes in Baltimore is an 800-unit public housing development located in the historic African American community of Upton, originally home to luminaries such as Thurgood Marshall and Clarence Mitchell Jr. It is adjacent to the affluent and predominantly white Bolton Hill, the cultural center and Meyerhoff symphony hall, and Maryland’s State Center offices – an antiquated 1950’s style office complex. The State of Maryland recently decided to redevelop the State Center complex as a mixed-use, transit-oriented development that will incorporate office, retail, and housing for a range of Baltimore workers and families. As required by Baltimore City’s inclusionary housing law, housing affordable to families with incomes as low as 30% of area median income will be part of the mix.

The current plans for the State Center complex do not include the McCulloh Homes, but the public housing’s close proximity of the new development suggests the need for a unified strategy that includes the preservation of McCulloh Homes and is anchored by a strong educational complex. The project presents a unique opportunity to create a school with a more diverse student population than is typical in Baltimore City, by serving children of state workers and those residing in the new complex, as well as those who live in McCulloh Homes and the surrounding community.

In the early years of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the Madison/Eutaw Street corridor, adjacent to the State Center, had been a racial demarcation line. Efforts by African Americans to cross that line resulted in enactment of Baltimore’s racial zoning ordinance in 1911, among the first racial zoning laws in the nation. During the 1930’s the State Center

---

49 See, for example, Laura Kurgan. Spatial Information Design Lab Projects. *Million Dollar Blocks*. Columbia University. Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation. Available at: <http://www.spatialinformationdesignlab.org/projects.php?id=16>

site had been identified for slum clearance and plans were made to build white-only public housing that would serve as a “splendid barrier” between the Black neighborhoods on one side and white Bolton Hill on the other. Although the white-only public housing units were never built, a building for Black public housing residents was. That building, McCulloh Homes, was expanded by an additional 516 units in the 1960’s.

The State of Maryland’s redevelopment efforts have focused on the presence of new subway and light rail stops, which connect the area to the larger Baltimore region. With the understanding that there would be a one-for-one replacement of State office space, the State of Maryland approved a plan promising partial demolition and the creation of high density mixed-use, mixed-income redevelopment, including 30% affordable housing. Joint Baltimore City and State of Maryland funding will finance much of the project.

McCulloh Homes is a relatively strong development that could anchor the kind of housing redevelopment/magnet school model we envision in this report, so that existing residents can benefit from increased opportunity in the neighborhood, and increased diversity in a neighborhood-based interdistrict magnet school. There is currently no proposal for a magnet school at the State Center redevelopment site, but it provides a good example of how this model could work, even in a state with no history of interdistrict magnet school development.

### *Developing a regional magnet school complex?*

The State of Maryland has taken a heightened role in this redevelopment project and has created a more demanding public planning process for this project than is usually required. It seems that this demonstrated level of concern creates a potent opportunity for the broadening of the vision for redevelopment. The developer selected for the project has previously gained a reputation as a leader in linking local public school improvements with HOPE VI public housing revitalization projects. The developer’s experience, along with Maryland’s sponsorship of the entire State Center project, could allow the creation of an interdistrict magnet school or magnet school complex adjacent to the redevelopment area. This school or complex could be funded by the state, rather than by Baltimore City Public Schools, and would be designed to attract an economically and racially diverse student body.

In a majority-minority city such as Baltimore, with a substantially low income student profile, a diversity plan for a regional magnet school might include outreach to the (1) children of State Center employees, regardless of where they live; (2) resident families of the planned mixed-income units; (3) resident families who live in McCulloh Homes and the surrounding neighborhoods, and (4) other families from throughout

the 5-county region. For the State Center workers, the possibility of sending their children to a school conveniently located near their workplaces could be appealing.

The magnet school complex could include both a regional arts-oriented program linked to the nearby arts and culture venues (this type of interdistrict magnet theme has proven highly effective in other regions), and a school focusing on politics and government with thematic ties to the state agencies nearby. Although a new school or schools could be constructed for this project, there are number of existing schools within the neighborhood that could also be selected for renovation and reconstitution as regional magnets. One of these existing schools, an aging four-story building, is very close to the State Center site. By upgrading the local school offerings while at the same time making the local schools regional magnets, that state would be increasing the marketability of the residential units planned for the site, and radically enhancing the educational options of children in the nearby McCulloh Homes.

The State of Maryland has some experience in operating schools within Baltimore City, through its sponsorship of the “SEED” boarding school on the site of a closed city high school in Baltimore. The school is entirely financed by the state and is not part of the city public school system.

