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For many years, there have been not one but two Pasadenas. On the one hand, the city of Pasadena, and the surrounding communities of Altadena and Sierra Madre, have populations that are more highly educated, and wealthier, than the state and the nation in which they reside. The thriving Pasadena area has nationally-known institutions such as the California Institute of Technology, the Jet Propulsion Laboratories (JPL), the Rose Bowl, the Huntington Library, and the Arts Center College of Design. But amidst this wealth and fame can be found another reality: a struggling low-income population, that is disproportionately Latino and African American, living in a quadrant of Pasadena and parts of Altadena, largely separated from the rest of the community.

The two Pasadenas are reflected to some degree (though not completely) in a dual system of schools: a collection of private schools which educates an astounding 30% of the area's students (triple the national average for private school attendance); and a system of public schools which is two-thirds low and moderate income, a strikingly high proportion for the three fairly affluent communities that make up the Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD).

There are some winds of change. A substantial number of middle-class families now use the public schools, responding to efforts going back a number of years to develop school programs that will serve all students well and attract more middle-class families to the public school system. At the same time, because of rising rents, some low-income students and their families are moving out of PUSD altogether. Observing these trends, some voices in the community understandably worry that too much attention is being paid to luring middle-class families and argue that efforts should focus instead on improving the achievement of low-income and minority children who make up the vast bulk of students. Rather than cater to a middle-class clientele, why not just fix high poverty schools by infusing them with more resources?

A long line of research, however, finds that it is virtually impossible to make separate systems of schooling for rich and poor equal. National research, and data from PUSD,
clearly demonstrate that all students – poor and middle-class – perform better in a unified system of public education that provides a healthy mix of students from different economic backgrounds in all the schools. Economically mixed schools are much more likely than high poverty schools to provide high levels of parental involvement, high standards and expectations, and high quality teaching. Attracting more middle-class families to PUSD is the single most important step the district can take to raise the academic achievement of low-income and minority students. It is not a diversion from improving the education of low-income students; it is a necessary prerequisite. Attracting more middle-class families to PUSD is not a zero-sum game that pits the middle-class against the poor. It is a win-win situation that will improve educational outcomes for both the middle-class and the poor.

The research suggests that low-income students can learn at high levels if given the right environment. But in Pasadena-area schools – and in much of the country – low-income and minority students are not reaching their full potential because they are educated in separate schools, outside the mainstream. Those students are denied equal opportunity, and the larger Pasadena community is losing out on the wasted talent of potential scientists, artists, business people and civic leaders.

Attracting a healthy economic mix in the public schools will require dramatic change. Many positive improvements are being made to the Pasadena public schools – test scores are rising; many middle-class families are taking a closer look at several improving schools. But reputations often lag changes in reality and something bold must be done to change the dynamic. To successfully attract more middle-class students to the public schools and improve the schools for all will require something much more dramatic: a reinvention of the public school system that makes far better use of the wealthy resources and world-class institutions that the community has to offer.

The good news is that PUSD has more potential to improve its schools, especially the academic achievement of its low-income students, than perhaps any other community in the country given the incredible resources within Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre. The question is whether community leaders in the PUSD area will rise to the challenge. In interviews with key business, political, and institutional leaders, it became clear that many are well-intentioned and wish to help the school system, but they have not yet engaged fully in the effort to turn the Pasadena public school system into a world class enterprise.

PUSD needs to think imaginatively about a system of magnet schools that have strong affiliations with the community's internationally-known resources. Would a math/science high school that has strong ties to Cal Tech, JPL, and major engineering firms be attractive? A theater, arts and music magnet with ties to the Arts Center College, the Armory, and the Pasadena Playhouse? A dual language Spanish-English immersion program, in which half the students are dominant Spanish speakers, half dominant English speakers, and both groups learn to be fluent in both languages by the end of
elementary school?

Families in the community should help make decisions about what types of magnet schools the district should offer. Parents with pre-school and school-aged children (in public and private school) should be surveyed to find out what sort of magnet schools would be attractive. If the idea of a Montessori elementary school (which puts an emphasis on learning from other students and through individual exploration rather than through lectures) proves exceedingly popular, and is likely to be oversubscribed, the district could create two schools with a Montessori teaching approach to accommodate the demand. Over time, there is no reason that all of PUSD's schools could not have a distinctive theme or pedagogical approach. There are models of cities – such as Cambridge, Massachusetts and Hot Springs, Arkansas – which have done just that, and have successfully drawn middle-class families back into the public schools.

In implementing an innovative program, Pasadena school officials should be firmly guided simultaneously by the twin goals of excellence and equity. Exclusive focus on one or the other is insufficient. In the 1970s, under court-ordered desegregation, Pasadena public schools engaged in a system of compulsory busing that focused on equity but which resulted in massive flight of middle-class families, from which Pasadena schools are still recovering. On the other hand, a return to "neighborhood schools" in Pasadena, and an end to the system of transfers and transportation, might attract more middle-class families, but only by creating small enclaves of privilege in an otherwise low-income system. To promote excellence and equity at once, Pasadena should consider a system of public school choice which eventually makes all schools magnet schools – open to all – and ensures economic and educational equity between schools over time.

This report begins by outlining background information on the cities that make up PUSD and the system of public and private schooling in the area. The document then traces the history of why middle-class families have largely withdrawn from PUSD, the efforts to bring them back over the years, and the controversy this strategy has spawned. Finally, the report outlines national and local evidence on the ways in which attracting a strong middle-class presence in public schools improves the education of all students, and makes recommendations on how a new system of magnet schools could transform the public schools in Pasadena.

The report draws on national, state and local data, collated by researcher Susan Johnson and others. The report also reflects discussions and interviews with roughly 100 residents of PUSD communities from a wide range of affiliations and with a diversity of viewpoints. Those discussions were instrumental in shaping the recommendations of this report. A list of those interviewed is found in the appendix.
II. Background on Pasadena

A. The Cities of Pasadena, Altadena, and Sierra Madre

The Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) draws on three cities: Pasadena, with a population of 133,936, Altadena, with a population of 42,610, and Sierra Madre with a population of 10,578, according to 2000 Census figures.

On average, the three cities are relatively wealthy, highly educated, and ethnically vibrant. As Figure 1 shows, the percentage of adults with a bachelor's degree or higher was 41.3% in Pasadena, 38.9% in Altadena, and 49.7% in Sierra Madre, compared with 26.6% in California and 24.4% in the United States, according to the 2000 Census.

Median family income figures are also somewhat higher in the three cities than in California or the U.S., as Figure 2 indicates. In the 2000 Census, median family income was $53,639 in Pasadena; $66,800 in Altadena, and $79,588 in Sierra Madre, compared with $53,025 in California and $50,046 in the United States.

Pasadena also boasts a vibrant blend of racial and ethnic diversity. In the 2000 Census, the city of Pasadena's three largest racial and ethnic groups were whites (53.4%), Latinos (33.4%) and African Americans (14.4%). Altadena's
Figure 2: Median Family Income Among PUSD-Area Adults Compared with Adults in California and the United States (2000)

Source: 2000 U.S. Census Data

Figure 3: PUSD-Area Families Below Poverty Level Compared with California and the United States (2000)

Source: 2000 U.S. Census Data
Figure 4: PUSD-Area Individuals Below Poverty Level Compared with California and the United States (2000)

Source: 2000 U.S. Census Data

Figure 5: PUSD-Area Private School Usage Compared with California and the United States (2004-2005)

population was 47.3% white, 31.4% African American, and 20.4% Hispanic, while Sierra Madre was less diverse in the 2000 census: 85.9% white, 1.0% Latino, and 0.1% African American.

