The True

ANSLEY ERICKSON
BRANDON BUCK
DAVID HOUSTON

ANSLEY ERICKSON, BRANDON BUCK, AND DAVID HOUSTON

Teachers College, Columbia University

THE TRUE
Human Knowledge

THE GOOD
Social Mores and Ethics

THE BEAUTIFUL
Aesthetics

THE PROSPEROUS
Economic Life

THE JUST AND WELL-ORDERED
Political and Civil Life

THE SUSTAINABLE
The Natural Environment

COMMUNITY ENDOWMENT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Much like biologists think of an ecosystem as a community of living and non-living things working together in the natural world, Thriving Cities uses a framework we call "human ecology" to help us envision a city. The human ecologies of a city contain and depend upon an array of different, but fundamental endowments. Such endowments: (a) give expression to long-standing and universally-recognizable ends that are essential to human thriving (e.g., intellectual life, aesthetics, sociality, play, health and security, transcendence); (b) become actualized within specific social practices and institutional settings (e.g., universities, theaters, social media, soccer clubs, health care, and places of worship); (c) have distinctive histories that shape their present and future possibilities; and (d) interact dynamically with one another, creating both virtuous cycles when robust and healthy, and vicious cycles when depleted and weak, but also generating synergies with unintended consequences and tensions between competing goods.

The language of endowments is highly intentional. It stands in direct opposition to the language of "capital," used by most standard and many cutting-edge approaches. Where capital denotes abstract, a-temporal, and amoral value that is at once fungible and fluid, which is to say unfixed (which is precisely the source of its conceptual strength), the language of endowments brings the dimensions of particularity and temporality back into view—endowments are the products of investments made over time and they must be maintained in the present if they are to remain available in the future. Also, attached to the language of endowments is a sense of fiduciary responsibility and obligation. Where capital functions as a medium of value and exchange irrespective of context, endowments function as a reservoir of wealth held in common—as a trust within very definite contexts. Despite its obvious strengths, the language of capital is not able to capture these essential qualities of community life, and not surprisingly, they remain empirically elusive in approaches that rely on it.

Our distinctively cultural approach, with its emphasis on the normative dimensions of common life in cities, invites us to see them in terms of six interactive (and ever-evolving) formative contexts in which we routinely see the exercise of moral agency and practical reasoning across human communities. The first three of the six endowments build on the classical ideals of "the True," "the Good," and "the Beautiful;" the last three are what we might call the modern ideals of "the Prosperous," "the Well-ordered and Just," and "the Sustainable." Together they form some of the most recognizable horizons of the human experience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.   INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS "THE TRUE"?

As defined by the Thriving Cities Project, the Endowment of "The True" concerns how the production and distribution of knowledge can or do relate to thriving by contributing to city and metropolitan life in three intersecting areas: culture, democracy, and the economy. Education and knowledge production in these three areas connect across the life span of individuals from youth to old age, across flows of information and thought within communities, and in both formal and informal spaces of education and learning. This vision of education, broadly defined, follows the ideas of esteemed historian and educator Lawrence Cremin, who argued for understanding of "the educative process across the entire life span, in all the situations and institutions in which it occurs, in a wide variety of social and cultural contexts, and in the past as well as the present and alternative imagined futures."[1]

Despite the power of Cremin's call, the majority of scholarship relevant to The True, particularly in the discipline of history, has made formal education and the processes of schooling its primary focus. That limitation, however, can provide an opportunity. How can understanding the persistent social and political debates over schooling in the United States help identify and refine the core questions that have and still do attach not only to formal education but to The True more generally? And how do these struggles illuminate the effort to define a thriving city? This brief explores this matter, rooted chiefly in the discipline of history but drawing where possible from key works and concepts in philosophy and political science as well. Where possible, it identifies examples of knowledge production and distribution in non-school spaces.

History offers myriad examples of how education takes place beyond schooling. In some cases these examples are brought to the fore in times when access to formal schooling has been denied or the quality of available schooling has made it a destructive rather than constructive force. As Vincent P. Franklin has shown in Philadelphia, and as Hilary Moss has documented in Baltimore, African American people have pursued learning through means as varied as the church, community learning centers, and apprenticeships, among many others.[2] Similar spaces have, or do, operate as sites of knowledge production and distribution even alongside formal schooling.

Efforts today conceptualize education as a multigenerational project, even when the education of the young remains the prime focus. The US Department of Education currently funds "Promise Neighborhoods," modeled after the Harlem Children's Zone. The program supports a range of services for participating families, with both children and adults obtaining access to an array of non-formal education opportunities on topics from nutrition and parenting to arts, athletics, vocational training, and job preparedness.[3]

Although this brief focuses chiefly on formal schooling, it recognizes multiple instances in which schools operate in connection with education more broadly defined—for example, school governance as a site of educative democratic practice (for adults) or schooling that builds on cultural expression and modes of communication prevalent outside of school. Whether in a school setting or outside of school, any educational endeavor faces core questions about the purposes of knowledge production and distribution.

A. THREE KEY ASPECTS OF THE TRUE, AND TWO ENDURING TENSIONS

In the US context, the mid- to late-nineteenth century was a crucial moment in the elevation of formal education as a prime venue for the pursuit of The True. In that moment, and since, both formal and informal educational enterprises have defined themselves around three areas: knowledge and culture, knowledge and democracy, and knowledge and the economy. This introduction sets out these themes, which are developed further in Section II ("Literature Review"), and identifies two general tensions that run across considerations of the pursuit of The True.

Horace Mann, the first commissioner of education in the first state (Massachusetts) to have such a

post, wrote some of American public education's key founding documents. In advocating a transition from a highly local, and highly variable, system of education in mid-nineteenth-century Massachusetts, to one that would involve a greater (if still quite meager, from the modern perspective) state role, Mann articulated what he saw to be the core purposes of public education. First, a democratic society depended on education for the making of the citizens who would guard and manage that democracy. That is, schooling was a fundamentally civic enterprise.

Second, public education had an equally economic function. In the Massachusetts of the 1840s, characterized by a swelling immigrant population, the diminution of ready opportunities for self-sufficiency via land ownership (in that most land had already been claimed), and the increasing economic prevalence of industrial production, Mann saw the danger of a permanently class-stratified (and potentially revolution-prone) society. Schooling would be "the balance wheel of the social machinery," in his famous words, the mechanism that would preserve an early American pattern of mobility regarding land ownership and prevent entrenched class divisions of the kind Mann and other Americans perceived and feared in Europe.[4] The very work of building schools became part of building not only a more elaborate state apparatus, but a basic economic infrastructure in early-modern America.[5]

Schooling could, in Mann's view, do all of this work while supporting, or at least not challenging, the religious and moral frameworks students experienced at home and at church. In an early example of tensions over how and whether schools could accommodate children of diverse cultural and religious backgrounds, not all students in Massachusetts schools or elsewhere agreed with Mann's perspective. Here, inseparably from schooling's civic function, its power to reinforce or weaken extant and new cultural trends came to the fore.

While Mann imagined a public school for a democratic society in a state that had earlier abolished slavery, that institution still distorted the fate of public education in America's slave states. Yet, in a profound illustration of how the pursuit of The True has been both broader and deeper than schooling alone, enslaved people made strenuous efforts to secure learning for themselves and their communities. Individually, slaves found opportunities to learn to read and write, to teach, and to marshal the knowledge they had acquired in the service of individual liberty and collective protest.[6]

After emancipation and Reconstruction, but within the grip of Jim Crow racism and inequality, African Americans residing in the South created educational institutions even as they lived in conditions of extraordinary privation. Seeing their tax dollars directed away from their communities by whites-only legislatures, they collected community resources toward building schools, hiring teachers, and transporting children to school. Capitalizing on Northern philanthropic dollars that encouraged black education but constrained it within boundaries that respected an oppressive labor market, African American communities navigated their hopes for their children through the tensions of an American system in which, as the noted scholar of the history of US education, James Anderson, memorably put it, "schooling for democratic citizenship and schooling for second-class citizenship have been basic traditions."[7] Twenty-first-century American inequality takes on different forms from those that characterized it in the blunt and brutal Jim Crow South, but the tension Anderson identified remains fundamental to the question of what The True is in the context of real, rather than ideal, communities and their systems of power.

Philosophical perspectives on education similarly have identified in their own terms tensions similar to those Anderson expressed. In doing so, they have named a basic and enduring tension in the idea of education. Public education represents something of a social paradox. On the one hand, public education performs a replicating function. That is, it serves to sustain and reproduce social practices, arrangements, and cultural codes from one generation to the next.[8] At the same time, however, public education also performs a transformative or disruptive function. Its aim in this respect is to invite new generations to imagine new possibilities and generate new social and cultural vistas.[9] Finding a satisfactory balance between these two—generally conflicting—aims proves extraordinarily difficult, and for this reason public schools, and potentially any enterprise involved in the pursuit of The True, constitute a site for contest among prevailing plural norms. In the context of emerging, shifting, and

diverse cultural norms, a landscape of sharp inequality and crucial if imperfect democracy, to what extent does the pursuit of The True in a thriving city require transforming rather than replicating extant patterns in culture, democracy, and the economy?

A second basic tension runs through discussion of The True in the city. Simply put, inequality interrupts the production and distribution of knowledge. This is a reality in any geographic context, but is particularly central in cities. Cities and metropolitan regions have been, over course of the twentieth century and with increasing visibility in the twenty-first, the site of yawning gaps between wealth and poverty, the home of deeply entrenched stratification. How do thriving cities address inequality in and through education? Can a city thrive without education that explicitly values and seeks greater equality?

This issue is in some respects only a refinement of the first tension discussed, between education as replicative or transformative. Do schools seek to—or in practice act to—replicate the inequality around them? Or do they (or could they) aid in the transformation of this inequality, helping to achieve its reduction? This is a question long debated by historians, sociologists, and philosophers of education. From the perspective of a normative view of the "thriving" city that identifies inequality as a core problem, processes of knowledge production and distribution must be arrayed intentionally to challenge inequality.

B. THE TRUE AND THE CITY

While there are multiple ways in which the pursuit of The True has been and is distinct in urban spaces, the term "urban education" is so freighted in contemporary discourse that a few clarifications are necessary, to look beyond the use of the term as a euphemistic descriptor for a troubled district serving predominantly poor students of color.

For much of the twentieth century, urban school systems were more amply endowed with resources, more bureaucratically elaborate, and more innovative than their rural or suburban counterparts. Urban schools generated models and norms of school organization, pedagogy, and governance that came to be broadly influential, helping to build a strikingly uniform national model of American schooling, despite the highly local nature of school governance. also, urban schools operated within a denser network of other institutional and social supports for knowledge production and distribution—from settlement houses to museums to theater to apprenticeships. The relative strength of urban systems extended even into regions, like the Jim Crow South, where education was much less developed. If there were high schools (and colleges) available to black students, they were almost always urban schools.[10]

Today, the implication that "urban education" captures the location of schooling for poor children of color, contrasted with a homogenous white and middle-class suburbia, is likewise inaccurate. Many American suburban municipalities and school districts are sites of great and increasing diversity along racial, ethnic, and class lines, even as others remain enforced bastions of white wealth and privilege.[11] This reality often makes it necessary to use a metropolitan frame of reference, looking across city, suburb, and exurb. This is not to broaden and dilute the meaning of "the urban," but to acknowledge the historical and current reality that these varied regions exist in interaction. Doing so can allow a continued emphasis on the specific nature of the city—its scale and density—for processes of education.[12]

This introductory section of the present brief has introduced three aspects of The True—knowledge and culture, knowledge and democracy, and knowledge and the economy—that are applicable to educational endeavors broadly conceived in any geographic context. Likewise, it has identified two core philosophical and social tensions in the pursuit of The True: (a) between replication and transformation, and (b) around how, or how extensively, to address inequality. These general themes take on particular meaning in the context of the city and metropolis, as we will explore in later sections.

The particular history of cities makes general issues in education and the pursuit of The True look different, or more intense, in three ways. First, cities have been centers of immigration, of concentrations

of poverty, of economic innovation. These realities create the context in which interactions between knowledge, culture, democracy, and the economy can look different or happen differently. Second, cities can also matter more directly—as actors in these interactions as well. How does the reality of urban density, for example, enable or stymie the transmission and development of diverse cultures? How does massive urban scale alter basic operations of schooling? Finally, contemporary developments that are city focused put new pressures on or create new opportunities for cities particularly. Increasingly centralized school governance and the concentration of school choice and charter efforts in cities are two key examples of such developments.

II.   LITERATURE REVIEW: THE TRUE IN HISTORICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

In this section, we focus on selected historical moments or topics that illustrate the ways in which education and knowledge production have interacted with culture, democracy, and the economy in historical context and with philosophical meaning. We introduce general themes and tensions in the work of knowledge production and distribution, with consideration for the particular meanings of these interactions in cities.

