

CHAPTER NINE

The Challenge of Inner City Education

LOIS A. LIBBY

There are two Connecticut described in public education circles: One Connecticut includes a set of school systems that are suburban, educating predominately white and/or Asian students. These school districts are relatively affluent with a high success rate in all indicators of educational progress: standardized test scores, college participation rates, and dropout statistics. The other set of Connecticut school systems is urban, comprised primarily of students of color, and of low socio-economic status. These systems have low ratings in educational progress including failing ratings on standardized tests (the most recent including the results on the No Child Left Behind Assessments [NCLB]), high dropout rates, low SAT results, and low college participation rates.¹ The purpose of this chapter is to focus on this latter set of schools, provide some history of their development, look at the indicators of poor progress in more detail, review options for ameliorating the urban school systems, including assessments of state efforts to date, and offer some perspectives and conclusions.

History of Public Education as a State Responsibility

The earliest laws of colonial Connecticut required every parent to see that the children under his/her aegis learned to read and write.² According to State Historian Christopher Collier, in the Calvinist Connecticut colony, "you served God in two ways,

one through worshipping Him and the other through your worldly calling—your trade.”³ The colonial governors not only expected that parents educate their children, they enforced their expectations through constables who tested children’s reading and writing skills and fined parents who did not comply. As will be seen with the enforcement of federal No Child Left Behind regulations, in 2003 the state has almost come full circle.

Since the 1700s, the Connecticut legislature has consistently exercised its authority over public education by requiring towns to establish schools, and when it had the resources, by developing a school fund to share the role of supporting schools with local communities. In the 1800s, the legislature also encouraged towns to consolidate public schools when schools in disrepair failed to improve, and finally, in the middle of the century, mandated that schools be free to students ages 4-12. In the 1900s, the high school became a focus for the legislature. For roughly the first half of the twentieth century, only urban districts were able to afford public high schools and suburban students were bused into the cities for regional high school programs. Eventually, state dollars allowed suburban districts to build their own high schools, leaving the urban schools to only those students who live in the cities.⁴

Thus the population of city schools became dominated more and more by children of color and poor students whose parents did not move to the suburbs. This trend has continued to the present. Moreover, white (and some minority) parents who have remained in the cities and can afford the cost of tuition have opted to send their children to private and parochial schools. This phenomenon has been exacerbated by the mandated desegregation plans of public schools in the cities in the 1970s, which remain in effect.

The city of Bridgeport offers a specific case study of the development of racial isolation in city schools in Connecticut. Until the late 1950s, students from suburbs such as Trumbull traveled to Bridgeport to attend high school. Trumbull then built a high school in the late 1950s, removing predominantly white students from Bridgeport’s three high schools. In 1975, the city became the subject of a federal desegregation suit based on the claim that the schools within the city limits needed to be racially

balanced. When mandatory busing became the rule within city limits, Bridgeport experienced more "white flight" to the suburbs as parents enrolled their students in private and parochial schools. For a period of time in the 1980s, the city actually paid for busing private school students to the private schools in suburbs.

The demographics of the population of public schools versus the overall population demonstrate the impact of white flight to this day. The overall population of the city of Bridgeport is roughly 33% white, 33% Black, and 33% Hispanic. The school population is 89% nonwhite (predominately African-Americans and Hispanics) and 11% white. In 1970, the nonwhite enrollment in the Bridgeport School system was 53%; in 1980, 74%; in 1990, 82%; and in 2003, 89%. This is an overall increase of 36% in the *proportion of nonwhite students since 1970*.⁵ The teachers of the students, however, remain predominantly white, which is another disparity issue for the litigants in the continuing desegregation suit against the city. As a result, the judge has ruled that Bridgeport must hire two nonwhite teachers for each white teacher.

Litigation and the Two Connecticuts

The state courts have been called upon to intervene in improving equity of educational opportunity for the students in the second Connecticut. In both *Horton v. Meskill*, decided in 1977 and the current *Sheff v. O'Neill*, decided in 1996, the plaintiffs have cited the state's responsibility for educating all of its citizens. Given the variable levels of local resources in the state, the suits have challenged the principle that local fiscal support of education, even enhanced by state assistance, can provide equitable educational opportunity. Since the local resources are generated from taxing the grand list of property in each community, the plaintiffs have railed against the "sheer irrationality of a system that allocates education on the basis of property values" (*Horton v. Meskill*).