**For a city of its modest size (about 135,000), Pasadena is associated with a stunning array of famous institutions.**

For a city of its modest size (about 135,000), Pasadena is associated with a stunning array of famous institutions. It is known for the Rose Bowl and the annual Rose Parade. It is home to the California Institute of Technology, one of the nation's leading universities, with 3000 employees. Associated with Cal Tech is NASA's well-known Jet Propulsion Laboratory (JPL), which employs 5000 people and is located in nearby La Canada Flintridge. Leading private high-tech employers include Parsons Engineering, a $3 billion engineering and construction company with 10,000 employees worldwide and Jacobs Engineering Group, a $6 billion enterprise, with more than 60 offices in 15 countries.1

In addition to its reputation in the sciences, Pasadena is known for its strength in the arts. It is home to the prestigious Arts Center College of Design, which offers undergraduate and graduate programs in transportation design, photography, advertising, graphic design, and film. Pasadena is also known for The Armory Center for the Arts, the Pasadena Playhouse, and the Norton Simon Art Museum. With its emphasis on education, the arts, and the sciences, Pasadena residents are said to treasure above all else a commitment to creativity.2

Pasadena is home to many other well-known institutions: Pasadena City College, the third largest community college in the country; the well-regarded Huntington Hospital; the Huntington Library, Arts Collection and Botanical Garden; and Fuller Theological Seminary. Other major employers include AlliedSignal, Ameron International, AT&T, Avery Dennison, Avon Products, Bank of America, Bolton Insurance, Chicago Title, Christie Parker Hale, the City of Pasadena, Clinical Microsensors/Motorola, Community Bank, Danone Water Products, Earthlink Network, Fannie Mae, HCM Claims, idealab!, IndyMac, Kaiser Permanente, Las Encinas Hospital, Macy's West, Montgomery Watson, Overture, Pasadena Hilton, Ritz-Carlton, Huntington Hotel, SBC, Sears, Sheraton, Pasadena, Target, Tetra Tech, Inc, Tokio Bank, United Commercial Bank, Vons Companies, Wausau Insurance, Wescom Credit, Western Asset Management, and Westin.3

Pasadena continues to attract new residents. Between 1970 and 2000, the population of Pasadena grew from 113,327 to 133,936.4 Since 2000, Pasadena has grown by between 5,000 and 12,000 residents, depending on the estimate used.5 But alongside the wealth and education and nationally-known institutions resides a second Pasadena, one not represented to the viewing public at the annual New Year's Day parade.6 In this Pasadena, the poverty rate is higher than the state and national rates. As Figure 3 shows, while Sierra Madre and Altadena have relatively low poverty rates, 11.6% of Pasadena families were below the poverty level in the 2000 census, compared with 10.6% of California families and 9.2% of U.S. families. Likewise, the individual poverty rate in Pasadena was higher (15.9%) than the figures for California (14.2%) or the United States (12.4%) in the 2000 census (see Figure 4). Pasadena's poverty is concentrated mostly in the northwest section of the city. In 2000, seven census tracts in northwest Pasadena had one-third (36.7%) of the city's population, but almost two thirds (61.5%) of its poor people.7

B. The Public and Private School Systems Roughly Reflect the Two Pasadenas

The public and private school systems, very roughly speaking, educate the two different Pasadenas. In 2004-5, there were 10,353 students attending 57 private schools within PUSD boundaries.8 During the same period, there were 22,336
students attending public schools in PUSD. The use of private schools within the PUSD is extraordinary: a rate of 31.7%, more than triple the California rate of 8.5% and the national rate of 9.7%. (See Figure 5)

If students in the PUSD area attended public school at the same rate as students nationally, it would mean an influx of more than 7000 additional public school students, bringing the total to close to 30,000. Although data are not readily available on the socioeconomic makeup of the private school students within PUSD boundaries, if the student population is reflective of the national private school population, the overwhelming majority are middle class or wealthy. In certain affluent areas of Pasadena, parents don't even consider using the public schools for their children. In some social circles, the question isn't public vs private school for children, but which private school to use. Other middle-class and affluent parents who wish to use public school say they are steered by real estate agents to surrounding school districts like South Pasadena, San Marino, Arcadia or La Canada-Flintridge.

The public school system, meanwhile, educates an

![Figure 6: Percentage of PUSD Students who are Low and Moderate Income Compared with California and the United States (2004-2005)](chart)

overwhelmingly low-income and working-class student population. While there are strong (and apparently growing) pockets of middle-class students in a few select schools within PUSD, roughly two-thirds of students (67.7%) are poor enough to qualify for free or reduced-price lunch, meaning their families make less than 185% of the federal poverty line. (In the 2005-06 school year, the cutoff for subsidized lunch was an annual income of $35,798 for a family of four.) By comparison, the comparable percentage eligible for free and reduced-price lunch in California was 49.1% and in the U.S. was 41.6%. (See Figure 6). Surrounding communities – South Pasadena, San Marino, Arcadia and La Canada-Flintridge – have low-income student populations of 10 percent or less.

It is important to emphasize that those eligible for free and reduced-price lunch include many students from working families, and many from families above the official federal poverty line (which was $19,350 for a family of four in 2005). An estimated 21 percent of students in PUSD are eligible for CalWorks, which provides temporary assistance for needy families with minor children. PUSD students are also far more likely to be members of racial and ethnic minority groups than is the general population of Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre. In 2004-05 school year, the public schools were 54.0% Hispanic, 25.7% African American, 15.4% white, with the remainder Asian, Pacific Islander, Filipino, American Indian or Alaskan Native, or Multiracial.

PUSD currently operates 32 schools – 24 elementary, 9 middle schools, and five high schools – which range widely in socioeconomic and racial characteristics. (Some schools serve more than one age category.) Among elementary schools, the percentage of low-income students (eligible for free or reduced price meals) span the spectrum from Don Benito (29.9% eligible in 2004-05) to Madison (99.1% eligible).

The achievement of PUSD students, while rising, lags substantially behind more affluent neighboring districts, due in large measure to the proportion of low-income students in the different districts. California reports student achievement based on an Academic Performance Index (API) ranging from a low of 200 to a high of 1000 points. California has set an API score of 800 as an eventual goal for all schools. California also ranks schools 1-10 based on their decile, with 10 being the best and 1 the worst. In 2005, PUSD schools averaged an API of 689. By comparison, more affluent neighboring districts had substantially higher API scores: Arcadia Unified (865), South Pasadena Unified (866), La Canada Unified (918) and San Marino Unified (932). In the 2005 decile rankings, released in March 2006, every school in Arcadia, La Canada, San Marino, and South Pasadena was ranked a 10. By contrast, Pasadena had no 10s and 14 of 31 schools scored below 5. A majority of PUSD schools failed to make "adequate yearly progress" under the federal No Child Left Behind law in 2005.

Education researchers have long known that the socioeconomic status of a student's family is the single most powerful predictor of academic achievement, so California devised a system in which schools are compared to those of similar demographic makeup. Comparing similar schools, PUSD had six schools ranked 10 and 23 ranked 7 or above. But Pasadena has set a goal of defying the odds and going beyond the goal of doing as well as other relatively disadvantaged school districts, being "the best of the worst."

Willard Elementary School
III. History of Why the Middle Class Left the Pasadena Public Schools and Efforts to Win Them Back

Why, in communities as wealthy as Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre, are the public schools far less affluent and more likely to struggle than in neighboring communities? Why do so many middle-class parents shun the public school system? To answer this question it is important to review some of the history of how PUSD came to look as it does today.

As a city of great wealth, Pasadena has always had more families using private schools for their children than is true nationally. Going back to 1951, roughly 18% of students used private schools in the Pasadena area, a figure that rose to 20% in 1966. In the 1970s, however, use of private schools spiked, particularly among whites, as Pasadena came under a court-ordered busing plan following findings of intentional discrimination.

In January 1970, PUSD was the first northern school district found guilty by a federal district court of willfully segregating its public schools by race. The differences in schools was often stark. For example, Cleveland Elementary School was 97% black, while Linda Vista Elementary School located a mile away was 92% white. Moreover, students at Linda Vista were assigned to McKinley Junior High School, which was 70% white, rather than predominantly black Washington Junior High School which was much closer. There were in some senses two Pasadena school systems – one for blacks and one for whites – a violation of the U.S. Constitution.

As a remedy, the court established the requirement that no school should have a majority of minority students. Some whites were bused from eastern parts of Pasadena to Muir High School, while some black students were sent to Pasadena High School on the east side. Predominantly black and white elementary schools were paired, with students attending K-3 often in more affluent white areas and 4-6 in predominantly black neighborhoods. When white flight ensued, the court said the district needed to redraw school district lines, annually if necessary, to hold to the goal. In 1976, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed this order, saying the court could not order readjustments due to demographic changes.

