Opportunity-Rich Schools and Sustainable Communities:

Seven Steps to Align High-Quality Education with Innovations in City and Metropolitan Planning and Development

Deborah L. McKoy
Jeffrey M. Vincent
Ariel H. Bierbaum

WHATWORKS COLLABORATIVE
Building Knowledge & Sharing Solutions
for Housing & Urban Policy

CENTER FOR CITIES & SCHOOLS
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Authors

This report was written by Deborah L. McKoy, Jeffrey M. Vincent, and Ariel H. Bierbaum of the Center for Cities and Schools (CC&S) at the University of California-Berkeley.

CC&S works to promote high quality education as an essential component of urban and metropolitan vitality to create equitable, healthy and sustainable cities and schools for all.

Acknowledgements

The What Works Collaborative

The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of those funders listed above or of the organizations participating in the What Works Collaborative. All errors or omissions are the responsibility of the authors.

Center for Cities & Schools
Institute of Urban and Regional Development
University of California-Berkeley
316 Wurster Hall #1870
Berkeley, CA 94720-1870

http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu

June 2011

Opportunity-Rich Schools and Sustainable Communities:

Seven Steps to Align High-Quality Education with Innovations in City and Metropolitan Planning and Development

WHATWORKS COLLABORATIVE

Building Knowledge & Sharing Solutions
for Housing & Urban Policy

CENTER FOR CITIES & SCHOOLS

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, BERKELEY

Forward

In 2010, the What Works Collaborative invited the Center for Cities & Schools (CC&S) at University of California-Berkeley to develop a report examining the ways in which public education relates to sustainable community planning. CC&S is an action-oriented think tank working to promote high quality education as an essential component of urban and metropolitan vitality to create equitable, healthy and sustainable cities and schools for all. CC&S efforts are inspired by on-the-ground innovations in communities across the country and by the pressing questions of leaders at every level of government. The CC&S team has worked extensively with educational and civic leaders in the San Francisco Bay Area and across the nation; we embraced the opportunity to further document and analyze what we have learned.

We are pleased to present this report, *Opportunity-Rich Schools and Sustainable Communities*, distilling the findings and analysis from over eight months of interviewing with more than 50 civic and educational policymakers, researchers, and practitioners at the federal, state, regional and local levels of government, and a range of community organizations and local leaders. Our primary audiences are leaders in city and regional planning and community development who strive to reach across the typically vast divides separating education and sustainable communities planning. We hope that our framework, the *Seven Steps to Align High-Quality Education and Innovations in City and Metropolitan Planning and Development,* lends support to federal agencies—and community development and regional planning practitioners in the field—in identifying the mechanisms to tangibly link their work to educational improvement efforts, to create cross-sector "win-wins," increase productivity, and foster social equity.

With each interview, our team heard about other innovative practices, only a fraction of which we have been able to include. In subsequent conversations with leaders, we have learned that additional information is needed on how to develop measureable indicators and specific metrics, to quantify the opportunity costs of not collaborating, and to bring wary or inexperienced stakeholders to the table for collaborative work. Thus, we hope that this report serves as a provocateur – raising critical new questions for further study and inciting others to positive action. CC&S will continue to work with civic and educational leaders across the country to investigate these issues, collect information on innovative practices and build on the foundational framework presented here.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   Introduction

Parents, teachers, and civic and educational leaders intuitively understand that high-quality educational opportunities for young people are essential to community health and economic vitality. Educational opportunity is the wellspring of individual, regional, and national progress. Many people across our nation, however, face daunting obstacles to getting ahead. This is especially true for low-income communities of color faced with substandard housing and high-poverty neighborhoods, where conditions undermine health and economic prosperity and overwhelm schools. A function of where people live, these roadblocks are especially pronounced for young people who lack the educational opportunities long associated with well-being and success in school and work over the course of their lives.

The goal of this report is to support federal agencies—and community development and regional planning practitioners in the field—in identifying the mechanisms to tangibly link their work to educational improvement efforts to create cross-sector "win-wins," increase productivity, and foster social equity. We aim to support those leaders who are working to overcome the historic divide between public education and sustainable communities planning. Done right, a cross sector approach not only leads to new operational efficiencies and the effective use of limited resources, but also has important implications for how institutions respond to social equity issues. Too often, equity in planning and development is limited to issues of affordable housing and transportation access. Similarly, educational equity is often reduced to issues of testing and accountability. While important, these limited approaches to planning, development, and education fail to address the broader, more dynamic nature of the inequalities that affect Americans. Beyond affordable housing concerns in a given neighborhood, many communities face extended "geographies of exclusion" based on the limited opportunities in their locale.[1] In addition to educational testing results that offer only a snapshot in time, students' success is better determined by a "trajectory" of diverse experiences and critical transitions from the time they are born to the time they enter the workforce.[2] This report frames integrated efforts—those that aim to make the most of available resources and to transform neighborhoods of poverty and failing education systems—as efforts that create robust *trajectories of opportunity* for all. This framing is grounded in planning and education research as well as a range of strategies and policy options currently employed across the nation.

Through innovative new partnerships and federal programs, such as *Choice Neighborhoods* and *Sustainable Housing and Communities,*[3] the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has strengthened its efforts to increase opportunity while promoting sustainable development.[4] By partnering with other

"It is common sense that the quality of public schools and the quality of cities affect one another but rarely, if ever, are educational and urban policies connected. Strategies are needed to do so, to ensure better schools, healthier neighborhoods, and more vital cities. "

- Bruce Katz
Vice President, Metropolitan Policy Program, Brookings Institution

The goal of this report is to support federal agencies—and community development and regional planning practitioners—in identifying the mechanisms to tangibly link their work to educational improvement efforts to create cross-sector "win-wins," increase productivity, and foster social equity.

federal agencies and departments, HUD is catalyzing new policy possibilities and realizing cross-sector, fiscally efficient "win-wins." More specifically, HUD collaborations with the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have led to the adoption of comprehensive livability principles that guide federal investments in housing, transportation, and land use (see sidebar). HUD has also sought increased alignment with U.S. Department of Education (ED) initiatives, most significantly *Promise Neighborhoods* and the *Full Service Community Schools Program.*[5]

These new partnerships underscore the deep and fundamental relationships among housing, neighborhoods, schools, and sustainability goals. The fate of young people who live in opportunity-starved communities is directly linked to the "shared fate" of their communities, regions, and the nation. Gone are the days when community development programs could be *either* "place-based" *or* "people-based."[6] Today, effectively building inclusive, opportunity-rich, and sustainable communities requires a comprehensive strategy of integrated planning and implementation that transforms places and supports individuals, families, and students who live and learn in those places. The question, then, is no longer *whether* HUD and other agencies should seek to align new programs with efforts to provide high-quality education, but rather *how* these agencies can best achieve this goal at local and regional levels. How might policy interventions and investments, which mostly focus on housing, be made to strategically support improving school quality? How can educational improvements and innovative education policies support local and regional planning and development?

This report offers answers to the above questions by describing current efforts across the country that are creating robust *trajectories of opportunity* for young people—a concept we discuss in more detail throughout the report. The experiences of elected leaders, officials, and practitioners bring to light the significant challenges to breaking down the political and historical divisions among professional fields. However, the challenges are not insurmountable and must be confronted. Not doing so inhibits the innovations necessary for city and regional planning to ameliorate the deep racial and economic inequalities across metro regions that limit individual potential and threaten community prosperity.

To begin, we briefly describe the key challenges and opportunities that arise during efforts to align new sustainable community planning and development with educational policies, programs, and practices that are responsive to the particular needs of students, their families, and the larger community. We then provide seven key action steps local governments and practitioners can take when working with local education agencies (LEAs).[7] These steps are designed to overcome some of the main challenges associated with the alignment of education and planning policy and practice.

2

The evidenced-based framework for the seven steps builds on previous What Works Collaborative papers[8] and is consistent with the latest research findings on increasing educational and lifelong opportunities for young people as well as the underlying vision and goals of many local, regional, and national sustainable development initiatives. In developing these seven steps, we drew on a national scan of promising practices (at local, regional, and state scales), the insights and experiences gleaned from policy leaders from across the country, and discussions with key staff at HUD, ED, and EPA. We also drew upon our seven years of research on these issues at the University of California–Berkeley's Center for Cities and Schools, especially our action research with LEAs, municipalities, regional planning agencies, and state policymakers throughout California.

II. Challenges in Linking High-Quality Education and Sustainable Communities

Linking improvements in education to sustainable regional planning and community development requires an understanding of the factors that have blocked such connections in the past and that could continue to undermine them in the future. These contextual challenges and tensions include persistent poverty and inequality, divergent paths of action, "siloed" institutions, and limited capacity. While they play out differently depending on local politics, economies, and history, most places experience these issues as the underlying context of their collaborative efforts.

Challenge #1—Poverty and Inequality: An Uneven Distribution of Opportunity Undermines Schools, Communities, and Young People's Life Chances

The persistent poverty and resultant inequality among communities in our metropolitan regions is manifest in differences in transportation infrastructure, quality affordable housing, municipal amenities (e.g., parks), and access to good schools and stable jobs that pay sustaining wages. Differences among places gives rise to what many scholars term the "uneven geography of opportunity."[9] Sociologists and urban planning experts have long understood that where people live greatly shapes their life chances. Research consistently finds a strong correlation between living in a neighborhood of concentrated poverty and poor life outcomes, poor health, low educational attainment, and low-wage work.[10] Poverty-concentrated neighborhoods tend to have poor-quality, unhealthy housing with little access to amenities; suffer from inadequate public infrastructure investment; and receive little private sector bricks-and-mortar investment. Such neighborhoods typically have higher crime rates, high schools with higher dropout rates and lower average test scores, and fewer opportunities for secure, living-wage employment.

These neighborhoods are typically cut off from the resources and amenities afforded by more affluent, opportunity-rich communities in the same region, where schools are generally more successful, infrastructure investments high, and jobs more plentiful.

Educators and educational researchers have recently sought to identify more precisely the underlying factors that result in an *achievement gap*—the widening discrepancy in educational attainment between African American and Latino students, on the one hand, and their white and Asian peers, on the other.[11] What they have found is that the achievement gap is largely the result of conditions that constitute an *opportunity gap*. That is, low-income and minority families and their children face double jeopardy; their neighborhoods lack such opportunities as quality child care, preschool, healthy environments, quality affordable housing, and legitimate or living-wage jobs with advancement opportunities. Their schools do not offer the social or academic support that would engender engagement and high achievement. As a result, young people in these communities never even get near the clear paths to academic success and economic self-sufficiency that opportunity-rich neighborhoods help carve out for the young people who live and learn there.[12]

Challenge #2—Achieving Social Equity: Agreed-Upon Goals, but Sometimes Divergent Paths

The disadvantages of living in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty are well-documented. Likewise, a preponderance of evidence demonstrates that children living in poverty benefit academically from economically integrated classrooms. Yet, schools, and the neighborhoods they serve, remain highly segregated, both racially and socioeconomically. Fortunately, over the past decades, policymakers have identified many, yet sometimes-divergent, policy mechanisms to foster mixed-income communities and economically integrated schools, ultimately to avoid segregation, create diversity, and increase equity across schools.

For example, in Montgomery County, Maryland, policymakers have sought economic integration of schools through inclusionary zoning, a strategy that provides economically integrated housing to families from a mix of incomes. As a result, local schools have greater diversity and have demonstrated substantial academic improvement over time.[13] Other integrative solutions, most often crafted by school districts, aim to provide more young people in disadvantaged communities with opportunities to access higher performing schools *outside* their immediate neighborhoods. Sometimes these solutions are enacted by giving families a choice in which school they attend; in other words, they are not required to attend their nearest school. Other times, students are purposefully assigned to a school (often outside their neighborhood) to create more diverse student bodies at individual schools. Magnet schools have proved a popular mechanism established

by school districts. These schools often have a thematic or pedagogical focus, and thereby act as a magnet to attract a mix of students through urban-suburban transfer programs or other non-neighborhood-based assignment policies.[14]

Other communities and school districts seek to improve education *within* high-poverty, low-opportunity neighborhoods. Strategies such as developing *community* or *full-service schools* that house a range of social service and health supports in addition to academic programming aim to position neighborhood schools as the center of a community. In this approach, students are provided access to services and supports that will ensure they are ready to learn, and the school may become a centerpiece community asset as new amenities and development emerge over time.

Each of these strategies can prove effective depending on local context, and many of them are not mutually exclusive. For example, a community school model can work well in a neighborhood that is economically integrated as a result of an inclusionary zoning policy. Studies show that *both* neighborhood-based and integrative education strategies have the potential to produce positive outcomes for students.[15] The challenge is for civic and community leaders to reconcile an often perceived tension between various viable policy strategies in light of local and regional environmental, economic, political, and social circumstances. Too often policymakers' integrative and neighborhood-based strategies are pitted against one another when in fact they can, and do, coexist in many communities. Thus, it appears that there is need for both strategies to be used – but in a fashion that compliments one another rather than competes.

Challenge #3—Rigid Silos: Entrenched Policy Divisions Persist between Educators and Urban Planners

Typically, the work of planning and community development practitioners and educators rarely intersects, even though schools and communities are inherently connected. These disconnects can result in redundant use of resources and inefficiencies in program and service delivery. In most locales, LEAs and local governments typically do not collaborate even on matters obviously related to both educational and community issues, such as new school siting, school renovation and expansion, changes to school attendance boundaries, coordinated school transportation services, and new family housing developments.[16] Increasingly communities across the country see these disconnects play out where school districts are planning to consolidate and close schools in the same neighborhoods that city leaders are directing revitalization efforts and new housing.

This silo planning phenomenon is largely a function of state policy, or, in most cases, the *lack* of state policy that would create incentives for collaboration, support cross-agency accountability, or mandate that planning and educational entities work

together.[17] In most states, LEAs are largely independent, autonomous jurisdictions that operate under a distinct set of state policies and regulations. These policies and regulations usually differ significantly from those that guide municipal practice.