A. KNOWLEDGE AND CULTURE

Along with formal educational institutions, cities have long hosted an array of both informal (spontaneous and unstructured) and non-formal (structured but occurring outside of school) educational spaces. Informal venues, from the barbershop to the card table, the playground, or the street corner, become sites of knowledge sharing and learning, existing concurrently with the refinement of cultural practices. Acknowledging this means conceptualizing many sites in the urban landscape as places for the production and distribution of knowledge and culture. Additionally, these learning spaces can offer potential connections with formal schooling. Scholars who have examined informal educational spaces note that practices like rap, which requires deft linguistic aptitude, or the game of spades, which rewards understanding of conditional probability, memorization, and risk assessment, develop skills that, if properly appreciated by teachers in formal school settings, can be built upon within the formal curriculum.[13]

Non-formal sites, such as museums, offer additional venues in which cities work to refine and transmit their culture, identity, and history. Museums can operate as depots of "shared learning" where learning takes on a markedly social dimension as citizens obtain new knowledge at the same time that they collectively negotiate the social and cultural meaning of that knowledge.[14] Memorial museums function not merely to teach about an event, but to instigate conversation surrounding the collective meaning of an event.[15] Whether this function occurs around the memorialization of particular events or the preservation and display of the artifacts of artistic traditions, museums can serve as key sites in the distribution of knowledge and culture. Many other institutions—such as public library branches, local historical societies, churches, and community centers—can serve similar functions.

Struggles over existing and emergent cultural forms and trends can take place in educational settings outside of schools, from the museum planning board to the inter-generational encounter on a street corner or in a church vestibule. Yet it is in debates over schooling that some of the most vivid public struggles have emerged over whether schools do, or should, reproduce existing social and cultural structures or transform them, particularly amid cultural diversity. Whose voices, peoples, views, and traditions are included, and whose are excluded, as schools and communities aim to preserve common traditions and practices? In this account, the history of public education in the United States (especially in urban centers) can be viewed as a history of inclusivity and exclusivity.[16] How and to what degree do schooling institutions accommodate pluralism, recognizing and supporting the diverse cultures they encounter, or to what degree do they struggle against or exclude this diversity? Of course, the

effort to balance inclusivity against exclusivity is also subject to a plurality of views, a reality that compounds the problem immensely. Who decides these matters, and on what basis? The topic of language offers one example of the broader and enduring question of how cultural and behavioral practices matter for student engagement and achievement within schools, and for the flows of culture in a community more broadly.[17]

The question of language in education has long been a ripe one for debate, encapsulating broader questions of how and to what ends culture is conveyed in society, and exemplifying the tension between ideas of education as replicative and education as transformative. The question of which languages are heard in—and supported by—which educational spaces has a rich history that illustrates the interrelationship between immigration and cultural diversity in American schooling.

Matters of language and immigration have particular salience for urban (and, increasingly, suburban) school systems because cities were where, for most of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, immigrant communities arrived and tried to establish themselves. But the city also is a factor in responding to cultural and linguistic diversity. Cities operate at a scale and density sufficient to increase the contact that groups have with one another, possibly heightening the challenges of diversity but also making the creation of distinctive communities possible—whether on the basis of ethnicity, language, sexuality, or some other attribute or other affinity.[18] The growing diversity of American suburban space, helped in part by the fact that, as of 2010, a majority of first-generation immigrants—51 percent—resided in suburbs, raises new questions about the experience of immigration-produced cultural diversity in that spatial and political form.[19]

Debates about language in schooling reflect transformations in educational thought. Through the 1960s and subsequent decades, an earlier emphasis on "Americanization" gave way to efforts to preserve native languages within schooling. This effort understood schooling as a force in the recognition and sustenance of various cultures and communities. At the beginning of the twenty-first century, amid incredible linguistic diversity in many urban and some suburban school systems and "English-only" referendums in multiple states and localities, debate continued within educational communities about how the practices and symbolic emphases of schooling related to culture via language. Scholars have begun looking at early Americanization education in a new light, and examining contemporary bilingual education practices in the hopes of locating a synthesis that at once recognized and supported home culture and language while building skill in English and knowledge of American structures and cultures for the sake of enabling access. These scholars are searching for a workable pluralism amid incredible linguistic and cultural diversity in America's urban, and increasingly suburban, schools and communities.

Between 1890 and 1920, twenty-two million immigrants arrived in the United States, most of them from Europe. They represented nearly half of the rapid population increase of those years. In school, many immigrant children encountered programs that sought to "Americanize" them quickly, by teaching them English, American history, and expectations of citizens in a democracy. Most schools in the first third of the twentieth century made few if any efforts to incorporate the home cultures of the students into the processes of education. (Notably, however, some did offer instruction in "home" languages, including German and Spanish, as early as the mid-nineteenth century in schools from Texas through the upper Midwest.) Americanization classes, for immigrant adults as well as children, "took an ethnocentric stance," presenting "US cultural patterns as being more desirable than the immigrants' ancestral cultures and languages."[20] Schools often sought to resolve diversity via assimilation.

Other institutions, created within immigrant communities, at once reinforced home cultures and proved to be powerful Americanizing agents in themselves. Foreign-language newspapers translated local happenings for immigrant communities and helped convey the norms of a new land. In the mixture of school- and non-school spaces for Americanization *and* the maintenance of home language and cultural traditions, historian Jeffrey Mirel describes how European immigrants in early-twentieth-century American cities were "Americanized on their own terms" in a dynamic interaction between their ethnic community institutions and explicitly Americanizing spheres like the schools. In Mirel's view,

this interaction resulted in a "broader, more cosmopolitan, and ultimately more democratic vision of American culture."[21]

In contrast with Mirel's "patriotic pluralism," many scholars who study the experience of Spanish-speaking immigrant communities offer a more critical take on the predominantly assimilationist impulses present in schooling later in the twentieth century. Although fully bilingual schools (in which instruction, texts, curriculum, and communications were available in a language other than English, as well as in English) existed as early as the nineteenth century for Spanish-speakers as well as speakers of German and a variety of other European languages in much of the United States, by the middle of the twentieth century most programs had shifted either to English only or the more narrowly defined (but in some cases still hard-won) English as a Second Language by the 1960s.[22]

In these contexts, the response to the question of where multiple cultures and languages fit in schooling tended to be answered in favor of assimilation, with little or no acknowledgment or support given to the maintenance of students' home language or culture. Angela Valenzuela labels such assimilationist models of education "subtractive" schooling practices because they require that non-native populations first eliminate their own cultural background in order to integrate into contemporary society. Subtractive schooling captures not only the removal of other languages from the schooling context via English-only education, but also describes the accompanying disregard for home cultures in school practices, rituals, and curriculum.[23]

Against subtractive schooling practices, scholars calling for "additive" schooling encourage schools to take a more pluralist (rather than assimilationist) stance—to build on prior knowledge and provide classroom materials that are more consonant with the ways immigrant students view and understand the world. Above all, the aim of additive schooling is to sustain and validate students' background culture by drawing from their native "funds of knowledge," including language, histories, and cultural practices.[24] Dual-language immersion and other approaches to maintaining the home language while adding English, with the goal of inculcating full bilingualism and biculturalism, is the aim.[25]

Amid fiery present-day debates about the presence of languages other than English in American life, politics, and schooling, advocates of "additive" schooling see a steep slope ahead in their efforts to encourage their desired practices. Especially when the frame of reference is expanded beyond the school and the school-aged child exclusively to consider the mix of "Americanizing" and culturally sustaining spaces that can exist across schools, foreign-language media, community organizations, and the like, Jeffrey Mirel's view of "patriotic pluralism" suggests that an additive approach to the inclusion of immigrant communities in American democracy has historical precedent. Community centers and organizations like the YMCA and YWCA worked to encourage cultural pluralism and aid immigrant communities' adjustment to American cities.[26] In the contemporary city, local libraries often link tutors with immigrants seeking naturalization and assistance in developing their skills in English. Mirel's examples may be particularly useful as well because they consider contexts where, as in so many present-day school systems, students with a variety of home languages meet in school. This emphasis on non-school factors runs the risk, however, of endorsing assimilationist efforts at school while relying on less securely established non-school entities to help sustain diverse cultural and linguistic traditions. What entities, in the thriving city, serve the function of the foreign-language press of the early 1900s, at once reinforcing home culture and mediating the connections to a new one?

Schools have long been the center of debates about culture in connection with, and beyond, the topic of immigration. The issue of language in school is only part of the broader question of what constitutes (or can constitute) culturally relevant or culturally sustaining pedagogy and schooling. This important question has resonance in regard to a variety of other issues, including the representation of diverse histories in curricula and the recognition and use of cultural modes and traditions in schooling (as in the embrace of hip-hop within both literacy and science education).[27] Given both the historical identification of urban centers with communities of color and the great need for improved educational outcomes in those communities, these approaches have particular relevance in urban settings. In those settings, simple dichotomies between education as replicative and education as transformative are upended, as the incorporation

of a "new" culture into the curriculum or the practices of schooling for some feels like a change, while for others it is a crucial step toward replicating and conserving that culture.

Matters of diversity in education—cultural, ethnic, or racial, as well as religious—have at times raised the question of whether broad goals of knowledge production and distribution are best served through a single public education system or by charging other entities with the pursuit of The True. These questions emerged as early as the "Bible Wars" of the 1840s, which tested Horace Mann's assertion that a generic Christianity could be palatable to Protestants and Catholics alike in an era of religious chauvinism and xenophobia. Mid-nineteenth-century Catholics who confronted anti-Catholicism in their textbooks and their children's schools protested by keeping their children out of school, and by lobbying to have public school funds flow to the church for the support of schools that would respect their religious commitments.[28] Their wish was not granted, and the New York City schools set about trying, if incompletely, to better include rather than separate out segments of the diverse and growing population of children they served.

Questions of diversity in schooling take on new meaning in the context of two contemporary developments around school organization, governance, and curriculum. Much of the heat in historical contests over the content of schooling has been generated because diverse communities have had a common stake in public schooling operated through a single local system. (In cities, that system can be vast; for example, the New York City public schools serve 1.1 million students.) What if questions of knowledge and culture devolve from large school systems to smaller and more autonomous entities? This could happen via education supported with public funds but managed either through quasi-public (charter) or private (voucher) arrangements, as well as through the jurisdictional fragmentation of small school districts within larger metropolitan areas.

The opportunity to frame their own answers to questions about knowledge and culture has been one of the motivations of some charter school advocates, and charter schools have developed across a broad spectrum of perspectives on knowledge and culture, from those that are explicitly Afrocentric to others emphasizing the study of the traditional Western canon.[29] This range also resonates with advocates of public school choice, charter or otherwise, seeing in smaller-scale and more autonomous operation the potential for educators and community members to define distinct pedagogical and/or cultural approaches.[30] What are the potential benefits, and costs, of such an arrangement not only for the process of schooling but for the process of democracy, particularly in cities where choice arrangements are most visible?

While school choice arrangements may create openings for a wider range of answers in practice to questions of knowledge and culture, another set of pressures facing American school systems might limit this diversity. Movement toward requirements for state-level standardized test systems (under the No Child Left Behind Act, from 2002 to 2012) has given way somewhat to strong incentives in the Race to the Top federal grant program for states to adopt the Common Core State Standards. These incentives push (if not without some state and grassroots resistance) toward a more unified, national approach to curriculum and assessment.[31] The standards do not mandate uniform pedagogical approaches explicitly, but the high stakes attached to them, and the fact that they apply across schools that would seek to answer questions of knowledge and culture in distinct ways, creates pressure toward narrower and more uniform curricula and pedagogy, a point discussed further in Section IV ("Indicators").

As we seek to suggest in the present section, seemingly narrow questions such as what languages find support or opposition in the practices of schooling in fact touch on fundamental question of how knowledge and culture interact. Who decides how schools or other entities address these questions is just one example of how questions of knowledge and culture are also questions about democracy.

B. KNOWLEDGE AND DEMOCRACY

A core meaning of The True in a democratic context is in the distribution and generation of knowledge

to enable participation in collective decision-making. A wide range of educational practices, from the formal (e.g., civics classes in high school) to the informal (e.g., televised political debates, politically engaged music lyrics, or sidewalk conversations) can be seen as educational enterprises encouraging and spreading knowledge that enhances democratic functioning. As philosopher Martha Nussbaum argues, with American colleges and universities in mind, education should target "complete citizens who can think for themselves, criticize tradition, and understand the significance of another person's sufferings and achievements."[32]

As the above discussion of how schools navigate cultural diversity suggests, schools are not only places for the making of citizens, but loci of democratic practice. The process of educational governance involves ample examples from which to consider how democratic citizenship does, and could, function. In the present sub-section, we use the matter of school governance to ask how democratic citizenship and participation is or could be understood as an educative endeavor. If democracy is itself educative, then various approaches to school governance should be evaluated as capturing, or missing, opportunities to engage citizens in the work of democracy, and thereby to educate.