From 1970 to 1980, white enrollment in PUSD declined by 9,000 students, from 15,647 to 6,641. Between 1970 and 2000, due to busing, a large influx of Latino families, and other demographic changes, PUSD went from being 53.7% white, 32.8% black, 9.2% Hispanic, and 4.3% Asian to being 50.7% Hispanic, 29.8% black, 15.5% white, and 4.0% Asian. Along the way, a number of minority middle-class families also left the district. The superintendent during the busing crisis, Ramon Cortines, told Star News reporter David Zahniser "The Pasadena court order integrated every one of the private and parochial schools in the area."
In order to stem middle-class flight, PUSD established three "voluntary" schools – two with a "Fundamental" teaching approach (Don Benito Elementary and Marshall Middle and High School), and one with an "Alternative" approach (Norma Coombs). The district received magnet school transportation funding from the state of California for these schools, which were meant to draw a diverse population from across the school district through choice rather than mandatory busing. Today, these schools continue to exist and 20% of openings are reserved for residents living close to the schools. Although the school district now admits students to these schools based on lottery, without respect to race, the state continues to provide transportation funding through its desegregation program.17

In 1979, a federal district court declared Pasadena schools unified and, over a period of years, busing was phased out and PUSD returned largely to a system of neighborhood schools. Beginning in the early 1980s, busing was cut from 12,000 students to 6,000, then to 3,000.18 Today, fewer than 2,000 non-special education students are bused.19 (These numbers do not include the three voluntary schools.) The school district also enacted an "open enrollment" policy in which families may choose a school other than the one to which their child is assigned, subject to space availability. Families are allowed to make up to five choices. Open enrollment admissions, like admissions to voluntary magnet schools, are subject to lottery and no racial integration requirements are applied. Transportation is not provided by the school district for open enrollment students. The popularity of the open enrollment program has increased so that today, 40% of students enroll in a school other than their neighborhood school.20 This high rate of participation in choice suggests a strong willingness on the part of PUSD parents to find the best schools for their children, even if it means going to a school outside their neighborhoods.

In recent years, a few PUSD schools have adopted distinctive themes. An International Baccalaureate (IB) Program is now in place in Willard Elementary, Wilson Middle School and Blair High School. The IB program uses a rigorous curriculum devised by the International Baccalaureate Organization in Switzerland. Students who pass challenging tests at the high school level receive an IB Diploma. More recently, the district adopted an arts emphasis at the McKinley K-8 school and a science emphasis at Washington Middle School. Critics say the McKinley magnet was poorly implemented at first, and large numbers of students who signed up for the school left mid-year. But the school has now improved, and McKinley students recently won the prestigious Bravo award for excellence in arts education from the Music Center of Los Angeles County. In one sign of the school's success, a number of McKinley teachers send their own children to the school. Critics say Washington's math/science magnet program, by contrast, has failed to reach a comparable level of success.

These special programs have had varied levels of success in attracting students. In 2004-05, among the schools with the IB program, Willard received 95 applications with 20 accepted, Wilson received 204 applications with 109 accepted, and Blair received 271 applications with 184 accepted. In 2004-05, the McKinley arts magnet attracted 361 applications with 214 accepted, but the Washington Middle science magnet received just 42 applications with 15 accepted. The district also has a number of high school "academies," but most are vocational in nature and are not highly sought after.

The three "volunteer" schools remain highly popular, even though they now use the district-wide curriculum (Open Court
Figure 8

Areas of major K-12 enrollment change in zones with over 100 students (2005)

Study areas with enrollment loss of over 50 students from 2001 to 2005 (red-yellow = loss of 1892 students)
Study areas with enrollment gain of over 5% from 2001 to 2005 (green = gain of 282 students)
reading and Saxon math) so the "fundamental" and "alternative" designations have lost much of their significance.

In 2004-05, Don Benito Fundamental received 996 applications with 140 accepted. Norma Coombs Alternative received 839 applications with 100 accepted, and Marshall Fundamental received 911 applications with 293 accepted.

Other steps have been taken to attract middle-class families to PUSD through restructuring of grade groupings. Because some middle-class families used PUSD for elementary school but left for middle and high school, K-8 programs were created at two schools – McKinley and Sierra Madre, modeled after the successful Norma Coombs K-8 configuration. Enrollment around both McKinley and Sierra Madre has increased recently.

A number of middle-class families are beginning to take a closer look at PUSD schools, and in July 2003, a group of about 10 families formed an organization known at the Pasadena Education Network (PEN) to urge other families who were likely candidates for private school to take a look at the public schools. PEN, whose list serve has grown to more than 500 people, helps organize school tours. The middle-class presence in the kindergarten class which entered in 2005 is slightly larger than that of the first grade class (which entered in 2004), but it is difficult to find a clear trend over the past several years.21

PEN organizers say their efforts to attract middle-class families have been made easier by two factors: the recently completed $300 million renovations of Pasadena public schools, which make the schools appear physically attractive; and rising student test scores. In 2001, only three PUSD schools scored over 700 on the API. By 2004, 14 schools did, and in 2005, 19 schools did.

At the high school level, there have been improvements, especially with respect to the Advanced Placement (AP) course program. In 2003, Marshall Fundamental was one of three schools in the nation to receive a College Board Inspiration Award for its work on equity and access to AP. And in 2006, Newsweek's annual survey of best American high schools cited Marshall's strong AP program, and a tripling in the portion of its students accepted at one of the University of California's campuses since 1997.22 Systemwide, the number of AP exams taken has increased, as has the number passing.

As PUSD has begun to make some modest strides in attracting more middle-class families and improving its overall quality, it is also facing the loss of larger numbers of low-income students due to demographic changes, spurred in part by rising housing costs and decisions by the city to encourage the construction of luxury apartments and condominiums.23 Between 2001 and 2005, the PUSD student population declined 9%. As Figure 7 shows, while there are small gains in student populations in middle-class areas surrounding...
McKinley and Sierra Madre, there are much larger losses in student population in the low-income Northwest section of Pasadena. Indeed, Northwest Pasadena and West Altadena accounted for 89.6% of the drop in enrollment.  

The loss in student population is expected to continue. According to a May 2006 report of Davis Demographics & Planning, if these trends continue PUSD enrollment is projected to decline from 21,220 students in 2005 to 18,640 students in 2012. Los Angeles County school enrollment as a whole is projected to decline from roughly 1.70 million students in 2004-2005 to 1.53 million students in 2014-2015. Statewide, more than 40% of public school districts are experiencing declining enrollment. Private schools in the PUSD district are also suffering declines in enrollment. Although the decline in low-income areas and the modest increase in high-income areas should result in a reduction in the proportion of low-income students in PUSD, it is not reflected in a decline in the percentage of students receiving free or reduced-price lunch because the district is now doing a better job of ensuring that students eligible for subsidized meals receive them.

The loss of student population – coupled with cuts in funding for schools from the state of California – has spawned a budget crisis in PUSD. California ranks 44th among the 50 states and the District of Columbia in per pupil expenditure adjusted for regional cost differences. Facing a substantial deficit, the school board moved to cut costs. Transportation and busing expenses were reduced by $1.3 million (out of a school district budget of $185 million), and four elementary schools are slated to be closed: Noyes, Edison Elementary, Allendale, and Linda Vista. Both moves drew opposition. Some families in Northwest Pasadena were upset that a reduction in busing would mean their children could no longer attend Sierra Madre Middle School and would be assigned to Washington. (Some though not all of that busing was restored.) Likewise, middle-class parents in Sierra Madre objected to the end of busing, arguing that their children benefited from the diversity the Northwest children brought, as well as the higher levels of funding through the federal Title I program for low-income students. Communities whose schools were targeted for closing also objected, to no avail.

Anger was especially strong among those who wondered why schools were being built to cater to the middle-class in Sierra Madre and McKinley, while other schools were being closed. Some said that given a limited pot of money, more funds should be spent on improving the schools in low-income areas where most of PUSD students reside rather than diverting it to chasing middle-class kids who are less needy. The debate over the school closings raised a fundamental issue: should the school district have the goal of achieving a greater economic mix in the public schools by attracting more middle-class families, or do those attempts represent a zero sum game in which the interests of low-income children are submerged?
IV. Why Attracting an Economic Mix in the Schools will Help Everyone in the School District

The enormous gap between the city's predominantly middle-class population and the school system's predominantly low-income population is bad for the school system not only because low enrollment means fewer state and federal funds but because having a strong core of middle-class families in a school is the single most important predictor of a school's success for all students, including the poor. All students, including low-income students, do better in an economically mixed environment than in schools with concentrated poverty. Researchers have for 40 years found that schools with high concentrations of poverty present, on average, a very difficult environment for student learning. While a few high poverty schools with charismatic principals and especially dedicated teachers have proven to be successful, the overwhelming majority of high poverty schools struggle. According to a study conducted by Douglas Harris of Florida State University, mixed income schools are 22 times as likely to be consistently high performing as high poverty schools.

The same pattern holds true for PUSD schools. As Figure 9 indicates, in general, more affluent schools score far higher on the California API than low-income schools. Test scores tend to be higher in schools on the left side of the figure – those with more affluent populations. There are some exceptions – Willard, Webster, and Franklin all score higher than one would expect for schools with substantial numbers of low-income students. But these three schools are unusual; for the remaining schools, there is a very strong association between socioeconomic status and achievement: the more middle-class students in a school, the higher the API scores (averaged 2004 and 2005).

