

PRRAC

Poverty & Race Research Action Council

1015 15th St. NW • Suite 400 • Washington, DC 20005 • 202/906-8023 • Fax 202/842-2885
www.prrac.org

Annotated Bibliography: The Impact of School-Based Poverty Concentration on Academic Achievement & Student Outcomes

Introduction

There is a robust literature on the impact of school-based poverty concentration on academic achievement. In the first major study on the topic since the 1966 Coleman Report, Mary Kennedy in 1986 found that the relationship between school poverty concentrations and student achievement averages is stronger than the relationship between family poverty status and student achievement.¹ Kennedy reported that non-poor students attending schools with high concentrations of poverty are more likely to fall behind than are poor students who attend schools with low concentrations of poverty.² Numerous studies substantiate Kennedy's findings;³ and at this point there is no question that school poverty concentration has a detrimental impact on student achievement.

The best summary of the literature on school poverty concentration is an *amicus* brief filed by the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and NYCLU in *Paynter v. State*. Because the *amicus* brief (prepared by Strook Strook & Lavin) summarizes the research so

¹ Kennedy, Mary M., et al. "Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services: An Interim Report from the National Assessment of Chapter 1," Office of Educational Research and Improvement, Washington D.C., 1986. p. 30.

² *Id.*

³ See Appendix Annotated Bibliography; *infra* note 12.

effectively, we will quote extensively from it in this summary.⁴ The *Paynter* brief reviews the history of poverty concentration research, beginning with the 1966 Coleman Report:

Still regarded as "the most important education study of the twentieth century," The Coleman Report concluded that, beyond individual student status, "a school's socioeconomic background is a strong determinant of its students' achievement." The Coleman Report at 21; All Together Now at 26. Since then, numerous scholars ranging across the political spectrum have agreed with Coleman. Indeed, dozens of studies since The Coleman Report conclude that concentrated poverty inevitably depresses achievement on a school-wide and a district-wide basis. See Stephen J. Schellenberg, *Concentration of Poverty and the Ongoing Need for Title I* in *Hard Work for Good Schools; Facts Not Fads in Title I Reform* (The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University 1998) ("*Concentration of Poverty*") ("the link between poverty and low achievement has become an unquestioned assumption"); All Together Now at 26 n.9-10.⁵

More recent research shows that school poverty concentration has an independent impact on educational outcome:

"Parents know what... fifty years of sociological data have made clear: being born into a poor family places students at risk, but to be assigned then to a school with a high concentration of poverty poses a second, independent disadvantage that poor children attending middle-class schools do not face. Taken together, being poor and attending schools with classmates who are poor constitutes a clear "*double handicap*." All Together Now at 25. See Concentrated Poverty and Educational Achievement at 1-2; *Concentration of Poverty* at 132; Judith Anderson, Debra Hollinger and Joseph Conaty, *Poverty and Achievement: Reexamining the relationship between Poverty and Student Achievement* (1992) ("*Poverty and Achievement*") at 1 ("The relationship between family poverty status and student achievement is not as strong as the relationship between school poverty concentration and school achievement average.").⁶

⁴ The social sciences sources listed in these excerpts include: Judith Anderson, Debra Hollinger and Joseph Conaty, *Poverty and Achievement: Reexamining the Relationship between School Poverty and Student Achievement* (1992) ("*Poverty and Achievement*"); Rebecca Barr and Robert Dreeben, *How Schools Work* (University of Chicago Press 1983) and Christopher Jencks, *A Reappraisal of the Most Controversial Education Document of Our Time in New York Times Magazine* (November, 1972)); James Coleman, *Equality and Educational Opportunity* (U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare 1966) ("The Coleman Report"); Kathleen V. Hoover-Dempsey, Otto C. Bassler and Jane S. Brissie, *Parent Involvement: Contributions of Teacher Efficacy, Socio-Economic Status, and Other School Characteristics* (Am. Educ. Research Journal, Fall 1997) ("Parent Involvement"); Christopher Jencks, *A Reappraisal of the Most Controversial Education Document of Our Time in New York Times Magazine* (November, 1972); Richard Kahlenberg, *All Together Now: Creating Middle-Class Schools through Public School Choice*, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute, 2003; Michael S. Knapp and Patrick M. Shields, *Reconceiving Academic Instruction for the Children of Poverty* (Eisenhower Nat'l Clearinghouse 1990) ("*Reconceiving Academic Instruction*"); Tama Leventhal and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, *Moving to Opportunity: What About the Kids?* (Teachers College, Columbia University Feb. 2001); Marion Orr, et al., *Concentrated Poverty and Educational Achievement: Politics and Possibility in the Baltimore Region* (University of Maryland (Draft) 2001); *Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services* (U.S. Department of Education Jan. 1986) ("*Poverty, Achievement and Distribution*"); Michael Puma, et al., *Prospects: Final Report on Student Outcomes* (Cambridge 1997) ("*Prospects II*"); *Quality Counts: 1998: The Urban Challenge* (Education Week Jan. 1998) ("*Quality Counts*"); Stephen J. Schellenberg, *Concentration of Poverty and the Ongoing Need for Title I* in *Hard Work for Good Schools; Facts Not Fads in Title I Reform* (The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University 1998).