Nineteenth-century models of school governance were highly local and somewhat informal, and directly involved laypeople in judgment about the most detailed of school practices. Local "examiners" visited schoolrooms at the end of the academic year to hear students' recitations and decide whether to hire or fire the teacher. Shifting our vision from the teachers and the students in the classroom to the experience of those "examiners," we can see them participating in a democratic act that involved making judgments about the purposes of schooling and its operation in their community.[33]

In the twentieth century, when activist and organizer Ella Baker met with Harlem neighbors in the Young Consumers' League, an economic collective, she enabled her neighbors to survive the straits of the Great Depression; she also worked on cultivating habits and skills of citizenship. A few decades later, when Baker was one of a cadre of active Harlem residents determined to confront segregation and inequality in their schools, she shaped her organizing work not only to pressure district leaders and local officials but to make these acts of democracy explicitly pedagogical, enhancing participants' capacity as citizens.[34] Organizing around schools was doubly educative—for the adults who were doing the organizing, as well as for the children in the schools they sought to improve. For Baker, as for the residents of a nineteenth-century town, the work of citizenship implied in governing schools itself encouraged knowledge production and distribution.

We can apply this perspective to contemporary trends in school governance, an area that has seen many changes over the last half-century, their pace accelerating in the last decade, which are visible most dramatically in cities. These developments include the expansion of mayoral control of education, the emergence of the portfolio management model (see below) in a handful of districts, and the experience of charter schools and school choice. What consequences do these shifts have on the idea of democratic participation as educational experience?

At the city level, education historically has operated separately from other municipal governance functions. This is largely a result of progressive reforms of the early twentieth century that sought to insulate education from what was perceived as an overly politicized city government. These reforms placed power in the hands of relatively depoliticized school boards and included the hiring of the first cadre of university-trained educational administrators.[35] With community frustration over unresponsive bureaucracy mounting in the 1960s, activists in New York City and elsewhere fought for community control of local schools through more local-level governance. In several cities, their efforts resulted in decentralization, with the large school district divided into smaller "community boards," each of which had an elected membership.[36]

Lately, in response to criticisms of school boards (whether at the local level or citywide) as inefficient and ineffective, a number of cities have begun experimenting with a return to more centralized authority, empowering the mayor to make major education policy decisions. Boston and Chicago were the first to reinstitute mayoral control, in 1991 and 1995, respectively. Cleveland, Detroit, Washington,

and New York City soon followed. There is little systematic research on the typical outcomes of mayoral control across different locations and different administrations; however, some trends have emerged in the shift toward this style of governance. The centralization of educational authority toward a single official can speed reform, but may do so at the expense of community access. With fewer individuals involved in the decision-making process, and fewer regular or available venues for public comment, it can become increasingly difficult for traditional educational actors, such as teachers and parents, to influence those in power. Opposition to more centralized authority has differed from location to location. In a few cities, Washington in particular, opposition to mayoral control tracked racial lines fairly closely. Opponents would cite local black communities' long-standing ties to leadership positions in the education system as well as the importance of schools as sources of employment. Teachers and parent activists also led much of the opposition to greater mayoral authority, arguing that the shift would reduce access to decision making.[37] Considering participation in decision making not simply as a principled value in a democracy but as an educative form of its own, school governance models that close access to deliberation risk negative consequences in both regards.

In a few cities, such as New Orleans and New York, a more intense form of centralization has materialized: the portfolio management model (PMM). Using the analogy of a stock portfolio, PMM relies on a strong central authority to collect copious data on students and schools; consequently, new iterations of successful schools are opened, and those that fail to perform are closed, much as a financial portfolio would be assembled on the basis of the performance of individual stocks.[38] Established to address the inefficiencies of managing educator behavior in a large bureaucracy, PMM grants more autonomy to the school level and the central office while greatly reducing the size of the pre-existing administration in the middle.[39]

This development may have profound consequences for the amount and scale of citizen participation in the governance of schools. Conceivably, PMM, with its expansion of autonomy for individual school sites, may provide parents with considerably more influence at their own child's school (although such influence will likely vary from school to school). However, as a result of the diminished middle management, parents are likely to have far fewer points of contact with decision makers who have any influence over the larger system. These new structures should be monitored for the extent to which they make participatory democracy more inaccessible, especially for people with limited resources or few social ties to those with authority. This concern matters regardless of the fact that highly local school governance and civic participation have a history of imperfect performance, including frequently low levels of voter turnout.[40]

Charter schools and other forms of school choice raise other questions about educational governance as democratic practice and educative opportunity. While choice enables families to select a school for their child, the increased power to exit a particular school may displace willingness to engage in collective action to improve a school or school system.[41] On the other hand, some charter schools are themselves examples of exceptional citizen participation, insofar as community-based organizations, religious organizations, nonprofits, or groups of educators can apply for a charter to operate a public school directly. While local-level participation in *school-level* governance may increase, collective governance over the educational enterprise overall may be reduced. Charter school governance flows through multiple and complex channels, mixing both public and private resources and authority. In what ways can a citizen, not only a parent in the immediate charter school community, participate democratically in public education under the charter model? The pathways are less direct than in a conventional model of local school board governance. Low-income and minority students and parents, as individuals, may see their educational options increase as newly established schools become available to them. Alternatively, or simultaneously, their opportunities for collective action to influence specific schools or system-wide issues may dwindle. A philosophical perspective on democratic participation as an educative enterprise helps broaden this discussion from concern over the outcomes for *schools* of various governance structures to concern over the outcomes for *citizens* and *citizenship.*

One basis for such a perspective is available from John Dewey, who, in *Democracy and Education,* makes two central claims: First, an educated public is crucial to a successful democracy; second, the aim of

public education is to *prepare* young persons to participate in democratic institutions. In other words, schooling should provide practice for democratic life.[42] Dewey gives further nuance to this idea by emphasizing inquiry in the rest of his political theory. Rather than think about education *for* democracy, it might be more accurate to conceptualize democracy *as* education. In other words, there is much in Dewey to suggest that democracy is first and foremost a fundamentally educative enterprise.

Broadly, traditional democratic theory can be separated into three types: representative democracy, participatory democracy, and deliberative democracy. Each of these models concerns the extent to which individuals' preferences are expressed and accounted for. Variously, the aim is either to aggregate preferences, mediate preferences, or develop a shared normative preference (i.e., the common good). All of these models share the assumption that each of us always already possesses a fully developed set of preferences and all that is required is for us to figure out how to litigate the differences among us. On one extreme, there is the popular vote; on the other, there is a robust conversation that encourages us to productively determine the common good. But in each case, there are preexisting individual preferences.

When Dewey emphasizes inquiry, however, a different model appears. In *The Public and Its Problems*, he describes the predicament of the many "unarticulated publics," and determines that our problems, while many and vast, are reducible to the singular: Our biggest problem is that we do not know what our problems actually are.[43] The primary lesson, therefore, "as far as method of social inquiry is concerned, is the prime necessity for the development of techniques of analytic observation and comparison, so that problematic social situations may be resolved *into definitely formulated problems* [emphasis added].[44] While we have endless problematic social situations, we have almost no definitely formulated problems.

To activate social inquiry, Dewey explains that we need first of all "free and full intercommunication," the requisite for which is the "improvement of the methods and conditions of debate, discussion and persuasion. That is *the* problem of the public."[45] It is in this respect that we can appreciate the central concern with democracy in Dewey. With the focus placed first on problems, social inquiry becomes supported by democracy, which is viewed as the vehicle through which publics (which arise because of problems and shared consequences) can be articulated. Full and open intercommunication is the condition sine qua non for all inquiry. We cannot articulate a definite formulation of our problems when full and open intercommunication is not present.

In this account, democracy is a fundamentally educative practice. Literally, we *learn* about previously undisclosed features of the world through democracy because democracy is productive of inquiry. The formula is straightforward: Without democracy there is no inquiry, and without inquiry there is no education. Thus, for Dewey, democratic participation is not simply a vehicle to express an already developed set of preferences, but, first, a means of discovering what our problems are. Until we know what our problems are, we cannot know what our preferences are. Per Dewey, then, democracy educates throughout the life span. From this perspective, we can evaluate what various school governance structures enable, or block, in the pursuit of education—for citizens—through the practice of democracy. We can also evaluate the strength of our democracy not only for its immediate outcomes but for the extent to which it is effectively educating current and future citizens in the habits of democratic deliberation.

Democratic practice—whether around the governing of schools or any of the myriad crucial questions our society faces—depends on the distribution of knowledge. Some of that distribution of knowledge can happen through processes of formal schooling, for young people as well as adults. But much of it happens in other venues, only some of which involve face-to-face interaction.

Beyond the bounds of the school, the traditional press and social media are important spaces for informal learning, and at times develop (not unlike the foreign-language press described by Jeffrey Mirel) to meet the particular needs of a community. A recent Pew report, for instance, found that African American people were more likely than other groups to utilize the social media application Twitter as a key knowledge resource, either because they believed their local news did not cover stories of interest

to the black community or because they believed the extant coverage to be racially biased.[46] Social media also offer an alternative journalistic tool and forum for political organizing and action in moments of crisis, as seen in response to recent police killings of young black people. Rather than exist fully outside processes of formal education, social media can be a key bridge between informal and formal education settings, connecting teachers with parents and raising awareness of community events and projects.[47] Additionally, formal educational institutions have worked to leverage social media within the classroom in order to promote greater student engagement.[48]

C. KNOWLEDGE AND THE ECONOMY

In this section, we focus on two elements of the interaction between education, knowledge production, and the economy: efforts to foster innovation and growth in connection with education, and the shaping of education to suit labor market needs over the course of the twentieth century. These two elements help illustrate the complexities involved in pursuing The True at the juncture of knowledge and the economy.

1. Innovation and Growth in Cities

The images associated with innovation in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries depict industrial manufacturing at an increasingly staggering scale (think of the Lowell, Massachusetts, textile mills compared to the Ford Motor Company's River Rouge Complex, covering an area of 1.5 square miles). Yet the late twentieth century had a different aesthetic and geography of innovation. The suburban research or office park—isolated from the urban whirr, in a pastoral, leafy setting—became the model for economic expansion driven by new knowledge. Far more research and office parks were built than ever became boom generators of the kind made legendary by the Route 128 corridor (around Boston) or Silicon Valley, yet the idea of the park said much about popular conceptions of where innovation could happen: in the suburbs, in connection with a major research university, and with major (and often) federal infusions of funds.

As Margaret O'Mara has documented in *Cities of Knowledge*, expertise, university infrastructure, and federal dollars had to align to produce an innovation zone capable of linking new knowledge to major economic growth, and more often than not they did not all come together. Nonetheless, this image of innovation and growth encouraged suburban development and helped push American higher education toward closer relationships with industry and business. And as O'Mara highlights, the pursuit of knowledge creation toward economic goals did not mean the fulfillment of social goals. Not only was the ideal of the suburban research park explicitly socially exclusive—focused on the spaces that an elite group of privileged white people and institutions defined as desirable—but the fact of successful knowledge production did little if anything to create new economic opportunity for working-class people and people of color. In O'Mara's view, universities, as key participants in making "cities of knowledge" like Silicon Valley, deemed it necessary to craft a distinction in their approaches to their agendas for knowledge creation and innovation, and in their approaches to their social responsibilities in light of inequality and blocked opportunity visible outside their campuses.[49]

Observers of American higher education writing since the publication of O'Mara's book in 2005 have linked the postwar turn to scientific innovation as a focus of higher education to both the "corporatization" of the university and the loss of focus on the less readily monetized humanities. Closer ties between knowledge generation and the derivation of profit from the resulting knowledge worry those who hope for a university context engaged in the pursuit of learning without the potentially narrowing impact of business involvement. For philosophers like Martha Nussbaum and other defenders of the humanities, the problem is not just the narrowing of research in the sciences but the tilting of the general university emphasis away from the humanistic, literary, and social and toward the scientific, technical, and material.[50]

If the development of university-business relationships in the early twenty-first century has seemed to exacerbate trends visible in the cities of knowledge of the mid-twentieth century, there are new

developments that might help mitigate the effects of these trends. For instance, the Brookings Institution sees the locus of twenty-first-century innovation as having shifted from the isolated suburban research park back into the city. Again anchored by research universities, as well as medical research and development centers, the new "innovation centers," in Brookings's view, open new opportunities through their physical location.[51]

