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Background & Policy Context

- The interrelated nature of public education and metropolitan planning
- Bifurcated education system
- Need for cross disciplinary professional development
Recent New York Times Headlines

• “New York Offers Housing Subsidy as Teacher Lure” - April 15, 2006

• “Connecticut Senate Votes to Ban Soda Sales in the State’s Schools” - April 21, 2006

• “Law to Segregate Omaha Schools Divides Nebraska” - April 15, 2006

• “Details of Schools Takeover Emerge” - April 13, 2006 (LA Times)
Aim of Presentations

• Identify key issues
• Highlight current research
• Identify policy options and strategies
• Provide recommendations for action
Topic Areas

- Land Development and School Design
- Housing, Schools and Transportation
- Community Health and Education
- Equity, Segregation, Choice and Education Reform
- Governance & School Finance
Land Development & School Design

Presented by: Jean Eisberg, Chris Lollini, Lauren Friedman, Susan Slingluff
Need for School Facilities

• Nationally, student population is projected to reach 81 million by 2050 (32% increase over 2000)

• Billions spent in 2005 on school construction
  – Nearly 60% of funds spent on new school construction
  – Most new schools built in growing suburbs on undeveloped land
How can we structure school facility funds and construction in a way that promotes sustainable development and regional equity?
Schools and Sprawl

- Current school site planning is contributing to suburban sprawl
Causes of School Sprawl

• “New is better”

• “Two-thirds” rule

• Acreage requirements

• Exemption from planning and zoning requirements

Folsom High School; Folsom, CA
Effects of School Sprawl

- Mega-schools
- Increased transportation costs
- “Leapfrog” development
- Physical disconnect between communities and schools
What to do about Sprawl?

- “Smart growth” planning principles encourage efficient use of land and resources.

- School siting and facilities design are essential to successful “smart growth” planning.
“Smart” Schools

- Compact school design
- Improved access for students and families
- Strengthen existing neighborhoods
- Preserve open space and the environment
- Joint-use facilities
- School as “Center of Community”
Policy Options

• Remove acreage requirements, allow for increased building heights

• Revise “two-thirds” rule to eliminate bias against renovation, adaptive reuse and historic preservation

• Integrate city and school planning processes

• Encourage public-private partnerships

• Involve schools in development agreements
Creating Regional Equity

- Balanced school investment between existing and developing neighborhoods will help struggling schools
- Create a range of housing choices to facilitate school desegregation
- Design schools to improve transportation efficiency and walkability
- Integrate schools and community health initiatives
Housing, Transportation, and Schools

Leigh Angres, Elinor Buchen, Sundar Chari, David Zisser
Driving Questions

• How do…
  – lack of quality affordable housing
  – poverty concentration
  – housing instability
  – transportation inequity
  …contribute to the quality of schools and student outcomes?

• What are strategies we can use to address these problems?
Background

1900: First racial zoning ordinance

1910: Racial zoning unconstitutional

1917: Racial zoning unconstitutional

1934 Housing Act: Redlining

1937 Housing Act: Public housing

1948: Racial covenants unconstitutional

1949 Housing Act: Eminent domain

1950s: Urban Renewal, aka Negro Removal

1956 Highway Act: Demolishes urban homes

1975: Exclusion based on income unconstitutional

1975: Exclusion based on income unconstitutional
Housing and Transportation Policy is School Policy

- Children are over-represented in low-income households

- Students from disadvantaged neighborhoods have more problems and attend schools with fewer resources

- Highly mobile students are more likely to drop out of high school

- Lack of transportation reduces ability to participate in school choice programs
Strategies

• Housing choice vouchers
  – Federal government

• Inclusionary zoning
  – Local government

• School choice
  – School district

• The developer model
  – Private/non-Profit developers
Housing Choice Vouchers

Section 8
• 60% are households with children
• Concentrated in poor and minority central communities

Results from Gautreaux
• Lower drop-out rates and higher performance

Results from Moving to Opportunity
• Little change in educational performance
## Housing Choice Vouchers (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
<th>Conditions for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Unwilling landlords</td>
<td>• Enforce anti-discrimination laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Transportation obstacles</td>
<td>• Counseling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Government subsidy insufficient</td>
<td>• Landlord outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dispersed locations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inclusionary Zoning

Montgomery County, MD

• Key provisions
  – Mandatory for developers
  – Low and moderate income
  – Units purchased by public housing authority

• Results
  – Over 10,000 affordable units
  – 80% of the recipients are minorities
## Inclusionary Zoning (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
<th>Conditions for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Better suited for moderate-income housing  
  • Developer opposition          | • High growth area                     |
|                                  | • Mandatory                             |
|                                  | • Targets low-income households        |
|                                  | • Maintaining affordability             |
School Choice and Transportation

Miami-Dade County Public Schools

- 370,000 students
- 80% minority
- “I Choose” program
  - Choice zones
  - Computerized routing system
### School Choice and Transportation (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
<th>Conditions for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Expensive</td>
<td>• Political support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Logistically challenging</td>
<td>• Equitable division of choice zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Not community-focused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• May reduce parental involvement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Developer Model