## VII. Conclusion

Research and on the ground experience in our urban areas demonstrates that it is time to more deliberately link school and housing policy in efforts to reduce concentrated poverty, promote school diversity and revitalize communities that have historically been disenfranchised. The history of housing discrimination, and of increasing poverty and segregation in our public schools today, makes this all the more urgent. One sensible route toward such collaboration is combining magnet school efforts and the HOPE VI program to deconcentrate poverty in neighborhoods *and* schools. The programs share a common goal and have established infrastructures and generally positive reputations. Such an effort is compatible with the Justice Reinvestment movement, which seeks to assist communities of concentrated disadvantage, which have long been overlooked and marginalized. Examples of similar cooperative efforts show considerable promise as road maps in moving such collaborative efforts to scale. Our roundtable in Tampa allowed us to move from an idea toward more concrete proposals for policy reform, as spelled out in the Appendix that follows.

## Appendix A: The “Opportunity Housing and Schools Act of 2009”

*A new initiative to link federal affordable housing development with high quality neighborhoods and schools.*

- Develop new “site and neighborhood standards” in the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program that are not based on race, but rather steer affordable housing development into areas with high quality schools, convenient mass transit, and significant employment opportunities. This initiative should be combined with strong affirmative marketing efforts to recruit families in areas where local schools are failing No Child Left Behind standards.
- Reauthorize the HUD housing mobility counseling program, along with a special targeted annual set-aside of Housing Choice Vouchers to assist low income families who wish to move from schools that are failing to meet NCLB standards to communities with high performing schools.
- Federal research initiative spearheaded by the HUD Office of Policy Development and Research to map opportunity housing zones for the 50 largest metropolitan areas – with a special emphasis on siting transit-oriented affordable housing development in high-performing school zones.
- Targeted Title I funding to promote academic growth and family transition support for low income students who transfer from a low performing school or district into a high performing school district.
- Provide meaningful standards and funding for the “Community Revitalization Plan” element of the Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program (which allows development in poorer areas) to include employment, education, and health enhancements for residents; target Department of Education Magnet School Assistance Grants to schools adjacent to new family LIHTC developments in community revitalization areas.

### *Specific proposals directed to HOPE VI, Magnet Schools, and Justice Reinvestment:*

- Amend Magnet Schools Assistance Program regulations and annual NOFAs to prioritize funding for magnet schools that “reduce racial and economic isolation for children living in a public housing development slated for major redevelopment through the federal HOPE VI program or similar public housing redevelopment program.”
- Amend the HOPE VI Reauthorization Bill in the House and Senate to provide that “each HOPE VI grant recipient shall establish, *in partnership with the state department of education and local school superintendent*, a comprehensive educational reform and achievement strategy, including objective standards and measures for performance, for transforming the schools that serve the revitalized HOPE VI sites into high performing schools, *and encouraging where feasible the development of regional magnet school or interdistrict transfer opportunities to break down concentrated poverty and racial isolation in the schools serving the children in the HOPE VI development.*” [emphasis indicates changes from current S. 829]
- Include support for magnet school development and interdistrict school placements as part of Justice Reinvestment strategies in high poverty, high incarceration neighborhoods (avoid Justice Reinvestment strategies that reconcentrate children in high poverty, racially isolated schools)

## Appendix B: February 28, 2008 Conference Agenda

### **Bringing Children Together:** *Magnet Schools and Public Housing Redevelopment*

Friday, February 29, 2008

Doubletree Guest Suites  
3050 North Rocky Point Drive West  
Tampa, Florida

### **Introduction and Draft Agenda**

In our February 29<sup>th</sup> roundtable discussion in Tampa we hope to begin exploring potential new policy directions for reducing racial and economic isolation in cities across the United States. In this effort, we will bring together representatives from housing, education and criminal Justice Reinvestment fields whose efforts complement each other. We do not have a directive agenda, but are hopeful that the participants in the roundtable will explore various policy and collaborative approaches and consider the feasibility of future partnerships.

After an early morning guided tour of the Lee Magnet Elementary School in Tampa, we will convene a discussion broken in three parts: a) introduction to recent efforts combining HOPE VI and school reform in specific sites b) discussion of best practices and political/funding models for successful magnet schools c) introduction to the Justice Reinvestment model and exploration of potential school-housing partnerships targeted to help children who live in neighborhoods of concentrated disadvantage. We asked several of you to kick off the discussion in each of the segments. However, we are not presenting traditional conference “panels.” This is a discussion-sized roundtable, well-suited to brainstorming and a give and take discussion. We look forward to a fascinating and productive convening.