As O'Mara's work reminds us, the suburban location of the earlier era's research and development parks was not the only barrier to their broadening of the distribution of knowledge or economic gains. Yet locating innovation campuses in cities opens up the potential for city residents to benefit from "inclusive" elements of innovation and knowledge creation. The Brookings Institution calls for these in the form of skill-increasing training opportunities so that residents of economically depressed urban areas close to universities can benefit from secondary- and tertiary-level growth driven by innovation.[52]

O'Mara's view of the historical interactions between cities and knowledge production and the Brookings Institution's call for a focus on innovation with attention to its geographic distribution both address aspects of the broader question of what cities mean for knowledge production and distribution. As a group of contemporary urbanists have argued, multiple facets of urban geography and density set a favorable context for innovation, creativity, and knowledge production. Although social media enable connectivity across huge expanses of space, proximity still matters, as argued by both Richard Florida and Edward Glaeser. Florida has developed an "economic geography of talent," Florida says,[53] while Glaeser and colleagues argue for the importance of the urban in an "economic approach to social capital." Social capital is the product in part of social connections, which "fall sharply with physical distance."[54] Additionally, geographic proximity fosters greater specialization across the work force, and this specialization can facilitate better distribution of talent, thus furthering innovation and knowledge production.[55] Quoting the economist Alfred Marshall, Glaeser writes that he sees in Silicon Valley an ideal example of these patterns, as individuals can "'learn skills from each other when they live and work in close proximity to one another.'"[56] Dense urban spaces provide opportunities for citizens to develop new skills and, perhaps more significantly, social connections that encourage both specialization and innovation. The urbanists' research also helps specify the consequences of racial segregation, which tends to hinder the production and sharing of social capital and talent. This, in turn, generally translates into significantly worse economic outcomes for segregated groups.[57]

Just as museums are important sites for the collection and discussion of local history, economic development efforts also involve the construction of narratives about a city, its history, and its identity. Television commercials, website ads, travel brochures, and billboards aim to articulate the identity of a city and claim a particular history for that city.[58] How that history is defined and conceptualized is sometimes subject to heated contest; boosterism can be at odds with the desire to preserve a particular historical narrative. In New Orleans, for instance, city leaders strove throughout the early twentieth century to gentrify the French Quarter and build the tourism industry. Demonstrating the "promotion of place," the New Orleans Association of Commerce worked to "authenticate commodified tourist images" of New Orleans, and subsequently to "sell New Orleans to New Orleans." Prior to these efforts, residents of the French Quarter, historically a diverse lower-income community, were invited to reimagine it, not as an out-of-the-way cultural enclave but as a cosmopolitan tourism destination.[59] Here the production of historical narratives about a community became one more point of connection between knowledge and economic growth efforts.

2. SCHOOLS, LABOR, AND LAND

The idea that education can prepare students for successful employment, for navigating the world of work, has long been assumed to be a core function of education. Despite the current interest in inclusive development, job training and the economic promise of education have also been troubled terrain. This situation communicates well the tension between education that is replicative—even if only of fundamentally unjust or unequal labor structures—and education that is transformative, creating opportunities for individuals and communities to experience mobility.

Early rationales for schooling in the preindustrial centuries emphasized schools' function of providing the skills that enabled religious salvation and civic participation. By the early twentieth century, with both industrial production and a new class of clerical and managerial occupations developing within the American economy, the direct linkage between the content of schooling and the shape of the labor market gained stronger expression. They came together in the World War I era to support what could be considered the first federal education policy at the elementary and secondary levels—the Smith-Hughes Act of 1918, which funded vocational education programs.

Over the first third of the twentieth century, educational participation and attainment and economic growth moved together in a seemingly reinforcing cycle. In booming industrial and immigrant towns like Gary, Indiana, school districts experimented with programs that merged academic, industrial, and civic training for the children of factory workers. By the 1930s, demonstrably more students remained in school longer, as a result of the spread of compulsory education and child labor laws, the diminished opportunity costs of schooling brought on by the Great Depression, the expansion of the social category of the "adolescent" (and fears of what adolescents would do in urban spaces without the controls of a school day), and the growth of a new class of clerical and office occupations for which a high school diploma became a necessary credential. By the close of World War II, the majority of Americans had at least completed high school, a development that transformed education from an elite to a mass enterprise. Graduation rates remained lower for black students than for their white counterparts, but in the 1950s and '60s African Americans' high school completion rate also rose significantly, and the rate of college matriculation increased across the board.[60]

How did this broader distribution of knowledge bear on the economy of the day? Examining aggregate patterns, economists Claudia Goldin and Lawrence Katz see the early- and mid-century decades as exemplifying a constructive race between education and technology, in which increasing demands for skill were met by increasing levels of education, driving growth and prosperity.[61] Within this aggregate picture, however, some variations emerge that offer important qualifications to the notion that knowledge and economic growth move reciprocally and with broad distribution.

In the same years that high schools targeted future assembly-line workers and white boys and girls took classes in stenography, hundreds of thousands of black students who had access to high school found themselves shunted into "trades obviously negro," or into the lower-skilled tier of their local vocational programs—at times into careers that previously had had no expectation of formal education, in the North as well as the South. If schooling did at times hook white workers to a ladder of mobility in industrial or clerical work, it did in the very same years often anchor black workers to that ladder's lower-paying, less skilled rungs. Limits on opportunity came not only through the systematic denial of schooling, but in the shaping of schooling to meet the needs of a heavily discriminatory labor market.[62]

During the mid- and late twentieth century, the connection between education and the economy became a site of great aspiration. If the New Deal attacked Depression-era poverty with an emphasis on job creation via public works projects (many of which resulted in the construction of substantial school buildings in urban centers), the War on Poverty, launched by the administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson in the 1960s, envisioned education as one of its chief levers against poverty. From the Head Start Program, which aimed to ensure school readiness, through the compensatory education efforts that grew out of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, to the Job Corps, the Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, and myriad other programs and pieces of legislation, political consensus absent elsewhere could be found around the idea that individual mobility could be achieved with new skills developed through educational opportunities available both in and out of school.

For scholars like Goldin and Katz, a present-day emphasis on education and increased skill is just what is needed to jump-start the knowledge-economic growth engine.[63] Yet the legacy not only of War on Poverty era programs but of job- and career-training efforts dating back to passage of the Smith-Hughes Act demonstrates the basic difficulties involved with preparing students for particular career

paths. Job expectations are ever changing, in ways that educators have had great difficulty gauging and, even when correctly gauged, matching to school practice.[64] Alongside business and industry calls for more targeted training have come the voices of others in the same fields dismissive of specialized training, looking instead, as a Tennessee manufacturer put it in 1971, for workers who "can just think."[65]

A more broadly critical view comes from those scholars who see, in the War on Poverty's emphasis on education, and in the ongoing variants that characterize the current rhetoric of "college and career readiness" offered by the Obama administration, an "educationalization of poverty." These scholars see in the current rhetoric of education, growth, and reduced poverty not only neglect of the history of troubled interactions between education and labor. They make a broader claim that this rhetoric and the efforts associated with it reflect the displacement of basic social welfare functions, particularly around poverty, onto schools *in lieu of* other agencies or structures. The educationalization of poverty and of social welfare displaces attention and resources away from antipoverty efforts that would be more structural than individual—that would consider the problem of redistribution of capital and power via minimum wage protections, for example, rather than an emphasis on human capital.[66]

The great hope that many individuals and families put in education as a route to mobility is further complicated in an era of rising tuition costs and growing student debt. While the large increase in college attendance over the immediate post–World War II decades had generous (if unevenly applied) provisions for college tuition in the GI Bill to thank in part, rising rates of matriculation are today underwritten by students and their families, with help from available but little-subsidized federal student loans. In her recent book *Degrees of Inequality,* Suzanne Mettler paints a troubling portrait of students seeking the American dream at increasingly expensive state universities and private for-profit colleges, burdening themselves, in the process, with debt that curtails the mobility they had hoped to secure.[67]

An encouraging counterpart to these developments, which supports broader participation in higher education without a narrowly vocational commitment, and without high loan burdens, comes from the Say Yes to Education initiatives and similar programs. These philanthropy-university partnerships identify selected school districts or portions of districts and guarantee tuition-free college education for students who graduate from high school in the district. Although the local economic and social revitalization goals that animate the effort are not yet fully tested, the breadth of the commitment to students and their learning, broadly defined, is notable.[68]

Today, despite the complex history of the relationship between knowledge and the economy, the rhetoric of individual mobility and collective economic growth through work-focused education continues to draw powerful allies. In a 2014 speech at a Nashville high school, where students attended one of five "academies" that each had a particular career focus (and in several cases bore the name of its corporate sponsor), President Barack Obama reiterated his administration's vision of school success and economic growth through worker preparation. In addition to the thorny practical questions that efforts like this face, including ones related to the spatial organization of work as compared to the spatial organization of residence and education, or the difficulty of accurately predicting labor need, a broader question emerges: What are the consequences for other realms of The True, in democracy and culture, when education for economic ends predominates?

Although the curriculum has been a key space in which to attempt to link knowledge and the economy, property markets have worked this way both historically and in contemporary contexts. In the early 1900s, city planners envisaged urban and metropolitan landscapes organized into "neighborhood units" that would link housing and schooling (and, in many cases, perpetuate segregation).[69] Schools became defining features of the community and part of the ascription of value to a residence. That dynamic continues today, especially as cities seek to draw and keep more middle-class residents. Marketing particular city schools to "high-value customers" (read professional, often white families), school districts see in schools a lever for economic revitalization not through innovation but through demographic change. Doing this often puts city school districts themselves in the business of creating "en-

clave" schools in privileged and at times segregated sections of larger and typically poorer districts.[70]

In the multiple ways that knowledge and the economy can relate both through efforts to make innovation and growth and efforts to make workers, the long-standing tension between education as replicative and education as transformative emerges again. When economic growth has seemed to generate or at least to accompany a wide distribution of its benefits, as was the case in the post–World War II decades when the poverty rate fell and wage gaps by racial category narrowed, linking knowledge and the economy seemed to help transform society in constructive and equality-oriented, if still incomplete, ways. Since the 1970s, as economic growth and poverty have both increased, and wage gaps have widened, the suggested link between knowledge and the economy seems at best incomplete without conscious attention to the distribution of innovation's benefits.[71] At worst, targeting knowledge production toward economic ends risks replicating or otherwise perpetuating deep patterns of inequality.

Each of these explorations into the relationships among culture, democracy, and the economy touches on only one or two of many possible examples or perspectives relating to the pursuit of The True, and, by focusing on formal education more than other means of encouraging the creation and diffusion of knowledge, risks missing additional themes. Nonetheless, a few key questions still arise and can apply more broadly:

1. Can a city pursue The True in culture, the economy, and democracy simultaneously, or does one or more of these elements predominate at a given moment? Do they compete?

2. To what extent do matters of inequality play out differently in these three areas of knowledge production and distribution (i.e., culture, the economy, democracy), and in what ways do they emerge similarly, or even in compounding ways?

3. In what ways is it useful to conceptualize challenges in knowledge creation and distribution as particularly urban, and in what ways could doing so interfere with rich thinking and broad strategizing about the needs of American learners and citizens whether in cities or elsewhere?

4. How do social and cultural identities matter in the consideration of various educational practices (in formal or informal contexts)?[72]

III.   THE ENDOWMENT IN CONTEXT: THE TRUE AND THE LIFE OF CITIES

Any effort to pursue The True, whether in formal educational structures or informal settings, functions inseparably from its context. Schools as institutions exist in a vast web of social, economic, and political relationships. While schools can be enormously influential in the lives of students, "out-of-school factors" such as family income, health, and geographic mobility can have an equal if not greater impact on students' educational experiences and also constrain the opportunity for adults to participate in knowledge creation and distribution. Shifts in education policy also have an impact on the daily functioning of schools and, to some extent, other educational enterprises.

Contextual factors can affect how students experience school (e.g., by resulting in inadequate health care and high rates of mobility); these factors can also structure the ways in which schools serve their students (see, e.g., the impact of changes in philanthropic giving and issues of federalism in education policy). In some instances, contextual factors such as the consequences of poverty and housing segregation shape students' experience of school as well as the ways in which schools provide services. An array of responses have emerged representing attempts to mitigate those contextual factors that create the greatest barriers to knowledge production and distribution; in considering these responses, we should also ask what opportunities exist for educational enterprises to build more fully upon aspects of the social context that could be enabling.