All students, including low-income students, do better in an economically mixed environment than in schools with concentrated poverty.

Figure 8: Percentage of Schools that are Consistently High Performing, by Socioeconomic Status

![Figure 8](image_url)

Note: High poverty is defined as at least 50 percent of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch; mixed income is defined as fewer than 50 percent eligible. High performing is defined as being in the top third in the state in two subjects, in two grades, and over a two-year period.


Of course, low-income schools are less likely to perform well in part
Table 1: Pasadena Elementary Schools: Relationship Between Economic Diversity and Academic Achievement (2004 and 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School</th>
<th>% Subsidized Lunch</th>
<th>API Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allendale</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>734.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altadena</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burbank</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>681.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Benito</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edison</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>699.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>716.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>741.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>747.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>716.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda Vista</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loma Alta</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>672.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longfellow</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>711.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>668.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKinley</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>732.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norma Coombs</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noyes</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>741.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roosevelt</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>710.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Rafael</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sierra Madre</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington AE</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webster</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willard</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>776</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The API scores listed for three schools—McKinley, Norma Coombs Alternative, and Sierra Madre—include scores from grades K-8 rather than K-5. PUSD does not disaggregate scores for grades K-5 separately from grades 6-8 in K-8 schools. Because the average API score is higher for elementary schools than middle schools, on average in PUSD, it is possible that the K-5 scores at these three schools are higher than the K-8 Composite score.

Figure 9: Pasadena Elementary Schools: Relationship Between Economic Diversity and Academic Achievement (2004 and 2005)
because individual low-income students have less access to healthcare, adequate nutrition, a quiet place to do homework, and the like. On average, low-income students lag behind middle-class students in academic achievement even before they enter the public school system in kindergarten. But there is a separate problem that arises when low-income students are concentrated in schools separately from their middle-class peers.

The legendary Coleman Report of the 1960s found that after the influence of the family, the socioeconomic status of a school is the single most important determinant of a student's academic success. The basic findings of the report – that all children do better in mixed-income schools than in high-poverty schools – have been affirmed again and again in the research literature. In 2005, for example, University of California professor Russell Rumberger and his colleague Gregory J. Palardy found that a school's socioeconomic status – the percentage of students who are middle-class in the school – had as much impact on the achievement growth of high school students as a student's individual economic status.

Consider results from the 2000 National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) among fourth graders in math. The data show that nationally, low-income students in more affluent schools (11-50% free and reduced price lunch) score substantially higher (218 and 219) than low-income students in high poverty schools, those with 75% or more low income (204). This 14-15 point difference is the equivalent of a year and a half's progress. The data suggest that poor kids can learn at substantially higher levels if given the right environment.

In PUSD, the same pattern of achievement holds: all economic and racial groups do better in economically mixed schools than in schools with highly concentrated poverty even though, as we shall see below, PUSD's high poverty schools spend
Note: The average proficiency by percentage eligible for free and reduced price lunch is based on the following schools: 20-29% (Don Benito); 30-39% (Norma Coombs Alternative); 40-49% (Sierra Madre Elementary); 50-59% (McKinley, Noyes); 60-69% (Burbank, Hamilton); 70-79% (Allendale, Linda Vista, Loma Alta); 80-89% (Altadena, Cleveland, Edison, Field, Franklin, Longfellow, San Rafael, Webster, Willard); 90-99% (Jackson, Jefferson, Madison, Roosevelt, Washington AE).
substantially more money than the more affluent schools. Looking at the English Language Arts exam results averaged over two years (2004 and 2005), Figure 10 shows that low-income students in mixed income schools are more likely to be advanced or proficient than low-income students in high poverty schools.

Likewise, all the major racial and ethnic groups do better in mixed-income schools than in high poverty schools, including Latinos (Figure 11); African Americans (Figure 12); and nonHispanic whites (Figure 13).38

The Pasadena data tracks with other individual school districts throughout the country. For example, in a May 2002 study of third, fourth and fifth-grade students in Denver, Colorado found that 53-54% of low-income students attending schools where less than 50% of their classmates were low-income had proficient or advanced reading scores on the Colorado Student Assessment Program, while only 33% had such scores in high poverty schools (those with 75% or more students eligible for subsidized lunch.)39 Likewise, a program in the Wake County (Raleigh) North Carolina schools, which seeks to limit concentrations of poverty to no more than 40% low income in any school, has proven successful in boosting the achievement of low-income students. Compared with other large North Carolina districts which have high concentrations of school poverty, Wake's low-income students are performing considerably better with 63.8% passing End of Course exams compared with 48.7% in Durham, 51.8% in Forsyth, 47.9% in Guilford and 47.8% in Mecklenburg. (see Figure 14)

Powerful evidence also comes from the "Gautreaux" program in Chicago which allowed low-income African American families to move to middle-class neighborhoods as part of a housing discrimination remedy. According to Northwestern University researcher James Rosenbaum, students allowed to attend mixed-income schools fared far better than comparable students who applied for suburban housing vouchers but instead were assigned to city neighborhoods and attended city schools. The students who moved to the suburbs were four
times less likely to drop out (5 versus 20 percent), almost twice as likely to take college preparatory courses (40 versus 24 percent), twice as likely to attend college (54 versus 21 percent), and almost eight times as likely to attend a four-year college (27 versus 4 percent).  

Why is it advantageous for students to avoid concentrations of poverty? Most everything that educators talk about as desirable in a school – high standards, good teachers, active parents, a safe and orderly environment, a consistent student and teacher population – are found in mixed-income schools. By contrast, schools with high concentrations of poverty have student populations that are highly mobile and individuals whose aspirations have been impeded by lack of role models and low expectations and are more likely to act out; parents who are less able to be active in the school; and teachers who have lower teacher test scores, less experience, and low expectations.

While money matters a great deal in education, people matter more. Consider the three main sets of actors in a school: students, parents, and faculty (teachers and principals). Research suggests that students learn a great deal from their peers, so it is an advantage to have classmates who are academically engaged and aspire to go on to college. Peers in mixed-income schools are more likely to do homework, less likely to watch TV, less likely to cut class and more likely to graduate – all of which have been found to influence the behavior of classmates. Mixed-income schools report disorder problems half as often as low-income schools, so more learning goes on. It is also an advantage to have high achieving peers, whose knowledge is shared informally with classmates all day long. Middle-class peers come to schools

### Figure 14: 2004-2005 North Carolina High School End of Course Exams Composite

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>All students</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Low Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Durham</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>48.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forsyth</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>51.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilford</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>47.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>47.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wake</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: The End of Course Composite consists of all End of Course subjects. Low Income is defined as eligible for free or reduced-price lunch.
with twice the vocabulary of low-income children, on average, so any given child is more likely to expand his vocabulary in a mixed-income school through informal interaction.44

Parents are also an important part of the school community, and research finds that it is an advantage to attend a school where parents are actively involved, volunteer in the classroom, and hold school officials accountable. Many poor parents care deeply about their children's education, but because low-income parents are often working several jobs and may lack transportation, they are less likely to be involved than middle-class parents. In mixed-income schools, for example, parents are four times as likely to be members of the PTA and much more likely to participate in fundraising than in high poverty schools.45 In Pasadena, substantial amounts of money have been raised from parents at mixed-income schools like Don Benito, Norma Coombs, and McKinley. More broadly, when middle-class families are part of the public school system, they – and their friends and acquaintances – may be more likely to support school revenue measures than if the system is seen as one that educates "other people's" children.