In the *Horton v. Meskill* case, the defendants of the status quo argued that towns' sovereign immunity was a precedent for maintaining local autonomy with respect to administering education. They also testified about the lack of conclusive evidence

of a correlation between amount of funds allocated for education and the educational product. The plaintiffs, on the other hand, cited citizens' rights for equal protection under the law. They noted the great disparities among such local municipalities such as Greenwich and rural Canton, the site of the plaintiff's school, in their ability to fund education. The state lost the *Horton v. Meskill* case, as summarized by the following memorandum included in the decision:

Under the equal protection clause, as interference with the fundamental right to education requires strict judicial scrutiny, the state's statutory system of delegating its duty to provide education to municipalities is not entitled to the usual presumption of validity and the state must carry a heavy burden of justification.

Since this decision, the State Department of Education has established a number of study commissions to determine state systems of funding based on equity factors. Prior to the court decision in 1974, the state education grant was a flat grant based on average daily membership on the schools' rosters. The remedy since 1974 has been to do away with flat grants in favor of formula grants based on the educational needs of students and the ability (or lack thereof) of communities to fund education.

In the *Sheff v. O'Neill* case, the issues focus specifically on equity of opportunity in the cities, specifically Hartford. The defendants cite the population trends of minority and poor students in the center cities where the schools are in increasingly run-down condition and resources are sparse. They provided evidence of disparity of educational opportunity between the cities and the suburbs and attribute the inequities at least in part to racial isolation. Among the questions raised was whether students must be educated in venues that reflect the diversity of the greater metropolitan areas.

The *Sheff v. O'Neill* ruling determined that the plaintiffs were correct in their assertion that the poor educational outcomes in Hartford were due to racial and economic isolation, and that diversity in educational populations is critical for students to be

fairly and properly prepared for society's needs. One remedy is to charge the state to broaden administrative oversight units from municipalities to larger regions (for desegregation purposes). If there were regional administrative units charged with desegregation, the state could provide incentives for schools to be constructed in sites on borders of two communities, thereby attracting diverse students. The state could even insist that grants for school construction include provisions for serving diverse populations. Currently, school construction grants do offer a 10% bonus for including space for out-of-district enrollment.

Under Lowell P. Weicker, Jr., as governor, the 1994 state legislature increased the pressure on voluntary regional desegregation through Public Act 93-263, which required the development of regional plans for quality, integrated education. The community administrators for each region were charged to devise projects and programs that would not only address desegregation within schools but also the issues of housing and poverty. These plans were drawn up and were either endorsed or voted down by regional representatives from the communities. When Governor Weicker stepped down, his successor, John G. Rowland, announced that he would not enforce the implementation of the plans.

To respond to the judicial pressure of *Sheff v. O'Neill* and the overall poor performance of the urban schools in the second Connecticut, the Connecticut State Department of Education appointed a blue-ribbon panel to recommend responses to the court finding that the state needed to redress the inequities in educational opportunities in the second Connecticut. As a result, the state has implemented a number of initiatives, including incentive funding opportunities for voluntary desegregation as well as grants to the cities in targeted areas such as literacy and early childhood education. In fact, current Commissioner of Education, Betty Sternberg, has indicated that the preponderance of state resources for education should focus primarily on the cities and address the "achievement gap" between students in the cities and the suburbs.

Initially in the 1980s, the state of Connecticut labeled urban school districts as "priority" in terms of need for educational funding and support from the Connecticut legislature. These

included the largest city school districts in Connecticut (Hartford, Bridgeport, and New Haven) as well as the next larger tier of city districts (Bristol, East Hartford, Meriden, New Britain, Windham, Waterbury, New London, and Stamford). Norwalk, Torrington, West Haven, and Danbury were added to a later list. Putnam is the only rural area listed as a priority district. As a result of the priority designation, these districts have been given weighted consideration in larger proportions of funding pots, for awards of discretionary grants, and in funding formulas for state aid. The 2004 legislature provided \$43.5 million for annual grants to priority school districts. These grants include the following, listed according to population:

Hartford	\$6 million
Bridgeport	\$5.5 million
New Haven	\$5 million
Norwalk	\$2.8 million
Ansonia	\$700,000

Programs and Projects in Response to Litigation

Subsequently, the following specific initiatives have been directed at improving the academic performance of students in the second Connecticut. The earlier projects, included in Public Act 97-270, can be grouped as efforts to counter racial isolation in the cities through intradistrict as well as interdistrict, regional efforts. Later efforts include grants for the cities, frequently to the exclusion of the suburbs. These are targeted toward improving academic performance in specific areas or for specific target populations. For the city of Hartford, these efforts have also included a takeover of the administration of the school system from 1997-2002.

