



FOCUS - 19 of 26 DOCUMENTS

Copyright 2003 MediaNews Group, Inc. and ANG Newspapers  
The Daily Review (Hayward, CA)

June 16, 2003 Monday

**SECTION:** LOCAL & REGIONAL NEWS

**LENGTH:** 2483 words

**HEADLINE:** Rich schools get richer, poorer ones languish

**BYLINE:** By Jill Tucker, STAFF WRITER

**BODY:**

Public education isn't supposed to pick sides, but it does.

It favors Alexene Farol over Gerry Silva. The two are eighth-graders who live 20 miles from each other but worlds apart.

At Pleasanton's Harvest Park Middle School, Alexene's teachers are better than Gerry's at Havenscourt Middle School in Oakland. Her classrooms are better. Her textbooks are better. The library, the science and computer laboratories, the playground and the music programs are better, too.

And although Alexene is considered socioeconomically advantaged, state taxpayers spend more money to educate her -- nearly \$27,000 more on her teachers -- than they spend on Gerry.

The two students' public schools are separate and unequal -- a condition only getting worse as budget cuts in California leave kids such as Gerry even more vulnerable in deteriorating classrooms staffed with uncredentialed teachers.

It never was supposed to be that way.

Public schools were supposed to be the great equalizer -- the one place where kids got an equal shot at a future regardless of what life was like on the streets outside.

But public schools never have been equal. California's schools -- like those across the country -- typically reflect the condition of their communities.

Students in poor communities enter

dilapidated classrooms where uncredentialed teachers with inadequate materials await -- and where parent involvement is limited or nonexistent.

Rich schools get richer, poorer ones languish The Daily Review (Hayward, CA) June 16, 2003 Monday

In better-off neighborhoods, sometimes just a few miles away, the schools nearly sparkle, sporting the latest facility upgrades, top-notch equipment and the most experienced teachers. With nighttime PTA meetings, weekend potluck fund-raisers and various festivities, these better schools lure upwardly mobile home buyers drawn to the first-rate education and other opportunities offered to their kids.

Convoluted funding It's a two-tiered system maintained by a convoluted funding formula that doesn't spend money based on where it will really matter and fails to place the best teachers -- or even simply qualified teachers -- with the children who need them the most.

And while politicians have loudly touted expensive education reforms, they have lacked the real political will to reform the system, instead simply raising the bar on the schools and the students.

"What's there isn't good enough," said Merrill Vargo, executive director of the Bay Area School Reform Collaborative, who asks whether there's the political will to say: "The public school system is one of the cornerstones of a democratic society, we have to make it work, and we have to make it work for poor kids, and it's not an option to say it doesn't."

In California, schools with the highest poverty and minority enrollment on average have 20 percent uncredentialed teachers on staff compared with 5 percent to 6 percent of teachers at the schools with the lowest percentages of poor and minority students, according to a 2002 study by The Center for the Future of Teaching and Learning, a Santa Cruz-based nonprofit.

And because beginning teachers are paid about \$40,000 less than 20-year veterans, the state's poor and minority students often are getting a bargain basement education when it comes to what taxpayers spend on their teachers.

#### Unequal facilities

Resources for facilities are just as unbalanced. A 2001 California Budget Project study found the schools with the lowest test scores received about 30 percent less state bond money than they should have -- because the state allocates the money on a first-come, first-serve basis rather than by greatest need.

The current budget crisis is exacerbating the situation, as parents with monetary means step in at already high-performing schools to fill in the holes left by spending cuts, leaving lagging schools to fall further behind.

California's low-performing schools are among the worst in the nation, said Linda Darling-Hammond, of the Stanford University of education and a national expert on education reform.

"I personally had never seen kids receive as low quality an education as I found in districts like Oakland, Ravenswood, San Francisco and Compton," she said. "It's just really tragic."

#### Funding is a mess

Money talks.

But money talks a lot louder for some California kids than for others.

Across the state, the majority of education dollars are doled out to schools not based upon need but upon 30-year-old formulas from pre-Proposition 13 property tax rates and subsequent legislative efforts to equalize funding that nonetheless give some districts hundreds or even thousands of dollars more per child than others.