Centennial Place, Atlanta, GA
- HOPE VI funding
- Mixed-income
- Local partnerships

Centennial Place Elementary
- Highest scoring elementary school in Atlanta in 2002
- One of the top performers in the state in 2005
## Developer Model (cont)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
<th>Conditions for success</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| • Displacement and gentrification  
• Complicated funding          | • Multi-sectoral partnerships              |
|                               | • Strong leadership                       |
Conclusions

- Strategies should consider local circumstances
- Outcomes dependent on specific parameters
- Lack of research & evidence on school impacts
Student Health:
School-Community Issues and Solutions

Gloria Bruce and Eliza Johnston

CP 290E
University of California-Berkeley
The Problem

• Health and achievement are linked

• Health, safety, and community well-being are linked

• Our focus: Obesity and Violence
Background: Obesity

• Scope of the Issue
  - 30% of US children are considered obese or at risk
  - Mental and physical health problems

• School performance and achievement

Source: California Healthy Kids Statistics
Background: Violence and Bullying

- **Scope of the Issue**
  - 30% of students have been affected by bullying
  - 9.2% of students have been threatened or injured by a weapon

- **School performance and achievement**
MENTAL & PHYSICAL HEALTH PROBLEMS

COMMUNITY or HOME influences
- Poverty, illness, poor nutrition
- Problems at home
- Neighborhood and environment

SCHOOL influences
- School environment and site
- Academic and social frustration
- Lack of support

influences
The role of schools:
Traditional health programs

- Vaccinations and screenings
- School nurse and first aid
- Health education in classroom
- Partnerships with state/local department of health or human services
- Reproductive health
The role of schools: New community approaches

- School-Based Health Centers (SBHCs)
- Emphasis on mental health and lifestyles
- Partnerships with community organizations, local businesses, health clinics, foundations

Geographic distribution of SBHCs in 2001 (n=1,385)

Source: National Assembly on School Based Health Care
Chappell Hayes Health Center

McClymonds High School (Oakland, CA)

• **745 students**: 79% Black, 10% Latino, 9% Asian, 2% other; 55% free lunch eligible

• **Funded by**: SF Foundation, Medical, Federal-State programs, Alameda County

• **Services**: Mental health, reproductive health, physical health, counseling

• **Partners**: Children’s Hospital Oakland, Alameda County

“Mac” is one of many community institutions in struggling but vibrant West Oakland.
School Based Youth Services

Pinelands Regional High School, (Tuckerton, NJ)

- **888 students**: 97% white, 2% Latino, 1% Black; 46% qualify for free lunch
- **Services**: Substance abuse support groups, counseling, job training, recreation and sports
- **Partners**: NJ Dept of Human Services, Kimball Health Center, Little Egg Harbor Police Dept., area recreational and vocational organizations

_Counselor at SBYS in Tuckerton – the suburban/rural fringe_
Final Thoughts/Recommendations

- Determining what works where
- Healthy facilities and neighborhoods
- Local regulations that reinforce healthy and safe school environments
- Full-service schools: bringing in the whole community
- Stable financing models
- Evaluation & best practices
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The Changing Nature of School Reform: Equity, Segregation and Choice

Driving Question:
What choice remedies exist to address persistent educational inequities, and how does neighborhood context inform which school reforms are most appropriate?
Concepts of Equity

- Public schools struggle with providing equity in access, funding, resources, and outcomes
- A lack of equity often translates into a negative impact on neighborhood desirability

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equity</th>
<th>Applied to Access</th>
<th>Applied to Funding</th>
<th>Applied to Resources</th>
<th>Applied to Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Webster: “no barriers”</td>
<td>Policies of inclusion: special education, desegregation by race, gender</td>
<td>Neutrality-oriented school finance cases</td>
<td>Policies of inclusion applied to special programs (like AP); language programs for ELL students</td>
<td>Affirmative action</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Norton Grubb, 2006
Effects of School Segregation

Research shows (Orfield, 2005):

• U.S. public schools 41 percent nonwhite
• Segregation of black and Hispanic students increasing since 1980s
• Achievement scores linked to school racial composition
• The more nonwhite a school is, the more likely it lags academically
Importance of School Choice

- Parents more involved, more satisfied when given a choice in schooling (Peterson & Howell, 2000)
- Choice decreases public school monopoly
- Choice enables parents to select a school to best address a child’s needs
- Schools become more accountable (D. Lee, 1990)
Neighborhood Impacts of School Choice

• Small Schools
  – may be neighborhood-focused or various themes may attract students from many neighborhoods

• Charter Schools
  – usually attract students from many neighborhoods

• Vouchers
  – usually disperse students from existing neighborhoods

• Community Organizing for School Reform
  – most neighborhood-focused of all the reforms
Small Schools

A scaled-down school of choice often thematically focused in an intimate learning environment.