We identify four structural policy challenges that hinder collaboration and partnerships:

1. LEA geographic boundaries may differ from municipal and/or a metropolitan region's boundaries. An LEA may serve multiple municipalities and/or a city may be host to several LEAs. Forging one-to-one relationships can be challenging enough, but in many communities and regions, there can be dozens or even more LEAs to bring to the table.

2. Planning time horizons typically differ between LEAs, municipalities, and regional agencies. School districts typically create 5- to 10-year capital plans, while municipal and/or regional plans often look 20 or more years into the future.

3. Development timelines and budgetary processes differ for school and housing, transportation, and other infrastructure development. This can interfere with securing approvals for joint planning, design, or development of facilities or programs and other operational procedures.

4. LEAs and municipalities or planning organizations rarely share data systems that would support shared knowledge about a wide range of community and educational indicators. State education reporting rules and school boards tend to drive LEA data collection, while municipal and regional agencies maintain their own data, often reflecting what is collected through the U.S. Census. While these data quite often describe the same families, data collection, cataloging, and analysis are usually done separately, and agencies do not have access to all the same information. Furthermore, planning agencies tend to develop models and projections based only on the data they can access; without shared systems, education data may never enter into regional modeling and forecasts.[18]

In spite of the challenges, some LEAs and municipalities and/or regional agencies across the country do effectively collaborate. Such partnerships are often driven by charismatic leaders who forge new relationships. Other times, agencies make formal attempts to restructure relationships. For instance, cities and LEAs may share staff, jointly funding or managing a single position. Additionally, city-school committees or "2x2" committees with elected leadership from both municipal government and the LEA may garner increasing decision-making power for specific projects. Finally, some districts or boards of education report directly to the mayor; an estimated 12 of the 75 largest urban districts engaged in the *National League of Cities Institute for*

6

Youth, Education, and Families report some level of mayoral control, from appointing superintendents to recommending select board members. At the state policy level, many state departments of education provide financial incentives for LEAs to partner with local governments, nonprofits, and other entities in planning and developing shared school facilities for community centers, recreational spaces, and playgrounds.

Challenge #4—Limited Capacity: Conventional Practice Reinforces Siloed Institutions

Given decades of separate but parallel work, LEAs, municipalities, and regional agencies that would like to collaborate often do not know where to start. This is hardly surprising given that these institutions operate with unique practices, languages, and organizational cultures. Collaboration is further complicated by a deep distrust among them that has developed over many years. Lacking a working knowledge of their counterparts' policies and procedures, leaders and staff often feel ill-equipped to even enter discussions. Since few local, regional, state, or federal policies require or provide guidance for such collaboration, it comes about idiosyncratically, left to chance politics or individual leadership rather than institutionalized policy and practice. Under standard operating procedure, just the act of seeking out information across agencies is not viewed as a part of anyone's official job description. As a result, municipal and regional agencies often lack the internal capacity to establish interagency partnerships.

There are no quick fixes. Yet, as described in this report, people and agencies across the nation are developing new and innovative practices that can lead to enhanced opportunities and sustainability.

III.   The Task Ahead: Ensuring Trajectories of Opportunity in Sustainable Communities

To set young people on a path to economic self-sufficiency and prosperity, we must align people, policies, and places to ensure robust trajectories of opportunity. For families and their children, opportunity often means access to several resources— smoothly functioning schools with qualified teachers, jobs with advancement possibilities, health care, and recreation. Furthermore, the underlying concept of a *trajectory* implies the long-range process of an individual's life beginning at cradle and continuing through college and covering not just classrooms but the full spectrum of a young person's life experience.[19] For example, young people benefit from age-specific supports and resources; strong evidence demonstrates that quality early childhood and pre-kindergarten programs prepare children for higher achievement in grade school.[20] Trajectories of opportunity thus structure success over the course of young people's lives, helping them overcome obstacles and benefit from education, family and social supports, and healthy and safe environments.

Because not all local neighborhoods have access to needed socio-economic resources, establishing trajectories of opportunity requires that young people and families in high-poverty neighborhoods have regional mobility to efficiently travel outside of their immediate neighborhood to other parts of the metropolitan area to access jobs, health services, and the best educational options. As sustainable community strategies also emphasize the importance of convenient, efficient multi-modal travel within a region, this becomes one "common-ground" goal between school and regional leaders.

Robust Trajectories of Opportunity for All: What "High-Quality Education" Means when Linked to Planning and Development

Over the past decade, educational reforms such as No Child Left Behind and local standards movements have positioned high-stakes testing as a de facto measure of school quality used by parents, policymakers, realtors, and others. While reflective of some measure of knowledge (and solid test taking abilities), such measures of student academic outputs are limited; they do not adequately consider the multidimensional and complex resources (inputs) needed to close the growing opportunity gap driving the nation's achievement gap. In working to support a trajectory of opportunity for young people, research and practice are developing and promoting new ways to understand, measure, and assess school quality.

8

Out-of-School Factors Contribute Significantly to In-School Success

Educational performance is a function of more than just what happens inside classrooms. Leading educational scholars and policymakers increasingly recognize the importance of factors outside school—many of which remain the purview of non-educators. Nonschool factors include socioeconomic differences, housing stability, available and affordable transportation options, health care, after-school programs, open space, and cultural amenities. Thus, planning and development are important parts of any meaningful attempt to address the issues confronting children and families in the communities where schools are located, including problems of poverty, urban decay and instability, and unemployment.[21] As education scholar Pedro Noguera notes, "Unless concerted action is taken to alleviate the hardships and suffering related to poverty and to spur development that can lead to economic and social stability for communities and families, little change in the character and quality of urban schools in the United States will occur." [22]

Money Is Not the Only Resource Required for Student and School Success

Schools need significant funding to recruit high-quality teachers, acquire and support appropriate technology learning tools, ensure safe and healthy buildings, and provide other educational supports. Yet ensuring trajectories of opportunity requires more than just dollars. Addressing the complex problems many students and their families face requires a two-way system of accountability—of educators to their communities and of communities to schools.[23] Thus, parents, community organizations, and civic leaders must all engage in providing support to students, families, and schools. In this way, the whole life of the learner is cared for in a more multidimensional educational context and with a broader understanding of education quality.

Thus, the resources and strategic thinking of planners, community development professionals, and regional policymakers fill a critical and unmet niche for preparing and supporting more equitable conditions. Ultimately these are the conditions for success and for building the contexts that facilitate high-quality education across metropolitan communities.

Educational performance is a function of more than just what happens inside classrooms.

IV. Seven Steps to Align High-Quality Education with Innovations in City and Metropolitan Planning and Development

For cross-sector policy and practice that promotes positive educational outcomes in tandem with housing, transportation, and sustainable community policies, we recommend seven important action steps for planners, policymakers, educators, and others. These recommendations stem from more than a decade of research and practical, hands-on work with dozens of city, school, and regional leaders seeking to break through past practices of isolation and forge new, innovative, and effective policies. While the steps are numbered, they need not be implemented in this same order. In developing these steps, we have aimed to provide a framework broad enough to guide more effective, aligned, and integrated policies while also recognizing the local, context-specific nature of this work.

Step 1   **Get to Know Your Educational Landscape**
Local or regional land use planning efforts should consider the current educational options and policies that affect families.

Step 2   **Engage School Leaders, Families, and Young People in Planning and Development**
Ensuring opportunity-rich and sustainable communities will in part depend on the effective engagement of residents of all ages.

Step 3   **Establish a Shared Vision and Metrics for Linking High-Quality Education to Economic Prosperity at Community and Regional Levels**
A robust, inclusive visioning process can begin to bridge rigid policy and institutional silos.

Step 4   **Support the Whole Life of Learners through Services and Amenities**
A fundamental component of opportunity-rich communities is the right mix of services and amenities that will support and attract a diverse set of residents.

Step 5   **Align Bricks-and-Mortar Investments for Regional Prosperity**
To structure opportunity and increase sustainability, cross-sector partners should coordinate capital investments in schools, housing, and neighborhoods.

Step 6   **Maximize Access to Opportunity through Affordable Transportation**
Taking advantage of increasing educational options and regional opportunity resources for families requires affordable, multimodal transportation options.

Step 7   **Institutionalize What Works to Secure Gains and Ensure Ongoing Innovation**
Inclusive and integrated planning should become "business as usual," with a set of formal relationships and processes that guide wise and efficient investments.

These seven steps are developed and illustrated using examples of local and regional planning and project implementations drawn from across the country. Following each step, we highlight *promising practices* that offer inspiration and useful models for local practitioners and policymakers who are launching or enhancing collaborative work. Ultimately, successful implementation of these action steps will depend on both horizontal alignment among local agencies and vertical alignment of local, regional, state, and federal policies and incentives.

SEVEN STEPS
Aligning High-Quality Education with
Innovations in City and Regional Planning and Development

KNOW	PLAN	IMPLEMENT	SUSTAIN
1. Know Your Educational Landscape	**2.** Engage School Leaders, Families, & Young People **3.** Establish a Shared Vision and Metrics	**4.** Support the Whole Life of Learners **5.** Align Bricks-and-Mortar Investments **6.** Maximize Access to Opportunity through Transportation	**7.** Institutionalize What Works

STEP 1: Get to Know Your Educational Landscape

Historically, public education aimed to prepare young people to enter the workforce and engage society as responsible citizens. Because these same goals are echoed today in new HUD programs and other innovative metropolitan initiatives, a range of existing educational programs and policies could be incorporated into transformative community development and regional planning policies. Realizing this possibility largely depends on understanding the local educational landscape in the context of important national trends in education.

Non-educators often have a limited grasp of the complex and diverse set of school programs, school choices, student needs, school assignment policies, and the like that make up an LEA's responsibilities. Constantly evolving, today's educational reality is much different than even 10 years ago. In Washington, D.C., for example, demographic shifts in the past decade brought sharp enrollment declines that triggered school closures. In Los Angeles, however, increasing immigration and other demographic changes have required historic levels of new school construction. Perhaps the single most important development over the past decade is that students and families now have an increasing number of educational options. For example, some students may enter a lottery or apply to attend a public charter school.[24] In some areas, students have the option of applying to theme-based magnet schools, usually located outside their home neighborhoods. Alternatively, or in conjunction with such choices, LEAs may have a student assignment policy that disperses students throughout the district to relieve overcrowding or to counter racial or economic segregation. Finally, students may attend a private or parochial school.[25] As a result, students do not necessarily attend the school nearest their home.

Because educational policy is set at both state and local levels, this trend toward increasing educational options for families varies from state to state, region to region, and locality to locality. Regardless of the specific context, educational options are likely to continue to play a significant role in choices families make about where to live. Local and regional planners responsible for projecting and accommodating housing demand and growth should be aware of educational options and policies, and how they might affect choices families make about housing. Below, we outline three key areas of the educational landscape that each locality and region should understand on an ongoing basis.

Understand Local Educational Policies and Demographics

Map LEA jurisdictions: LEAs are distinct jurisdictions with physical geographic boundaries and governance authority that may or may not align with other city or regional agencies. A city may have only one LEA within its boundaries, or

many. Alternatively, an LEA may serve one or many cities. San Francisco Unified School District, for example, aligns one LEA, one city, and one county of seven square miles; a nearby LEA, the West Contra Costa Unified School District, aligns with five cities and six unincorporated areas, covering 65 square miles. Mapping LEAs is all the more important as boundaries and governance structures are changing.

Identify key leaders and existing partnerships: Begin by reaching out to educational leaders, especially superintendents, schools boards, and senior staff members. In doing so, non-educators will often find that local LEAs already have some form of partnership with other local government agencies or community-based organizations. For example, school districts may have extensive agreements involving joint use of school or community facilities ranging from community use of school gymnasiums, playgrounds, and classrooms to shared funding for after-school programming or crossing guard programs. Such partnerships generate significant "win-wins," as LEAs and their students and families get increased resources and services. City leaders may meet regularly with LEA officials—either as part of a formal city-school committee or more informally as an outgrowth of personal relationships. Intensifying city-school-community partnerships depends on learning from and building on current collaboration.

Understand LEA attendance boundaries and assignment policies: Each LEA will likely organize its attendance boundaries and school assignment policies differently. The majority of our nation's students attend local neighborhood schools. But a growing number of districts have diverse school assignment policies or offer greater school choice to parents. Many schools, especially at the elementary level, maintain neighborhood boundaries for student assignment. However, these boundaries may or may not map with what a local government considers its neighborhoods, which may instead more closely follow census tract designations or zip codes. Aligning these boundaries with planning and redevelopment areas is critical to ensuring that investments made in communities and schools are optimally leveraged. In many cities, including San Francisco, Berkeley, Cambridge, and Baltimore, students are assigned to school not based upon where they live but rather through a controlled school choice program based largely on families' stated preferences and considerations to ensure racially and socioeconomically integrated classrooms. As discussed in challenge 2 above, because HUD's new programs support social and educational goals of equity and inclusion, policymakers should understand where the efforts of local and regional initiatives complement those of LEAs, as well as where they may be at odds.

Chart student demographics: Most metropolitan areas contain socioeconomically, racially, and ethnically diverse populations across the region. Reflective of demographic change, student populations follow immigration and migration within and between states. By 2040, for example, people of color will represent the majority population in the United States.[26] Understanding the current and projected demographics of students and families in a region and local communities is critical to ascertaining the kinds of academic and extracurricular needs, social service interventions, and additional amenities required to meet families' needs. Students of color, English language learners, and low-income families may need many and varied types of supports—both in and out of school—to ensure educational success. A combination of district data points (e.g., percent of students who qualify for the federal free and reduced-priced meal program [FARM]) and nonschool data (e.g., census tract demographic information) will provide a robust picture of the students and families served.[27] Collaborative data collection and analysis will show where concentrations of poverty exist as well as segregation across the region and correlations with measures of school quality and performance.