Project Concern and Project Open Choice

In the 1960s, Project Concern was initiated to allow selected urban students to attend schools in surrounding suburbs. State grants paid for the transportation as well as tutors, social

workers/school counselors, and bus aides, and the grants to suburban districts included small stipends for each student accepted. Although the project waned in the 1980s, due to criticism that the program had minimal impact on the urban population overall in the cities and that the cities selected only "model" students for participation, some suburban school districts continued supporting students who had started attending their schools through the 1980s. In the 1990s, as a partial response to the concerns of *Sheff v. O'Neill*, the state legislature created a new "two way" busing program that is still in effect. For selected urban areas (Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport) contiguous suburban and urban school districts must indicate the number of openings they have for students from the urban districts. Students apply and if selected (by lottery if necessary), they enroll and are transported at public cost. The receiving district is granted \$2,000 per pupil. Urban students predominate in this busing program, although some suburban parents who work in cities opt to send their children to schools near where they work. This program was briefly extended to New London, Windham, and Waterbury, but has been discontinued for these urban areas. The Connecticut Center for School Change notes that the implementation of Project Choice has resulted in the following criticisms:

Since the program is predicated on available space, in Bridgeport, in 2000-01 only 23 of the 457 students who applied were able to participate. (Students who gain entry into the program must be allowed to complete high school in their receiving districts, and suburban districts who are strapped for space cannot be induced to making a legal commitment to students for twelve years).

The current transportation grant is much too small for the way that Project Choice is implemented in the New Haven and Hartford regions.

The students who choose to attend schools are not reflective of the racial make-up of the sending communities, e.g., African Americans are much more

likely than Latinos to participate and minorities from the suburbs make up the majority of students who attend the urban schools. For these reasons, the program has not had a significant effect on racial balance in the public schools.⁶

Magnet Schools

In the 1970s, after the implementation of federal court-ordered desegregation plans that involved court-ordered busing of students within cities, Connecticut, like other states, experienced "white flight" to the suburbs in its major cities. To counter this phenomenon, the United States Department of Education offered federal grants to develop magnet schools to attract students back to the cities' public schools. These schools used funds for resources to develop special themes to capitalize on interests of students, such as the arts, technology, foreign languages, or environmental education. Most of these magnet schools are still operating, and the federal magnet schools assistance legislation still awards a minimum number of grants in multi-year cycles, frequently to help older magnet schools to update their resources or add technology. Originally there were entrance requirements and/or testing to entice the "best students," but the federal government has recently disallowed testing as a requirement for admission in its more recent rounds of grants. If more students apply than can be enrolled, lotteries are conducted for different racial and ethnic groups to ensure diversity, and school districts provide transportation for the students who choose and are selected for the magnet schools. Due to the demographics, white students have had better odds for admission. Since there were only a minimum number of magnets developed (three in Bridgeport and one in Norwalk, for example), there have never been enough magnet school openings to meet the demand. By contrast, in New Haven's open enrollment program and in Montclair, New Jersey, all elementary schools are magnet schools with varying themes, so all parents truly have a choice. Targeting interdistrict projects, the Connecticut State Department of Education now provides the bulk of grant funding for magnet school projects in urban centers.

Interdistrict Magnet Schools

In the 1980s, it became apparent that major Connecticut cities' schools, for all intents and purposes, were racially isolated. Desegregation with a significant number of white students required going beyond city boundaries. Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport had and continue to have nonwhite enrollments upwards of 86%. Thus another voluntary response to concerns of *Sheff v. O'Neill* became interdistrict magnet schools and interdistrict projects.

The Connecticut State Department of Education offered incentive grants to develop interdistrict, regional magnet schools. Currently thirty-one such magnet schools are in operation in the cities of Hartford, New London, New Haven, Bridgeport, Waterbury, and Norwalk. There are six part-time interdistrict magnet school programs, in which students attend their locally assigned school for part of their educational program and the interdistrict magnet school for a special academic focus (e.g., Japanese, the arts). Two of these interdistrict magnet schools have been approved but are still searching for sites. Some of the schools were developed with support from the federal magnet schools assistance legislation as well as construction grants from the Connecticut legislature. They enrolled 10,640 students in the 2003-04 school year and are operationally funded primarily by the State Department of Education, with some contributory funds from the participating districts. They have magnet themes, such as combining childcare and education in all-day programs, the arts, and technology. These magnet schools have added grades or the next level of school (e.g., middle school) as they have gained in popularity.