A. OUT-OF-SCHOOL FACTORS

The often-noted link between family income and educational achievement tends to elide the actual mechanisms and obstacles that inhibit the school success of children born into poverty. Greg Duncan and Richard Murnane, as editors of the volume *Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances*, attempt to make sense of the effect of worsening income inequality on the processes of schooling. Wealthier families can invest considerably more in their children's education. This investment often comes in the form of conscious choices to live in high-income districts that spend heavily on educational services—communities that are out of reach for families of less means. Educational institutions in poorer neighborhoods, lacking the financial, human capital, and political resources provided elsewhere by wealthier residents, may decline in quality. Low-income families have a more difficult time acquiring high-quality childcare and are less likely to have access to schools where high student achievement is the norm. Moreover, at times, higher crime rates in poorer communities present a basic threat to physical safety and can make it more difficult to recruit and retain high-quality teachers.[73]

The emergence, since the 1970s, of mass incarceration as an American phenomenon has particular meaning for schools and communities, especially in inner cities and for communities of color. Of the nearly seven million Americans involved in the criminal justice system—on parole or probation, or in prison—the vast majority are from high-poverty neighborhoods in the central city. The spatially concentrated impact of mass incarceration alters and destabilizes students' homes and communities. It also coincides with an increasing criminalization of youth behavior in schools—in response to a rhetorical, but not actual, sense of increased violence or danger in urban school systems. Minor offenses like truancy, smoking, talking back, or loitering, once the jurisdiction of school staff responsible for discipline, now often lead to arrests by police officers. Combined with "zero tolerance" disciplinary codes, the result is high rates of suspension and expulsion from school, as well as a growing feeling of discouragement and alienation among all students, regardless of whether they become subject to police action in school.[74]

Perhaps one of the most tangible impediments to educational success is the existing inequality of access to health care in the United States. A range of health disparities can directly or indirectly affect educational achievement. Untreated or under-treated problems related to vision, hearing, oral health, lead exposure, asthma, prenatal alcohol exposure, second-hand smoke, attention deficits, hyperactivity, and nutrition track low socioeconomic status. The causal pathways between these problems and educational outcomes can be direct (sensory deficiencies, problems with cognition, and chronic absenteeism) or indirect (decreasing connectedness and engagement with school), but they generate considerable obstacles to learning.[75]

A number of other out-of-school factors can affect students and schools. Higher rates of violence are often concentrated in poor neighborhoods, placing greater stress on some of the most vulnerable student populations, occasionally with dire consequences. In low-income communities, there are substantially higher rates of mobility and student transience as families move from place to place in search of employment. Such instability has the capacity to disrupt a student's education. Differences in economic status in the immediate term—in income and job stability—matter here, but multigenerational patterns of wealth inequality matter as well. Even at the same income levels, considerable differences in wealth as measured in property ownership and other investments emerge between white families—who were the historical beneficiaries of subsidy programs that, beginning in the New Deal and reaching well beyond World War II, extended benefits in home finance, Social Security, education, taxation, and transportation—and their black peers, who were often locked out of the benefits of these programs.[76]

Out-of-school factors such as these not only shape students' progress through schooling, but help determine their readiness for school at the outset. Differences in student achievement appear as early as kindergarten, and they are surprisingly durable. In our current system, students who start behind are, on average, unlikely ever to catch up. Achievement gaps between students of different socioeco-

nomic status and students of different races or ethnicities typically become visible when children take their first standardized tests in third or fourth grade, but the educational discrepancy begins before then. Betty Hart and Todd Risley found that low-income three-year-olds knew only about half as many words as their more affluent peers.[77] Other studies confirm a gap in pre-academic skills by age three between white and black students. Parental education, family structure, neighborhood conditions, and the number of educational materials in the home affect school readiness significantly. Some of the differences in early educational ability are attributable to parenting differences, including how and how much parents talk to, read to, and play with their children. Additionally, low-income children, particularly low-income children of color, disproportionately suffer from a lack of quality health care, poor nutrition, exposure to environmental toxins, violence, emotional stress, and prenatal exposure to tobacco, alcohol, drugs, and maternal stress.[78]

Steven Barnett and Cynthia Lamy argue that high-quality, universal, publicly funded preschool will reduce these pre-kindergarten gaps. Moreover, low-income students tend to experience a larger benefit from preschool than their wealthier peers. Barnett and Lamy cite three studies—the Perry Preschool Study, the Abecedarian Study, and the Chicago Longitudinal Study—that provide rigorous evidence of improved educational and personal outcomes for disadvantaged students. However, the programs investigated in these three studies were of exceptionally high quality. A meta-analysis of preschool effectiveness research indicates that many preschool programs, including the federal Head Start Program, do not produce equally impressive results, or generate improvements that diminish over time. On the other hand, a few large-scale initiatives provide exceptions to this rule. The preschool programs operated by the Chicago Public Schools in the 1980s and the current Abbott preschool program in New Jersey both contributed to notable achievement gains among students—if perhaps less so than the Perry or Abecedarian programs. Preschool programs with high standards for learning; strong, highly educated, and adequately paid teachers; on-site supervision and time for teacher planning; and small classes with at least two adults can mitigate early discrepancies among students.[79]

The idea of a comprehensive educational response to out-of-school challenges is drawing interest today. Historically, such efforts often took the form of community schools—institutions designed to be both traditional schools and centers for community services in health, job training, and legal advice, among other areas. A reform that dates to the early twentieth century, community schools have found recent support in Oakland, California (where the city is seeking to turn all of its public schools into community schools), in pockets of New York City, and elsewhere. Furthermore, acknowledgment of the broad consequences of poverty for educational outcomes has generated interest in so-called cradle-to-career organizations such as the Harlem Children's Zone and a federal grant program formulated along similar lines, the Promise Neighborhoods Initiative. The Harlem Children's Zone and Promise Neighborhoods operate from the premise that disadvantaged children often need an integrated and comprehensive array of services, ranging from access to prenatal care for their mothers to college application assistance, in order to mitigate the impact of poverty. A number of these wrap-around programs extend their services not only to students but to their whole families, providing social services, parenting classes, and financial advice to adults as well.

The history of similar programs' response to the multiple needs of poor families raises important questions for contemporary practice. The "community schools" programs of the early twentieth century, favored by progressive educators and vital to efforts to incorporate new immigrants into industrial cities, at times functioned as explicitly segregated spaces. Not only did these programs reinforce segregation by drawing homogenous communities together around needed school resources; they also fostered a definition of racially and ethnically bound "community."[80] Additionally, they raised the now long-standing question of how much of the work of social welfare can or should be located within the institution of school. This is a variant on the issue of the "educationalization of poverty," discussed earlier in the present brief, but it is nonetheless one that requires assessment of the limitations and tradeoffs that come from relying on schools and similar institutions in this way.

B. SEGREGATION

Cities seeking to encourage The True not only face the reality of multiple and high-needs populations, but also the impact of how these populations are distributed in urban and metropolitan space. With more than sixty years having passed since *Brown v. Board of Education*, resegregation of the public school system continues to intensify. According to the UCLA Civil Rights Project, segregation of black and Latino students remains a major pattern in US schooling, including schools in the North and its largest cities. It is increasingly an issue in the suburbs, which, in the largest metro areas, are now roughly half nonwhite.[81] Although less likely to be characterized by resource deficits or compounding patterns of low achievement, segregated white, often suburban schools isolate their students from the benefits of diversity in learning as well.[82]

Segregation in America occurs along racial and economic lines simultaneously. Black and Latino children tend to be in schools where the majority of students come from families with low incomes. Moreover, over the last quarter-century, the US Supreme Court and lower courts have ended their oversight of most court-mandated desegregation plans, and segregation has increased markedly. In the South, the region that saw the most extensive application of court-mandated desegregation plans, segregation has not quite returned to pre-*Brown* levels, but all of the progress made since 1967 has been lost.[83]

The consequences of segregated schools can be dire. Racially and socioeconomically segregated schools serving poor children of color are typically staffed by less experienced and less qualified teachers, experience higher rates of teacher attrition, and tend to have less adequate facilities and materials than integrated schools. The disparity in teacher quality is particularly problematic. Having a strong teacher in elementary school, according to a recent longitudinal study, is associated with lower teenage pregnancy rates, higher college attendance rates, and higher income. Moreover, since the publication of the 1966 report *Equality of Educational Opportunity* (popularly known as "The Coleman Report"), researchers have concluded that the concentration of poverty in a school affects the achievement of a student more than his or her individual poverty status, a finding that suggests the power of peer effects on educational outcomes. Furthermore, low-income and segregated schools tend to provide less rigorous educational experiences than more affluent schools. This trend has intensified in the contemporary accountability era, in which more segregated schools have often adopted pedagogies oriented toward rote skills and memorization in order to make quick gains on standardized assessments.[84]

On the other hand, the benefits of desegregation are significant. Desegregated learning environments are associated with the development of stronger critical thinking skills, a reduced willingness to use stereotypes, and an improved ability to communicate and make friends with peers of different backgrounds. Desegregated schools are also associated with higher academic achievement for minority students while exerting no negative impact on white students. In a study of the academic outcomes of students who attended schools desegregated by virtue of their county's inclusionary zoning program, attendance at desegregated schools had a greater impact on student achievement than targeted efforts in high-poverty schools. Additionally, black students who attended desegregated schools were more likely to graduate from high school and college, to earn more throughout their careers, and to be in better health later in life. Lastly, students of all races who attended integrated schools were more likely to be associated with integrated institutions throughout their lives, including colleges, workplaces, and neighborhoods, supporting the development and maintenance of more integrated institutions in the future.[85] Although it receives less attention than testing and accountability in contemporary education discourse and policymaking, intentional race and class desegregation efforts remain important modes of better distributing knowledge.

C. NEW ACCOUNTABILITY, NEW ACTORS

Systemic shifts in education over the last decade have marked the operation of schools and school districts. Some of these changes are novel developments, while others actually perpetuate persistent historical patterns.

The nature of philanthropic giving in education has altered over the last decade. Many major foundations have re-styled themselves as practitioners of "venture philanthropy."[86] These organizations have begun to adopt practices from the start-up tech community and investment banking, focusing intently on aggressive and quantifiable returns on investment. If their initiatives are successful, these returns will take the form of measurable changes such as rising test scores, increased graduation rates, or decreases in teen pregnancy. Sarah Reckhow reports that new patterns in giving also show a shift in the direction and scale of philanthropic giving in education.[87] Foundations are increasingly focused on school districts that possess particular political characteristics, namely mayoral or state control, in the hope that more centralized authority can better promote and sustain favored initiatives. Reckhow also has found that major foundations have begun to direct the majority of their grants to nonprofit organizations and charter schools rather than school districts themselves. Furthermore, in order to obtain these grants, educational organizations must align themselves with foundations' expectations or perceived expectations; the outcome is a more homogenous nonprofit and charter sector.

Despite the influence of private money, education in the United States functions and is primarily funded within a nested system of governments. As discussed in the literature review in Section II, greater centralization at the local level is a feature of the contemporary education landscape in many cities. Pressures for centralization at another level—in federal policy and national politics—have also altered the functioning of urban schooling in significant ways since the mid-twentieth century. A bipartisan consensus enabled passage of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB), which established a combination of a considerably larger federal influence in education and an increased emphasis on standards, accountability, and school choice. NCLB, in fact a reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, navigated the same shoals of liberal and conservative opposition experienced by its predecessors. Conservatives staunchly opposed any expansion of federal authority beyond categorical programs and supplemental funding for low-income schools and children, but agreed to liberal calls for increased funding in return for expanded state-level standards and accountability mechanisms. Civil rights advocates favored NCLB's attention to accountability, particularly in its requirements that educational data be reported, and that sanctions be attached to inequalities then visible by, race, class, and language status. Once enacted, NCLB increased federal spending in exchange for state standards, federally mandated consequences for failure to meet standards (which could include a district- or state-level takeover), and some expansion of school choice.[88] City school systems had long been subject to the incentives and limitations of federal funding, but NCLB brought a major expansion of the extent to which measures of student success and teacher and school quality were understood as matters of federal policy concern, even if still mitigated by state decisions (such as which standardized tests to use). In Part IV of the present brief ("Indicators"), we explore the particular consequences of contemporary testing and accountability policies for schools and districts.