The result is a mess, according to state and local officials.

"California school finance is such -- somebody called it a Winchester Mystery House -- that the way it is put

together makes absolutely no sense," said school board president Terry Thygesen, of Menlo Park City Elementary School, which receives about \$11,000 to spend on each child if all public funding, a parcel tax and parent contributions are included.

In Dublin, where the standardized tests scores are among the state's best, the district received \$7,839 in total revenue for each of its 4,421 students during the 2001-2002 academic year, according to the state-supported Education Data Partnership.

Over the hill in Hayward, officials received \$7,180 to spend on each of the district's 24,199 students -- nearly \$16 million less than if the district had been funded at the same level as Dublin's.

Or head east to Manteca, where officials got by with \$6,393 for each of 21,309 students.

The explanation for such differences?

"You can never explain it to a real person, because there is no rationale about why a district will get a much higher level of funding than another," said state Sen. Dede Alpert, D-San Diego, a vocal advocate for education in the Legislature.

That means schools with the most disadvantaged students don't have any advantage when it comes to getting more basic education dollars. The fact that Gerry can't take home a history textbook for homework -- because there is only one classroom set -- falls on deaf fiscal ears.

Favoring white, wealthy

In fact, the system favors white and wealthy kids.

According to a 1999-2000 study by The Education Trust, a national nonprofit dedicated to closing the achievement gap, California spent \$5,036 per student in districts with the highest minority enrollment, \$369 less than in low-minority districts, and \$5,202 per student in districts with the highest poverty levels, \$59 less than in low-poverty districts.

That includes categorical state funding for programs often targeted to low-income students and low-performing schools.

Granted, it doesn't include the more than \$1 billion in annual federal Title I money for the state's low-income students. Title I money pays for tutoring programs, classroom aides, materials, curriculum and some teaching positions, but it hasn't significantly closed the gap, according to federal research.

Some say the money is spread too thin, others say it doesn't address the actual quality of teachers and facilities, focusing too much on aides and administrators.

More importantly, Title I money is supposed to provide additional resources for disadvantaged students and never was intended to make up for the short shrift in state school spending.

"Those kids need a heck of a lot more resources than the well-to-do, upper middle class, educated students," said Paul Goldfinger, vice president of School Services of California, a school finance consulting firm. "We have a system that does it on the cheap and hopes that it works out."

Money follows teachers

The financial inequalities are magnified when tracked to the classroom. Although districts get a set amount of money per student, the money follows the teachers, not the kids.

Rich schools get richer, poorer ones languish The Daily Review (Hayward, CA) June 16, 2003 Monday

This year, taxpayers spent \$82,126 to teach Alexene for the six hours she was at school each day in Pleasanton. In Oakland, taxpayers spent \$55,199 to teach Gerry for his six hours of classes. That's a \$26,927 difference.

While that says nothing about the quality of their teachers, California schools do not allocate money for teachers based on quality. They pay teachers based on whether they have a credential and on the number of years they have been teaching.

All of Alexene's teachers have credentials, and almost all have at least two decades of experience, if not three. Only Gerry's gym teacher is fully qualified to teach. The rest of his teachers lack a full credential and have one or two years of experience.

Yet, educators say, all schools are subject to the state's high-stakes accountability system.

And all children are subject to the same standardized tests, whether they get a \$10,000 public education in high-ranking Menlo Park or a \$6,400 version in middle-of-the-pack Manteca.

That means Gerry takes the same tests as Alexene.

The odds are his scores will be lower.

At Havenscourt, standardized test scores are among the worst in the state -- with an Academic Performance Index of 446 on a 1,000-point scale. At Harvest Park, test scores are among the state's best, with an API of 838.

"These scores are not imprinted on kids' DNA," said BASRC's Vargo. "They're a reflection of what they're taught. It's just tragic when that happens, and it's happening every day in those schools."

Spending doesn't keep pace

After Prop. 13 passed in 1978 -- shifting property tax dollars and education finance to the state -- legislators set about boosting funding in districts whose local property taxes previously put them at a disadvantage.