Interdistrict Cooperative Program

The interdistrict cooperative program includes projects to increase the contacts between urban and suburban students for educational purposes, such as regional summer schools, joint arts and music programs, and shared use of educational facilities, such as Norwalk's Maritime Aquarium. The amount of the grant for

interdistrict projects is determined by the number of students who will participate from both the urban and suburban districts, and by the length of time and number of shared experiences in which the groups of students will be involved. Currently there are over a hundred interdistrict projects, enrolling at least 60,000 students.

Charter Schools

In the 1990s, the State Department of Education initiated a charter school program under Public Act 97-290 to develop innovations in schools as well as to provide yet another option for desegregation, especially across district lines. These schools are frequently smaller in physical size, have a lower ratio of students to teachers, and the leaders in the school take on full accountability and responsibility for the school. Charter school developers apply for and receive their charter directly from the State Board of Education. Act 97-290 has a provision for consideration of the reduction of racial, ethnic, and economic isolation as a factor in approving new charter schools. There are currently thirteen charter schools in Connecticut, predominately in the major cities. They enrolled 2,224 students in the 2002-03 school year, but according to the Center for School Change, each school draws its students from one or two towns only, reducing their contribution to racial and socioeconomic isolation.⁷ The charters must be renewed every five years.

One school option that the Connecticut legislature has discussed but has not implemented is a voucher program. In 1995, the state legislature debated legislation to offer vouchers to poor children (those eligible for free and reduced lunch). Students could use the vouchers in private and public schools who offered spaces. It came within one vote of passage. Former Governor Rowland and Senator Joseph I. Lieberman endorsed vouchers, although Rowland backed away from them prior to resigning from office. In a letter to the author, Lieberman states:

Private school choice can open doors for children in our poorest neighborhoods, where religious schools—particularly Catholic schools—often have had better

results than public schools. I have long believed what some research has shown: that the success of parochial schools is in part due to their students' and teachers' shared beliefs and strong moral values. Lower-income parents who want their kids to learn in a religious environment should have that chance, just as wealthier parents do.⁸

Educators within the state have expressed concern that the institution of vouchers will result in even lower-performing urban schools, since experience in other states demonstrates that the parents who exercise choice options typically have higher incomes and are better educated than the parents whose children stay in the low-performing schools.⁹ Moreover, the amount of the vouchers that was proposed in 1995 did not meet the total cost of the student's tuition; therefore, parents with the lowest incomes would likely find the voucher program cost-prohibitive. Still, vouchers will likely be instituted as a "remedy" for students whose schools do not meet state standards within two years as result of the federal No Child Left Behind Act.

More recently, major new initiatives from the Connecticut State Department of Education have moved away from addressing racial isolation *per se*, although state funds continue to support charter and interdistrict schools that were developed in the 1980s and 1990s. As mentioned earlier, only two of these new types of schools are in the planning stages. It should be noted that new regulations for school construction and the overall lack of state funds due to state deficit spending have essentially made constructing any new schools difficult. It should also be noted that not all magnet schools or charter schools require new construction, since space may be provided by the school district.

The more recent funding initiatives to address the achievement gap between students in the two Connecticuts include direct interventions for or grants to the cities. These approaches do not address racial isolation as a possible factor in poor academic outcomes. The funding initiatives include urban preschool programs (these result from promising academic outcomes for Headstart and other preschool programs); literacy programs to

include early intervention and literacy tutors; and summer school and after school remedial programs. The underlying assumption is that the more time spent in school academic programs will increase student performance. Many of these projects are funded by federal grants. It should be noted that much of this money is being redirected to pay for the mandated testing required by the NCLB Act or in block grants to states.

Yet even with all these initiatives there were 149 schools in Connecticut on the list of under-performing schools recently published in reporting for the federal NCLB Act, and 80% were in the urban schools of the second Connecticut, the preponderance of which were, as expected, in the three largest cities, Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport. Connecticut typically is cited as the "best in the nation" in assessments of basic skills overall, but the NCLB Act highlights Connecticut's failures in improving the performance of urban students.