The Obama administration, while remaining remarkably consistent with its predecessor's education platform, has pursued a different set of tactics. It has used the Race to the Top program and waivers from certain aspects of NCLB to engage, in the words of Jal Mehta and Steven Teles, in a form of "jurisdictional politics," wherein the federal government supports like-minded new entrants into the field of education rather than focus exclusively on changing the behavior of existing educational actors.[89] Where NCLB used traditional carrot-and-stick policymaking to establish new incentives and deterrents for educators, Race to the Top paired with NCLB waivers empowered new actors as they incentivized the growth of charter schools and alternative certification programs, and encouraged data-driven educational nonprofits while exerting significant pressure on traditional education actors, such as teachers' unions, through the encouragement of performance-based teacher evaluations. The priorities of the Obama administration have empowered a new set of players in urban education, shifting the dynamics of education politics in favor of less traditional participants. For Mehta, these developments reflect the outcome of a long history of the "underprofessionalization" of the education field, rendering schools of education and teachers unions less able to bring professional expertise and political strength to bear on major questions of education policy.[90] Acknowledging both the historical importance and the limitations of teacher union organizing, Jonna Perrillo has helpfully identified the as-yet-unresolved tensions between, on the one hand, teacher unionism galvanized, after the 1960s, around ideas of

"teacher rights," and, on the other hand, the pursuit of "student rights" under the rubric of civil rights and, increasingly, school reform.[91]

D. The Problem of the Divided and Unequal Metropolis

None of the contextual features discussed above figure uniquely or exclusively in cities, but all appear in different intensity or form depending on where in the American metropolis one is located. Despite the reversal of decades of anti-urban cultural attitudes and the embrace of cities as not only sites of creative production and innovation but cachet, wealth, and gracious living, the dominant story in education remains one of suburban privilege. As James Ryan states so clearly, "the most important boundary in public education" is "the boundary between city and suburban schools."[92] And there are many of those boundaries, as most metropolitan areas are divided into myriad smaller jurisdictions and accompanying, or separately organized, school districts. Growing suburban diversity complicates this generalization, yet in many respects it still holds true: Urban districts face the challenges of out-of-school factors in much more concentrated and intensive ways than their typically wealthier, whiter suburbs. Although a metropolitan economy, or elements of culture or social interaction, may flow fluidly across jurisdictional boundaries, schooling remains heavily bounded by these factors. Only 1 percent of American public school children attend school outside their school district.[93]

Jurisdictional lines are crucial in structuring and preserving segregation and stymieing desegregation. As a first step in evaluating whether or how to act upon segregation, metropolitan areas today face the question of how to understand it. With the Supreme Court's 1974 decision in *Milliken v. Bradley*, suburbs and cities were found to have no reciprocal responsibility for segregation. The district court judge who had initially ordered busing across the Detroit school district and dozens of suburban districts felt otherwise, as did Justice Lewis Powell in a strong dissent in *Milliken*. Since 1974, as historians have uncovered slabs of evidence for the intentional state-sanctioned construction of segregation in housing and schooling together, the losing side's case seems stronger and stronger. Yet most Americans (or most white Americans) continue to imagine contemporary segregation as the product of individual choice rather than policy choice. A first step in rectifying metropolitan segregation and its sharp consequences for educational equality will be to reckon with the actual history of both policy-based and popular segregation.[94]

Another step will be to reckon with the complex landscape of need and resources in the metropolis. Today, after decades of what Ryan describes as policies of "save the city, spare the suburbs,"[95] many urban school systems (but certainly not all, as New York State's example proves well) outspend their surrounding districts. But the seemingly simple measure of per pupil spending does not account for huge variations in student need. With more poor students, more special-needs students, more English Language Learners, and the heightening effects of segregation on all these students, cities require far more resources than their suburban counterparts to achieve anything close to parity. And to some extent seeking to think in terms of resource parity across segregated populations follows a false logic. No dollar amount can be attached to opportunity-producing peer effects that have been shown, repeatedly, to increase achievement over both the short and long terms.

School choice programs overwhelmingly respect district boundaries rather than allow students to traverse them. School choice's evident appeal to city systems, even as better-resourced (in social and material terms) suburban districts tend to opt out of choice and instead protect the governance structures long in place, raises important questions about the vision and limits of choice.[96]

School district fragmentation may be the best example of the ways in which a city or metropolis can be successful in purely economic terms——generating growth, innovation, and wealth—while doing little to broadly distribute the benefits of this thriving. Wealthy people who work in a downtown financial district can amass great wealth that they can use either to fund their children's private school education in the city or pay high property taxes to support their education in suburban public schools. Or, as mentioned earlier, they can concentrate their resources in an urban "enclave" school, focusing on that

school without connection to the broader district of which it is a part. Jurisdictional divisions within a metropolitan area are not the only mechanism for reinforcing wealth for some and poverty for others, but they remain a powerful mode for doing so. Where metropolitan cooperation seems appealing, even mandatory, as a means of achieving economic development, transportation solutions, and many other goals, the clear divisions between suburban and city school systems (or, increasingly, between inner-ring, higher-poverty suburban school systems and those that remain elite bastions) speaks to the power of jurisdictional boundaries. The consequences reach beyond the educational because, as we have suggested above, divisions between school systems that reflect or sharpen segregation can distort public discourse about crucial questions of knowledge and culture, democracy, and the economy.

School districts that have, because of judicial pressure or historical decision, opted to organize school systems at the metropolitan-area level or higher have seen marked benefits. Wake County, North Carolina (home to Raleigh), enjoyed much higher achievement levels and enrollment stability for both black and white communities in the years in which the district intentionally balanced enrollment to ensure that no more than 40 percent of the children in any school were poor.[97] Doing so was possible because Raleigh's large scale kept the district's average poverty rate lower than would have held had the city center been divorced from the surrounding suburbs. City-suburban boundary crossing in schooling has also worked to create greater integration in housing, as a recent study of four Southern metropolitan school districts shows.[98]

Metropolitan consolidation, often a political nonstarter, is not the only approach to confronting areas of inequality between schools, and efforts at desegregation even within urban-only districts can be meaningful. Without suggesting a facile remedy, it is crucial to confront the reality that even as commuters, cultural flows, and ideas traverse the city and suburbs fluidly, multiple lines of division defend elite suburban resources from poorer city and suburban needs in schooling. Many decades of school policy have reinforced these divisions. What vision of thriving could help challenge it?

IV. INDICATORS: NARROW, AND BROAD, VISIONS OF THE TRUE

A. EXISTING INDICATORS RELATED TO THE TRUE

The Thriving Cities Project was motivated in part by the desire to create a more humanistic view of thriving, and to explore how it could be assessed with measures more robust than traditional ones like gross domestic product (GDP). We could think of fourth- and eighth-grade reading and math scores as The True's GDP. That is, these test scores in two disciplinary areas are the broadly referenced measures in education that define success or failure, even as they cut multiple crucial elements of thriving out of view.

But arguably, these test scores operate with even more power than measures of GDP. In real life, GDP matters in its own right. But in education, test scores feed directly into various layers of policy judgment and either bring further support or sharp sanction, regardless of whether or not they are valid predictors of future knowledge, skill, or success.

In the domain of The True, test scores have great power within current accountability systems. Educational institutions judged to be failing on the basis of test scores face lost resources or closure; students face retention, and teachers, to varying extents in varying district and state contexts, face salary consequences or termination. The narrow focus on a set of indicators like standardized test scores has accomplished one of the purposes identified by its early proponents: It has made the identification of achievement gaps between students by racial category, class, language status, and disability status much more visible than was the case before NCLB.

The power of test-based accountability systems is broader than reading and math tests alone, because the focus on selected test areas, and even particular approaches within the test, when linked to high stakes, has worked to redirect much of American curriculum and practice toward the goals valued in

these tests. Time spent on basic yet less tested areas like science and social studies has diminished greatly. Time devoted to other areas of the curriculum, from art and music to physical education, has also decreased sharply.[99]

Yet as discussed above, in Section III ("The Endowment in Context"), the impact of high-stakes testing is not universal. It might seem so, as public schools in a given state are part of that state's accountability system as required first by NCLB and now Race to the Top, but in fact the meaning in practice of this accountability system is highly contingent on a district's location and its social and economic features. Curricular narrowing has been most severe in districts least certain to have their students pass the test, so that the neediest students are also the ones now least likely to have access to an appropriately broad and opportunity-rich curriculum. They are the most likely to see already-limited art and music instruction dwindle further, to see opportunities for healthy physical activity shrink.[100] This is a cruel irony given that many educators and civil rights advocates who supported accountability as measured by test scores intended to foster greater equality by calling attention to gaps in educational outcomes.[101]

If outcomes are taken into consideration, the existing indicators as collected by the Thriving Cities Project only partially convey the impact that school systems and families are experiencing as the result of current accountability practices. The indicators list includes those that carry high stakes and those that do not. Without a more hierarchical structure, the list does not communicate the disproportionate power of some indicators relative to others. But it does reflect how indicators in reading and math have displaced many other ways of thinking about educational outcomes; these other ways are conspicuous by their very absence. On the indicators list, students' achievement is measured only in math and reading, with a single reference to another discipline, science, at the tenth- grade level only.

It is noticeable also that the indicators typically speak in aggregate terms, while only occasionally disaggregating data by categories of race, class, language status, and ability/disability, as was required in accountability systems beginning with NCLB. Similarly, the existing indicators make little use of spatial modes of thinking about the metropolis. The crucial question might be, for example, not only how many jobs are available in a given metropolitan area, but to what extent these jobs are accessible (via proximity or feasible and affordable transportation) to those in need of employment. Similar questions can be asked about the concentration of educational, cultural, and civic opportunities, and about the concentration of challenges to thriving such as rates of incarceration, unaffordable housing, or schools with high dropout or suspension rates.

Overall, the indicators list reflects the same bias toward formal schooling that this brief demonstrates. The vast majority of indicators focus on formal modes of schooling, either in preschool, K–12, or college. Even when the constituent population is older than school age, the measures for knowledge creation and distribution focus only on formal higher education. Indicators available in other areas, especially in The Good and The Beautiful, highlight elements of informal education in spaces including libraries, museums, and cultural centers.

High-stakes indicators in education now cluster in the group placed under the label "outcomes" rather than "opportunity." The potential displacement of attention from opportunity onto outcome exclusively has been a concern of educators and policymakers since the first round of discussion about outcome standards in the 1990s. Then, a series of discussions, ultimately not fruitful, emerged about "opportunity-to-learn" standards that could accompany outcome standards.[102] A new version of this debate emphasizes the difference between measuring an "achievement gap" and tracing an "opportunity gap" or an "education debt."[103] Without dismissing the importance of identifying inequalities in outcome measures, this addition to the accountability discourse is crucial in two respects. First, it helps highlight the multiple contextual factors that bear on educational success. Second, and more broadly, it moves away from the dangerous possibility that, without specifying the real causes of achievement gaps, talk of "racial disparities" in education can feed rather than challenge lingering racism.[104]

In regard to educational opportunity, measures of "out-of-school" factors that condition schooling for children and families are largely absent from the list of current indicators. Some, appropriately, are lo-

cated in connection with other Endowments—we could consider measures of child and family health, for example, to be crucial to The True but reasonably located in The Sustainable. Or the percentage of a community earning a living or self-sufficiency wage could be located in The Prosperous. Because of the importance of conveying the interrelationship between these factors and educational opportunity, a set of indicators for a thriving city ideally would convey these relationships across Endowments. Ideally, they would be integrated into the categories of both "outcome" and "opportunity," as they are central to, rather than auxiliary portions of, thinking about The True.

B. POTENTIAL INDICATORS FOR A FULLER VISION OF THE TRUE

With appreciation for the value of many of the indicators included on the current list, including those that might be problematic if considered in isolation, we suggest, in the list that appears below, additional indicators that might add to the discussion of both opportunity and outcome related to The True. In keeping with the themes developed in Parts II and III of the present brief, we first explore crucial contextual measures that affect The True, then considers indicators that might further explore knowledge in relationship to culture, democracy, and the economy. Ideally, these indicators would be collected and mapped spatially across cities, suburbs, and exurbs.

Knowledge in Context:
These suggested indicators can be understood as measures of both opportunity and outcome.