Inventory Educational and Workforce Assets

To engage in meaningful dialogue with LEAs, local municipalities need to have a working understanding of programmatic and curricular priorities and broader community assets. Community assets include both traditional schools and nontraditional educational environments. The P–16 (preschool to university) continuum in education recognizes that a quality education starts with early child care, extends through an aligned system of preschool through high school, and continues through higher education and career development. In certain cases, these programmatic priorities also directly inform other regional efforts in workforce development and regional competitiveness. Understanding the local context requires inventory of five categories of educational assets:

High-quality child care and early learning: Increasingly, educators, parents, and community leaders alike recognize that child development from birth to age 5 is critical to future emotional, social, and academic success. Research shows that children who participate in high-quality early learning environments develop better language skills, score higher on school readiness tests, and are more likely to be literate, employed, and enroll in postsecondary education as adults.[28] While considered outside the boundaries of traditional K–12 systems for many years, aligning education with high-quality child care and preschool is now a central part of how we understand a quality education today. These services are generally funded and operated by either private providers through the federal Head Start Programs or by the state.

K–12 assets: LEAs vary in the ways they organize levels of schooling, with different configurations most common in elementary and middle schools.

- **Elementary and middle school programs and reforms set the stage for college and career:** Elementary and middle schools are configured differently for reasons usually driven by educational programming and current resources. These configurations aim to increase personalization and connection both within the school and often to local neighborhoods. Known to be critically important developmental years, educational programs recognize that preparing for college starts in elementary school. Further, some researchers argue that middle school is the critical time where students disengage and leave school or begin preparation for high school and beyond.[29]

- **High school programs and reforms call for college and career preparation for all:** Stakeholders from President Obama to national education foundations to state policymakers to educational researchers have all made college and career preparation a top policy priority. Some high school programs are forging more and stronger connections between classrooms and the world outside. These efforts connect academics to student interests, job preparation, and college readiness with the hope of increasing graduation rates, enrollment, and persistence in college, and ultimately raising earning potential. These efforts complement non-LEA district efforts in workforce development and offer opportunities for nonschool stakeholders, such as private industry or government entities to support and engage students and schools—by providing mentors, internships, and a direct link to the ever-changing realities of local and regional economies.

Out-of-school time (OST) programs and support services: A broad array of additional services designed to reinforce and complement regular academic programs are an essential part of today's educational experience for students. Art, music, technology education, and recreation programs are recognized as important aspects to a well-rounded education, in addition to counseling and supportive services for those in need of them.[30] A combination of private and federal, state, and local government dollars usually fund such services, which are administered by schools or community-based organizations.

Higher education: Our nation's prosperity depends on its ability to prepare all young people for college, career, and life. Higher education (a.k.a. postsecondary education) refers to a broad range of institutions including two-year colleges, four-year universities and colleges, seminaries, institutes of

technology, and other collegiate-level institutions that award academic degrees. States and regions vary in the sort of public and private systems available, but regardless, higher education attainment increases individual earning potential and contributes to regional economic prosperity.[31]

Regional workforce preparation and adult education: A broad range of institutions provides a region's continued education and workforce preparation for youth and adults. Increasingly, community colleges are recognized and invested in as instrumental partners in providing these opportunities. Every year, community colleges educate and train more than 6.2 million students, from recent high school graduates to retirees trying to learn a new language or skill. Community colleges are gateways to the local labor market and thus are essential resources in building a region's workforce. Diverse regional workforce partnerships are also an important, relevant trend. In several states, including Pennsylvania, Oregon, and Washington, industry-driven collaborations have brought employers, public education and workforce training providers, community-based organizations, and labor unions together to develop solutions to regional economic and workforce challenges. These partnerships map labor market trends, identify growth industries, develop new training programs and curriculum, and ensure that training meets regional employers' needs.[32]

Assess Physical School Infrastructure

The more than 90,000 public schools across the country are place-based neighborhood assets. In addition to the regular school activities, communities use indoor and outdoor school facilities and spaces for everything from voting to sports leagues and neighborhood meetings. The physical conditions of these assets vary considerably, which affects educational quality; a growing body of evidence finds that poor school building conditions are strongly associated with poor educational outcomes and create formidable barriers to student success.[33] Specifically, information should focus on the following:

- Physical conditions of existing schools
- Level of identified but unmet improvements needed
- School building utilization by students, defined by the enrollment-to-capacity ratio
- Locations of planned new schools
- School closure plans
- Joint-use (or similar) agreements for community use of schools

Given the role that schools play in families' housing choices, the quality and capacity of existing school infrastructure and plans for new construction or modernization are important considerations for other neighborhood development activities.

Cincinnati, Ohio—Regional university-city collaboration assesses needs and identifies resources that result in educational improvement

In Cincinnati, the Strive Initiative's *Student's Roadmap to Success* specifies the "key experiences and milestones that are necessary along a child's journey from cradle to career." The research-based roadmap provides a mental model for communities to better understand a child's entire learning journey, identify specific outcomes along the way that must improve, and then focus on specific strategies that will move those indicators. Strive, a partnership of education, business, philanthropic, non-profit and civic leaders, "unites common providers around shared issues, goals, measurements, and results, and then actively supports and strengthens strategies that work" with the goal of ensuring that all children succeed from birth through career. With support from the Living Cities, Strive has developed a framework communities can use to develop partnerships that meet their unique needs. The framework has been refined through work in five cities of 2011. Strive's Cincinnati outcomes have earned national attention from planners and educators; in its four years, Strive Cincinnati partners have seen positive trends in more than half the indicators tracked, including high school graduation rates, fourth grade reading and math scores, and preschool-age children who are prepared for kindergarten.

Strive: http://www.strivetogether.org

Emeryville, California—Facility assessment study inspires vision of school and community revitalization

A partnership between Emery Unified School District and the City of Emeryville produced a *Youth Services Master Plan* in 2002, with the stated goal of maximizing benefits of programs for young people. When the plan's authors, a task force of diverse local stakeholders, toured the district's school buildings, many were surprised to find the facilities in serious disrepair. Following this discovery, the city and school district embarked on a joint effort to assess the conditions of all facilities and program needs for students and community members. From the *Plan* came the recommendation that the city and the school district jointly build a new K–12 school and community center on the current secondary school site. In pursuing this recommendation, the city and the school district are planning a joint development project—the Emeryville Center of Community Life (ECCL), which will house the district's secondary school, before- and after-school programming, and city-run programs, services, and activities for students and the community. The redevelopment project will bring school and city programs onto one central site with state-of-the-art facilities in this small urban city. In 2008, Emeryville voters passed a bond measure with more than 80 percent support, which will facilitate the ECCL's construction.

Emeryville Center of Community Life: http://www.emeryvillecenter.org

Washington, DC—Citywide analysis illuminates complex residential and enrollment patterns

In 2007, the Washington, D.C., Office of the State Superintendent commissioned a study to understand the causes and implications of rapidly declining school enrollment and how to retain and attract families. The 21st Century School Fund, the Brookings Institution, and the Urban Institute collaborated on the research, bringing together diverse expertise on education, housing, and neighborhood change. The partners developed a sophisticated framework using student, school, and neighborhood quantitative data; focus groups with parents and high school dropouts; and meetings with city stakeholders and education and housing officials to understand the complex and dramatic changes occurring in the city. The 2010 report*, Quality Schools, Healthy Neighborhoods, and the Future of D.C.*, fostered a more informed dialogue about enrollment retention and attraction strategies, school closure options, and school assignment policy changes. The process and findings shed light on the often overlooked relationship between residential patterns and school assignment, building bridges between city, neighborhood, and educational stakeholders' interests.

Quality Schools, Healthy Neighborhoods report:
http://www.21csf.org/csf-home/publications/QualitySchoolsResearchReport/QualitySchoolsPolicyReport9-18-08.pdf

San Francisco, California—Joint city and school district sponsored study supports expanded community use of school facilities

The city, the LEA, and community-based organizations in San Francisco collaborated on a study to improve community access to the city's 134 schools for programs, services, and activities. Conducted by the Center for Cities and Schools at the University of California-Berkeley, the study mapped the nonschool users and uses of school spaces and convened a diverse stakeholder group to discuss challenges and improvement options. The report, *San Francisco's Public School Facilities as Public Assets*, provided a policy, management, and budget framework for the LEA to expand and sustain community use throughout its schools. In 2011, the school board formally adopted a resolution to support expanding community use (e.g., joint use) and the partners are working to implement the report's recommendations.

San Francisco's Public School Facilities as Public Assets:
http://www.dcyf.org/Content.aspx?id=3440&ekmensel=14_submenu_162_link_2

STEP 2: Engage School Leaders, Families, and Young People in Planning and Development

As our nation's metropolitan communities continue to grow and develop, their ability to do so in healthy and sustainable ways will largely depend on the engagement and participation of diverse stakeholders. While urban and regional planners likely understand the importance of participatory planning, they often do not recognize that school leaders, young people, and families can make enormous contributions to the process. By focusing on a common problem, diverse and even competing interests are overcome through shared planning and action.[34] Ultimately, effective civic engagement processes address the interests and constraints of all parties. These processes include ongoing involvement in real decision-making and policy implementation and ultimately lend greater legitimacy to final plans and clear the way for smoother implementation.

LEA engagement in planning is often instrumental in fostering new or enhancing existing partnerships with local and regional agencies around joint programs, shared facilities, and other infrastructure issues. When LEAs find a seat at the city and regional planning table, the planning process can also reach directly into schools by connecting to educational programs and curriculum. Realizing benefits of broad participation and opportunities for effective engagement requires planners and policymakers to consider the following four key components.

Identify Multiple Ways for LEA Personnel to Engage in the Planning Process

Planning processes can be long and complex. Identifying critical junctures for LEA personnel to engage ensures that participation is constructive and adds value. For example, decisions around planned housing units, new parks adjacent to schools, and/or bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure are relevant to school stakeholders who are concerned about shifts in enrollment, opportunities for shared use of space, and non-auto access to schools. Understanding the relationship between housing patterns, population, and the interests of school stakeholders, such as school enrollments and specific community amenities adjacent to schools that support educational opportunities is crucial in developing a well-informed process.

Different phases of the process provide opportunities to leverage city and school constituencies. For example, planning processes often set the stage for land allotment, but it may not be until the implementation phase that the specific number of housing units is set, thus determining actual student generation rates. Schools may use public meetings during an implementation phase to reach other city residents who have an interest in supporting schools. Because of this opportunity to leverage constituencies, planning processes can best access personnel if meetings do not compete with important school calendar dates;

**2.** Engage School Leaders, Families, and Young People

PLAN

- Identify multiple avenues for LEA personnel to engage in the planning process

- Identify opportunities for students and parents to engage the planning process

- Connect young people's participation to classroom learning

- Ensure meaningful and sustained engagement of LEA personnel, student, and parents

IMPLEMENT

SUSTAIN

teachers, for example will likely not be available in the summer for intense public participation, nor for meetings during the school day.

Identify Opportunities for Students and Parents to Engage in the Planning Process

Even the best community engagement processes can face apathy, resistance, and suspicion from local residents fearful of change or distrustful of government or private sector redevelopment programs. Young people bring fresh ideas and a sense of hope and inspiration, and their participation often catalyzes action among adults. Soon, conversations move past blame and toward imagining real possibilities, tangible action steps, and shared responsibility. Parents and other adults who might not otherwise be engaged in school or community activities can find a more welcoming avenue to get involved by attending a student public presentation. There is mounting evidence of the benefits of inviting young people, particularly students of color and students who live in low-income communities, to play important roles in community projects.[35] Advocates and researchers can now point to a key benefit of involving students in planning and redevelopment: broader participation and increased understanding among stakeholders ultimately results in better decisions that create better cities.[36]

Engaging families and young people in planning requires careful attention to the type, time, and location of participation. Some cities have youth commissions or boards that hold decision making authority. Other cities appoint community and youth representatives to government councils, commissions, or school boards. Some communities have structured youth-led outreach campaigns around projects designed to engage adults and young people not usually drawn to traditional public processes. The specific form of engagement is dependent on local context and need; regardless of the strategy, well-structured opportunities provide time for learning about formal city policies and processes, different modes of engaging for different learning styles, and attention to basic logistics, such as language translation, child care, and food availability.

Connect Young People's Participation to Classroom Learning

An important and relevant educational movement, *linked learning* connects learning inside school to life outside classrooms by linking curriculum to real-world experiences (e.g., internships and work-based learning opportunities in fields such as engineering, arts and media, and biomedical and health sciences).[37] Youth participation in city planning can be an especially effective form of linked learning; it has a clear relevance and tangible impact on a student's world and preparation for college and career.[38] There are many excellent opportunities to engage students in this form of learning. Redevelopment efforts proposed in HUD's *Choice*

Neighborhoods and *Sustainable Housing and Communities* or other innovative local or regional initiatives also offer possibilities for linked learning that simultaneously build students' skills, improve communities, and recognize schools as important assets to local neighborhoods and metropolitan regions. Because parents may be concerned that youth engagement in civic activities may detract from schoolwork or other responsibilities, aligning these efforts with school becomes all the more important, to ensure not only student buy-in, but also teacher and parent support.[39]

Ensure Meaningful and Sustained Engagement of LEA Personnel, Students, and Parents with Appropriate Capacity Building Tools

As discussed previously, city and regional leaders and LEA personnel do not necessarily have the know-how or relationships to partner in robust ways. Likewise, working with residents of all ages is not something that comes naturally to many professionals. Therefore, many adults would benefit from opportunities to build their capacity to work across agencies and with students and families, either through trainings, toolkits, or peer-to-peer learning. Likewise, while school stakeholders, young people, and families may be motivated to participate in civic activities, their knowledge of formal planning processes and content areas may be limited. Through community and group activities, in-class connections, or ongoing mentorship, these stakeholders can gain knowledge about how to channel their vision into the decision-making processes of their community.

"The partnerships created between local government and young people can be invaluable in helping youth and their families learn about, and then work on behalf of, city plans and policies."