Research finds that the best teachers, on average, are more attracted to mixed-income schools than those with concentrated poverty. Finally, research finds that the best teachers, on average, are more attracted to mixed-income schools than those with concentrated poverty. Nationally, teachers in schools with strong middle-class populations are more likely to be licensed, less likely to teach out of their field of expertise, less likely to have low teacher test scores, less likely to be inexperienced, and more likely to have greater formal education. Teachers generally consider it a promotion to move from poor to mixed-income schools, and the best teachers usually transfer into such schools at the first opportunity.46 Locally, Pasadena Unified has 81.5% of teachers fully credentialed, a lower rate than more affluent districts such as South Pasadena (98.4%), La Canada (98.3%), Arcadia (94.9%), and San Marino (95.6%). Moreover, teachers in mixed-income schools are more likely to have high expectations. Nationally, research has found that the grade of C in a mixed-income school is the same as a grade of A in a high poverty school, as measured by standardized tests results. Mixed-income schools are also more likely to offer AP classes and high level math.47 Despite recent lawsuits in California, schools with concentrations of poverty in the state continue to offer fewer AP classes.48

It is important to note that the research finds that the key issue in raising academic achievement is the economic mix in the school, not the racial and ethnic mix per se. While there is good reason to favor racially and ethnically integrated schools (to promote greater tolerance), the academic benefits of integration are associated with class. Researchers have found that the reason black achievement rose with racial desegregation in certain communities (like Charlotte, NC) was not that blacks benefited from sitting next to whites, but that low-income students benefited from a mixed-income school environment. By contrast, in communities like Boston, which tried to integrate low-income whites and low-income blacks, no significant achievement gains were found.49 In Pasadena, a school that is "majority-minority" like Don Benito (37% white), performs at very high levels because there is a strong core of middle class families (71%) of all races and ethnicities.
It is also important to note that middle-class achievement is not hurt by the presence of low-income students in mixed-income schools. In Wake County (Raleigh), for example, middle-class achievement continues to rise, even as low-income students are doing better. This is a crucial finding for middle-class parents who are understandably concerned that their children not be used as guinea pigs for a social experiment that helps low-income children. Sherri Phillips, a middle-class parent in Wake County, said that the economic mix concerned some parents at first, but the attitude has changed over time, given excellent test results. Moreover, many middle-class parents realize that their children affirmatively benefit from exposure to diversity. "We can't live in a box, like everybody's the same and you're just like me," she told one reporter. "You can't do that."50 Another suburban Raleigh parent, Betty Trevino, told The New York Times that she doesn't mind the distance her son travels to attend a mixed-income magnet school located in Raleigh. "I think it works," she says, "because it's such a good school."51

While some argue that PUSD should simply "fix" high poverty schools by investing "more resources," it is important to note that the highest poverty schools in the district – which have the lowest test scores – also spend the most. In very rough terms, the districts spends $4800 per pupil in general revenue, but spends another $1380 (for a total of $6180) for students in schools with concentrations of low-income students, English language learners, and lower test scores. (These numbers do not include general district spending on such matters as administration.) For example, in fiscal year '06-'07, Federal Title I funds for low-income students range from nearly $400,000 at Washington Accelerated Elementary to $0 at Don Benito.52 By the same token, PUSD spends more, not less, per capita than some of the surrounding public school districts like La Canada. What the money measure misses is the critical role of nonmaterial "resources" – academically engaged peers, active parents, and the best teachers – that flow, on average, to mixed-income schools.

Pasadena public schools are caught in a trap: to attract the middle class, the schools need to improve; but to significantly improve, the schools need more middle-class students. While there are individual high poverty schools that beat the odds, there are no high poverty school districts anywhere in the nation that are high performing.53 To extricate itself from this Catch-22, Pasadena schools need to change the paradigm by doing something dramatic.
A. Honoring Twin Goals: Excellence and Equity.

In the past, PUSD has engaged in segregation, then tried compulsory busing. The first was wrong, and the second backfired. Segregated schools "held" the middle class, but was racist and inequitable. Compulsory busing sought to remedy an egregious wrong but resulted in massive flight from the public schools. PUSD needs a third way – beyond busing without options on the one hand and a return to de facto segregated neighborhood schools on the other.

On one level, PUSD has already moved beyond official segregation and compulsory busing through its system of open enrollment. But the current student assignment regime has negative remnants of both of the older systems. Roughly 60% of students attend assigned schools, many of which are economically and racially isolated. The other 40% employ choice, but in large measure, it is choice without special curricular and pedagogical approaches, and as such has failed to attract large numbers of middle-class families.

To serve the twin goals of excellence and equity, PUSD officials should consider adopting an extensive system of magnet schools – with real thematic choices – to provide an excellent education for students currently using the system and a strong incentive for families using private schools or considering private school, to use PUSD. At the same time, choice should be implemented in a way that ensures all students – low-income and middle-class – have a chance to attend good, economically mixed, public schools.

The goal of PUSD reform should be to provide every student in the school district with a first-rate education. This means making sure that every school in the system is excellent -- that it provides principals, teachers, staff, students and parents with the resources they need. We know, however, that individual students learn differently. Schools can help them reach their full potential, but there is no single formula, no cookie-cutter approach, to achieving this goal. A strong school system provides parents and students with learning options so that different students can reach the same destination -- achieving at their highest potential -- from different paths.

The plan outlined below is ambitious, but Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre have the potential to have a first-class public school system. In fact, with all its world-class institutions and engaged citizens, it is probably fair to say that

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10 Pillars to Creating A System of Equitable Magnet Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Create Real Choices for Families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Involve Parents and Teachers in Determining the Options Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide A Coherent Trajectory K-12 But Prioritize Magnets at the Secondary Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Give Priority to Applicants who are Walkers, Siblings, and Promote Economic Diversity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre have more potential to improve the public school system than any other cities their size in the country. What's missing so far is the political will -- particularly among its political leaders, business leaders, and civic leaders -- to fully engage in this task. A few key leaders need to step up to the plate and embrace reform, form partnerships, engage grassroots participation, identify a vision and develop a roadmap. These leaders can catalyze a process -- requiring several years to carry out -- that can dramatically improve PUSD. It will take hard work, and there may be some setbacks along the way, but the legacy will be to secure a positive future for the children in the community and, by doing so, a healthier community for all.

B. A System of Equitable Magnet Schools

This report recommends a system of equitable magnet schools resting on 10 pillars.

1. Create Real Choices for Families.

PUSD has extensive open enrollment, but few genuine magnet schools. A magnet school should offer the basic curriculum to all students -- reading, math and the like -- but on top of the basic academic program, offer a plus. That plus can come in the form of a pedagogical approach (fundamental, Montessori, Multiple Intelligence, multi-age classrooms) or a theme (math/science, the arts, language). The point is not that any particular magnet theme would be attractive to everyone -- it won't be -- but that it will be attractive to a significant number of families because it fits the individual needs of their children.

Choice is important here because parents have critical insights into what kind of educational approach will motivate, excite and challenge their children. It is important to emphasize that under a system of magnet schools, every student will learn the basics of reading, writing, math, science, art, music and citizenship to prepare her for the future, whether it be college or vocational training. But magnets offer something extra. In addition, each magnet school will attract a cluster of principals and teachers who are excited about and committed to teaching in a school that builds on their strengths in terms of pedagogical approaches and curriculum, so this system will be motivational for the principals and teachers and get them to work at their very best. It is also important to note that whether parents choose to send their children to the closest school in their neighborhood or to a school in another neighborhood, a magnet system will promote a stronger sense of "learning communities" because everyone in each school -- parents, students, principals, and teachers -- will have made a positive choice to go there. This system of magnet schools builds on some of the successes already underway in PUSD, such as the IB program, the arts focus at McKinley, the academic and arts program at Norma Coombs, and the fundamental program at Don Benito.

2. Draw on Pasadena Resources

PUSD currently has forged partnerships with a number of leading Pasadena institutions -- Cal Tech, JPL, the Arts Center and others -- but those partnerships could be taken a step further so that individual schools take on themes associated with various community resources. Five examples come readily to mind. These ideas may be revised, but they illustrate the way in which private/public partnerships could be used to create attractive public magnet schools.

A Math/Science Magnet affiliated with Cal Tech, JPL, Jacobs, and Parsons.

The school -- or series of K-5, Middle and High Schools -- would teach a basic curriculum but put a special emphasis on the sciences. Teachers would receive special training in
innovative techniques for communicating math and science. Artwork hanging in the hallways of the school would be geared toward themes like space exploration. In high school, students might have the opportunity for internships at JPL, Jacobs, or Parsons or with scientists and high-tech professionals at various think tanks and firms, such as idea lab. Cal Tech faculty, graduate students, undergraduates, and area alumni might become involve in mentoring at the school.

There are many successful math/science magnet schools after which PUSD could model its program. The California Academy of Mathematics and Science, for example, is a public magnet high school located on the campus of California State University, Dominguez Hills in Carson. The school draws students from middle schools in Long Beach Unified, Compton Unified and several other districts. Founded with the help of a $1 million grant from TRW, the school is aimed at boosting the number of female and minority scientists and engineers. Today some 95% of graduates attend four year colleges and universities, including Cal Tech, MIT, Harvard and Berkeley.

Although Cal Tech is not equipped to set up a Cal Tech Lab School by itself (it does not have an education school the way many universities do), in partnership with other science-oriented institutions in the city, it could help develop a very attractive magnet school. The school would be open to all Pasadena public school students but might be particularly attractive to the thousands of parents who are employees – secretaries, lab technicians, scientists, janitors and middle managers – at Cal Tech, JPL, Jacobs, Parsons and other scientific and technology-oriented institutions in the area. Given Pasadena's student population, the school might become a valued source of diversity for these institutions as well. If it succeeded, the Math/Science Magnet could become a selling point for employers seeking to recruit new employees who would cannot afford to use private schools for their children.