⁵ Brief Amicus Curiae on Behalf of NAACP Legal Defense & Educational Fund, Inc. and the New York Civil Liberties Union, 2001 NY App. Div. Briefs 567, 19 (2001).

⁶ *Id.* at 23.

High concentrations of school poverty threaten the opportunities of poor and non-poor students alike to obtain basic and essential skills:

The U.S. Department of Education has assessed the effect of poverty concentration on both poor and non-poor students alike. See, e.g., Poverty, Achievement and Distribution. In schools with less than 7% poverty, 27.6% of poor students and 11% of non-poor students achieved below the national average. But when school poverty levels increase to greater than 24%, then 56% of poor students and 36.9% of non-poor students fell below the national average. Although the primary conclusion is that both groups suffered dramatically, it is noteworthy that concentrated poverty had a greater relative impact on non-poor students. *Id.* at 21.⁷

Research also finds that there is a “tipping point” at which the effects of poverty concentration “become more deeply ingrained and therefore less susceptible to correction from the school itself.”⁸

Research establishes that most successful schools are those in which the middle class is the majority. Success starts turning to failure, it is generally agreed, when the school becomes 50% minority or low income. See *All Together Now* at 39. The *Prospects* studies found that when half a student body is poor, then all students' achievement will be depressed, and that when 75% is poor, then all students' achievement will be "seriously" depressed. *Prospects II* at 12. Another expert has concluded that a district with over 60% poor children "can no longer rely solely on its own internal efforts" to avoid failure. *Concentration of Poverty* at 133. By comparison, RCSD's 90% poverty configuration puts it well beyond even these ominous figures, into a level identified as "extreme poverty." *Id.* at 134.⁹

The correlation between poverty concentration and academic achievement is partly explained by the human dynamics found in all schools. First, peer influence impacts student achievement:

Experts have called students themselves the "hidden curriculum," meaning that students learn as much from peers as from textbooks, homework, class projects and other pedagogical services provided by the school. *All Together Now* at 48. Indeed, studies have found that peers exert a stronger influence on students than do teachers and parents. *Id.* at 48; *The Coleman Report* at 302 (highlighting the importance of this finding). In low-poverty schools, this high degree of influence is educationally advantageous, as peer interaction between different socio-economic groups and achievement levels generally has a positive effect on outcomes because students testing below grade-level "are distinctly helped by being in school with more high-achieving students." *All Together Now* at 50. In high-poverty schools, however, where the myriad socio-economic problems of impoverished neighborhoods are dominant, peer influence can be a dangerous thing, seriously interfering with a student's ability and motivation to learn and achieve. See *Quality Counts, School Climate* at 1...¹⁰

Peer influence in high-poverty schools will not only diminish a student's ability to learn, but his or her motivation to learn. Whether rich, poor or middle class, a student placed in a high-poverty school will encounter an atmosphere that can be hostile to hard work and high achievement. Impoverished students lack the life experience to see the value of hard work in school, and may regard academic success as a capitulation to the values of a

⁷ *Id.* at 24.

⁸ *Id.* at 25.