- The National League of Cities

Portland, Oregon—Grant program helps young people envision and create a better future for themselves and their communities

The City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability hires young people to work alongside city planners and sustainability professionals to assist in shaping Portland's long-range planning. In the Youth Planning Program (YPP), young people are provided small grants to create community-based projects that are initiated, designed, and run by youth age 21 and younger. The Youth Action Grants provide up to $1,000 to any Portland youth wishing to take action that makes elements of the city's plan, "Our Bill of Rights: Children + Youth," a reality. City leaders started the program after recognizing that youth age 18 and under make up a quarter of the city's population, while youth age 25 and under make up a third. But as former Portland Mayor Tom Potter noted, youth make up "100 percent of the future." One recent YPP project, the Eastside MAX Station Communities Project, examined half-mile areas surrounding six MAX light-rail stations through surveys and focus groups to identify young people's concerns about the area and their priorities for change.

The Youth Planning Program:
http://www.portlandonline.com/bps/index.cfm?c=50268

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania—Youth unite to address common concerns and take collective action for better schools

The Philadelphia Student Union (PSU) is a youth-led organization that promotes and supports the power of young people to demand high-quality education in Philadelphia public schools. Recently, PSU organized students and community members around the transformation of West Philadelphia High School by encouraging community participation in developing the physical design for the new school. PSU successfully worked with the district to include more community representation on the district's formal design team. While the final physical design does not fully represent the educational vision of the students involved, some revisions were incorporated to better align the physical structure to the small-school vision of students and faculty.

Philadelphia Student Union, West Philadelphia High School campaign:
http://home.phillystudentunion.org/Campaigns-and-Actions/West-Philadelphia-High-School.html

San Francisco Bay Area, California—Linked Learning creates city-school collaboration, enhances classroom curriculum, and offers real-world opportunities for youth

The Y-PLAN (Youth—Plan, Learn, Act, Now) is an award-winning and nationally recognized methodology for youth civic engagement in city planning that uses urban space slated for redevelopment as a catalyst for community revitalization and education reform. A model of what it means to effectively link learning experiences inside the classroom to the world outside, the Y-PLAN strategy is aligned with high school curricula from social studies to environmental science and supports graduation requirements, such as senior projects and community service hours. In 2010, the California Department of Education recognized Y-PLAN as an educational best practice of linked learning. Over the past decade, Y-PLAN has engaged more than 1,000 young people across the country in local planning projects, informed more than 50 community development projects, and prepared hundreds of civic and educational leaders to partner with and learn from and with young people. Projects range from youth involvement in the HOPE VI redesign in Oakland and Richmond, California, to the development of a multipurpose center and renovated park focusing on the creation of safe and inviting pathways in San Francisco for young people of all ages to enjoy. After working hand-in-hand with their adult allies, young planners are invited to present their work before city councils, school boards, and other public forums. Such events typically welcome a wide range of busy parents, other relatives, friends, and even neighbors—most of whom otherwise never engage in public matters—who are first in line to see these young people step up to the microphone.

Y-PLAN: http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/engaging.html

Chicago, Illinois—Students sit at the metropolitan planning table

In Chicago, young people engage directly in the city's regional planning process and in developing future policy. Operated by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning, Future Leaders in Planning (FLIP) brings 14- to 18-year-olds into the planning process to work with elected officials, community leaders, and others in summer programs and by serving on regional planning committees. In 2009–2010, FLIP participants divided into five subject teams ranging from housing and land use to transportation to health and human services. The students developed and delivered presentations and guidebooks to help high school students around the region implement aspects of the "Preferred Regional Scenarios" found in Chicago's GO TO 2040 plan.

Future Leaders in Planning: http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/flip-future-leaders-in-planning

Hampton, Virginia—Youth make sustained contributions to developing livable cities

The Hampton Coalition for Youth is a city department that serves as the "coordinating, planning, and catalyst organization for youth issues in Hampton." The coalition oversees citywide initiatives that focus on youth resources, manage the Youth Commission, provide paid staff and intern positions to more than 100 youth each year, and support youth-serving community organizations. The Hampton Youth Commission represents youth's ideas in the city's planning and decision-making processes and acts as an advisory board to the city council. Hampton's young people assist in the development of the youth-related components of the city's Comprehensive Plan. Recently, youth planners rewrote the city's bicycle ordinance and assisted in the development of a citywide bikeway system. Youth planners have also awarded more than $40,000 annually to youth initiatives and were placed on a range of city boards and adult commissions. This initiative is a key component of Hampton's goal to become one of the country's most livable cities, and America's Promise Alliance recently named Hampton one of America's 100 Best Communities for Young People.

Hampton Coalition for Youth: http://www.hampton.gov/foryouth/
America's Promise Alliance:
http://www.americaspromise.org/Our-Work/Community-Action/100-Best-Communities/2010-Winners/Hampton-VA.aspx

STEP 3: Establish a Shared Vision and Metrics Linking High-Quality Education to Economic Prosperity at Community and Regional Levels

As integrated policies become a more common component of community development and metropolitan planning, educators will come to the planning table to help shape a more inclusive vision. A shared, comprehensive, and public vision statement articulates the interdependency of community, regional, and educational prosperity. It provides the basis of a story from which all stakeholders can work and a consistent way to communicate goals across "siloed" institutions. As the saying "what gets measured, gets done" asserts, collaborative processes require accompanying benchmarks and performance metrics to gauge progress; these tools allow agencies to align, if not integrate, their work, as they have common goals and objectives around which to organize. This robust process will inspire all stakeholders—elected leaders to district and city staff members, parents, and students—to hold, carry, and advocate for the articulated vision. Such a process involves the following three key components.

Cultivate Leadership and Champions

Collaborative initiatives require strong, effective leadership to motivate and manage diverse stakeholders and move an integrated planning process forward. However, developing leadership also requires time and an array of strategies to meet stakeholders "where they are at." Strategies for developing leadership include

- Capacity building by third-party intermediaries who conduct training, coaching, and professional development;
- Regional learning networks; and
- Research on and documentation of the national context for local work.[40]

Champions who carry the message of a unified vision and can speak on behalf of the planning process are critical to effective collaboration. They are found among stakeholders and third parties and ultimately must be cultivated across and at every level of each organization.

Adopt the Vision Statement Formally across Institutions

The formal adoption of a vision statement by governing bodies (e.g., boards of education and city councils) ensures the sustainability of and commitment to that shared mission. Formal adoption provides a clear and public signal that subsequent steps to an integrated planning process can be taken. Even in the absence of such steps, a shared vision can empower localities and regions to incorporate education issues into their plans, thereby driving future planning and growth strategies.

KNOW

3. Establish a Shared Vision and Metrics

PLAN

- Cultivate leadership and champions
- Adopt the vision statement formally across institutions
- Develop common indicators to measure change and foster shared accountability

IMPLEMENT

SUSTAIN

Develop Common Indicators to Measure Change, Foster Shared Accountability, and Increase the Effective Use of Scarce Resources

Through the visioning process, stakeholders must agree on how to hold themselves and each other accountable. Accountability depends on collectively established indicators that allow stakeholders to objectively measure progress toward predetermined goals, track specific data and improvements, and identify new opportunities for realizing social equity, increasing organizational productivity across agencies, and aligning operational resources. When executed properly, accountability metrics honor individual activities and collaborative efforts, measure changes in collaborative processes and policy/program implementation outcomes, and provide decision makers with objective means of measuring improvements in the use of increasingly scarce resources.

Numerous regional entities across the country have begun tracking educational trends in their regions, including Boston, Chicago, and Portland. Leading national think tanks (Urban Institute, Brookings Institution, and the 21st Century School Fund) recently created a tool to assess the multiple dimensions of school quality as it relates to changing demographics and housing in Washington, D.C. Prominent housing researcher David Rusk has proposed that Metropolitan Planning Organizations develop a *segregation index* using U.S. Census data that specifically incorporates educational data in relation to neighborhood segregation. In the Bay Area, the Center for Cities and Schools is developing a framework for a regionally based *educational opportunity index* (EOI) that analyzes the diverse resources (inputs) that support educational performance for all students and the development of equitable and sustainable communities. These may include the availability of transit and affordable housing, as well as qualified teachers and high-quality school facilities. These types of tools can provide greater insight and shape to regional planners' and local practitioners' analyses as they aim to understand how families make choices about where to live and what schools their children attend. Regional and local agencies can work with educators and education research specialists to develop useful and feasible tools that meet their local needs and foster collaborative practice and shared accountability.

Chicago, Illinois—Metropolitan planning process highlights role of educational quality in the metro's economic prosperity

The Chicago GO TO 2040 regional plan was adopted by the Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning (CMAP), a new regional planning body created by the state legislature to facilitate integrated planning processes. CMAP engaged in a three-year visioning and planning process that brought together hundreds of diverse stakeholders, including educational leaders, policymakers, parents, and young people to create a shared vision for the future of the region. CMAP used the software tool MetroQuest to guide the visioning and planning process during GO TO 2040. In this master regional plan, the cross-sector agency acknowledges attractive community schools as inextricable parts of livable communities. Moreover, the regional planning process identified attractive affordable housing and quality community schools as two essential components of urban reinvestment. The agency encourages and creates incentives for collaborative planning. To ensure sustained collaboration and integration of policies, Chicago officials created a regional indicators project, MetroPulse, that tracks progress toward achieving the plan's regional vision. This process led to the inclusion of more than 15 new indicators focused specifically on education, including the Quality of Educational Opportunities, Educational Outcomes, Enrollment/Attendance, and Funding/Cost.

GO TO 2040: http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/goto2040
CMAP Education Strategy Report:
http://www.cmap.illinois.gov/strategy-papers/education
Chicago Metroquest: http://www.metropulsechicago.com

Charleston County, South Carolina—Collaborative planning process produces youth master plan

In October 2005, Charleston Mayor Joseph P. Riley appointed a youth master planning team to develop a countywide plan in collaboration with mayors of 16 municipalities in the region. The team included leaders from the cities, local LEAs, nonprofits, and faith-based organizations. Trained facilitators conducted focus groups and surveyed about 900 youth to determine their opinions about current services and identify further needs. Completed in 2007, the Youth Master Plan identified seven goals to comprehensively support young people. The employment and transportation goal, for example, emphasized the need for adequate and accessible transportation for youth to get to and from work and work-based learning experiences.

Charleston Youth Master Plan:
http://www.charlestoncity.info/shared/docs/0/caymp%20final.pdf

San Francisco, California—City and school leaders forge partnerships to create a common vision, integrate policies, and share accountability to improve outcomes for young people and families.

In 2006, the mayor of San Francisco articulated a vision for the city's housing revitalization program called HOPE SF while the superintendent of San Francisco Unified School District (SFUSD) was unveiling a new vision and strategic plan with a strong neighborhood focus. To ensure that these innovative initiatives were mutually supportive, city and educational leaders starting working together to learn more about each other's institutional goals, resources, and needs. For example, the first of six HOPE SF developments in Bay View Hunters Point secured funds from a local foundation and commissioned CC&S in 2009 to help create an education master strategy plan for this HOPE SF community that would effectively align housing policies and citywide school reform efforts. Building from this work and other key projects, the city and school district now work hand in hand to design and implement coordinated policies and outcome measures. For example, the SFUSD director of policy now serves as the lead liaison to HOPE SF and, likewise, HOPE SF leaders serve on school district committees. The nationally recognized Enterprise Community Partners recently joined this effort by establishing the HOPE SF Education Task Force, comprised of 15 community members, developers, educators, and local experts charged with driving future fundraising campaigns and ensuring a clear and consistent vision is communicated across sectors. This kind of continuing collaboration is essential to realizing the measurable outcomes identified by both the city and the school district, including greater community involvement in local schools, increased graduation rates, improved access to services and open space, and increased college attendance.

HOPE SF: http://hope-sf.org/improvements.php
HOPE SF Education Report: "Creating Pathways of Educational and Neighborhood Success: The Hunters View Centers of Community Life (2009)":
http://hope-sf.org/PDFs/CCS_Hunters_View_Report.pdf

STEP 4: Support the Whole Life of Learners through Services and Amenities

To close the opportunity gap, young people need services and amenities that support them in school and life, including enrichment programs before and after school hours, out-of-school academic supports, health care, healthy food, and safe and nurturing environments. Opportunity-rich communities contain these types of services and amenities and thereby support and attract an economically and racially diverse group of residents. Hence, communities should strive for not only the supports disadvantaged students require but the programs and amenities higher-income families expect.

Communities will vary on the supports, programs, and amenities needed. The information collected in step 1 helps partners assess the landscape of opportunity resources available in particular neighborhoods, and guide specific implementation of steps 4, 5, and 6 based on this local context. In step 4, we discuss the specific components required to support the whole life of learners. Doing so is closely linked to the recommendations in the next two steps, as shown in our graphic (see page 11). Step 5's recommendation to align bricks-and-mortar is in large part aimed at using capital funds to build the innovative facilities that will house the services, programs, and amenities for children and families discussed in step 4. Step 6's recommendation to maximize access to opportunity through affordable transportation options focuses on increasing regional mobility for young people and families to access the variety of opportunity resources available outside their immediate neighborhoods.

Provide Comprehensive Social Services Aligned with Educational Needs and Opportunities

Comprehensive social services are student and family supports typically provided during out-of-school time even though educators generally understand that these services support and complement core academic goals. Often, public agencies and nonprofits provide such services with a mix of LEA, municipal, county, state, federal, and foundation funding. These supports range from small, targeted programs achieved through partnerships with individual providers to more robust partnerships that provide wraparound services, as seen in the community school models. Most importantly, schools and service providers should tailor the services and programs offered to the social and educational needs of students. Educators and others should ask and be able to answer the question: *How do out-of-school support and enrichment activities explicitly align with and support core academics?* As service providers and teachers make these connections more explicit, students are better supported in academic success and career and college preparation.

KNOW

PLAN

4. Support the Whole Life of Learners

IMPLEMENT

- Provide comprehensive social services aligned with educational needs and opportunities
- Provide quality amenities to attract families and enrich students' lives
- Harness public and private program funding

SUSTAIN

Provide Quality Amenities to Attract Families and Enrich Students' Lives

Coupled with services, family-oriented amenities attract families to a neighborhood and offer enrichment opportunities. We focus on two highly desirable amenities that can be developed during a local or regional planning process: early learning and healthy living environments. As described in step 1, high-quality early learning programs are important for all families because they lay a foundation for later learning and healthy social and emotional development. High-quality child care, serving children from birth through age 3 and preschool for 3- to 5-year-olds, is an asset in communities and an increasingly popular component of new community development strategies and regional planning processes. Many new housing developments include child care facilities on site or are established through shared-use agreements (described further in step 5).