Columbus School in Bridgeport offers a case study of the difficulties in improving performance. According to school administrators in a report in the *Connecticut Post*:

Enrollment has only grown since it was targeted by the state in 1999 as in need of improvement. Most Columbus students come from low income families. There is a high minority population. Many are bilingual and spend half the year here [at Columbus], half in Puerto Rico or Brazil. Despite teacher training and new instructional programs, Connecticut Mastery Test scores have remained flat.¹⁰

The *Connecticut Post* article also reports that teachers in Columbus School argue that testing students who have minimal English-speaking ability and learning disabilities is unfair. Under the NCLB Act, 95% of all students are expected to take the test, although 60% of students in one testing class have been in this country for less than one year.

If the students' performance at Columbus School and all but four of twenty-five elementary schools in Bridgeport, as well as the other schools on the NCLB list, does not improve to meet

NCLB standards, the parents in those schools will be able to gain vouchers to send their children to "better" schools. Rosemary Coyle of the Connecticut Education Association notes in an article in the *Hartford Courant* that since Connecticut has had state testing for two decades,

we are painfully aware that some students are not achieving at grade level. Our challenge has been and continues to be adequate social programs and innovative school programs that meet the needs of every child.¹¹

The national demographer, Harold Hodgkinson, offers an outsider's perspective on the funding of schools within the second Connecticut, both with respect to the causes of the disparities among communities and the progress for reform. He cites the "major reliance on towns as funding mechanisms" and notes that in comparison to other states, there is "no intermediate governmental level" for tax purposes, such as counties; moreover, school districts have no taxing authority.¹²

Section 1-15 and 10-240 of the Connecticut state laws makes every town a school district, and education expenditures compete with all other community expenditures. This system differs from a state like Illinois, in which the school district can be its own taxing authority. The introduction of a state (e.g., California or Florida) or county system (e.g., Fairfax County, Virginia) to fund education would broaden the city and small town base to provide resources for public education and would also provide a broader base for desegregation. Connecticut's dependence on the immediate local community for funding enhances the opportunity for disparities between communities, and, in fact, the discrepancy between the highest and lowest amounts of funding per child is almost two to one.

Hodgkinson reiterates Connecticut's lack of success in dealing with "the percent of Connecticut's children who are at serious risk of failure in school and life." He notes that "to neglect this 10% causes no immediate harm to Connecticut's political or business leadership in that they are confined to a small area—mainly the cities of Hartford, New Haven, and Bridgeport. He

warns that this "underclass" is growing, however, and notes that Connecticut's "poverty population is increasing more rapidly than the wealthy."¹³

Among the typical national "solutions" to addressing the non-college-bound students in public education in both the cities and suburbs are regional vocational education programs. It should be noted that four of the eight state high schools that were on the NCLB Act's list as demonstrating lack of academic improvement were vocational technical schools located in the cities of Hartford, New Britain, New Haven, and Stamford. The State Department of Education has direct administrative oversight of these programs. Their poor performance gives credence to Hodgkinson's theory that the state is not "seriously attending to the needs of the 'underclass' students" in the second Connecticut.

As a result of conducting national research and forums within Connecticut to test out ideas, the Center for School Change has proposed a "radical solution" to the inequities of the second Connecticut.¹⁴ The proponents conclude that voluntary efforts to address the racial and economic isolation cited in *Sheff v. O'Neill* will not work. In the forums conducted in the major cities of the state, the researchers found a general acceptance of the belief that ethnic diversity is important but not critical to public education. The Center's proposal, therefore, is that the state should mandate large administrative regions for public education, such as found in Jefferson County, Kentucky, and Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, and then provide for a system of forced choice among schools to the parents and students within the regions, i.e., the administrators would assign spaces within each school in the region and parents would choose among the spaces available. The resulting school population would ensure integration either on the basis of racial or ethnic groups or on the basis of socioeconomic status.

Simultaneously, there would be an effort to improve the quality of the public schools in the urban communities, perhaps by making smaller schools and smaller class sizes as well as funding preschools. The funding of the administrative regions could be accomplished either by allowing the large region taxing authority or by requiring that each participating community pay

a share of the cost of the regional programs. The proponents suggest, at a minimum, that a pilot program with these attributes be initiated with the support of non-profit and business communities. In considering the viability of such proposals, Hodgkinson notes that:

Connecticut's tradition of very autonomous towns has made it difficult for the state to lead in an era of state togetherness as suggested in . . . federal legislation. Being small in size and population is not necessarily an advantage in "getting your act together" as a state.¹⁵

Conclusion

Even with the variety of attempts to ameliorate the problems of the second Connecticut, the publication of the NCLB Act testing results has highlighted the continuing, growing achievement gap between the cities and the suburbs. The efforts to address racial isolation have not been sustained, as evidenced by the decline in new interdistrict projects. Hodgkinson suggests that Connecticut has not seriously addressed the issues of the major cities as a priority, even though their minority, disadvantaged population is growing in the state and even though employers are already relying on this population to fuel the state's economy.