### **DRAFT AGENDA**

8 a.m. – Continental Breakfast at the hotel. (Room Location to be determined)

8:30 – 10:30: Tour of Lee Elementary School in Tampa (bus leaves from the hotel)

11:00 – 4:30: Roundtable discussion back at the hotel –



**A. HOPE VI and school reform:** examples of recent school reform initiatives as part of public housing redevelopment efforts

Richard Baron, McCormack Baron Salazar, St. Louis  
Sandra Moore, Urban Strategies, St. Louis  
Kris Siglin, Enterprise Community Partners, Baltimore

**B. Magnet School best practices:** The role of magnets in encouraging racial and economic integration & models for funding and development

Bruce Douglas, Capitol Region Education Council, Hartford  
David Lerch, magnet school consultant, Washington, DC  
Myron Orfield, Institute on Race & Poverty, Minneapolis

**C. Combining HOPE VI and magnet school development, and the role of Justice Reinvestment:** Support for housing and school integration on the state and local level, prospects in Congress, and working with the Justice Reinvestment movement to support school and housing reform

Michael Thompson, Council of State Governments  
Barbara Sard, Center on Budget and Policy Priorities  
Deborah McKoy, Center for Cities and Schools, University of California at Berkeley

(Closing remarks and adjourn)

## Appendix C: List of Conference Attendees

### Bringing Children Together: *Magnet schools and Public Housing Redevelopment* Friday, February 29, 2008 Tampa, Florida

*Hosted by the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice and  
The Poverty & Race Research Action Council,  
With financial support from the Open Society Institute*

#### List of Attendees (alphabetical)

Elinor Bacon  
ER Bacon Development, LLC  
4725 Wisconsin Ave., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20016  
202-244-3696  
[ebacon@erbacondevelopment.com](mailto:ebacon@erbacondevelopment.com)

Richard Baron  
McCormack Baron Salazar  
(Carol Jackson –  
314-335-2876)  
1415 Olive St., Suite 310  
St. Louis, MO 63103-2334  
314-621-3400  
[richard.baron@mccormackbaron.com](mailto:richard.baron@mccormackbaron.com)

Carly Berwick  
149 Harrison Ave.  
Jersey City, NJ 07304  
917-304-4690  
[cberwick@gmail.com](mailto:cberwick@gmail.com)

Iris Bradford  
1903 Monumental Rd.  
Dundalk MD 21222  
443-216-2412  
[irisbaltimore@aol.com](mailto:irisbaltimore@aol.com)

Bruce Douglas  
Capitol Region Education  
Council  
111 Charter Oak Ave.  
Hartford, CT 06106  
860-247-2732  
[bdouglas@crec.org](mailto:bdouglas@crec.org)

Susan Eaton  
Research Director  
Charles Hamilton Houston  
Institute for Race and Justice  
Harvard Law School  
125 Mt. Auburn St. #357  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617-495-8089  
617-216-6388 (cell)  
[seaton@law.harvard.edu](mailto:seaton@law.harvard.edu)

Dr. Mary Ellen Elia  
Superintendent, Hillsborough  
County Schools  
Tampa, FL  
813-272-4055  
(Assistant, Kristin Jernigan)  
[Maryellen.ilia@sdhc.k12.fl.us](mailto:Maryellen.ilia@sdhc.k12.fl.us)

Frank Fernandez  
Executive Director  
Community Partnership for  
the Homeless  
P.O. Box 685065  
Austin, TX 78768  
[ffernandez@austinhomless.org](mailto:ffernandez@austinhomless.org)  
512-469-9130 ext. 2 (Tel.)  
512-469-0724 (Fax)  
[ffernandez@austinhomless.org](mailto:ffernandez@austinhomless.org)

Salin Geevarghese  
Annie E. Casey Foundation  
701 St. Paul St.  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
410-547-6600  
[sgeevarghese@aecf.org](mailto:sgeevarghese@aecf.org)

David Harris  
Charles Hamilton Houston  
Institute for Race and Justice  
Harvard Law School  
125 Mt. Auburn St. #357  
Cambridge, MA 02138  
617-495-8075  
[dharris@law.harvard.edu](mailto:dharris@law.harvard.edu)

Diane Houk  
Fair Housing Justice Center  
5 Hanover Square  
New York, NY 10004  
212-400-8280  
[dhouk@helpusa.org](mailto:dhouk@helpusa.org)

Professor Olati Johnson  
Columbia Law School  
435 West 116th St.  
New York, NY 10027  
[johnsonolati@yahoo.com](mailto:johnsonolati@yahoo.com)