1. **Income**
   a. Percentage of the local population earning a living wage (or "self-sufficiency" wage, in the language of the Greater Portland Pulse indicators project)
   b. Ratio of local minimum wage to living or "self-sufficiency" wage
2. **Segregation**
   a. Metropolitan-area segregation indices (expressed in terms of percentage of students who would have to move for schools to match the demographic composition of the area, and expressed in terms of highly concentrated populations of students by racial category, class, ability, and language status)
   b. School-level segregation indices (to track concentrations of students as a feature of within-district rather than between-district patterns)
3. **Other Supports for Learning**
   a. Availability of high-quality, affordable childcare
   b. Access to fresh, affordable food
   c. Access to safe places for children to play
4. **Criminalization and Incarceration**
   a. Percentage of children who have a court-involved or incarcerated family member
   b. School suspension and expulsion rates

Knowledge and Culture

1. **Opportunity**
   a. Inventory of school practices that engender inequitable patterns by social grouping or identity category
   b. Percentage of students in schools who identify their schools as places where (a) adults care about them and (b) they feel smart[105]
   c. Percentage of languages spoken in the school district into which school communications are translated
   d. Percentage of languages spoken in the metropolitan area that are represented on the shelves of local and school libraries
   e. Art, music, drama, and creative writing opportunities available to students

during the regular school day

  f.   School partnerships with arts and cultural organizations

2. **Outcome**

  a. Academic measures (of attainment, including high school and college graduation) and achievement (in a full range of disciplines) disaggregated by race, class, language status, and disability

  b. Inventory of products of diverse cultures in public spaces

Knowledge and Democracy

1. **Opportunity**

  a.   Percentage of age-eligible high school graduates who are registered to vote

  b.   Inclusion of measures of civic participation in high school graduation requirements

  c.   Employer supports for time off for voting and volunteer service

  d.   Indicators of clarity of school and district communication about public decision-making about education[106]

  e.   Access to voting without barriers that tend to discriminate or have starkly unequal impact by race and class (e.g., disenfranchisement because of a prior conviction record or voter ID requirements)

2. **Outcome**

  a.   Voting rates, including those for local-level elections and for young voters

  b.   Participation in volunteer groups, including school organizations (e.g., the PTA)

  c.   Index of acts of civic participation other than voting (e.g., contacts with elected officials per capita)

  d.   Volunteer hours committed per capita

  e.   Willingness-to-fund measures for schools (e.g., percentage of local tax base allocated to public services such as education)

Knowledge and the Economy

1. **Opportunity**

  a.   Job training and adult education opportunities for adults outside of formal higher education

  b.   Processes in place to monitor patterns of inequality by social grouping or identity within economic growth efforts

2. **Outcome**

  a.   Graduation rate for first-generation college students

  b.   Median student debt at college graduation

  c.   Measure of local business hiring from local labor pool

These suggestions represent an attempt to imagine indicators for The True that conceptualize a fuller vision of knowledge production and knowledge distribution than is conveyed in extant indicators as catalogued by the Thriving Cities Project. Admittedly, some of them lack specificity on what, exactly, could be counted in regard to a given indicator. Examples from other Endowment areas may offer templates on which to further refine these indicators. The main emphasis here, however, is on ensuring that (a) the importance of knowledge and culture, democracy, and the economy is fully visible, and that (b) ideas of opportunity, both in school practices and in other areas of urban and metropolitan life, are as crucial to measure as markers of outcome.

IV.   CONCLUSION: THE TRUE AND THE THRIVING CITY

As Jal Mehta recently argued in his survey of school reform efforts over the last century, economic rationales for schooling gained increasing prominence in American public discourse over the second half of the twentieth century.[107] In this context, where calls for school improvement return over and over to ideas of job preparedness, economic growth, and the financial rewards to be gained from skill, innovation, and knowledge, it is particularly important to highlight the multiple aims of education over the longer course of US history. Americans have acted, collectively and individually, on visions of schooling, and of education more broadly defined, that are powerfully motivated by desires not just for economic well-being but for robust civic participation. In their schools, they have seen key forces in the making and sustaining of culture. Communities have trusted their schools to help transmit what is treasured—in the form of language, artistic tradition, or collective memory—from one generation to the next. In this context, thinking of education, of knowledge production and distribution, under the heading of "The True" usefully highlights the humanistic as well as the material, the areas of culture and citizenship as well as the economy.

Pointing to this range of functions and purposes for education is important in any context, but is particularly important for cities today. Cities (and their broader metropolitan areas) are undergoing multiple simultaneous and complex changes. Economic change, demographic transition, and the ways in which city residents encounter one another in the dense urban landscape all bring to the fore the question of what "The True" is in this context. Are processes of knowledge production and distribution more focused on reproducing the extant social, economic, and cultural orders, or on trying to move these orders in new or even transformative directions?

The problem of inequality, visible in many contexts but especially stark in US cities and their metropolitan regions, draws this tension between reproduction and transformation even more to the fore. Do schools, in practice or intent, seek to reproduce a highly unequal social and economic structure, or transform it? History offers ample cases in which schools have perpetuated class stratification, yet history offers as well many robust visions of education for social change, championed by groups as diverse as Ella Baker's Harlem neighbors and the activists of the 1960s advocating bilingual education. And despite history's demonstrations of efforts to achieve economic growth through education have been troubled, new attention to innovation in cities usefully pairs attention to new knowledge production and the distribution of the gains it is hoped to bring. Recognizing these ongoing, and, at times, constructive, tensions is essential to defining what "The True" can mean in a thriving city.

NOTES

(Endnotes)

1   Lawrence Cremin, *Public Education* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1976), quoted at "History and Education," Teachers College, Columbia University, accessed May 5, 2015, http://www.tc.columbia.edu/a%26h/history-ed/.

2   Vincent P. Franklin, *The Education of Black Philadelphia: The Social and Educational History of a Minority Community, 1900–1950* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1979); James D. Anderson, *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1988); Hilary Moss, *Schooling Citizens: The Struggle for African American Education in Antebellum America* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

3   Promise Neighborhoods Research Consortium, "What Works," accessed September 2014, http://promiseneighborhoods.org/programs.1.html.

4   Horace Mann, tenth and twelfth annual reports, in *Lectures and Annual Reports on Education* (1867), accessed May 5, 2015, at https://archive.org/details/lecturesannualre01manniala.

5   Nancy Beadie, "Education and the Creation of Capital: Or What I Learned from Following the Money," *History of Education Quarterly* 48 (2008): 1–29.

6   Heather A. Williams, *Self-Taught: African American Education in Slavery and Freedom* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2005); Moss, *Schooling Citizens.*

7   Anderson, *The Education of Blacks*, 1.

8   Hannah Arendt, *Between Past and Future: Eight Exercises in Political Thought* (New York, NY: Penguin Books, 1998); Pierre Bourdieu, *Reproduction in Education, Society, and Culture* (Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1977).

9   Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of Freedom: Ethics, Democracy, and Civic Courage* (New York, NY: Rowman & Littlefield, 1998); Samuel Bowles, *Schooling in Capitalist America: Educational Reform and the Contradictions of Economic Life* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1976).

10   David B. Tyack, *The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1974); Anderson, *The Education of Blacks.*

11   Michael Jones-Correa, "Reshaping the American Dream: Immigrants, Ethnic Minorities, and the Politics of the New Suburbs," in *The New Suburban History*, eds. Kevin M. Kruse and Thomas J. Sugrue (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 183–204.

12   See, for example, Ansley T. Erickson, *Schooling the Metropolis: Educational Inequality Made and Remade in Nashville, Tennessee* (manuscript in progress); Jack

Dougherty, "Shopping for Schools, *Journal of Urban History* 38, no. 2 (2012): 205–24.

13   Alfred R. Schademan, "What Does Playing Cards Have to Do with Science? A Resource-Rich View of African American Young Men," *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 6, no. 2 (2011): 361–80; Marsha Taylor Delain, P. David Pearson, and Richard C. Anderson, "Reading Comprehension and Creativity in Black Language Use: You Stand to Gain by Playing the Sounding Game!," *American Educational Research Journal* 22, no. 2 (1985): 155–73; Carol D. Lee and Yolanda J. Majors, "'Heading Up the Street;: Localised Opportunities for Shared Constructions of Knowledge," *Pedagogy, Culture, and Society* 11, no. 1 (2003): 49–68.

14   Jan Packer and Roy Ballantyne, "Solitary vs. Shared: Exploring the Social Dimension of Museum Learning," *Curator: The Museum Journal* 48, no. 2 (2005): 177–92; John H. Falk and Lynn D. Dierking, *Learning from Museums: Visitor Experiences and the Making of Meaning* (Lanham, MD: AltaMira Press, 2000).

15   Adam Gopnik, "Stones and Bones: Visiting the 9/11 Memorial and Museum," *The New Yorker*, July 7, 2014, http://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2014/07/07/stones-and-bones.

16   Robert Lowe and Harvey Kantor, "Terms of Inclusion: Unity and Diversity in Public Education," *Educational Theory* 57 (2007): 369–88.

17   This formulation of the question is from Prudence Carter, "Student and School Cultures and the Opportunity Gap," in, *Closing the Opportunity Gap: What America Must Do to Give Every Child an Even Chance,* ed. Prudence Carter and Kevin Welner (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013), 143–55. In regard to the educational enterprise, there is a robust conversation about the meanings and impact of culture, and cultural diversity. There are multiple trends in this literature, from discussions of culturally responsive pedagogy to cosmopolitanism to global citizenship education. In this limited space, we have chosen to focus on one relatively more concrete example that includes particular policy questions and challenges.

18   George Chauncey, *Gay New York: Gender, Urban Culture, and the Making of the Gay Male World 1890–1940* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1995).

19   Jill H. Wilson and Audrey Singer, "Immigrants in 2010 Metropolitan America: A Decade of Change" (State of Metropolitan America Report No. 64), Brookings Institution, October 13, 2011, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2011/10/13%20immigration%20wilson%20singer/1013_immigration_wilson_singer.pdf.

20   Carlos Ovando, "Bilingual Education in the United States: Historical Development and Current Issues," *Bilingual Research Journal* 72, no. 1 (2003): 1–24. On early bilingual education programs, see Carlos Kevin Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education in Texas, 1836–1981* (College Station: Texas A&M Press, 2007).

21   Jeffrey E. Mirel, *Patriotic Pluralism: Americanization, Education, and European Immigrants* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010), 11, 4.

22   Blanton, *The Strange Career of Bilingual Education.*

23   Angela Valenzuela, *Subtractive Schooling: US-Mexican Youth and the Politics of Caring* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1999).

24   Luis C. Moll, Cathy Amanti, Deborah Neff, and Norma Gonzalez, "Funds of Knowledge for Teaching: Using a Qualitative Approach to Connect Homes and Classrooms," *Theory into Practice* 31 (1992): 132–41; Christine E. Sleeter, "Preparing Teachers for Culturally Diverse Schools," *Journal of Teacher Education* 52 (2001): 94–106; Geneva Gay, *Culturally Responsive Teaching: Theory, Research, and Practice* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2000).

25   Ana María Villegas and Tamara Lucas, "Preparing Culturally Responsive Teachers: Rethinking the Curriculum," *Journal of Teacher Education* 53 (2002): 20–32; Heraldo V. Richards, Ayanna F. Brown, and Timothy B. Forde, "Addressing Diversity in Schools: Culturally Responsive Pedagogy," *Teaching Exceptional Children* 39 (2007): 64–68; Lesley Barlett, *Additive Schooling in Subtractive Times: Bilingual Education and the Dominican Immigrant Youth in the Heights* (Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press, 2011); Django Paris, "Culturally Sustaining Pedagogy: A Needed Change in Stance, Terminology, and Practice," *Educational Researcher* 41 (2012): 93–97.

26   Raymond A. Mohl, "Cultural Pluralism in Immigrant Education: The International Institutes of Boston, Philadelphia, and San Francisco, 1920–1940," *Journal of American Ethnic History* 1, no. 2 (1982): 35–58.

27   Jonathan Zimmerman, *Whose America? Culture Wars in the Public Schools* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002); Amy Binder, *Contentious Curricula: Afrocentrism and Creationism in American Public Schools* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004); Ernest Morrell, "Rebel Musics: African Diaspora Culture and Critical Literacy Pedagogies," in *Teach Freedom: Education for Liberation in the African-American Tradition,* ed. Charles Payne and Carol Sills Strickland (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2008), 222–35.

28   Diane Ravitch, *The Great School Wars* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 1984).

29   Eric Stulberg and Lisa M. Rolfes, *The Emancipatory Promise of Charter Schools: Toward a Progressive Politics of School Choice* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 2004); on "traditional" charter schools, see, e.g., Great Hearts Charter Network, www.greatheartsaz.org.

30   Deborah Meier, *The Power of Their Ideas: Lessons for America from a Small School in Harlem* (Boston, MA: Beacon Press, 1995).

31   Christopher Tienken and Yong Zhao, "How Common Standards and Standardized Testing Widen the Opportunity Gap," in *Closing the Opportunity Gap,* eds. Carter and Welner, 111–22.

32   Martha Nussbaum, quoted in Ethan Schrum, "A Bibliographic Essay on the University, the Market, and Professors," *Hedgehog Review,* Spring 2012, 43–51.

33   The diary of Mary Mudge, 1854, in the collection of Schlesinger Library, Harvard University, reproduction in authors' possession; Carl F. Kaestle, *Pillars of the Republic: Common Schools and American Society* (New York, NY: Hill & Wang, 1983).

34   Charles Payne, "'Give Light and the People Will Find A Way': Ella Baker and Teaching as Politics," in *Teach Freedom,* ed. Payne and Strickland, 56–66; Barbara Ransby, *Ella Baker and the Black Freedom Movement: A Radical Democratic Vision* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2003).

35   Tyack, *The One Best System.*

36   Jerald E. Podair, *The Strike That Changed New York* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2002); Daniel H. Perlstein, *Justice, Justice: School Politics and the Eclipse of Liberalism* (New York, NY: P. Lang, 2004). On Chicago, see Dorothy Shipps, *School Reform, Corporate Style: Chicago, 1880–2000* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006).