The school might be named after Albert Einstein, who spent time at Cal Tech. One can imagine a school which became a source of great pride in the community – with parents sporting bumper stickers about the Einstein Math/Science Magnet, the way many private school parents currently boast of their children's private school attendance.54

In addition to educating its students to excel in math and science, the school would also be responsible for developing math/science curricula and teaching methods that can be utilized in other PUSD schools. The math/science school will thus have significant ripple effects throughout the district, helping students who are not enrolled in this school. Given the remarkable clustering of scientific talent in the PUSD-area, it is shocking that community leaders have not found a better way to take advantage of this natural resource in their own backyard.

Many middle-class parents, concerned that arts programs have been cut from some public schools under pressure from the federal No Child Left Behind Act, might flock to a school known for its priority on creativity.
A Theater, Arts and Music Magnet High School affiliated with the Arts Center College, the Pasadena Playhouse, the Armory, the Huntington Library, and the Norton Simon Museum.

The McKinley K-8 School, with its emphasis on the arts, has been fairly successful in attracting a middle-class population, alongside its lower-income student cohort. After a rocky beginning, McKinley is now a source of pride in PUSD. A strong high school program might prove an important complement to McKinley. (And, to the extent McKinley becomes oversubscribed, there may be room for a second K-8 arts program.) The school could have a particular emphasis on the arts, music, and theater, and forge strong ties with the Arts Center College of Design, the Pasadena Playhouse, the Armory, the Huntington Library, and the Norton Simon Museum. Many middle-class parents, concerned that arts programs have been cut from some public schools under pressure from the federal No Child Left Behind Act, might flock to a school known for its priority on creativity. With a strong emphasis on design, the school might also appeal to parents who are concerned that their children learn practical skills as well as an appreciation for Van Gogh.

Many of the cultural institutions in Pasadena already have strong school programs, which could continue to be available to all students in the district, but the Theater, Arts and Music Magnet School could become known for those who want an especially intensive exposure to the arts. The school might even offer extra space (which is abundantly available in PUSD) to nonprofit arts groups, with clear guidelines for shared use.55

A College Academy affiliated with Pasadena City College.

A special magnet high school might build on relationships with another important local resource: Pasadena City College (PCC). Currently, individual students in PUSD (generally juniors and seniors) may take college courses at PCC for $26 a credit (the fee is often waived for Pasadena students), but very few do. Surrounding districts have much greater levels of participation. PUSD could create a College Academy High School in which students routinely take a fairly large number of PCC courses. The courses might be taken at PCC, or be taught by PCC faculty in empty space in one of Pasadena's high schools. To serve students who are vocationally oriented, a part of the school could be devoted to those programs.56

A Health Sciences Magnet affiliated with the Huntington Hospital and Kaiser Permanente.

A special magnet devoted for health sciences, for high school students interested in becoming doctors, nurses, or health technicians, could be affiliated with the well-known Huntington Hospital and possibly as well with Kaiser Permanente, a major local employer. The magnet could be modeled after Los Angeles's highly successful Francisco Bravo Medical Magnet, opened in 1990, and located near County/USC Medical Center.

A Dual Language Spanish-English Immersion Magnet.

One of the great resources in PUSD is the rich linguistic and cultural diversity of the community. In PUSD, 21.7% of students are English learners who speak Spanish.57 A dual-language immersion program, in which half the student population were Spanish dominant and half English dominant would tap into those resources for all students. In dual language immersion programs, schools have signs in both
languages, and some classes are taught to both groups of children mostly in Spanish, with other classes taught mostly in English. Students typically become extremely fluent in both languages after six years.\(^58\)

The program would be attractive to English speaking families (of whatever race or ethnicity) who would like their children to become fluent in Spanish. Today, some affluent parents send their children abroad to become immersed in a foreign language. Some find private schools attractive because of the emphasis placed on languages. A public dual language immersion program would offer a unique opportunity to become fluent in a foreign language through a public school, at no cost to the parents.

And the program would be attractive to those Spanish speaking families who would like their children to be fluent in English, and also like the message that dual language programs send: that there is value in all students. In a dual language program, students from different backgrounds come together on equal footing. If elements of Spanish history and culture were built into the program, this would fill a current void in the curriculum. In meetings, members of the Latino community often expressed concern that their views were ignored by PUSD; a school (or schools) which met their needs might address some of these feelings.\(^59\)

There are other significant resources in the Pasadena area that could be drawn upon, such as the Huntington Library, the Pacific Oaks College, Earthlink, and the nonsectarian divisions of Fuller Theological Seminary. A Business Magnet might form a partnership with some of the major employers in town. The possibilities go on and on.

### 3. Involve Parents and Teachers in Determining the Options Available.

Rather than decreeing a list of magnet schools from on high, PUSD should consider polling and surveying parents in the community (those using public school, those using private school, and those with pre-schoolers) to get a sense of what types of magnets would be most attractive. Focus groups could also be employed. All parents want a school with good teachers, a safe campus, and up-to-date equipment and books, but what pedagogical approaches or curricular themes are especially exciting to parents? What is it that the private schools are offering that is enticing (for example, an emphasis on the arts or languages), and how could the public schools provide something even better? Parent surveys were critical for the establishment of magnet programs in places like Montclair, New Jersey, Duval County, Florida and Hot Springs, Arkansas.\(^60\)

The list of school options might include the five outlined above. But it might also include a "Core Knowledge" School associated with the theories of educator E.D. Hirsch, who emphasizes learning broad swaths of academic material; an Essential School associated with the theories of educator Theodore Sizer, who emphasizes in-depth knowledge of a smaller number of topics; or a Multiple Intelligences School associated with the theories of educator Howard Gardner, who says each person has eight intelligences – linguistic, logical-mathematical, spatial, musical, bodily-kinesthetic, interpersonal, intrapersonal, and naturalistic – and that conventional schools tend to ignore several of these. A Montessori school, with its emphasis on active learning and multi-age class groupings, might be attractive to some families, while a school which emphasizes the environment and outdoor activities might be attractive to others.

Teachers and principals should also be involved in the process of identifying appropriate magnet schools. Teachers often
become excited about the subject area they teach in and about different pedagogical approaches. One of the advantages of a system of magnets is that teachers can better match their particular interests and beliefs about teaching to a particular type of school.  

**4. Implement the System of Magnet Schools Deliberately and Carefully Building Up to a Goal of Making Every School a Magnet School.**

Creating good magnet schools requires careful planning, teacher training, and careful implementation. Slapping a magnet name on a school which is not fully prepared to implement the program can backfire and drive more families away from the public school system. Magnet programs should be phased in, so that students currently attending a given school are grandfathered and allowed to stay until they reach the point of moving onto another school level.

But the long-term goal is to have every school offer something distinctive over time. Rather than create a system of (desirable) magnet schools and (less desirable) regular schools, eventually every school can be a magnet school. This is the model used in places like Cambridge, MA and Montclair, NJ and is based on successful designs put together by Professors Charles Willie of Harvard University and Michael Alves of Brown University.  

Once a system of universal magnets is put into place, all families should be required to choose a school at the beginning of elementary, middle and high schools. (Their choice could be the neighborhood school.) Universal choice avoids problems of stratification that arise under systems in which middle-class parents tend to actively exercise choice while low-income parents tend to "choose not to choose."

**5. Provide A Coherent Trajectory K-12 But Prioritize Magnets at the Secondary Level.**

The magnet themes and approaches selected should offer a consistent and coherent program throughout the K-12 process. Today, PUSD schools offer a consistent track in a Fundamental education (Don Benito Elementary, Marshall Middle and High School), and the International Baccalaureate Program (Willard Elementary, Wilson Middle School and Blair High School). Similar coordination between elementary and secondary schooling should be provided as magnet offerings are made available.

In developing magnet programs it may make sense to begin with secondary schools, which often lose families to private schools. In recent years, there has been strong demand for an increasing number of elementary schools within PUSD. Prioritizing magnet offerings at the secondary level might boost the chances of retaining these families. Ultimately, though, a coherent K-12 program is an important goal. School officials should consider giving priority in the lottery to students who are continuing in a certain type of program in middle school and high school admissions.
6. Adjust the Types of Magnet Offerings to Reflect Demand

As the system of magnet schools is built up, some will be overchosen year after year and others may be underchosen. The oversubscribed schools should be franchised. For example, if Fundamental schools are oversubscribed in year in and year out, rather than rejecting large numbers of families (who may turn to private school), the district should create a second, sister Fundamental magnet school. Over time, severely under-chosen schools which have failed to attract families should be closed and reopened with a more desirable program. For school boards which face inevitable community outrage whenever schools need to be closed, or whenever boundaries are changed, it is desirable to have an objective way to make decisions about closing schools; those that are most underchosen are the least justified in staying open.