⁹ *Id.*

¹⁰ *Id.* at 26

middle class they have been excluded from. All Together Now at 51-2. In high-poverty schools, students who work hard may be mocked for their efforts, and academic success is regarded with suspicion, or hostility. Impoverished students also lack the experiential foundation to share their middle class peers' desire to succeed or appreciate the connection between success in school and success in life. See Concentrated Poverty and Educational Achievement at 6 (describing how "general isolation from mainstream experiences and opportunities," "limited life chances," "prior negative experiences," and "experiences of exclusion from mainstream institutions" all work against educational achievement).¹¹

Parents also influence educational outcomes:

Studies have repeatedly shown that middle class parents are simply more active in and more demanding upon their children's schools -- and that their efforts get results: increased involvement and higher expectation translate into higher performance. Kathleen V. Hoover-Dempsey, Otto C. Bassler and Jane S. Brissie, Parent Involvement: Contributions of Teacher Efficacy, Socio-Economic Status, and Other School Characteristics (Am. Educ. Research Journal, Fall 1997) ("Parent Involvement").

Socio-economic class is a "primary predictor" of parental involvement. All Together Now at 62. Parental involvement, in turn, is regarded as a hallmark of successful schools. See Tama Leventhal and Jeanne Brooks-Gunn, *Moving to Opportunity: What About the Kids?* (Teachers College, Columbia University Feb. 2001) at 24. Moreover, parental participation in school raises achievement levels for the whole school. All Together Now at 63. Yet while parents in low-poverty schools tend to view themselves as "partners with the teachers," participation by parents in high-poverty schools tends to be "abysmally low." Compare Parent Involvement at 430 with All Together Now at 62. Parents are, in effect, an important educational resource, but one that varies greatly in quantity and quality, with high-poverty inner-city schools lagging far behind middle-class suburban schools.¹²

Finally, teachers influence educational outcomes:

Unfortunately, under-qualified teachers too often end up at high-poverty schools. If they do not start their careers there, then they are transferred from middle-class schools where they were not making the grade "to a high-poverty-school dumping ground." All Together Now at 71. Under-qualified teachers bring with them a litany of ominous statistics: less likely to be licensed, less experienced, more likely to teach out of their field, less formal education and lower test results than colleagues in low-poverty schools.

Furthermore, teachers in high-poverty schools can be "desperate" to leave, wracking their schools with high rates of teacher turnover. Id. Understandably, these vacancies are hard to fill. Teachers with the option prefer the higher salaries and more comfortable atmosphere of middle-class schools. As a result, vacancies end up being filled by candidates whose main virtue is their availability.¹³

Students in high poverty concentrated schools are further disadvantaged by a "dilution of the curriculum," which "undercuts even the bright, motivated student who happens to attend a high-poverty school."¹⁴ They also confront diminished teacher expectations:

¹¹ Id. at 27.

¹² Id. at 28.

¹³ Id. at 29.

¹⁴ Id. at 30-32.

A combination of peer, parent and teacher influences works a fourth kind of pedagogical deprivation at high-poverty schools, namely a dilution of the curriculum. Because it is the curriculum that drives learning and should promote academic achievement, this is potentially the most damaging aspect of the causal link between high-poverty schools and inadequate outcomes. An inadequate curriculum undercuts even the bright, motivated student who happens to attend a high-poverty school. All Together Now at 75 n.120 (citing Rebecca Barr and Robert Dreeben, *How Schools Work* (University of Chicago Press 1983) and Christopher Jencks, *A Reappraisal of the Most Controversial Education Document of Our Time in New York Times Magazine* (November, 1972)).

Over and above eroding teacher quality, diminished teacher expectations has its own deleterious effect on the curriculum of high-poverty schools. Concentrated Poverty and Educational Achievement at 6. From the outset, the bar is set lower for these students. Educator Deborah Meier has found that "whether schools are public or private, the social class of the students has been and continues to be the single most significant factor in determining how a school works and the intellectual values it promotes." All Together Now at 72. Schoolwork graded as a "C" in a low-poverty school would earn an "A" in a high-poverty school. Students in low-poverty schools are more likely to be rewarded for academic excellence; students in high-poverty schools for attendance. Id. at 72-73, 75 n.115. See generally *Prospects* at 84-91; Michael S. Knapp and Patrick M. Shields, *Reconceiving Academic Instruction for the Children of Poverty* (Eisenhower Nat'l Clearinghouse 1990) ("*Reconceiving Academic Instruction*").

In addition, guidance counselors, so key to the transition out of high school into college and beyond, also labor under diminished expectations. The result is another missed opportunity to motivate students to push themselves further in school and in life. And as already discussed, parents in these schools are not involved enough to demand higher expectations from the school or do not have high expectations themselves, so there is no corrective mechanism as there is in middle class schools. In sum, from teachers to principals to counselors in high-poverty schools, diminished expectations shrink both the short and long-term educational potential of their students, and in so doing, their potential for success in life is also sold short. See Concentrated Poverty and Educational Achievement at 6 ("expectations are widely regarded as critical to student success").¹⁵

Current research corroborates these findings. For instance, a forthcoming issue of *Teachers College Record*, vol. 112 no. 4 (2010), focuses on the effects of school composition on educational achievement and presents recent findings of various sociologists and professors of education on the impact of socioeconomic and racial school context on student achievement.