Bolder programs, such as tinkering with regional administrative units for educational purposes to provide a broader base for resources and desegregation, have not been seriously considered. Single urban areas such as Bridgeport are noteworthy in 2003 for having the highest combined state and local taxes in the nation and therefore are in a poor position to generate more taxes to serve their disadvantaged population. Adding an intermediate governmental unit akin to a county system would be difficult since county government is essentially moribund in Connecticut, as compared to other states, but this solution would expand the tax base and encourage school construction to integrate students across districts. Recruiting teachers and reporting test results across districts in the larger region should lead to increased expectations for all students within the new administrative boundaries.

In 2005, per the regulations of the NCLB Act, parents of children in low-performing city schools can choose to send their students to "better schools." It is difficult to speculate on the extent to which they will exercise this option and which schools will open their doors to these students, but the impact on the "schools left behind" is predictable. When parents are allowed to "choose" their children's schools, it is the better-educated, higher-income parents, or parents who have a particular religious or cultural school of choice, who have taken these options in the past leaving the lower-income, neediest at risk students in the inner city schools.¹⁶ Moreover, it was noted earlier that the label of "low performing" does not necessarily decrease the numbers of students in the schools, as evidenced by the Columbus School in Bridgeport, which has been labeled "low performing" since 1999, but has experienced considerable growth especially in its non-English-speaking population.

The NCLB Act, with its standards and unfunded mandates, may exacerbate the achievement gap between the cities and the suburbs to the breaking point so that the State of Connecticut takes the "second Connecticut" more seriously and develops the political will to take more drastic measures to address the growing disparities between trapped, deprived students in the cities and those of their suburban counterparts who live in adjacent and proximate communities. Employers needing to employ city dwellers may also drive strong efforts to improve the lot of students in the cities. It would appear that comprehensive action plans by regions as articulated by Governor Weicker need to be reestablished, in which school district regions articulate goals, objectives, and programs that they will undertake to "unify" the equity of educational opportunities and increase racial integration in each region. Implementation of strong action is required if Connecticut wants to remain in the forefront of overall educational performance. The state needs to consider innovative strategies designed to promote equity of educational opportunity and the well-being of all of its students, not just those in the suburbs. It is important that all students have access to high goals and expectations, especially the students in what is now "the second Connecticut."

Notes

Jack Hasegawa, educational consultant in the Connecticut State Department of Education, has provided guidance and resources to the author in preparing this chapter.

1. Harold Hodgkinson, *Connecticut: New Dreams from Old Realities* (Washington: Institute for Educational Leadership, Center for Demographic Policy, 1994), p. 24.

2. Alice Walker, *School Bulletin #4* (Hartford: Connecticut State Department of Education, 1926), p.10.

3. Christopher Collier, quoted in *Sheff v. O'Neill*, 238 Conn. 1 (1996).

4. *Sheff v. O'Neill*.

5. Reports issued by the Connecticut State Department of Education, www.Cstde.state.ct.us.

6. Gordon A. Bruno and Kathryn A. McDermott, *Beyond the Unexamined Remedy: Moving Toward Quality, Integrated Schools* (Hartford: Connecticut Center for School Change, 2000), pp. 29-30.

7. Bruno and McDermott, *Beyond the Unexamined Remedy*, p. 28.

8. Letter to Lois Libby from Senator Joseph I. Lieberman, May 10, 1995.

9. Report Issued by the Connecticut State Department of Education on State Results of No Child Left Behind Act, www.Cstde.state.ct.us.

10. Linda Conner Lambeck, "Schools Try Everything to Boost Test Scores," *Connecticut Post*, September 14, 2003, p. A1.

11. *Hartford Courant*, September 15, 2003.

12. Hodgkinson, *Connecticut: New Dreams from Old Realities*, p. 9.

13. Hodgkinson, *Connecticut: New Dreams from Old Realities*, p. 9.

14. Bruno and McDermott, *Beyond the Unexamined Remedy*, pp. 7-12, 50-56.

15. Hodgkinson, *Connecticut: New Dreams from Old Realities*, p. 21.

16. Valerie Martinez, Kay Thomas, and Frank Kemerer, "Who Chooses and Why: A Look at Five School-Choice Plans," *Phi Delta Kappan* 51, no. 8 (May 1994): 678-81.