7. High Academic Quality and a Strict Discipline Policy.

In order for magnet schools to be attractive to families with options, they have to provide not only an interesting theme or pedagogical approach but also a strong core academic program and a safe and disciplined environment. In interviews, middle class families now in private school returned again and again to the importance of discipline. Observers say John Muir High School saw a dramatic improvement in this area following the adoption of a zero tolerance policy which said that students who engaged in fights would be referred to juvenile court. National evidence suggests that families of all racial and ethnic groups place a high priority on school discipline.

National evidence suggests that families of all racial and ethnic groups place a high priority on school discipline.

8. Provide Free Transportation and Good Information to Students and Parents.

To ensure that all students have an equal opportunity to attend any of the magnet school offerings, the district should provide reasonable transportation free of cost to students. The logistical difficulties in Pasadena are modest compared to other districts. PUSD covers a total of 34.2 square miles according to U.S. Census data. By comparison, Wake County North Carolina, which has an extensive system of magnet schools, measures 864 square miles. In some senses, Pasadena is the ideal size for an extensive system of magnets: big enough that it is able to offer lots of different appealing options, but small enough so as not to be unmanageable. (See also discussion about costs below)

PUSD should explore ways of collaborating with established public transportation systems – with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transit Authority (MTA) and the Pasadena Area Rapid Transit System (ARTS) in designing a transportation plan for PUSD students. Such collaboration might save money and reduce the number and cost of buses that PUSD has to provide through a private contractor. Already, 40 percent of PUSD students attend schools outside their immediate neighborhoods. A free transportation system would relieve the burden on parents to provide transportation, which poses some hardships on working parents.

In addition, to ensure equity, all families should be provided high quality information about the magnet alternatives offered. Special outreach should be made to communities that may not have availed themselves of choice under the exiting Open Enrollment system. In order to avoid domination of the choice system by well-informed middle-class parents, PUSD should work with a variety of community organizations, social service agencies, parents' groups, and religious congregations in the community to educate parents about their options and help them mobilize to have a strong voice in PUSD matters.
9. Give Priority to Applicants who are Walkers, Siblings, and Promote Economic Diversity

While magnet school applicants should generally be admitted by lottery, the system should build in three priorities: for walkers, for siblings, and to ensure that choice promotes economic diversity rather than economic segregation.

Most people agree that a family which lives across the street from (or in close proximity to) a school should receive a priority in admissions. Likewise, it is better not to break families up into different schools, so siblings should be given a priority. To ensure that there is equity between schools, and that all students benefit from an influx of middle-class families, steps should also be taken to ensure a healthy economic mix at all schools. While it is desirable to have a good ethnic and racial mix as well, the drivers of academic achievement are class-based. While there are legal complications to using race in student assignment, there are no similar obstacles to considering a student's socioeconomic status.

Some school districts, like Cambridge Massachusetts, set an explicit goal that all schools should be within a certain percentage point range of the district's socioeconomic average. In the case of PUSD, an immediate mandate that all schools reflect the district average might well result in middle-class flight from certain schools that are now well below that average (Don Benito, for example, has just 29.9% of students eligible for subsidized lunch). Such a move would be counterproductive. It would be more prudent to set very wide bands initially (say, ± 30% free and reduced lunch). Over time, if the middle class population grows in the district – as demographers are predicting – the band can be slowly narrowed, as more predominantly middle-class schools will fall closer and closer to within a range of the district average.

10. Avoid within-school Segregation.

It is important to take steps to ensure that economically integrated school buildings do not become rigidly segregated by economic status at the classroom level. Japan has been very successful in using mixed ability classrooms at the elementary school level, with greater grouping by ability in the secondary years. Even in the later grades, it makes more sense to group in some subjects (math) than in others (civics). And steps should be taken to avoid racial, ethnic or economic bias in tracking, and to find creative ways to ensure that the best teachers do not wind up teaching only in the advanced classes.

C. Will It Work?

Is the Plan too Costly?

Given that PUSD has been going through a budget crisis, can the district afford a new system of magnet schools? Can it afford not to?

Magnet plans are not inexpensive. They require a special curriculum, special teacher training, and transportation, among other things. Estimates on the extra costs associated with magnet schools range from $200 more per pupil to as much as 12% more per pupil compared with other schools. But in Pasadena, which already has an extensive system of public school choice, a few of the very popular schools – like Don Benito – are what educators call "natural" magnets, schools that are already attracting lots of students year after year and don't require a dime in extra spending. And there are several sources of outside funding that the district could tap for other magnet programs.

The costs of transportation required in a system of public school choice and magnet schools always provide a fat political target, and raise the argument: "We should spend money on the classroom rather than on busing." In fact,
transportation is currently a tiny portion of the PUSD budget – approximately 2.5 percent. Nationally, 57% of public school students are transported at an annual cost of less than $500 per pupil. In Pasadena, the annual cost per general education student is $750 when transported by school bus and $486 when transported by MTA. (The cost per special education student can be far higher) Under the federal No Child Left Behind Act, school districts are required to pay transportation costs for students in Title I schools that have failed to make adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years so that they can attend a better performing public school.

Moreover, if transportation ends up providing a healthy economic mix of students in a school, the research suggests that is far more effective than the extra $1380 being spent on low income students in Pasadena, where, in high poverty schools, there is sometimes little to show for the extra expenditure. Controlled studies in San Francisco, St. Louis and Norfolk, Virginia found that students in racially and economically integrated settings had greater academic gains than similarly situated students who received extra compensatory per pupil spending in racially and economically segregated schools.

Significantly, PUSD can look to outside sources of support for funding magnet schools and transportation. The state currently provides financial assistance for transportation to PUSD’s three voluntary magnet schools. There is also state funding available from the California Department of Education for specialized secondary schools. The federal government provides more than $100 million annually in grants through the Magnet School Assistance Program (MSAP) to which PUSD can apply in a competition with other school districts. Private foundations have already supported PUSD programs like the International Baccalaureate magnets and could be tapped more aggressively. Finally, part of the advantage of forming partnerships between PUSD and wealthy private institutions in Pasadena – such as Cal Tech and the Arts Center – is that private and nonprofit sector sources can help contribute to the cost of creating special magnet programs.

Will the Plan Engage the Entire Community?
The district has been trying to persuade all families – including those with options – to use the public schools for years. There has been some modest success in recent years. Will a system of magnet schools be even more effective than past efforts, particularly in attracting parents of pre-school children who are deciding whether or not to use public schools?

Given the very high rate of private school usage in Pasadena, there is an unusually large pool of potential families from which to draw. Some families will never consider the public schools no matter how attractive they are. But many more may prefer both the price and the idea of using high quality public schools.

Private school tuition in Pasadena can top $20,000 a year. Some parents would prefer to have less financial pressure, and work fewer hours so they could spend more time with their children. And, outside of a handful of truly excellent schools, many of the private schools in the Pasadena area are not very academically distinguished many observers say. Aside from the financial incentive to use public schools, some Pasadena parents appear to have a "public school ideology," that is, they prefer the idea of using public schools in a democratic society so long as those schools are strong.

There is some preliminary evidence to suggest that there is demand for greater choice in Pasadena. According to one survey, sponsored by the PUSD Commission on Educational Choice in May 2003, parents said they wanted more schools with specialized curriculum focus by a margin of 79.3%-

Private and nonprofit sector sources can help contribute to the cost of creating special magnet programs.
11.6% (8.4% were neutral), but the response rate was very low. Likewise, a small poll of families in the Linda Vista neighborhood conducted in November 2005 found strong support for magnets which focused on Basic Skills/ Fundamental, Gifted and Talented, and Math/Science/ Technology. There are early signs of success at attracting middle-class families in schools like McKinley and Sierra Madre, and the growing list of PEN families may auger a renewed commitment to public schools among the middle class.

Outside of Pasadena, there are other examples of success. In urban districts like Hartford, Connecticut, special magnet schools, one with a Montessori program, another with a Multiple Intelligences philosophy, have long waiting lists of suburban middle-class students. Likewise, when Cambridge Massachusetts first magnetized all of the schools in the early 1980s, the public schools saw a 32% increase in new white students and a 13% increase in new minority students over four years. The overall share of school aged students attending public schools rose from 75% to 88% over a six year period. Hot Springs, Arkansas, saw its enrollment drop from 6000 students to 2800, but its adoption of a magnet program in 2000 reversed the decline, and today enrollment has risen to 3555 students.