Opportunities for healthy, active living are also increasingly popular amenities that attract families to communities and enrich children's lives. In recent years, public health advocates have documented many communities that lack pedestrian infrastructure, play and open spaces for physical activity, and grocery stores that stock fresh fruits and vegetables.[41] Incorporating these features into a neighborhood development simultaneously supports the federal government's Livability Principles and educators' goals for high-quality education by creating positive conditions for learning.

Harness Public and Private Funding to Align Program Operations for Efficiency

Providing services and amenities that will attract, support, and enrich families in conjunction with regional planning efforts presents an opportunity to leverage a variety of funding streams. Public funds come from different departments and from federal, state, or local agencies. For example, both ED and HUD provide funds to LEAs and housing agencies for child support services. Beyond public funds, several entities provide funding for family-oriented programs and services, including private and philanthropic organizations. However, these program-focused funds are often disconnected from broader planning efforts. By better coordinating projects, LEAs and local municipalities can leverage and maximize diverse funding streams in program design, staffing, and operations. For example, public agencies have entered into joint purchasing contracts to save money by buying bulk quantities of commodities like computers and other materials that can be used in class and for out-of-school activities.

Multnomah County, Oregon—County, city, schools, and community organizations align services in support of neighborhood schools and residents

SUN Community Schools transform schools into full-service community centers. As part of the broader SUN Service System, in 2010, 60 SUN Community Schools delivered social, health, and support services to 21,000 students (pre-K through 12th grade) and an additional 71,000 residents in the Portland metropolitan community with the goal of promoting educational success and self-sufficiency. SUN provides vital services by aligning city, county, state, and federal resources and programs through a single service delivery system located at schools. It also harnesses the assets and strengths of the community by engaging families, businesses, faith communities, and other community partners to have a collective impact on the educational success of the community's young people. Each individual SUN Community School links with local community institutions such as libraries, parks and community centers, neighborhood health clinics, places of worship, and private businesses. The SUN Service System and Community Schools made a significant difference in the lives of the children and families it supported, including increases in state benchmark scores for reading and math; improved average daily attendance, homework completion, and classroom behavior; stabilized housing for families; and increased parent participation in children's school.

SUN: http://web.multco.us/sun

New York City—Harlem Children's Zone provides "cradle to grave" supports for neighborhood residents

Focused on a 150-block area of Harlem in New York City, the Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ) is a much praised comprehensive service, support, and enrichment program for children and families. The program's two fundamental principles are (1) to provide sustained assistance to children as early as possible, and (2) to surround them with adults who support children's pipeline to success. HCZ includes in-school, after-school, social service, health, and community-building programs for children and families, and operates in both the local traditional public schools and HCZ's own Promise Academy public charter schools. The "baby college" offers a series of workshops for parents of newborn children to age 3. Through this unprecedented alignment of services and programs, HCZ children have demonstrated improvement in academic performance and have inspired ED's Promise Neighborhood Initiative.

Harlem Children's Zone: http://www.hcz.org/

Kalamazoo, Michigan—Targeted incentives for families and students improve academic and community outcomes

Made possible by a multimillion-dollar endowment from an anonymous donor, The Kalamazoo Promise is the nation's "first large-scale educational program built around a full-ride scholarship." It offers students who meet basic graduation requirements the opportunity for waived tuition to a Michigan state college or university for up to four years. Kalamazoo Public School enrollment is up 22% since the announcement, and Kalamazoo continues to have one of the lowest unemployment rates in Michigan. Further, since The Kalamazoo Promise was announced, the population of Kalamazoo has increased faster than any other urban area of the state, student achievement seems to be increasing faster than comparable districts in Michigan, and student retention at all grade levels has improved since The Promise was announced.

The Kalamazoo Promise: https://www.kalamazoopromise.com
Evaluation of The Kalamazoo Promise: http://www.wmich.edu/kpromise/ and
http://www.upjohninst.org/kalamazoopromise.html

National—Coalitions and philanthropic organizations support collaboration, wraparound services, and out-of-school activities for enhanced teaching and learning

Diverse entities working across the country provide support to local jurisdictions for collaborative efforts. For example, the Coalition for Community Schools is an alliance of national, state, and local organizations in K–16 education, youth development, community planning and development, family support, health and human services, government, and philanthropy, as well as national, state, and local community school networks. The Coalition conducts research, convenes practitioners across the country, disseminates information, and promotes a policy framework for enhancing teaching and learning. Seeking to support collaboration from the philanthropic sector, the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation launched its Communities Learning in Partnership (CLIP) program in 2010. Four million dollars in CLIP awards were made to city-school collaborations across the country that focus on improving high school graduation rates, college and job readiness, and college retention. Similarly, the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation's New Day for Learning Program invests in pilot schools that keep their doors open after school hours and provide a range of social supports and activities to students and families. The Wallace Foundation supports high-quality out-of-school programming in cities around the United States and also publishes valuable resources that LEAs and other community agencies can use in developing their own programs.

Coalition for Community Schools: http://www.communityschools.org/
Gates Foundation CLIP:
http://www.gatesfoundation.org/united-states/Pages/education-strategy.aspx
Mott's New Day for Learning: http://www.newdayforlearning.org
Wallace Foundation: http://www.wallacefoundation.org

STEP 5: Align Bricks-and-Mortar Investments for Regional Prosperity

Place-based capital investments are key components in structuring both opportunity and sustainability. They are also core elements of both the *Choice* and *Housing and Sustainable Communities* initiatives. For the most part, federal funds from HUD either directly fund implementation of or planning for bricks-and-mortar projects. Planning for capital investments (e.g., housing, transportation, commercial, or other urban infrastructure) catalyzes cross-sector, interagency partnerships that increase livability. Unfortunately, such projects are usually pursued in isolation from the school infrastructure investments that school districts make, and thereby opportunities for realizing shared benefits, improving the efficient use of public resources, and attracting families to communities with high-quality schools are lost.

Establish Schools as Centers of Opportunity-Rich Communities

Public schools are one of the most high-profile and prevalent public assets, and as such they can be easily harnessed as centers of opportunity-rich communities. Schools can provide space not only for traditional educational endeavors but for physical activity, community building, social events, and other initiatives common in vibrant communities. Key strategies for positioning schools the public at the center of communities include the following:

> *Ensuring adequate modernization and expansion of existing schools.* Too often, budgetary constraints make it difficult for school officials to keep buildings and grounds safe, attractive, and educationally enriching. Low-income, minority, and urban students often attend schools in the worst physical conditions.[42] As noted previously, studies find that poor school environments negatively affect teaching and learning. Adequately modernizing and expanding schools supports sustainable communities by investing in community-serving infrastructure and accommodating enrollment increases that may accompany infill housing development within existing neighborhoods.

> *Siting new schools so they are connected to neighborhoods and energy efficient.* Many new schools are built on large parcels of land (often 20 to 50 acres). This approach ignores land consumption outcomes and increased travel time for children and families. Often, new schools, particularly in suburbs, do not have safe sidewalks for pedestrians or are not accessible by public transit. This increases the use of private cars and school busses, and decreases opportunities for active lifestyles.

KNOW

PLAN

5. Align Bricks-and-Mortar Investments

IMPLEMENT

- Establish schools as centers of opportunity-rich communities
- Ensure family-oriented, mixed income housing
- Pursue joint development

SUSTAIN

Planning and designing with efficiency and sustainability as priorities by encouraging joint use and adaptation of schools within communities. Opening up schools to community uses, such as festivals, student enrichment programs, sports leagues, informal use of playfields, and arts programs fosters healthy, vibrant, and sustainable communities. Because schools (especially elementary schools) are frequently located in residential neighborhoods, sharing facilities means more activities at a single location, which reduces the need to drive from place to place. This shared use provides opportunities for all residents, promotes healthy living, and contributes to conservation and preservation of natural habitats.[43] Furthermore, joint-use agreements with community-based organizations, city, and county agencies foster the provision of services, programs, and amenities to support the whole life of children, as discussed in step 4. As a result, schools house not only core classroom activities, but academic support services, social services, and extracurricular activities run by community-based organizations and other non-school groups.

Ensure Family-Oriented, Mixed-Income Housing

Access to stable, high-quality affordable housing is associated with a wide range of positive effects for students, teachers, schools, and districts.[44] Given the current housing crisis—characterized by a prevalence of unaffordable rent, an abundance of substandard living conditions, and less stable employment—many public school families are finding it increasingly difficult to find a safe, healthy, and affordable place to live. Such conditions create a forced residential mobility that disproportionately affects low-income families and families of color, significantly disrupts student academic experiences, and contributes to low achievement and high dropout rates.[45] Furthermore, the confluence of issues that plague neighborhoods of concentrated poverty are reflected in often overwhelmed neighborhood schools. Students who face regular violence in their neighborhoods or unstable living environments bring these stresses to school, and these pressures and traumas interfere with learning.

Mixed-income housing, a long-standing HUD strategy, aims to decrease high concentrations of neighborhood poverty and provide affordable housing options for families, which in turn fosters stability for students and their families. Beyond direct gains for students in classrooms, new housing development that helps ensure affordability and family stability also benefits teachers and staff. Mixed-income housing provides affordable housing for teachers and other school employees, meeting both LEA goals of retaining high-quality faculty and staff and regional goals of providing workforce housing.

While the impacts of mixed-income housing developments should ultimately prove positive for creating integrated and stable classrooms, in the short term, new

34

housing can pose challenges for school sites and LEAs. In some cases, new housing will increase enrollment at nearby schools, which by extension affects school operations and LEA funding. Most often, new housing that includes units for larger families will increase enrollment, requiring schools to accommodate the new demand. For schools at or above capacity, this presents a challenge; however, for under-enrolled schools, new students are welcome and bring additional financial resources. In other circumstances, new developments, such as larger HOPE VI or Choice Neighborhood projects may require removing housing to redevelop land. In such cases, local school officials could see an abrupt (albeit temporary) enrollment decline. Because school funding is tied to enrollment numbers, these "missing" students translate into reduced school funding, which brings further deterioration to an already challenged school. Collaborative planning structures can mitigate these challenges so that housing development timeframes align with school schedules, and educational leaders have an advance understanding of the changes coming to the neighborhood.

Pursue Joint Development

Joint development can foster schools as centers of community and encourage joint use and affordable, family-oriented housing. Through joint development, two or more organizations partner to plan, site, design, or build facilities. Often, joint developments are public-private partnerships, but they can also be public-public partnerships. For instance, a school district may partner with government or private organizations, such as municipalities, counties, community colleges, or nonprofits, to build new facilities that will be jointly used by the partners.[46] Joint development requires a comprehensive planning process, where entities negotiate funding for planning, construction, and maintenance of the facility. In some cases, joint development may include a combination of educational and recreational facilities, housing, or commercial development. Should the local political context permit, joint development can be a highly efficient use of public funds.

Atlanta, Georgia—Revitalized communities include new mixed-income housing, charter schools, and social and recreational services

The Villages at East Lake and Centennial Place in Atlanta, Georgia, are two innovative and important examples of what holistic and integrated approaches to community revitalization can produce. Part of the Purpose Built Communities Network, the East Lake Foundation "helps families build brighter futures by sponsoring cradle-to-college academic, enrichment, recreational, mentoring, and scholarship programs for children; and counseling, support groups, and training for adults." In 1995, a group of community leaders established the *East Lake Foundation* to revitalize the blighted neighborhood, plagued by violence, poor schools, and substandard public housing. The outcome is mixed-income housing, cradle-to-college educational opportunities with a new charter school and YMCA, a public golf course and other recreational spaces, and commercial development, including a grocery store and two banks. Likewise, Centennial Place also signals a change in the way the Atlanta Housing Authority approaches its developments. As part of the federally-funded HOPE VI program, Centennial Place replaced dilapidated public housing with mixed-income housing, including two- and three-story garden and townhouse units to mirror the architecture of Atlanta. The site includes revitalized open space and a charter school. Notably, the design and implementation of Centennial Place was part of broader neighborhood redevelopment efforts. The residents have experienced a drop in crime, a rise in wages, and improvements in student academic achievements.

The East Lake Foundation:
http://purposebuiltcommunities.org/network-members/atlanta.html
Centennial Place:
http://www.brookings.edu/metro/pubs/AtlantaCaseStudy.pdf

Santa Ana, California—City, LEA, and nonprofit co-locate and pursue redevelopment

In 2006, the Santa Ana Unified School District (SAUSD) built a new high school on the site of a former school and adjacent land acquired from the City of Santa Ana and a local museum. Today, the Hector G. Godinez Fundamental High School has a 26-acre campus abutting the separately owned Centennial Heritage Museum and city park space. Both the museum and the city provided land to the school district to meet the new high school's space needs. The three partners viewed the project as a way to rebuild and expand the school without having to acquire additional land in the immediate area, of which there is little. The alternative might have been for the school district to look to rebuild its school in another location. The city saw the project as an opportunity to expand the resources at the park and increase community services in an underserved area. The new school facilities include a performing arts center, library and media center, gymnasium, outdoor basketball courts, and numerous football, soccer, and baseball fields. SAUSD has a joint-use agreement with the city for shared use of the indoor and outdoor recreation spaces. The district also has a joint-use agreement with the museum, which provides expanded curriculum options for students.

Hector G. Godinez Fundamental High School: http://www.sausd.us/godinez

New Orleans, Louisiana—Community redevelopment centers on school and community services

The Lagniappe Project is a comprehensive community development project focused on a charter school, community health center, and senior center. The planning firm, Concordia, well known for its "nexus planning" concept, is leading a planning process for temporary and long-term sites. The school will enroll 1,500 students in small learning communities, including two elementary schools, two middle schools, and one high school. By placing educational facilities at the center (or nexus) of community development, Concordia leverages the physical redevelopment of schools and neighborhoods to benefit students, families and the whole community. They are also bringing the Nexus Planning methodology to over a dozen other communities across the nation.