The impact of school poverty concentration on academic achievement is widely documented. In a poverty concentrated school, students are denied the benefits of positive peer influence, parental school involvement, and quality teachers. They are confronted with diluted curricula and diminished teacher expectations. All students, poor and non-poor, are subject to the detrimental educational effects of attending a poverty concentrated school. While it is true that intensive educational reform can bring measurable improvements to high poverty schools, such concentrations of poor children should be avoided wherever feasible.

School Poverty Concentration Annotated Bibliography

¹⁵ Id.

Research Literature

Anderson, Judith, et al. Re-Examining the Relationship between School Poverty and Student Achievement, *ERS Spectrum*, V. 11, n. 2, Spring 1993, p. 21- 31.

Banks, Karen. The Effect of School Poverty Concentration in WCPSS. *Research Watch*. E&R Report No. March 2001: Karen Banks, Director of Wake County, NC's Evaluation and Research Division, presents research on the impact of school poverty in the Wake County Public School System. Reports a relationship between elementary school poverty and school performance, especially at the most highly poverty concentrated schools; but, at the middle school level, varied achievement due to many other influences besides concentration of poverty. Hypothesizes that large changes in the concentration of poverty in a school is necessary to produce educationally significant changes in student achievement growth.

Barr, Rebecca; Dreeben, Robert. *How Schools Work*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983: Sociological study of social organization of schools and classrooms, the division of labor, and the allocation of key resources. Explains how instructional groups originate, form, and change over time. Focusing on first grade reading instruction, study shows that individual reading aptitude has little direct relation to group reading achievement and virtually none to the coverage of reading materials. Rather, individual aptitude is the basis on which teachers form reading groups that are given different instructional treatment.

Benson, James; Borman, Geoffrey. Family and Contextual Socioeconomic Effects Across Seasons: When Do They matter for the Achievement Growth of Young Children?, University of Wisconsin- Madison, Wisconsin Center for Education Research, 2007: Examines socioeconomic effects on achievement growth during the kindergarten and first-grade school years and the summer season between them. Finds that socially induced school-year learning gaps cumulate such that they exceed socially induced summer-season learning gaps in size. Concludes that the most effective way to reduce stratification in early childhood learning is to look for ways in which schools can be managed so as to reduce, and eliminate when possible, the persistent social disparities in school-year learning rates; and to provide effective preschool opportunities that reduce the large gaps in school readiness.

Caldas, Stephen J. Multilevel Examination of Student, School, and District-Level Effects on Academic Achievement. *Journal of Educational Research*, Vol. 93, no.2., Dec. 1999: Examines whether concentrations of single-parent families in school districts can account for school-level academic outcomes. Finds that poverty level, racial composition, and parental composition of the school are highly correlated but that family composition is the strongest predictor of performance; the prevailing family structure of a school's students accounts almost completely for variations in performance between school districts.

Caldas, Stephen; Bankston, Carl III. Effect of School Population Socioeconomic Status on Individual Academic Achievement, *Journal of Educational Research*, May 1997, p. 269: Examines the relationship between the socioeconomic status of peers and individual academic achievement. Finds that the effect of schoolmates' family social status on achievement is significant and substantial, and only slightly smaller than an individual's own family background status. Attending school with classmates who come from higher SES backgrounds tends to positively raise one's own academic achievement, independent of one's own SES background, race, and other factors. This correlation is primarily due to the fact that poor peer environments tend to be minority concentration schools, and then to the fact that poor peer environments contain peers with relatively low family social status backgrounds.

Coleman, James. Equality and Educational Opportunity, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, ("The Coleman Report"), 1966: The seminal "Coleman Report" is the first report to suggest that a school's students' family backgrounds is a greater determinant of academic achievement than other educational inputs, including levels of school funding and racial compositions of the schools. Finds that attending schools with high concentrations of low income students decreases academic achievement, and attending schools with low concentrations of low income students increases academic achievement.