Breaking out of old ways will require strong leadership not only from the schools themselves, but from the larger community. A 2004 U.S. Department of Education study found that community leaders in places like Raleigh, North Carolina and Chattanooga, Tennessee, were critical to the creation of vibrant and successful magnet schools that have immeasurably strengthened the public schools in those communities. A genuine commitment of a core group of civic and business leaders in St. Louis was also instrumental to preserving a public school choice program to ensure equal opportunity for all students. Business leaders saw that a system of choice in the area yielded higher high school and college graduation rates and rallied behind the program. There are some preliminary signs that community leaders in Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre may be ready to step up to the challenge. Donations from foundations, corporations, and individuals to the Pasadena Educational Foundation, for support of the public schools have risen 113% in recent years, from $844,000 in 1998 to $1.8 million so far in the 2005-2006 school year. Large contributions include a $650,000 grant from Washington Mutual for staff development, parenting programs and awards to teachers for classroom projects; a $560,000 grant from the California Endowment for health programs; and a $350,000 individual gift for computer labs.

Creating a Virtuous Cycle
Ultimately, a well-designed and executed plan of universal magnet schools should create a virtuous cycle: by drawing in some middle-class families, the district should see a rise in test scores for two reasons. The presence of greater numbers of middle-class children will make the aggregate scores rise on average given their more advantaged home environments. Moreover, the evidence suggests the positive effects of economic mixing should trigger a rise in the scores of low-income students already attending the public schools. As test scores rise, more middle-class families will be attracted to the public schools, and test scores will rise further. As more middle-class families come to know the public school system, overall political support for public schools should rise, and new financial resources are likely to become available to purchase important things (teacher development, enriched curriculum, smaller class size), triggering another rise in test scores.

A student now attending a high poverty school with low levels
of parental involvement and low test scores would have access to a special magnet program that would better fit her needs. If the program attracted a mixed income population, she would be surrounded by peers who have big dreams and expect to go on to college as a matter of course, and she would perform, the research suggests, at higher levels. A middle-class student, now attending a private school, could attend the same high quality magnet – with, say, a math/science theme – receiving an excellent education and interacting with students different than him. His parents would save a lot of money now devoted to tuition and enjoy more time with their children. A science teacher, now plugging along in a traditional school, would know the excitement of getting up every day to teach in a school with a special emphasis on a theme about which she cares deeply, working alongside other like-minded teachers and having the chance to work with Cal Tech faculty and Parsons engineers.

This favorable scenario is possible, but by no means inevitable. It is far easier to stick to well known patterns of behavior, with low-income students consigned to inferior public schools, along with a minority of middle-class students, while large number of middle-class and wealthy students attend private schools. The two Pasadenas have lived side by side for many years; separation is the default position. But continuing down this path represents a missed opportunity, and involves an ongoing mismatch between the city of Pasadena and its neighbors Altadena and Sierra Madre, which are largely thriving, and the system of public schools, which is not. Pasadena, Altadena and Sierra Madre will never be fully stable – or realize their full potential – until the public schools are as strong as the community as a whole.
Appendix: List of People Interviewed

Ria Apodoca, PUSD Teacher
Karen Aydelott, Executive Director, YMCA
Mike Babcock, Member, PUSD Board of Education
Vernon Baptiste, Past President, Altadena Rotary
German Barrero, Parent, Chair, PUSD Community Advisory Committee for Special Education
Brian Biery, Director, Neighborhood Connections
William Bibbiani, Member, PUSD Board of Education
Bill Bogaard, Mayor, City of Pasadena
Raul Borbon, Member, Institute for Popular Education of Southern California
Chris Brandow, Executive Director, Pasadena Education Network
George Brumder, Retired Lawyer
Maureen Carlson, Retired Lawyer
Dr. Percy Clark, Superintendent of Schools
Jackie Clem, Co-President, Pasadena Education Network
Melody Comfort, Parent, PTA Council Member
Ray Cortines, Former PUSD Superintendent of Schools and Former Chancellor, New York City Schools
William Creim, Attorney, Creim, Macias & Koenig
Hall Daily, Assistant Vice President, Government and Community Relations, California Institute of Technology
Dick Davis, Volunteer, Community member
Rosa de la Cruz, Parent, Latino Forum participant
Vannia de la Cuba, Field Representative for Pasadena City Council
Connie de la Torre, Parent, Latino Forum participant
Prentice Deadrick, Member, PUSD Board of Education and parent
Peter Dreier, Professor, Occidental College, Parent
Kathy Duba, Deputy Superintendent, PUSD
Randy Ertel, Executive Director, El Centro d'Accion Social
Jesus Esparza, Former Chair, Community Advisory Committee for Bond Measure, Measure Y
Serafin Espinoza, Director, Villa Parke Community Center
Tanya Flores, Parent, Latino Forum participant
Jon Fuhrman, Manager, Application Development, Employers Insurance Group
Ty Gaffney, Principal, Sierra Madre Elementary and Middle
Richard Gray, Head, LaSalle High School
Ron Hacker, Former PUSD Food Services Director
Art Hammond, Jet Propulsion Laboratory
Bob Harrison, President, PEF Board of Directors, Parent
Mike Hendricks, Director, Government Funding and Elementary Curriculum
Efraim Hernandez, President, Washington Middle School PTA, Parent
Dolores Hickambottom, Retired Field Director for State Senator Jack Scott
John Hitchcock, Executive Director, Hillsides Home for Children
Ed Honowitz, President, PUSD Board of Education, Parent
Michael Hurley, President, Linda Vista Annandale Residents Association
Rose Ingber, Principal, Jackson Elementary
Susan Johnson, Parent, Researcher
Debbie Jones, Parent, Blair High School
Dr. Susan Kane, Associate Director, Beckman Research Institute, City of Hope Medical Center
Peter Kaufman, President, Glenair
Kim Kenne, Parent, Altadena Task Force member
Lena Kennedy, Parent and District Director to Assemblywoman Carol Liu
James Kossler, President, Pasadena City College
Sue Lafferty, Education Director, Huntington Library
Fred Law, Parent, Audio Restoration Engineer
Paul Little, Member, Pasadena City Council
Isela Lopez, Parent, Latino Forum participant
Esteban Lizardo, Member, Board of Education
Linda Machida, Parent and PEF grant writer
Roberta Martinez, Executive Director, Latino Heritage Association
Kristin Maschka, Member, Pasadena Education Network and parent
Mark Mastromatteo, President, McKinley PTA, Parent
Maria Matias, Parent, Latino Forum participant
Kim Matsunaga, Administrative Director, Huntington-USC Institute on California and the West
Jennifer McCreight, Parent, Representative of Guidance Software, Inc.
James McNulty, CEO, Parsons Corporation
Corinne McQuigen, Provost, Pacific Oaks College
Gary Moody, Pasadena NAACP
Cheri Moreno, Business Manager, PUSD
Larry Morrison, Partner, The Arroyo Group
Stella Murga, Executive Director, Pasadena Youth Center
Eddie Newman, Director, Regional Occupation Programs and Partnership Academies
Ryan Newman, Community Member
Ligia Ocampo, Parent, Latino Forum participant
Dawn O'Keefe, Parent, Blair High School
Hermina Ortiz, Parent, Latino Forum participant
Carolyn Ota, PTA Council President
Oscar Palmer, Former Principal, Rose City Continuation School
Joan Palmer, Past President, Arts Commission
Scott Phelps, Member, Board of Education, former PUSD teacher
Mikala Rahn, President, Public Works, Inc., Parent
David Seidler, Jet Propulsion Lab
Joy Silvern, OneLA, Invest in Kids
Marguerite Ann Snow, Ph.D, Parent, Professor, Charter College of Education, California State University, Los Angeles
Peter Soelter, Member, Board of Education
Joyce Streator, Member, Pasadena City Council
Bethel Tor, President, United Teachers of Pasadena, PUSD Teacher
William Trimble, City of Pasadena Planning Department
Sid Tyler, Member, Pasadena City Council
John Van de Kamp, Former California Attorney General; Chair, PEF Leadership Council
David Walker, Director of Public Programs, Art Center College of Design
Scott Ward, Executive Director, Armory Center for the Arts
Joyce Westletoff, Parent, Invest in Kids
Polly Wheaton, Sotheby's International Realty
Lyla White, Executive Director, Pasadena Playhouse
Rita Whitney, Sotheby's International Realty
Larry Wilson, Editor, Pasadena Star News
Marge Wyatt, Former PUSD School Board member
Inez Yslas, Latino Forum participant
Joe Zeronian, Co-Director, Rossier School of Education, USC
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