Lagniappe Project:
http://www.concordia.com/pages/view/103/Project-Management-for-Lagniappe-Project-and-Academies

Santa Monica, California—City and LEA partner in development for joint use in revitalization project

In 2008, the City of Santa Monica and the Santa Monica-Malibu Unified School District (SMMUSD) sought to coordinate redevelopment efforts between the SMMUSD's high school campus (known as Samohi) and the City's Civic Auditorium campus. The undertaking came about because of the unique joint-use potential in the concurrent development of these campuses, located across the street from one another and within walking distance of downtown Santa Monica. Although the City does not have jurisdiction for improvements on SMMUSD campuses, because of this joint-use effort, the City Council gave city staff direction to assess redevelopment funding eligibility for joint-use community facilities on the school site. As part of the Redevelopment Agency's five-year implementation plan for 2010–2015, in 2009, the City Council prioritized $57 million in funds for the first phase of joint-use improvements associated with the long-term plan for the Samohi campus. Since this time, the school district has refined the overall plan and phase 1 improvements. Phase 1 prioritizes joint-use opportunities on the school campus and will include a new gymnasium, synthetic for the football field, and support facilities for the outdoor amphitheater. Other planned projects in the downtown area (within walking distance of the campus) include a new light rail station, a new seven-acre park, and a new 325-unit mixed-income housing development. Working together, the city and the school district have found ways to maximize amenities to benefit students and the community.

Santa Monica Civic Center Joint Use Project: http://fip.smmusd.org/1ccjup.aspx

Richmond, California—Neighborhood revitalization partnership strategically aligns capital investments for community and educational improvement

Since 2001, a coalition of partners, including the City of Richmond, Richmond Housing Authority (RHA), Richmond Community Foundation (RCF), West Contra Costa Unified School District (WCCUSD), National Park Service (NPS), Bay Area Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), and local neighborhood councils and nonprofit organizations, have been working together on the Nystrom United Revitalization Effort (NURVE). Bay Area LISC has played a crucial leadership and capacity building role, bringing stakeholders together to discuss alignment of more than $200 million in adjacent capital building projects. NURVE partners aim to revitalize the economy and improve quality of life in the area surrounding the Nystrom Elementary School and Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Park, and local public housing developments. NURVE was launched to strategically address the complex issues that face the Nystrom neighborhood, such as physical and economic blight, crime, challenged public schools, and unemployment. NURVE partners believe these issues can be addressed by bringing in needed resources and through local neighborhood-based revitalization and collaboration. NURVE partners are pursuing recreational, programming, and cultural joint use by aligning the planning and design of 210 units of affordable housing, the renovation of the historic World War II maritime building (which will house child care), a new recreational park space, and the renovation of the local elementary school.

NURVE: http://www.ci.richmond.ca.us/index.aspx?NID=1939

Baltimore, Maryland—Housing vouchers increase access to quality suburban schools

The Baltimore Housing Mobility Program (BHMP) provides families from high-poverty, disadvantaged urban communities with a new home and school in a lower-poverty neighborhood through a regional voucher program, thereby expanding housing choices for low-income families. BHMP has overcome some of the strongest obstacles to using housing vouchers in neighborhoods with high-quality schools by increasing neighborhood relocation options. Previously, voucher holders in the federal Housing Choice Voucher Program (formerly titled Section 8) were typically limited to living in "voucher submarkets" where racial and economic segregation is high and educational opportunities are limited. However, since 2004, more than 1,500 families from Baltimore have relocated to lower-poverty, more racially diverse suburban and city neighborhoods; of these families, 88 percent choose suburban counties. As a result, more than 1,200 low-income children are now attending high-performing, mixed-income suburban schools. On average, only 33 percent of the students in these schools are eligible for free or reduced-price lunch compared with 83 percent in the original schools. Academically, between 69 and 76 percent of students scored proficient or higher on state math and reading tests after taking advantage of the voucher program, compared with 44 to 54 percent who scored at those levels in the original schools.

Baltimore Housing Mobility Program:
http://www.prrac.org/pdf/BaltimoreMobilityReport.pdf

STEP 6: Maximize Access to Opportunity through Transportation

Providing high-quality school facilities, affordable housing, and vibrant civic spaces is not enough if families cannot easily, affordably, and safely get to these places. Families need affordable transportation options to get to and from home, school, work, and recreation, and they should have options for taking transit, bicycling, walking, and driving. The increasing number of school choice options makes transportation even more important for young people who do not always attend their neighborhood school. This is especially true for high school students. For example, as described in Step 1, students may be attending a district-wide magnet or charter school or a public school with a specialized program. A family's ability to take advantage of increased educational options hinges on their access to safe, reliable, and affordable transportation. In this way, then, access to transportation often determines which families have the opportunity to choose the most appropriate schools and other educational services for their children.

Make Areas Surrounding Schools Pedestrian and Bicycle Safe

In 1970, about half of all students walked or biked to school; by 2000, that number had dropped to less than 13 percent of students.[47] Now, more than half of the nation's school-age students arrive at school in private automobiles. Many factors contribute to this trend, including a neighborhood's physical infrastructure, which may be poorly maintained or privileges car travel at the expense of bicycles and pedestrians. Physical upgrades to sidewalks, bicycle lanes, street lighting, and street furniture improve the safety and vibrancy of public spaces and enable young people and their families to more easily access local schools. In addition to environmental benefits, walking and bicycling increases students' physical activity, which contributes to public health benefits, including lower obesity rates. School districts and localities can coordinate these types of infrastructure improvements and leverage precious public dollars. Partnerships around crossing guards are also common and tremendous assets to families' safe walking and bicycling to school. The Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) program is an international initiative that engages students, parents, teachers, and local communities in increasing opportunities for walking and biking to school. SRTS programs "examine conditions around schools and conduct projects and activities that work to improve safety and accessibility, and reduce traffic and air pollution in the vicinity of schools."[48] From 2005 to 2009, the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration Office (FHWA) funded $612 million in a variety of SRTS initiatives across the country. SRTS has been an effective forum through which city and school officials come together

6. Maximize Access to Opportunity through Transportation

IMPLEMENT

- Make areas surrounding schools pedestrian and bicycle safe

- Align transit options to support school choice and extracurricular opportunities

- Create incentives for multimodal choices by students and families

- Site schools to maximize multi-modal access

SUSTAIN

and pursue practices and policies to benefit students, families, and their communities.

Align Transit Options to Support School Choice and Extracurricular Opportunities

In addition to walking and biking, students use transit—buses and trains—to get to and from school and afterschool activities. Student use of transit appears most common in cities and older suburbs where higher densities make the trip more convenient. Access to safe, reliable, and affordable transit helps students to get to school on time. Consistent communication between transit agencies and LEAs can ensure that bus routing and schedules align with school schedules. Depending on funding, transit agencies may be able to augment service on routes that serve students at peak school times. Given the increasing landscape of school options, transit can play a key role in ensuring all families' access to educational choices.

In addition, students (especially middle and high school students) use transit to get to afterschool activities that enhance their educational experience. This includes internships, clubs, jobs and recreational activities. For many students, reliable transit means the difference between participating or not participating in these kinds of productive, engaging, and academically enriching opportunities. School stakeholders should also consider transit schedules when designing and encouraging students to take part in particular activities or internships. In other words, simply securing a student a spot in such programs is often not enough. Educators need to be aware of students' abilities to get safely and affordably to these activities.

Create Incentives for Multimodal Transportation Choices by Students and Families

Once transportation options are available, students and families may require incentives to use them. Incentives that inspire students and families to bicycle, walk, or take transit to school do not need to cost additional money. Urban design elements and neighborhood infrastructure that create safe and vibrant environments are critical to getting families out of their cars. For example, reliable and affordable transit with well-marked, safe, and well-lit stations and shelters support ridership and are key features for families and young people. Many transit agencies offer low-cost or free transit passes for students or low-income riders. Because many students do not have their own income, and yet are dependent on transit, these pass programs are often the only way students can get to and from school.

Site Schools to Maximize Multimodal Transportation Access

The location of a school affects many community elements, including walkability, traffic congestion, neighborhood desirability, and even housing prices. Because many schools are sited in communities, strategies to reduce carbon emissions and conserve land need to consider schools.[49] While most school construction today consists of the renovation and rehabilitation of existing buildings, some districts continue to build new schools where populations are growing. How and where officials choose to build these new schools invariably affects other public infrastructure needs, such as roads and sidewalks, and this often determines whether students and families can walk, bike, or ride transit to school. The EPA offers resources to support "smart growth" school siting and in 2010 released *Draft Voluntary Guidelines for Selecting Safe Locations for New Schools*.[50]

Strategically locating schools and community facilities allows the former to serve as the home base for a range of academic and extracurricular activities. For example, strategic school siting might mean that students may more easily and safely get to afterschool programs, nearby recreation centers, or an internship at a local business. Likewise, parents may walk their children to school on the way to their jobs, or pick up kids on their way home, making balancing responsibilities more manageable. Strategic colocation is not enough, however. These capital projects must also consider the pathways and access *between* facilities. Coordinating streets, sidewalks, transit, and other transportation improvements will leverage limited public dollars and ensure people can get to and from the school and city facilities.

Boston, Massachusetts—Interagency partnership promotes safe routes to school

Formed in 2006, the Massachusetts Safe Routes to School Task Force provides guidance on the development of the state's Safe Routes to School (SRTS) initiatives. The task force includes representatives from state departments of transportation, education, public health and public safety; members from the Federal Highway Administration; stakeholders from the Massachusetts Elementary School Principals' Association, Massachusetts Teachers' Association, and the Massachusetts PTA Association; law enforcement; community leaders; and the advocacy groups WalkBoston and MassBike. The task force meets four times per year to evaluate Safe Routes to School efforts and develop strategies for improving and expanding Safe Routes to School initiatives across the state. Currently, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDot) has developed partnerships with nearly 350 elementary and middle schools in 116 communities. MassDot currently has 1 access and safety improvement project completed, 4 others entering construction, 7 in design, and 37 receiving assessments of their needs. Infrastructure improvement projects include sidewalk improvements, traffic calming and speed reduction, pedestrian and bicycle crossing improvements, and secure bicycle parking. These nearly 350 participating schools have also received SRTS educational materials for students, parents, and community leaders, as well as pedestrian and bicycle safety education programs.

Massachusetts Safe Routes to School Task Force:
http://www.saferoutespartnership.org/massachusetts

Rochester, New York—Regional transit provider partners with LEA to increase student ridership

Rochester's Regional Transit Service gets subsidies from local businesses and the regional LEA to maintain service in spite of systemic funding reductions from the state. As a result, ridership increased by more than 7 percent in the first year of contracted service with the LEA (between fiscal years 2006-07 and 2007-08). Also, more than 95 percent of students in the Rochester City Schools who use public transportation to get to and from school take advantage of the RTS Express Transfer Service. This allows students to travel directly from their school to their neighborhoods, bypassing downtown transfers. Students depend on transit as a more affordable transportation option to get to school on time. Furthermore, according to Rochester School Superintendent Jean-Claude Brizard, the school district saves money as a result of the transit service: "Public transportation is also 30 to 40 percent less expensive for us than yellow school bus service. Those are dollars we can redirect to our schools and classrooms, where they can have the biggest impact on student achievement."

Rochester Regional Transit Service:
http://www.rgrta.com/pdf/33207_RGRTA.pdf

Nationwide—Multiagency partnerships create childcare centers at transit hubs

Across the country, diverse, multiagency partnerships have formed to support families by creating childcare centers in transit-oriented developments. In San Jose, California, the Tamien Child Care Center opened at the Tamien CalTrain and light rail stations in 1995. The $2.5 million, 9,600 square foot facility sits on a previously underused site owned by Santa Clara Valley Transportation Authority (VTA). Bright Horizons Children's Centers, Inc., operates the center under contract with VTA. The center enrolls nearly 150 children from 6 weeks to 12 years old. Incentives for families to use the childcare and transit include rail and bus discounts, priority enrollment, and tuition discounts for children of transit users. The collaboration was San Jose's first working relationship between childcare and transit. The flexible funding provisions of the federal transit law allowed FTA to provide partial funding for the project. Funds also came from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

In Columbus, Ohio, the South Linden Transit Center opened in 1999 and includes a bus depot, daycare center, children's health clinic, bank, and medical office. The 24-hour facility is designed to assist parents who work nontraditional hours and encourage their use of transit on their daily commute.

In Kansas City, Missouri, the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority and the KCMC Child Development Corporation joined forces for what is known as the 39th and Troost Development. The joint venture features a large indoor transit waiting space and a 5,100 square foot childcare facility for children 6 weeks to 5 years old. The site also features a satellite desk for the Kansas City Police Department. The colocation of childcare with transit encourages parents to use transit by making drop-off to childcare easy and safe.

Tamien Child Care Center: http://www.vta.org/services/child_care.html
South Linden Transit Center:
http://www.fta.dot.gov/documents/051112a_Revised_NCNW_brochure.pdf

Baltimore, Maryland—LEA and transit provider partner to provide free bus service to students

Baltimore City Public Schools (BCPS) has a long-established contractual agreement with the Maryland Transit Administration (MTA) to provide no-cost bus service to eligible middle and high school students. BCPS pays MTA for the service, which costs far less than what it would spend operating and maintaining its own school buses. Between 25,000 and 28,000 students use the program.

Maryland student bus service:
http://planning.maryland.gov/pdf/ourproducts/publications/modelsguidelines/mg27.pdf

7.