Entwisle, Doris; Alexander, Karl; Olson, Linda. Chapter 4: Elementary School Organization in *Children, Schools, and Inequality*, Colorado: Westview Press, 1997. p. 63-80: Describes the extreme tracking of the student body, as a whole, in high poverty concentration schools, compared to treatment of the student body in low poverty concentration elementary schools. Examines how tracking impacts school functioning, teacher behavior, and student performance in low SES schools.

Entwisle, Doris; Alexander, Karl. Summer Setback: Race, Poverty, School Composition, and Mathematics Achievement in the First Two Years of School, *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 57, No.1, Feb. 1992. p. 72- 84: Investigates reasons for lower math achievement among first grade African American students. Reports that the most important source of variation in achievement is differences in family economic status, followed by school segregation. Finds that poor children of both races consistently fall behind academically in the summer but do as well or better than non-poor children when school is in session. Considers shortcomings of many summer programs for disadvantaged students but suggests that effective summer programs can counteract typical summer academic loss.

Goddard, Roger; Salloum, Serena; Berbitsky, Dan. Trust as a Mediator of the Relationships between Poverty, Racial Composition, and Academic Achievement: Evidence from Michigan's Public Elementary Schools, *Educational Administration Quarterly*, Vol. 45, April 2009, p. 292- 311: Study of relationship between trust and academic achievement in Michigan elementary schools. Results indicate that, although there is a strong negative correlation between trust and racial composition,

socioeconomic disadvantage, and school size, trust is a strong independent positive predictor of academic achievement.

Hogrebe, Marc C.; Tate, William F. IV, School Composition and Context Factors that Moderate and Predict 10th-Grade Science Proficiency, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 112, no. 4, 2010: Examines relationships between 10th-grade science proficiency and school context factors related to school environment, courses, and teachers. Confirms that socioeconomic and minority status of schools are important predictive factors of academic achievement. Finds that schools with more low-income and minority students achieve higher science proficiency scores when they have a greater percentage of courses taught by highly qualified teachers and more regularly certified teachers. Suggests that teacher quality in high-poverty majority-minority school settings remains an important policy target for reform and improvement.

Hoover-Dempsey, Kathleen V.; Bassler, Otto C.; Brissie, Jane S.. Parent Involvement: Contributions of Teacher Efficacy, Socio-Economic Status, and Other School Characteristics, *American Educational Research Journal*, Vol. 24, No.3, Autumn 1987, p. 417- 435: Examines whether varying levels of parent involvement in students' educations is related to variations in qualities of school settings. Finds that the best predictors of parental involvement are teacher efficacy and school socioeconomic status, although SES is only significantly implicated in school-based, not home based, indicators of parental involvement.

Hoxby, Caroline M., The Power of Peers, *Education Next*, Summer 2002, p. 57-63: Addresses principal difficulties confronting theories of peer effects on educational achievement and flaws in past studies on the issue. Presents research study that overcomes these flaws and finds that individual students' level of academic achievement is impacted by their peers' race, ethnicities, and levels of academic achievement.

Kennedy, Mary, et al., Poverty, Achievement and the Distribution of Compensatory Education Services, U.S. Department of Education, December 1986: The first major study on the impact of poverty concentration on academic achievement. Describes the background and purpose of the Education Consolidation and Improvement Act of 1981, Chapter 1; examines all students who could be or have been called "educationally deprived;" discusses impact of trends in childhood poverty on Federal aid programs;" and analyzes program beneficiaries. Finds that achievement scores of all students, not just poor students, decline as the proportion of poor students in a school increases. Concludes with recommendations for how the federal government could better serve low income students.

Lippman, Laura; Burns, Shelley; McArthur, Edith K. *Urban Schools: The Challenge of Location and Poverty*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Education, Office of Educational Research and Improvement, 1996, p. 75- 126: Detailed comparison of experiences of students in urban schools with low poverty concentration versus schools with high poverty concentration, in relation to school resources and staff; school programs and course taking; and student behavior. Finds that students in public schools

with high poverty concentrations have less desirable school experiences than those in low poverty schools on almost every measure. Includes easy-to-read chart comparing experiences of high poverty and low poverty urban students on each indicator.

Newton, Xioxia. End of High School Mathematics Attainment: How Did Students Get There?, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 112, no.4, 2010: Investigates how high school seniors get to where they are in terms of end-of-high-school mathematics attainment; and explores what factors predict students' attainment and their growth trajectories in mathematics during secondary school years. Finds that several individual, school composition, and opportunities to learn variables, such as early tracking and course progress, are strong predictors of students' mathematics attainment and growth.