37   Jeffrey R. Henig, "Mayoral Control: What We Can and Cannot Learn from Other Cities," in *When Mayors Take Charge: School Governance in the City*, ed. Joseph P. Viteritti (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2009), 19–45; see also Eva Gold, Jeffrey R. Henig, and Elaine Simon, "Calling the Shots in Public Education: Parents, Politicians, and Educators Clash," in *Public Education under Siege,* ed. Michael B. Katz and Mike Rose (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013), 207–20.

38   Katrina E. Bulkley, Jeffrey R. Henig, and Henry M. Levin, eds., *Between Public and Private: Politics, Governance, and the New Portfolio Models for Urban Schools Reform* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

39   Paul Hill, "Leadership and Governance in New York City School Reform," in *Education Reform in New York City: Ambitious Change in the Nation's Most Complex School System*, ed. Jennifer A. O'Day, Catherine S. Bitter, & Louis M. Gomez (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2011).

40   Kathryn McDermott, *Controlling Public Education: Localism versus Equity* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999).

41   Albert O. Hirschman, *Exit, Voice, and Loyalty: Responses to Decline in Firms, Organizations, and States* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1970).

42   John Dewey, *Democracy and Education* (New York, NY: Free Press, 1997). Originally published 1916.

43   John Dewey, *The Public and Its Problems* (New York: Swallow Press, 1954), 78. Originally published 1927.

44   Ibid., 101.

45   Ibid., 211, 208.

46   Aaron Smith, "African Americans and Technology Use," Pew Internet Research Project, January, 2014, http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/01/06/african-americans-and-technology-use/.

47   Glen Bull et al., "Connecting Informal and Formal Learning Experiences in the Age of Participatory Media," *Contemporary Issues in Technology and Teacher Education* 8, no. 2 (2008): 100–107.

48   Miikka Salavuo, "Social Media as an Opportunity for Pedagogical Change in Music Education, *Journal of Music, Technology, and Education* 1, nos. 2–3 (2008): 121–36.

49   Margaret Pugh O'Mara, *Cities of Knowledge: Cold War Science and the Search for the Next Silicon Valley* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press 2005).

50   For a survey of this literature, see Schrum, "A Bibliographic Essay," 46–47.

51   Bruce Katz and Julie Wagner, "The Rise of Innovation Districts: A New Geography of Innovation in America," Brookings Institution, 2014, http://www.brookings.edu/about/programs/metro/innovation-districts.

52   O'Mara, *Cities of Knowledge*; Katz and Wagner, "The Rise of Innovation Districts."

53   Richard Florida, "The Economic Geography of Talent," *Annals of the Association of American Geographers* 92, no. 4 (2002): 743–55.

54   Edward L. Glaeser, David Laibson, and Bruce Sacerdote, "An Economic Approach to Social Capital," *Economic Journal* 112, no. 483 (2002): 437–58.

55   Edward L. Glaeser, "Learning in Cities," *Journal of Urban Economics* 46, no. 2 (1999): 254–77; Gilles Duranton and Diego Puga, "Micro-Foundations of Urban Agglomeration Economies," *Handbook of Regional and Urban Economics* 4 (2004): 2063–117.

56   Glaeser, "Learning in Cities," 254.

57   Michael Woolcock, "Social Capital and Economic Development: Toward a Theoretical Synthesis and Policy Framework," *Theory and Society* 27, no. 2 (1998):

151–208; David M. Cutler and Edward L. Glaeser, *Are Ghettos Good or Bad?* (Report No. w5163) (Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research, 1995).

58   Gregory John Ashworth and Henk Voogd, *Selling the City: Marketing Approaches in Public Sector Urban Planning* (London, England: Belhaven Press, 1990).

59   Kevin Fox Gotham, "Selling New Orleans to New Orleans: Tourism Authenticity and the Construction of Community Identity," *Tourist Studies* 7, no. 3 (2007): 317–39; Kevin Fox Gotham, "Tourism Gentrification: The case of New Orleans' Vieux Carré (French Quarter)," *Urban Studies* 42, no. 7 (2005): 1099–121.

60   John L. Rury and Shirley A. Hill, *The African American Struggle for Secondary Schooling, 1940–1980* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2011).

61   Claudia Goldin and Lawrence Katz, *The Race between Education and Technology* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2010).

62   These observations draw from an article by Ansley Erickson, "American Colleges and Slavery: Historical Entanglements That Matter for Understanding Inequality Today," *Teachers College Record,* May 30, 2014, http://www.tcrecord.org/Home.asp.

63   Goldin and Katz, *The Race between Education and Technology.*

64   This is an ongoing theme in vocational education literature. See, e.g., Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School* (New York, NY: Vintage, 1964) and, more recently, Ansley T. Erickson, *Making the Unequal Metropolis: School Desegregation and Its Limits* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, forthcoming).

65   Herbert M. Kliebard, *Schooled to Work: Vocationalism and the American Curriculum, 1876–1946* (New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 1999); Erickson, *Schooling the Metropolis.*

66   David Labaree, "The Winning Ways of a Losing Strategy," *Education Theory* 58, no. 4 (2008): 447–60. For an overview, see Harvey Kantor and Robert Lowe, "The Price of Human Capital: The Illusion of Equal Educational Opportunity," in *Public Education Under Siege,* eds. Michael B. Katz and Mike Rose (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2013):75–83.

67   Suzanne Mettler, *Degrees of Inequality: How the Politics of Higher Education Sabotaged the American Dream* (New York, NY: Basic Books, 2014); on the GI Bill and its limits, see Ira Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White: The Untold History of Racial Inequality in Twentieth-Century America* (New York, NY: Norton, 2006).

68   On the Say Yes to Education, see www.sayyestoeducation.org, accessed May 18, 2015.

69   For one example of neighborhood unit planning in educational practice, see Erickson, *Making the Unequal Metropolis*, ch. 1 and passim.

70   Maia Bloomfield Cucchiara, *Marketing Schools, Marketing Cities: Who Wins and Who Loses When Schools Become Urban Amenities.* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2013).

71   Josh Bivens, Elise Gould, Lawrence Mishel, and Heidi Shierholz, *Raising America's Pay* (Washington, DC Economic Policy Institute, 2014); Colin Gordon, *Growing Apart: A Political History of American Inequality,* 2013, http://scalar.usc.edu/works/growing-apart-a-political-history-of-american-inequality/index.

72   Carter, "Student and School Cultures."

73   Greg J. Duncan and Richard J. Murnane, *Whither Opportunity? Rising Inequality, Schools, and Children's Life Chances* (New York, NY: Russell Sage, 2011); Ellen Goldring, Lora Cohen-Vogel, Claire Smrekar, and Cynthia Taylor, "Schooling Closer to Home: Desegregation Policy and Neighborhood Contexts," *American Journal of Education* 112, no. 3 (2006): 335–62.

74   Heather Thompson, "Criminalizing Kids: The Overlooked Reason for Failing Schools," in Katz and Rose, *Public Education under Siege,* 131–39. On mass incarceration, see Michelle Alexander, *The New Jim Crow: Mass Incarceration in the Age of Color-Blindness* (New York, NY: New Press, 2012).

75   Richard Rothstein, *Class and Schools: Using Social, Economic, and Educational Reform to Close the Black-White Achievement Gap* (Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute, 2004); Charles Basch, "Healthier Students Are Better Learners" (New York, NY: Campaign for Educational Equity, 2010).

76   Katznelson, *When Affirmative Action Was White.*

77   Betty Hart and Todd Risley, *Meaningful Differences in the Everyday Experience of Young American Children* (Baltimore, MD: Brookes, 1995).

78   W. Steven Barnett and Cynthia E. Lamy, "Achievement Gaps Start Early, Preschool Can Help," in *Closing the Opportunity Gap,* Carter and Welner, 98–110.

79   Ibid.

80   Ansley T. Erickson and Andrew R. Highsmith, "Segregation as Splitting, Segregation as Joining: Schools, Housing, and the Many Modes of Jim Crow," *American Journal of Education*, 121, no. 4 (forthcoming); Andrew R. Highsmith, *Demolition Means Progress* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

81   Gary Orfield and Erica Frankenberg, "*Brown* at 60: Great Progress, a Long Retreat, and an Uncertain Future," Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles (UCLA), May 15, 2014, http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-051814.pdf; Amy Stuart Wells et al., *Divided We Fall: The Story of Separate and Unequal Suburban Schools 60 Years after* Brown v. Board of Education, May 2, 2014, Teachers College, Columbia University, http://www.academia.edu/6937670/Divided_We_Fall_The_Story_of_Separate_and_Unequal_Suburban_Schools_60_Years_after_Brown_v._Board_of_Education.

82   Erica Frankenberg, Chung-Mei Lee, and Gary Orfield, "A Multiracial Society with Segregated Schools: Are We Losing the Dream?," Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles (UCLA), January 16, 2003, http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/a-multiracial-society-with-segregated-schools-are-we-losing-the-dream; Amy Stuart Wells et al., *Both Sides Now: The Story of School Desegregation's Graduates* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2009).

83   Gary Orfield and John T. Yun, "Resegregation in American Schools," Civil Rights Project, (Harvard University), June 1999, http://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/resegregation-in-american-schools/orfiled-resegregation-in-american-schools-1999.pdf.

84   Orfield and Frankenberg, "*Brown* at 60."

85   Ibid.; see also Amy Stuart Wells and Robert L. Crain, "Perpetuation Theory and the Long-Term Effects of School Desegregation," *Review of Educational Research* 6 (1994): 531–55.

86   Janelle Scott, "The Politics of Venture Philanthropy in Charter School Policy and Advocacy," *Educational Policy* 23 (2009): 106–36.

87   Sarah Reckhow, *Follow the Money: How Foundation Dollars Change Public School Politics* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013).

88   Patrick McGuinn, *No Child Left Behind and the Transformation of Federal Education Policy* (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2006); Jesse Rhodes, *An Education in Politics: The Origins and Evolution of No Child Left Behind* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2012). See also Jal Mehta, *The Allure of Order: High Hopes, Dashed Expectations, and the Troubled Quest to Remake American Schooling* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2013).

89   Jal Mehta and Steven Teles, "Jurisdictional Politics: A New Federal Role in Education," in *Carrots, Sticks, and the Bully Pulpit: Lessons from a Half-Century of Federal Efforts to Improve America's Schools*, eds. Frederick M. Hess & Andrew P. Kelly (Cambridge, MA: Harvard Education Press, 2011): 197–216.

90   Mehta, *The Allure of Order.*

91   Jonna Perrillo, *Uncivil Rights: Teachers, Unions, and Race in the Battle for School Equity* (Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press, 2012).

92   James Ryan, *Five Miles Away, A World Apart: One City, Two Schools, and the Story of Educational Opportunity in Modern America* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 2010), 3.

93   Ryan, *Five Miles Away,* 9.

94   For a summary of the literature, see Matthew Lassiter, "Schools and Housing in Metropolitan History: An Introduction, *Journal of Urban History* 38, no. 1 (2012): 195–204.

95   Ryan, *Five Miles Away*, 119.

96   James Ryan has referred to this as the "suburban veto" of choice in "*Brown,* School Choice, and the Suburban Veto," *Virginia Law Review* 90 (2004): 1635–47.

97   Gerald Grant, *Hope and Despair in the American City: Why There Are No Bad Schools in Raleigh* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).

98   Genevieve Siegel-Hawley, "City Lines, County Lines, Color Lines: The Relationship between School and Housing Segregation in Four Southern Metro Areas," *Teachers College Record* 115, no. 6 (2013):1–45.

99   Tienken and Zhao, "How Common Standards."

100   Ryan, *Five Miles*, ch. 7; Susan Eaton, *The Children in Room E4: American Education on Trial* (Chapel Hill, NC: Algonquin Books of Chapel Hill, 2007).

101   Rhodes, *An Education in Politics.*

102   See Richard F. Elmore and Susan H. Fuhrman, "Opportunity-to-Learn Standards and the State Role in Education," *Teachers College Record* 96, no. 3 (1995): 432–57.

103   Kevin G. Welner and Prudence Carter, "Achievement Gaps Arise from Opportunity Gaps," and Gloria Ladsen-Billings, "Lack of Achievement or Loss of Opportunity?," in *Closing the Opportunity Gap,* ed. Carter and Welner, 1–10, 11–24.

104   On this trouble within the "health disparities" literature, see Merlyn Chowkwanyun, "The Strange Disappearance of History from Racial Health Disparities Literature," *DuBois Review* 8, no. 1 (2011): 253–70.

105   These suggestions draw on the terminology in Carter, "Student and School Cultures," 155.

106   For an example of a project trying to communicate to stakeholders how decision making works in the context of mayoral control and centralization, see Teachers Unite and Center for an Urban Pedagogy, "Schools Are Us," accessed May 7, 2015, http://welcometocup.org/Projects/MakingPolicyPublic/SchoolsAreUs.

107   Jal Mehta, *The Allure of Order*.