Institutionalize
What Works

SUSTAIN

- Support capacity building

- Measure change, assess impact, and leverage results

- Leverage diverse resources

- Balance "what works" with "what could be"

STEP 7: Institutionalize What Works to Secure Gains and Ensure Ongoing Innovation

Calls for partnerships and collaboration are not new. Leaders across the public, private, and philanthropic sectors have worked toward this goal in the past with mixed results. Positive and lasting change will require more than throwing additional resources at initiatives that are only new in name. Inclusive and integrated planning must become "business as usual," with a set of institutionalized relationships and processes that serve as an engine for future policies and programs. By institutionalizing what works, collaborative initiatives will secure gains and establish the necessary conditions for ongoing innovation. Establishing a "two-way system of accountability" where schools and the cities they serve are equally accountable to each other for delivering on the promise of opportunity-rich schools and sustainable communities.[51] Step 7 consists of four key areas that focus on a critical juncture in the process of aligning high-quality education with city planning and metropolitan development.

Support Capacity Building for New Professional Practice, Formal Communication Systems, and Streamlined Collaborative Decision-making

Organizational leadership must recognize that cross-sector work takes significant effort and requires an investment of time and potentially new ways of working. Internally, individual job scopes should explicitly communicate the roles and responsibilities for cross-agency collaboration. Staff must be recognized and compensated for these new expectations around collaboration. Cross-agency work must be structured as not just a political gesture or short-term, grant-driven assignment.

Substantive shifts in roles and responsibilities will facilitate the development of a common vocabulary. However, these shifts require intentional and well-structured capacity building support systems. As anyone who has been involved with cross-sector efforts knows, this coordinated work is not easy, as practices are deeply entrenched. Stakeholders frequently lament that they need more time to bring people together and work on developing a common language for meaningful communication. Capacity building strategies can take many forms, but to create long-term, systems-wide change requires ongoing dialogue and engagement of diverse stakeholders who learn to work together as a community of practice.

As collaborations move from the work of individual leaders to "business as usual," partnerships will form more permanent structures. Formal standing committees or working groups among agencies (e.g., "2x2" committees or city-schools committees) with representatives from school boards, LEA staff, city council, and city staff should

44

meet regularly. For maximum efficacy, some authority over budgeting or other approval processes must lie with these committees. Agencies may also adopt written agreements. In tenuous political environments with changing leadership at city hall and LEAs—where for example, the average tenure of an urban school superintendent is three and a half years[52]—this documentation formalizes organizational relationships and transcends individual personality. Agreements may be a memorandum of understanding (MOU) outlining specific shared priorities and resources, a joint-use agreement (JUA) defining how local school and community facilities will be shared, or a joint-powers authority (JPA) that retains independent authority through a board of directors, usually with representation from collaborating agencies.

Measure Change, Assess Impact, and Leverage Results

Sustained positive change beyond stakeholders that initially participate will also require effectively using new indicators and data systems to measure change, assess impact, and then make data-driven policy and program decisions. As described in step 3, many localities and regional agencies are developing publically available web-based indicator projects that include education as a key measure of a community's health and economic vitality. These integrated indicator systems support robust data-driven policymaking. Furthermore, the public nature of the web-based information provides more opportunity for community accountability, which in turn ensures ongoing collaborative work.

Research and documentation in the form of ongoing evaluation of policy and program efforts is essential, as few funding sources are willing to invest significantly beyond a start-up program without ample evidence of positive outcomes. Evaluation and more long-term research and data collection are also important to provide the necessary feedback loops that validate what works, help disseminate lessons learned, and ensure that local practice is effectively linked to state and federal policies and programs. These types of assessment will allow us to move beyond intuition and anecdotal evidence to data-driven policy decisions.

Leverage Diverse Resources

Now more than ever, economic conditions call for innovative partnerships and efforts to maximize resources. Agencies forced to make cuts in their own budgets must work to diversify funding to sustain programs into the future, including looking to philanthropic resources and partnerships with the business community. Across the nation, city-school-regional initiatives are funded in a number of ways, but most often private and public funding sources are combined.

> *"We must go from recognizing such integrated policies as the work of extraordinary individuals to the regular work of extraordinary systems."*
>
> —Tony Smith, Superintendent, Oakland Unified School District

Balance "What Works" with "What Could Be"

Changing the status quo will depend on striking a delicate balance between evidence-driven policies and instilling new systems with enough flexibility to be innovative and not adverse to risk. While evidence-based proven practices are critical, localities and regions need room to experiment, dream about what could be, and take calculated risks. If we truly seek innovation in our classrooms and playgrounds and in our city council chambers and business parks, then we must continue to find ways to encourage creativity; in this way, we will move from pockets of change to systems of opportunity.

National—Coalition of private foundations promotes integrated initiatives by leveraging funds and providing expertise

Living Cities is a coalition of 22 of the nation's largest private foundations. In 2010, the coalition launched the Integration Initiative to advance successful models for effective urban investment and transformation. The initiative awarded approximately $80 million in funding in six regions across the nation. Taking a regional approach to affecting local change, the initiative is "committed to integrative and sustainable approaches to revitalizing neighborhoods and connecting low-income people to opportunities in their region." Living Cities also created the Sustainable Communities Boot Camp to build the capacity of HUD grantees to develop sustainable communities. Living Cities recognizes education as a key component of strong neighborhoods and regions. They currently fund the national expansion of the STRIVE model and are exploring other ways to connect education to integrated initiatives.

Living Cities: http://www.livingcities.org/

National—Community of practice formed to ensure high-quality school facilities for all students

With support from the Ford Foundation, the 21st Century School Fund launched the Building Educational Success Together (BEST) initiative, a nationwide partnership of organizations working to improve public schools and neighborhoods in their communities with a particular focus on improving urban school facilities as school and neighborhood assets. BEST partners have created model policies, procedures, and tools for ensuring high-quality school facilities for all children. BEST focuses on constituency building, financing, government reform, public-private partnerships, intergovernmental collaboration, and school facility management. Over the past 10 years, BEST partners conducted a range of national studies demonstrating how school facility conditions are linked to teacher satisfaction and success as well as other academic outcomes for students and families. Their research also revealed the need for increased capital funding and for greater equity in how school facility funding is administered. BEST is also developing proposals for new federal and state roles in the provision of healthy, safe, and educationally appropriate facilities that anchor communities.

Building Educational Success Together (BEST): http://www.bestfacilities.org

National—Technology systems help capture and align data essential to ensuring high-quality programming, maximum impact, and continued funding

A range of technology tools is available to educational and civic leaders to align data collection and management, and ensure data-driven collaborative decision-making. For example, the Efforts to Outcomes (ETO™) software, created by the company Social Solutions, is used by several national nonprofits and public agencies (e.g., Harlem Children's Zone, Catholic Charities, YWCA, United Way, Goodwill, Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Social Service Administration, the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development) to collaborate on data management, which ultimately improves their service quality and effectiveness. Similarly, the Youth Data Archive (YDA), created by the John W. Gardner Center for Youth and their Communities at Stanford University, is a tool for shared data systems that enables policymakers, researchers, and practitioners to coordinate analyses, develop data-driven policy and program solutions, and initiate critical new areas of research. These applications and others like them illustrate the power of data management and the importance of leveraging diverse resources from business, nonprofit, academic, and public sectors.

Efforts to Outcomes: http://www.socialsolutions.com/
Youth Data Archive: http://gardnercenter.stanford.edu/current_initiatives/youth_archive.html

San Francisco Bay Area, California—Cities, schools, and university partner create regional learning network for community and educational change

Six cities and five LEAs in the San Francisco Bay Area came together in 2006 in partnership with the University of California–Berkeley's Center for Cities and Schools to create a regional learning network for sharing best practices and learning from one another about how best to support young people, families, and the region at large. The network, called PLUS (Planning and Learning United for Systems-change), provides coaching, technical assistance, public institutes and forums, and graduate student assistance to each city-school team. Likewise, PLUS engages university partners such as the Department of City and Regional Planning and the Principal's Leadership Institute at the Graduate School of Education and to provide pre-professional development training to future educational and civic leaders across the region. PLUS offers research-driven recommendations and strategies that can inform policymaking by uncovering how to plan and build integrated cross-sector systems of opportunity.

PLUS: http://citiesandschools.berkeley.edu/leadership.html

Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina—Joint resolution by city, county, school, and library agencies spawns task force to promote systematically aligned capital investments for joint use

In 1995, the Mecklenburg County Board of Commissioners, Charlotte City Council, the local community college board, and the county library board adopted a joint resolution promoting joint use of public facilities. The resolution established the multiagency Joint Use Task Force, which meets monthly and has representation from two dozen agencies (including transportation, stormwater, parks and recreation, fire, and nonprofit organizations). The Task Force's purpose is to align public capital investment in the region for win-wins, including reduced facility development costs, reduced operation costs, and create superior environments for the community. As a result, many dozens of joint-use facility arrangements are in effect and more than a dozen joint-use projects have been completed, including colocating a new elementary school next to a new transit park-and-ride structure (the roof of the parking structure is the school's playfield); Ballantyne Park, which includes a new elementary school, middle school, fire station, YMCA, and library; multiple joint-use schools and community recreation centers (one of which also houses a stormwater detention facility); multiple colocated joint-use schools and parks; and multiple joint-use school and library facilities. Moreover, a mandatory referral process requires that the task force review a purchase of property or transfer of property to make recommendations to the governing bodies. The task force formally brings together the various public agencies in the region making capital investments and explores what joint-use opportunities are possible given each organization's plans. Through the adoption of the Joint Resolution, the agencies formally recognized that joint use has cost savings and that long-range facility plans must be made in a coordinated fashion.

Charlotte-Mecklenburg Joint Use Task Force:
http://www.newpartners.org/docs/presentations/thurs/NP11_Wells.pdf

V.   Conclusion

Strategically aligned investments in housing, regional transportation, education, social services, and economic development have the potential to transform not only neighborhoods but also schools. New creative investment can also transform the ways residents of all ages engage with their communities and the ways policymakers and local agencies collaborate with each other and the public, ultimately catalyzing lasting, positive, and systemic change. As described in this report, recent developments in policies and practices across the nation at all levels of government are converging in ways that alter the status quo and vastly improve the quality of life for families and young people. Faced with limited access to critical economic and social opportunities, these promising practices can lead to new trajectories of opportunity for all young people by aligning high-quality education with innovations in city and metropolitan planning.

This report presents compelling examples of communities, cities, and regions working in constructive, productive partnerships with LEAs to transform neighborhoods of poverty into neighborhoods of opportunity. We have described seven practical steps that city and regional planners and development agencies can take to build effective partnerships with LEAs and the families and students they serve. By adapting these recommended steps to local circumstances, partnerships fill important needs, such as: safe, stable, and affordable housing; transportation options to access educational resources and opportunities; and school facilities that become resources for the whole community by providing recreational opportunities and promoting a healthy, active lifestyle.

To make these visions reality, we must come to *know* the educational landscape and *plan* in an inclusive way that engages diverse educational stakeholders and young people. Collaborative planning helps agencies and community members recognize and acknowledge accountability to each other. We must also *implement* future local and regional planning and development systems in new, integrated ways to support the whole life of learners through supportive services and amenities. Finally, we must *sustain* these ongoing innovations through institutionalized and sustainable change.

Moving forward, we recommend three key areas of work that HUD along with other government agencies and philanthropic organizations should pursue in support of innovations across the country.

1. **Support regional cross-sector learning networks and development of "communities of practice."** Third-party facilitation and federal agencies, especially HUD and ED, should participate with educators and local and regional planners for discussions about shared interests and best practices. For example, jointly sponsored and promoted presentations and webinars can contain examples of innovative efforts, such as those highlighted in this report. Another strategy is an annual Promising Practice awards program, jointly managed by HUD and ED to honor and promote innovative localities that demonstrate positive impacts.

2. **Develop capacity building tools.** Tools that build agencies' capacity to work together and offer inspiring examples of innovative practices are fundamental to supporting learning networks and communities of practice. HUD and other federal agencies should develop an online interactive database where localities can post innovative projects on an ongoing basis. These cases should also include the award submissions as winners from the federal program described above. From these initial snapshot examples, agencies can pursue more in-depth best practices and create toolkits on specific subjects, including the seven steps outlined here.

3. **Conduct outcomes research and launch demonstration programs.** HUD, other government agencies, and philanthropic organizations should conduct multidisciplinary outcome assessments of the types of projects described in this report. Working with research partners, continued development of assessment tools and indices like the regional Education Opportunity Index described earlier would allow for measurement on a variety of indicators related to education, positive community change and engagement, and regional sustainability. As part of the research, HUD and others should consider implementing and studying demonstration programs around specific issues such as shared data systems, joint use of schools, or joint development.

[1] Briggs, Xavier de Sousa (Ed.). (2005). *The Geography Of Opportunity: Race And Housing* Inextricable C*hoice In Metropolitan America.* Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

[2] Grubb, W. Norton. (2009). *The Money Myth: School Resources, Outcomes, and Equity*. Russell Sage Foundation Publications.

[3] See *Choice Neighborhoods*: http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/cn/; and *Sustainable Housing and Communities*:
http://portal.hud.gov/portal/page/portal/HUD/program_offices/sustainable_housing_com munities.

[4] Recently, HUD announced two new underlying goals across all of its programs: (1) enhance access to opportunity for lower-income people and people of color, and (2) encourage sustainable communities. In a recent What Works Collaborative paper, the authors write, "Sustainable means different things to different people, and no single definition for sustainable communities or sustainable development has been widely accepted. Usually the terms refer to how the development of a community over time protects the environment for future generations" (p. 7). They also note that, "To examine the potential synergies and tensions between the two [HUD] goals, we focus on the narrower view of sustainability, which we call 'environmental sustainability'" (p. ii). Vicki Been, Mary Cunningham, Ingrid Gould Ellen, Adam Gordon, Joe Parilla, Margery Austin Turner, Sheryl Verlaine Whitney Aaron Yowell, and Ken Zimmerman. (2010). *Building Environmentally Sustainable Communities: A Framework for Inclusivity*. Washington, DC: What Works Collaborative, Urban Institute.

[5] See *Full Service Community Schools Program:*
http://www2.ed.gov/programs/communityschools/index.html and *Promise Neighborhoods*: http://www2.ed.gov/programs/promiseneighborhoods/index.html

[6] Teitz, Michael B. (1989). Neighborhood Economics: Local Communities and Regional Markets. *Economic Development Quarterly* 3(1): 111-122.