David Lerch  
Lerch Educational Consulting,  
Inc.  
7 Drayton St., Suite 208  
Savannah, GA 31401  
912-232-1644  
(fax) 912-236-8885  
[david@dklerch.com](mailto:david@dklerch.com)

Demetria McCain  
Inclusive Communities Project  
3301 Elm St.  
Dallas, TX 75226  
214-939-9239  
[Dmccain@inclusivecommunities.net](mailto:Dmccain@inclusivecommunities.net)

Deborah McKoy, PhD, MPA  
Executive Director – Center for  
Cities & Schools  
Institute of Urban and Regional  
Development  
UC Berkeley  
324 Wurster Hall  
Berkeley, CA 94720  
510-643-3105  
[debmckoy@berkeley.edu](mailto:debmckoy@berkeley.edu)

Sandra Moore  
President  
Urban Strategies  
1415 Olive St.  
St. Louis, MO 63013  
314-335-2908  
[Sandra.moore@urbanstrategies.org](mailto:Sandra.moore@urbanstrategies.org)

Carol Naughton  
The East Lake Foundation  
2606 Alston Dr.  
Atlanta, GA 30317  
404 373-4351  
404 373-4354 (fax)  
[cnaughton@eastlakefoundation.org](mailto:cnaughton@eastlakefoundation.org)

Myron Orfield  
Institute on Race and Poverty  
Univ. of Minn Law School  
420 Law Center  
229 19<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Minneapolis, MN 55455  
612-625-7976  
[orfield@umn.edu](mailto:orfield@umn.edu)

Dennis Parker  
ACLU Racial Justice Program  
125 Broad St.  
New York, NY 10004  
212-519-7832  
[dparker@aclu.org](mailto:dparker@aclu.org)

Egbert Perry  
The Integral Group, Atlanta  
The Integral Group LLC  
60 Piedmont Rd.  
Atlanta, GA 30303  
404-224-1861  
[eperry@integral-online.com](mailto:eperry@integral-online.com)

john powell  
Kirwan Institute for the Study  
of Race & Ethnicity  
The Ohio State University  
433 Mendenhall Laboratory  
125 South Oval Mall  
Columbus, OH 43210  
(Barbara Carter)  
614-688-4498  
[powel088@yahoo.com](mailto:powel088@yahoo.com)

Robert Rooks  
439 Ramblewood Circle  
DeSoto, TX 75115  
(home) 972-223-8136  
(cell) 214-664-8691  
[rrooks99@hotmail.com](mailto:rrooks99@hotmail.com)

Barbara Samuels  
ACLU of Maryland  
3600 Clipper Mill Rd, Suite 350  
Baltimore, MD 21211  
410-889-8555 (ext 114)  
[samuels@aclu-md.org](mailto:samuels@aclu-md.org)

Barbara Sard  
Center on Budget &  
Policy Priorities  
820 1<sup>st</sup> St. NE #510  
Washington, DC 20002  
617-566-1154  
[bsard@rcn.com](mailto:bsard@rcn.com)

Elizabeth Horton Sheff  
45-5 Evergreen Dr.  
Hartford, CT 06105  
860-231-0244 (h)  
860-560-5501 (w)

Kris Siglin  
Enterprise Community Partners  
10227 Wincopin Circle  
American City Building  
Columbia, MD 21044  
800.624.4298  
[ksiglin@enterprisecommunity.org](mailto:ksiglin@enterprisecommunity.org)

Len Stevens  
Box 2479  
Sarasota, FL 34230  
941-355-5258  
[lbstev63090@earthlink.net](mailto:lbstev63090@earthlink.net)

Philip Tegeler  
Executive Director  
Poverty & Race Research  
Action Council  
1015 15th St. NW #400  
Washington, DC 20005  
202-360-3906  
[ptegeler@prrac.org](mailto:ptegeler@prrac.org)

Michael Thompson  
Council of State Governments  
Justice Center  
100 Wall St.  
20th Floor  
New York, NY 10005  
212-482-2320  
(Fax) 212-482-2344  
[mthompson@csg.org](mailto:mthompson@csg.org)

Susan Tucker  
Open Society Institute  
400 W. 59<sup>th</sup> St.  
New York, NY 10019  
212-548-0600  
[stucker@sorosny.org](mailto:stucker@sorosny.org)

Roger Williams  
Annie E. Casey Foundation  
701 St. Paul St.  
Baltimore, MD 21202  
410-547-6600  
[rwilliams@aecf.org](mailto:rwilliams@aecf.org)