Palardy, Gergory. Differential School Effects among Low, Middle, and High Social Class Composition Schools: A Multiple Group, Multilevel Latent Growth Curve Analysis, *School Effectiveness and School Improvement*, vol. 19, no. 1, March 2008, p. 21-49: Examines differential school effects between low, middle, and high social class composition public schools. Finds that student learning in low SES schools is far more sensitive to school factors than in middle and high SES schools. Even after controlling for extensive set of student background characteristics and school inputs, students attending low SES school continue to learn at significantly lower rates.

Perry, Laura B.; McConney, Andrew. Does the SES of the School Matter? An Examination of Socioeconomic Status and Student Achievement Using PISA 2003, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 112, no. 4, Nov. 2, 2010, p. 7-8: Research into the relationship between school SES and student outcomes in Australia. Examines whether the association between school SES and student outcomes is stronger for students from lower SES backgrounds than for students from higher SES backgrounds; and whether increases in school socioeconomic composition are consistently associated with increases in student academic achievement. Finds that increases in the mean SES of a school are associated with consistent increases in students' academic achievement, and that this relationship is similar for all students regardless of their individual SES.

Pong, Suet-ling. The School Compositional Effect of Single Parenthood on 10th-Grade Achievement, *Sociology of Education*, Vol. 71, no. 1, Jan. 1998, p. 23-42: Finds a detrimental contextual effect on 10th grade mathematics and reading achievement associated with attending a school in which a high concentration of children are from single-parent homes, even when controlling for individual demographic characteristics and family background, which is further mediated by school-based social capital and economic resources. Schools' SES and social capital completely explain differences in educational achievement between schools with low concentrations of students from single-parent families and schools with medium concentrations, although an effect of attending a school with high concentrations of single-parent families still remains. Hypothesizes that when students from single-parent families are the majority population in a school, the school's economic and interpersonal resources are so low that the school fails to attract good teachers and other school personnel.

Michael Puma, et al., *Prospects: Final Report on Student Outcomes*, U.S. Department of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service, April 1997: Examines the effects of Chapter 1 on student achievement and other school-related educational outcomes. Although school-wide Chapter 1 programs were positively associated with academic achievement in highly disadvantaged schools, its assistance was insufficient to bring its students up to par. Finds that characteristics of the individual student and family account for the largest part of the variation in student achievement as measured by test scores, but that schools also make an important contribution.

Ready, Douglas; Silander, Megan. *Estimating the influence of School Racial and Socioeconomic Composition on Student Learning: Methodological Challenges and Alternative Solutions*, 2008.

Rumberger, Russel; Palardy, Gregory. Does Segregation Still Matter? The Impact of Student Composition on Academic Achievement in High School, *Teachers College Record*, Vol. 107, no. 9, 2005, p. 1999-2045: Examines whether racial and socioeconomic segregation is still contributing to the achievement gaps among students. Finds that average SES level of students' schools has as much impact on their achievement growth as their own SES status; and school SES status has as much impact on advantaged as on disadvantaged students, and almost as much impact on Whites as on Blacks. Impact of SES composition was explained by teacher expectations, the amount of homework that students do, the number of rigorous courses that students take, and students' feelings about safety. Results suggest that schools serving mostly lower income students tend to be organized and operated differently than those serving more affluent students, transcending other school level differences such as public or private, large or small. Considers whether such school characteristics can be changed by policies to reform schools and funding systems versus policies to desegregate schools.

Rusk, David. *Classmates Count: A Study of the Interrelationship between Socioeconomic Background and Standardized Test Scores of 4th Grade Pupils in the Madison-Dade County Public Schools*, Washington D.C., 2002: Cross-sectional analysis of fourth grade students in sixty elementary schools in sixteen school districts of Madison-Dane County, Wisconsin from 1998-2001. Measures the extent to which the SES status of a school's pupil population effects academic performance, and for what type of students a school's SES context matters most. Finds that, of the six independent input variables tested, only the percentage of low income pupils in the school has any explanatory power for district-by-district variations in test scores
(online at: <http://www.schoolinfosystem.org/archives/Unifiedfinalreport.pdf>)

Ryabov, Igor; Van Hook, Jennifer. School Segregation and Academic Achievement among Hispanic Children. *Social Science Research*, vol. 26, 2006, p.767-788: Examines effects of race/ethnicity and income composition of schools on academic achievement of Hispanic adolescents and how school composition effects vary for adolescents according to how many generations their families have been in the United States. Finds that school racial composition has little, if any, effect on academic achievement, as tested by AHPVT, of Latino adolescents, but socioeconomic composition does; this finding does

not vary by immigrant generational status. The impact of school composition on GPA, however, is insignificant for all Latinos except the first generation. Includes extensive review of the literature on reasons for the impact of school composition on learning outcomes.