Benefits of Small Schools
• Decrease in violence and behavior problems
• Greater parental and community involvement
• Improved instructional quality and teacher job satisfaction

Barriers to Effective Implementation
• Traditional notions school structure
• Laws in some states requiring construction of large schools
• Perceived lack of cost effectiveness

Case Studies
– Oakland Small Schools Initiative, New York
– New Visions for Public Schools
Charter Schools

Autonomous, tax-funded public schools, freed from most school district regulations.

Benefits of Charter Schools
• Many offer curriculum in music, foreign languages and fine arts
• More flexible than traditional schools: less unionization, longer hours
  – Case Studies: High Tech High, Lighthouse Community Charter, Knowledge Is Power Program (KIPP)

Barriers to Effective Implementation
• Difficulty securing facilities, start-up funding, and expertise to run a charter school
• Parents may not be able to determine whether their charter school is effective
  – Case Studies: ReadNet
Charter School Achievement?

• Charter schools had null or negative effects on test scores (RAND Corporation, 2003)

• Elementary charter schools have faster academic growth than public schools (Goldwater Institute, 2004)

• In nationwide study, charter students are 5.2% more likely to be proficient in reading, 3.2% more likely to be proficient in math (Hoxby, 2004)
Vouchers

Certificates issued by the government to families, who then have the ability to choose among competing schools.

Benefits of Vouchers

• Creates incentive to maximize quality and lower cost
• Low-income families could break suburban-urban barrier
• Increased choice options for families
  – Case Study: Milwaukee

Barriers to Effective Implementation

• Cost effectiveness, quality remain legitimate concerns
• Access barriers for low-income families
• Supply/demand limited without religious schools
Case Study: The Milwaukee Parental Choice Program

- Means-tested voucher program
- 118 schools; 15,000 students
- 97% of choice students are black and Hispanic
- 70% attend religious schools
- School quality highly variable
- Little evidence of creaming
Community Organizing for School Reform

Relies on *collaboration between schools and community organizers* to improve educational opportunities and advance community development objectives.

**Benefits to Community Organizing**
- Reform efforts grow organically out of local interests and ideas
- Develops leadership from within community
- Efforts can be linked to far-reaching community development

**Barriers to Effective Implementation**
- School districts reluctant to work with community groups
- Individual schools/community orgs responsible for reform
- School reformers don’t see value of engaging community
Case Study: New Settlement Apartments Parent Action Committee

- **South Bronx**: high poverty, crime, economic stagnation
- **NSA**: 1990 renovated block of abandoned buildings for 900 low-income families
- **PAC**: 1996 NSA parents concerned about quality of neighborhood schools petition for removal of principal
- 2001 PAC & NSA coalition of school organizing groups to hold district leadership accountable
Recommendations

To address the issues of equity and segregation and increase the effectiveness of choice options, we recommend:

• More easily accessible information for parents
• Access and retention safeguards in order to increase civil rights protection
• Create incentives for attracting low-income students to more affluent schools
• Encourage schools and communities to work together to continually improve neighborhood schools
• Increase best practice sharing among newer reform choices
• Regional cooperation in desegregation efforts to provide more equitable schools
  – E.g., Provide subsidy for students who travel to a new school
Outstanding Questions

• What other evidence exists to support or refute use of these choice options?

• How can community organizations, school district officials and reformers be encouraged to collaborate on providing equitable education?

• What role can planners play in improving schools in different neighborhood contexts?
Introduction

Key Question
What governance and finance structures would support greater integration of schools with cities/metropolitan regions and lead to increased school performance?
Background

• Traditional Governance and Finance Models

• Increased Accountability

• Alternative Governance Models
  – Strong Mayors

• Alternative Finance Models
  – State-Level Finance
### Governance and Accountability

**WHO IS ACCOUNTABLE?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Accountability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FEDERAL</strong></td>
<td>President, Dept. of Education, Congress, Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STATE</strong></td>
<td>Governor, Dept. of Education, Chief State School Officer, State Board of Education, Legislature, Courts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL</strong></td>
<td>Superintendent, School Board or Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCHOOLS</strong></td>
<td>Principal, PTA, Teachers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governance and Accountability

• Importance of accountability

• Accountability models:
  – Electoral
  – Market competition
  – Civic involvement
  – Legal
Trend: State-Level School Finance

- Role of local property taxes
- Litigation: Equity → Adequacy
- Leveraging private resources
Annual Expenditures by Funding Source

Sources: NCES, "Common Core of Data," surveys and unpublished data.
Trend: Strong Mayor Initiatives

What:
• Mayor is responsible for public schools
• Reduce size and influence of Board of Education
• Board of Education is appointed, not elected

Why:
• Centralizes accountability
• Potential for coordinated policies and budgeting
Case Studies:
Cities with Strong Mayors

• Boston – Thomas Menino
• Chicago – Richard M. Daley
• New York – Michael Bloomberg
Conclusions

• External factors influence school performance

• Trends moving in opposing directions

• Strong Mayor Initiative - promising link between cities and schools
Recommendations

• Study the direct effect of Strong Mayor Initiatives on school performance

• Study the effect of greater state-level finance authority on educational equity