[7] We use the term "local education agency" or LEA to refer to public school districts.

[8] Been, et al. (2010); Turner, Margery Austin and Berube, Alan. (2009). *Vibrant Neighborhoods, Successful Schools: What the Federal Government Can Do to Foster Both*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

[9] Briggs, (Ed.). (2005).

[10] See Crane, Jonathan. (1991). Effects of Neighborhoods on Dropping out of School and Teenage Childbearing. In Christopher Jencks and Paul E. Peterson (Eds.), *The Urban Underclass* (pp. 299-320). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; Wilson, William Julius. (1990). *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press; Yinger, John. (1993). *Closed Doors, Opportunity Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*. New York: Russell Sage; Orfield, Myron. (2002). *American Metropolitics: The New Suburban Reality*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press; Dreier, Peter, Mollenkopf, John H. , and Swanstrom, Todd. (2005). *Place Matters: Metropolitics for the Twenty-first Century*. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas; Turner, Margery Austin. (2008). Residential Segregation and Employment Inequality. In James H. Carr and Nandinee K. Kutty (Eds.) *Segregation: The Rising Costs for America* (pp. 151-196). New York: Routledge; and Fletcher, Natasha O. (2008). Poverty Concentration and De-Concentration: A Literature Review. *LBJ Journal of Public Affairs*, 19, 69-81.

[11] The Harvard Education Press marked this important development in the field by putting out a collection of influential studies titled *The Opportunity Gap: Achievement and Inequality in Education*. The volume brings together research spanning more than three decades and looks at the history of inequality in education and how educators have come to think in terms of an "opportunity gap." DeShano da Silva, Carol, Huguley, James Philip, Kakli, Zenub,

and Rao, Radhika (Eds.) (2007). *The Opportunity Gap: Achievement and Inequality in Education*. Harvard Education Press.

[12] McKoy, Deborah, Vincent, Jeffrey M., and Bierbaum, Ariel H. (2010). Trajectories of Opportunity for Young Men and Boys of Color: Built Environment and Place-making Strategies for Creating Equitable, Healthy, and Sustainable Communities. In Christopher Edley, Jr. and Jorge Ruiz de Velasco (Eds.). *Changing Places: How Communities Will Improve the Health of Boys of Color* (pp. 495-533). Berkeley: University of California Press; Acevedo-Garcia, Dolores, Osypuk, Theresa L., McArdle, Nancy, and Williams, David R. (2008). Toward a Policy-Relevant Analysis of Geographic and Racial/Ethnic Disparities in Public Health. *Health Affairs* 27(2), 321-333.

[13] Schwartz, Heather. (2010). *Housing Policy Is School Policy: Economically Integrative Housing Promotes Academic Success in Montgomery County, Maryland*. New York: The Century Foundation.

[14] ED defines a magnet school as "a public elementary or secondary school or public elementary or secondary education center that offers a special curriculum capable of attracting substantial numbers of students of different racial backgrounds." See: www2.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/choice/magneteval/glossary.pdf.

[15] Numerous studies in recent years have measured the academic outcomes associated with increased student integration in schools and classrooms, which has typically been done by assigning low-income students to lower-poverty schools and/or through district- or region-wide school assignment programs. For example, see: Schwartz, Heather. (2010); Holme Jennifer Jellison, Diem, Sarah, and Mansfield, Katherine Cumings. (2009). *Using Regional Coalitions to Address Socioeconomic Isolation*. Harvard: Charles Hamilton Institute for Race and Justice; Eaton, Susan. (2010). *How the Racial and Socioeconomic Composition of Schools and Classrooms Contributes to Literacy, Behavioral Climate, Instructional Organization and High School Graduation Rates* (research brief). The National Coalition on School Diversity and the Charles Hamilton Houston Institute for Race and Justice at Harvard Law School; and Engdahl, Lora. (2009). *New Homes, New Neighborhoods, New Schools: A Progress Report on the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program*. Baltimore: Poverty and Race Research Action Council (PRRAC) and The Baltimore Regional Housing Campaign. Studies have also looked at the effect of non-integrative or neighborhood-based interventions, which tend to focus on increasing the academic and health support programming for students in their existing schools. For example, see: Dobbie, Will and Fryer, Jr., Roland G. (2009). *Are High-Quality Schools Enough to Close the Achievement Gap? Evidence from a Bold Social Experiment in Harlem.* Boston: Harvard University; Whitehurst, Grover J. and Croft, Michelle. (2010). *The Harlem Children's Zone, Promise Neighborhoods, and the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education*. Washington, DC; Brookings Institution; Coalition for Community Schools and Institute of Education Leadership. (2009). *Community Schools Research Brief*. Washington, DC: IES. http://www.communityschools.org/assets/1/AssetManager/CCS%20Research%20Report2009.pdf

[16] Vincent, Jeffrey M. (2006). Public Schools as Public Infrastructure: Roles for Planning Researchers. *Journal of Planning and Education Research*, 25(4), 433-437; McKoy, Deborah L., Vincent, Jeffrey M., and Makarewicz, Carrie. (2008). Integrating Infrastructure Planning: The Role of Schools. *ACCESS*. 33(4), 18-26; Torma, Tim (Ed.). (2004). Back to School for Planners (Special Issue). *Planning Commissioners Journal,* 56.

[17] Beaumont, Constance. (2002). *Why Johnny Can't Walk to School: Historic Neighborhood Schools in the Age of Sprawl.* Washington, DC: National Trust for Historic Preservation.

[18] Bierbaum, Ariel H., Jeffrey M. Vincent, and Deborah L. McKoy. (2011). *Growth and Opportunity: Aligning High-Quality Public Education and Sustainable Communities Planning in the Bay Area.* Berkeley, CA: Center for Cities and Schools.

[19] See Secretary of Education Arne Duncan's 2010 speech on the Obama Administration's commitment to supporting early learning programs and services that will "ensure that every child has access to a complete and competitive education from the day they are born to the day they begin a career." See: http://www.ed.gov/news/speeches/working-together-early-learning-secretary-arne-duncans-remarks-early-childhood-2010-in.

[20] Kirp, David. (2007). *The Sandbox Investment: The Universal Preschool Movement and Kids-First Politics*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

[21] Rothstein, Richard. (2010). *How to Fix Our Schools,* Issue Brief #286. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.

[22] Noguera, Pedro. (2003). *City Schools and the American Dream: Reclaiming the Promise of Public Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, p. 142.

[23] Grubb, W. Norton. (2009). *The Money Myth: School Resources, Outcomes, and Equity*. Russell Sage Foundation Publications. p. 300.

[24] ED defines charter schools as "independent public schools designed and operated by educators, parents, community leaders, educational entrepreneurs, and others. They are sponsored by designated local or state educational organizations who monitor their quality and effectiveness but allow them to operate outside of the traditional system of public schools." See: http://www2.ed.gov/nclb/index/az/glossary.html?src=az

[25] Nationally, 10.5%of elementary and secondary students are enrolled in private schools. Source: National Center for Education Statistics. (2009). Digest of Education Statistics. Retrieved on April 1, 2011 from http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010013.

[26] Blackwell, Angela Glover and Pastor, Manuel. (2010). Let's Hear It for the Boys: Building a Stronger America by Investing in Young Men and Boys of Color. In Christopher Edley, Jr. and Jorge Ruiz de Velasco (Eds.). *Changing Places: How Communities Will Improve the Health of Boys of Color* (pp. 3-35). Berkeley: University of California Press*.*

[27] Smith, Robin, G., Kingsley, Thomas, Cunningham, Mary, Popkin, Susan, Dumlao, Kassie, Ellen, Ingrid Gould, Joseph, Mark, and McKoy, Deborah (2010). *Monitoring Success in Choice Neighborhoods: A Proposed Approach to Performance Measurement*. Washington DC: What Works Collaborative, Urban Institute.

[28] Kirp, David. (2007); Fuller, Bruce. 2007. *Standardized Childhood: The Political and Cultural Struggle over Early Education.* Palo Alto: Stanford University Press. Bridges, Margaret, Fuller, Bruce, Rumberger, Russell, and Tran, Loan. (2004). *Preschool for California's Children: Promising Benefits, Unequal Access*. Policy Brief 04-3. Berkeley: Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE).

[29] Williams, Trish, Rosin, Matthew, and Michael W. Kirst. (2011). Gaining Ground in the Middle Grades. *Education Outlook*, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research.

[30] See e.g., the innovative after-school programs featured in National League of Cities. State of City Leadership for Children and Families. See: http://www.nlc.org/File%20Library/Find%20City%20Solutions/IYEF/state-city-leadership-rpt-sep09.pdf

[31] Cortright, Joseph. (2005). The Young and the Restless in a Knowledge Economy. Chicago, IL: CEOs for Cities. Retrieved on April 1, 2011 from http://www.ceosforcities.org/pagefiles/CEOs_YNR_FINAL.pdf

[32] For more information on regional workforce partnerships, see recent Jobs for the Future publications, including, *Innovations in Labor Market Intelligence: Meeting the New Requirements of Regional Workforce and Economic Development* (2010), *Expanding the Mission: Community Colleges and the Functions of Workforce Intermediaries* (2010), and *Building Regional Partnerships for Economic Growth and Opportunity* (2009), http://www.jff.org/publications

[33] Schneider, Mark. (2002). *Do School Facilities Affect Academic Outcomes?* Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Educational Facilities; Higgins, Steve, Hall, Elaine, Wall, Kate, Woolner, Pam, and McCaughey, Caroline. (2005). *The Impact of School Environments: A literature review*. The Design Council, The Centre for Learning and Teaching, School of Education, Communication and Language Science, University of Newcastle; Filardo, Mary and Vincent, Jeffrey M. (2010). Research on the Impact of School Facilities on Students and Teachers: A Summary of Studies Published Since 2000. *Educational Facility Planner* 44(2 & 3), 25-27.

[34] Briggs, Xavier de Souza. (2008). *Democracy as Problem-Solving: Civic Capacity in Communities Across the Globe.* Boston: The MIT Press.

[35] Hart, Roger A. (1997). *Children's Participation: The Theory and Practice of Involving Young Citizens in Community Development and Environmental Care.* London: UNICEF / Earthscan Publications Ltd.; Checkoway, Barry, Pothukuchi, Kameshwari, and Janet Finn. (1995). Youth Participation in Community Planning: What Are the Benefits? *Journal of Planning Education and Research,* (14) 134-39; McKoy, Deborah L. and Vincent, Jeffrey M.. (2007). Engaging Schools in Urban Revitalization: The YPLAN (Youth—Plan, Learn, Act, Now!). *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 26(4), 389-403; McKoy, Deborah L. McKoy, Vincent, Jeffrey M. and Bierbaum, Ariel H. (2010); National League of Cities. (2010). *Authentic Youth Civic Engagement: A Guide for Municipal Leaders*. Washington, DC: NLC.

[36] Driskell, David. (2002). *Creating Better Cities with Children and Youth: A Manual for Participation*. London: Earthscan.

[37] For more information on linked learning activity in California, see: ConnectEd. The California Center for College and Career. Retrieved on April 1, 2011 from http://www.connectedcalifornia.org/pathways/index.php

[38] McKoy, Deborah L. and Vincent, Jeffrey M. (2007).

[39] National League of Cities. (2010), pp 33-34.

[40] McKoy, Deborah L., Bierbaum, Ariel H., and Vincent, Jeffrey M. (2009). *The Mechanics of City-School Initiatives: Transforming Neighborhoods of Distress and Despair into Neighborhoods of Choice and Promise*. Berkeley, CA: Center for Cities and Schools.

[41] For example, see: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies and PolicyLink. (2004). *A Place for Healthier Living: Improving Access to Physical Activity and Healthy Foods*. Oakland, CA: PolicyLink.

[42] U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). (1995). *School Facilities: Condition of America's Schools*. Washington, DC: GAO; U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO). (1996). *School Facilities: Profiles of School Conditions by State*. Washington, DC: GAO; and Building Educational Success Together (BEST). (2006). *Growth and Disparity: A Decade of US Public School Construction*. Washington, DC: BEST.

[43] 21st Century School Fund (21csf) and Center for Cities and Schools. (2010). *Joint Use of Public Schools: A Framework for a New Social Contract*. Washington, DC: 21csf.

[44] McKoy, Deborah L. and Vincent, Jeffrey. (2008). Housing and Education: The Inextricable Link. In James H. Carr and Nandinee K. Kutty (Eds.), *Segregation: The Rising Costs for America* (pp. 125-150). New York: Routledge; Hartman, Chester, and Franke, Todd Michael. (2003). Student Mobility: How Some Children Get Left Behind. *Journal of Negro Education*, 72(1), 63-78; Rusk, David (2010). Building Sustainable, Inclusive Communities: How America Can Pursue Smart Growth and Reunite Our Metropolitan Communities. Washington, DC: Poverty and Race Action Research Council (PRRAC). Retrieved on April 1, 2011 from http://www.prrac.org/pdf/SustainableInclusiveCommunities.pdf; Schwartz, Heather. (2010).

[45] See e.g., Kerbow, David. (1996). Patterns of Urban Student Mobility and Local School Reform. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk* 1(2), 147-169; Schachter, Jason. (2001). *Geographical mobility: Population characteristics.* Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

[46] 21st Century School Fund and Center for Cities and Schools. (2010).

[47] McDonald, Noreen C. (2007). Active Transportation to School: Trends Among U.S. Schoolchildren, 1969–2001. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 32(6), 509–516.

[48] Safe Routes to School Online Guide. Last updated August 17, 2006, retrieved from http://www.saferoutesinfo.org/guide/index.cfm

[49] U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (2003). *Travel and Environmental Implications of School Siting*. Washington, DC: EPA.

[50] See U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Smart Growth and Schools at http://www.epa.gov/smartgrowth/schools.html; and School Siting Guidelines, Public Review Draft for Review at http://www.epa.gov/schools/siting/

[51] Grubb, W. Norton. (2009). p. 297.

[52] Council of Great City Schools. (2006). Urban school superintendents: Characteristics, tenure, and salary. *Urban Indicator* 8(1), 1-10.