Saporito, Salvatore; Sohoni, Deenesh. *Mapping Educational Inequality: Concentrations of Poverty among Poor and Minority Students in Public Schools*, The College of William and Mary Department of Sociology, 2005: Considers how much the racial composition of public school attendance area influences the decision of wealthier families to enroll children in private, magnet and charter schools; and documents how the choices of wealthier families exacerbate poverty concentrations among poor and minority students enrolled in public schools. Finds that economic segregation in public schools is higher than expected given distribution of poverty across neighborhoods; compared with white students, racial minorities are exposed to much higher poverty rates in schools than one would expect given the poverty rates in their neighborhoods. (available online at: http://www.allacademic.com//meta/p_mla_apa_research_citation/1/0/5/2/4/pages105244/p105244-1.php)

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Poverty and Student Mathematics Achievement in *The Condition of Education 2006* (NCES 2006-071). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office, 2006: Summarizes findings from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) on the correlation between school-based concentration of poverty and students academic achievement. Includes tables showing academic achievement of students at schools with different concentrations of poverty, broken down by students' race/ethnicity, language spoken at home, and SES status. Shows that both low and high SES students have significantly lower academic achievement in low SES schools than in high SES schools.

Williams, J. Douglas. School Composition and Contextual Effects on Student Outcomes, *Teachers College Record*, vol. 112, no. 4, 2010: Examines the relationships among school composition, several aspects of school and classroom context, and students' literacy skills in science. Finds that literacy performance is associated with the extent to which school systems are segregated "horizontally," based on the distribution among schools of students from differing SES backgrounds, and "vertically," due to mechanisms that select students into different types of schools. Finds that both horizontal and vertical segregation are associated with lower student outcomes. Calls for implementation of policies aimed at increasing inclusion or differentially allocating school and classroom resources among schools serving students of differing status.

Policy Literature

Chambers, Julius; Boger, John Charles; Earls, Anita; High, Rebecca. *The Socioeconomic Composition of the Public Schools: A Crucial Consideration in Student Assignment Policy*. UNC Center for Civil Rights at the UNC Chapel Hill School of Law, 2005: Policy report that advocates a revised student assignment system in NC's Charlotte-Mecklenburg school districts, with floor and ceiling levels that cap poverty levels in every school throughout the district. Reviews literature relating to socioeconomic composition of schools and various ways in which composition impacts student achievement in general, and literature relating to Charlotte- Mecklenburg, in particular. Outlines reasons for revising school assignment system. Explains how an SES balancing

plan could effectively be incorporated into a ‘choice’ plan and describes the experience of three school districts that implemented balancing plans. Briefly discusses the legal merits of using SES as a student assignment factor.

Fiske, Edward B. Controlled Choice in Cambridge, Massachusetts, in *Divided We Fail: Coming Together Through Public School Choice*. Washington D.C.: The Century Foundation, 2002, p. 167-207: Documents the origins, evolution, and impact of controlled school choice in Cambridge over the past two decades, with particular reference to why the school committee considered the shift from race to socioeconomic status. Uses data supplied by the Cambridge public schools and interviews with people involved with the public school system, academic studies of controlled choice in Cambridge, and the author’s own experience with the Cambridge school system. Finds that controlled choice has for the most part succeeded in fostering racial diversity but has not had the positive impact on overall student achievement predicted; and analyzes reasons for this mixed success. Concludes with policy suggestions.

Flinspach, Susan Leigh; Banks, Karen E. Moving Beyond Race: Socioeconomic Diversity as a Race-Neutral Approach to Desegregation in the Wake County Schools, in *School Resegregation: Must the South Turn Back?* Boger, John Charles; Orfield, Gary, eds., North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 2009, p. 261-280: Explains the history of, and reasons behind, Wake County, NC’s implementation of socioeconomic, race-neutral student assignment. Describes in detail the city’s assignment system and how it sustains school diversity and supports achievement. Examines evidence that the race-neutral strategy is maintaining a level of racially balanced schools in the district and may be a factor in raising achievement and narrowing the income achievement gap.