At the same time, California's school spending has failed to keep pace with that of other states. The overall quality of California's schools fell from among the best in the country to the bottom of the barrel.

Local school districts were forced to become creative or watch the quality of their classrooms continue to decline. Parents created nonprofit education foundations, pouring millions into district coffers each year.

And districts started to get parcel taxes passed. Well, some did.

According to a 2001 report by the Public Policy Institute of California, parcel taxes are passed primarily in districts with high-income and highly educated parents -- and raise an average \$500 per student.

Of the 62 districts that passed parcel or assessment taxes between 1983 and 2002, nearly four out of five were in the Bay Area, with 14 in Marin County alone. Five have been passed in Alameda County, eight in San Mateo County and zero in San Joaquin County.

Emeryville, Burlingame, San Mateo-Foster City and San Carlos were among the few districts that obtained the minimum two-thirds vote needed to pass a parcel tax in a special election on June 3.

"The government is just not giving enough funds and paying for things to give a quality education," said Lynne Young, president of the Menlo-Atherton Education Foundation. The district in the foundation's area receives about \$800,000 from parcel taxes each year.

What about the districts that cannot pass a tax?

"It's in high-minority, low-income schools that kids are basically being abandoned," Stanford's Darling-Hammond said. "Increasingly, it looks like some kids are just being written off in terms of education."

Would more money help?

There are those who say that even if we spent more money on the children who need the most help, it wouldn't matter much. They say socioeconomics determines a child's future more than teachers, textbooks or comfortable classrooms, so we need to fix society rather than fix the schools.

"You can't say all you have to do is put the best highly qualified teacher in that classroom or the best principal or equalize funding or fix the bathrooms," said state facility director Brooks. "Kids ideally would come from families with adequate parent support. They would adequately be fed. Obviously, you can't fix it all. It isn't just an educational problem."

True, but that does not justify the disparity, education activists say.

"Changes in the system are just too hard if the adults responsible for the change in the end don't believe these kids can learn as much as the white and Asian kids," said Russlyn Ali, director of The Education Trust-West. "You have to change the way people think about poor and minority people. Everybody has the right to learn. Everybody can learn."

Fixing the system requires radical change -- changes in the way we fund schools and facilities, and changes in the way we place teachers, say educators, activists and even politicians.

Sen. Alpert is working to implement a state master plan for education that among other things would establish what a quality education looks like and how much it costs.

The state then would add more money to accommodate the extra needs of low-income students.

"Believe me, I don't think this is going to be easy," Alpert said.

These changes would require extraordinary political will by state officials -- a factor often missing when it comes to creating true change for children Gerry.

"I think the middle class doesn't know how bad the Havenscourts are," said John Affeldt, a managing attorney of San Francisco-based Public Advocates Inc. "And I think if they did, there would be more political will."

The state has undertaken massive education reform efforts in the last several years, but many programs -- such as some teacher recruiting and retention efforts -- have fallen by the wayside in the lean budget times. Or, like class size reduction, they are offered to everyone, thus sustaining or even widening the gap in quality.

Forcing the issue

Frustrated with state inaction, civil rights activists sued the state in May 2000 to force elected officials to address the disparity. The Williams vs. State of California lawsuit hopes to force the state's hand in fixing Gerry's school and those in similar straits.

"We have a system where some schools are getting funded more than others," said Affeldt, who helped file the lawsuit in state Superior Court. "I don't think the public wants those conditions to continue either. If we're not educating those kids, we're not going to be able to maintain the level of economic prosperity we have."

In the meantime, the vast inequalities in public education will continue to be the norm, an accepted standard in our

public schools.

And that will have repercussions not only for students Gerry but also for every taxpayer in the state.

"We will continue as a state to get sued by people who argue there is no equity," Alpert said, referring to the pending Williams case. "Sometimes [a lawsuit] seems to be the only thing that gets people going. It's an awful sad reality."

Contact Jill Tucker at [jtucker@angnewspapers.com](mailto:jtucker@angnewspapers.com) .

**LOAD-DATE:** July 2, 2003