Jencks; Christopher. A Reappraisal of the Most Controversial Education Document of Our Time, *New York Times*, Aug 10, 1969, p. SM12: Overview of the history of the Coleman Report, including reasons for its commission, criticism of the report, discussion of the report’s impact on education, and methods for addressing the report’s findings. Includes an excellent summary of the report itself.

Kahlenberg, Richard D. *All Together Now: Creating Middle-Class Schools through Public School Choice*, Washington D.C.: Brookings Institute, 2003: Thorough discussion of SES-balancing plans, and their outcomes, as implemented in La Crosse, WI and Wake County, NC. Presents arguments made by proponents of socioeconomic balancing in the school districts. Describes the rationale, development, successes, and criticism of the districts’ plans. Concludes that economic integration is the new frontier of school desegregation and must be actively pursued.

Kahlenberg, Richard D. Economic School Integration: An Update, *The Century Foundation Issue Brief Series*, 2002: An update of The Century Foundation’s February 2000 idea brief on Economic School Integration. Documents the increasing level of economic school segregation in the U.S. and argues that the best way to improve education would be to give every American schoolchild the chance to attend a middle-

class public school. Lists eight communities currently using socioeconomic integration, and briefly describes how the integration schemes work. Presents overview of studies that found low income and middle class students do better in majority middle class school than they do in high poverty schools, and studies on the reasons students perform better in middle class schools. Includes extensive endnote citations to relevant authority. (online at: <http://www.tcf.org/Publications/Education/economicschoolintegration.pdf>)

Knapp, Michael; Shields, Patrick. Re-conceiving Academic Instruction for the Children of Poverty, *Phi Delta Kappan*, v. 71, n.10, June 1990, p. 753- 58: Examines the premises underlying conventional approaches to teaching disadvantaged students and suggests more effective methods for teachers in poverty concentrated schools.

Mial, Richard. La Crosse: One School District's Drive to Create Socioeconomic Balance, in *Divided We Fail: Coming Together Through Public School Choice*. Washington D.C.: The Century Foundation, 2002, p. 115- 140: Documents La Crosse, WI's hotly-contested transition to and experience with SES student allocation, based on interviews with key players, an extensive survey of local newspaper accounts, and the author's own observations as a political writer, reporter, and editorial writer in La Crosse. Explains the relative dearth of studies on the success of La Crosse's allocation system. Presents anecdotal information and a comparison of test scores by school from year to year, which suggest that increased socioeconomic balance has improved learning.

Orfield, Gary; Gordon, Nora. *Schools More Separate: Consequences of a Decade of Resegregation*, Cambridge: Harvard Civil Rights Project, 2001: Documents the history of school racial/ethnic segregation; the American public's attitude toward school integration; and the current movement toward re-segregation. Presents critical implications of unequal education. Concludes with policy recommendations for increasing SES and racial/ethnic integration.

Orr, M., Stone, C., & Stumbo, C. *Concentrated Poverty and Educational Achievement: Politics and Possibility in the Baltimore Region*. University of Maryland. Unpublished manuscript, 2002: Summarizes research on the impact of concentrated poverty on education, in general, and its impact on Baltimore City schools, in particular. Provides an overview of how Baltimore City's public schools became, and why they continue to be, poverty concentrated. Calls on state officials to work with the city and representatives from the inner suburbs to recognize and address the problem of school-based poverty concentration. Offers policy recommendations for decreasing poverty concentration in the city schools.

Schellenber, Stephen K. Concentration of Poverty and the Ongoing Need for Title I in *Hard Work for Good Schools: Facts not Fads in Title I Reform*. Orfield, Gary; DeBray, Elizabeth, eds. The Civil Rights Project: Harvard University, 1998.

Silberman, Todd. Wake County Schools: A Question of Balance, in *Divided We Fail: Coming Together Through Public School Choice*. Washington D.C.: The Century Foundation, 2002, p.141- 166: Thorough analysis of Wake County, NC's effort to

preserve hard-fought educational equality gains in the face of federal court holdings that school assignments in which race plays a role are unconstitutional. Documents, from the perspective of proponents and opponents of SES allocation involved in the Wake County education system, of Wake County's legacy of integration; mixed success with magnet schools; and transition to SES student assignment. Examines how changing residential patterns and existing school options challenge the SES allocation program.