

Welcome you're listening to a UC Davis Center for Poverty Research Conference podcast. I am the center's deputy director, Marianne Page. In January 2014 the center hosted the war on Poverty conference. The conference hosted top Poverty experts from across the country to discuss the U.S. safety net on the 50 year anniversary on the war on Poverty.

In this presentation Sarah Revver discusses the history and legacy of Title one, the 1965 legislation which sought to improve academic achievement among on disadvantaged youth. Weaver is an associate professor of public policy in the UCLA Luskin School of Public Affairs and a faculty research fellow of the National Bureau of Economic Research.

>> Okay, so thanks so much to the organizers and it's been it's been really fun seeing all the papers so far, and. And thank you for staying on I'm gonna be talking about the history and legacy of Title one, which is Title one of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which is the K-12 battle in the, in the War on Poverty.

This is, I'm gonna be drawing a lot of joint work with Liz Casio and, and Nora Gordon. Throughout the talk though I, I should not impli, implicate them in this talk itself.

>> That's okay.

>> The, the, the work is it's so long agenda that we have had so I'll begin with you obligatory photo of, of Johnson signing my piece of the War on Poverty.

And what he said about it so this was in 1965 with his one of his Elementary school teachers. I, maybe the only one to include a photo of George W Bush, um, but this is the the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is and Title one in particular is formerly still with us and was last reauthorized as no child left behind in, 2002, and has not actually be reauthorized since then.

It's supposed to be every five years, but I'll, I'll come back to this a little bit at the end. And they basically have been, funding with continuing reg, resolutions because. They they are continuing to give the money but there is a lot of debate about the stings and I'm going to talk a lot about the importance of the strings that come with this program.

Ok so we have seen a lot over the last day and a half about inequality in opportunity and outcomes. Let me just start with a little bit of what things looked like, in the education room in this, before the War on Poverty began. So opportunities and outcomes were, were very unequal, when the War on Poverty was declared think you, looking at Elementary and Secondary spending, the the suburbs spent about 50 % more per pupil than, than their cities at that time.

And the five highest income states, spent more than twice as much as the, the five lowest income states and I'm gonna show you some, some state level analyses states are, incredibly important in, in school finance they were at the time and they, they continue to be. But I'll show you how, how this, this sort of thing has evolved over time among 26 to 30 year old whites in 1960, 71% were high school grads in the five highest income states and 52% in the, in the lowest income states.

So there was, across states and, a lot of this is regional. A south versus the rest of the country. But there was these big gaps across places and for blacks so you can see also the black white gaps were enormous and also within each race looking across space by income there were these very large gaps in attainment.

So the Elementary and Secondary Education Act was meant to address these inequities. And it, it represented a, a fundamental change in the role of the federal government, in K-12 education which had, from the founding, been and then a very local and state level endeavor. And there's sort of three ways in which we see this as having changed the role of the federal government and I'm gonna talk a little bit about each of these.

So first of all it, it was big and I'm gonna come back later and say it was really way too small in in, in terms of trying to address the inequities that existed but it doubled federal spending for K-12 education at the time so the prior

programs were the, the largest programs pre-existing.

Excuse me. Were the National Defense Education Act, which was a post-Sputnik sort of. We need to be educated so that we can fight the Soviets kind of thing, and the federal impact aid, which went to school districts that served Native Americans and that had military presence and things like that so this.

Title one which is the largest component of ESEA was, was large at double spending but it was also compensatory or, or progressive so that the distribution of aid was specifically related to poverty and that had not previously been the case and actually. This time period is essentially the, the, the birth of the progressive dis, progressive spending on K-12 education and the food aspect is that this money had strings attached.

So in the past the federal again the it was, it was viewed that K-12 education was to be done by local school districts and states. The federal government shouldn't be shouldn't be butting in that's still largely the case in many ways but this was sort of the first time that.

Yeah. The funding for K-12 education was tied to other social policies and initially school disaggregation and that's gonna be a very important part of the legacy of Title one so Title one was by far the largest component of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act both by money and I think in terms of policy.

Later on in the 70s, other other things were added. I was talking to a student yesterday about migrant education was added and but Taiwan was and remains the biggest component and I'm gonna basically only talk about Title one going forward. Okay so what was the Title one program?

It has, it has changed a lot but also not changed a lot but let me talk about what the program looked like at it's inception so. From an economics perspective, the Title one program is a restricted block grant from the federal government to a local school district. Where the targeted good is educational services for poor kids.

Okay, so technically the money goes from the federal government to the state education agency, and then it's divided up to local school districts. It particularly in the beginning of the program the state education agency doesn't do anything. They only it's you know it's basically just a pass through so from an economic perspective you can really think of this as, as, as money that's going from the federal government directly to local school districts.

The money is supposed to be spent on, educational services for, educationally disadvantaged students. That's the targeted, good it's supposed to be, supplemental. It does not, there's no matching component, so it doesn't change the relative price of, these the targeted good versus other goods. So actually, this, you can basically, if you can go back to the graph that Hillary showed for food stamps.

It's the same that's the, you know, the analysis that, that you would do that basically this is income to local school districts. One thing I think is interesting I, I myself have put that graph in my papers in terms of, you know, the motivation for thinking about how local school districts might respond to receiving this income.

If you think back to microeconomics now then we're gonna put preferences in there it's not an individual it's a government so at. There are interesting questions people will often say okay it's the preferences of the median voter. But you actually need to take on you know whether that's how decisions are getting made in local school districts but that's the structure of the program.

Okay, so initially there was very little regulation over the use of funds so this is in contrast to enforcement of the the, the Civil Rights Act aspect of this, which I'll come back to but basically, I think. There were about three people in the office of education who were responsible for, monitoring the use of this billion dollars in, federal money.

But, but my understand in reading of the history and also you can see it in the data, is that Johnson was committed to. To enforcing the desegregation requirements that came along with Title one and, and they did withhold fines from some districts and they did monitor that. So over time the program became highly regulated okay so this is, this is very much in contrast to now.

And I think this is an important legacy long term legacy of the program and this was in response to to basically concerns about misuse of funds and concerns about crowd out which were. I think, well founded in 1969 the NAACP released a report showing you know a lot of misuse of funds in, in ways that were were racially motivated, but also in general, you know, using Title one funds for band uniforms, and things like that.

And the, this led to sort a lot of concern about this, and a lot of regulation over the funds now if I have economists of education or educators in the room. They don't think about Title one like this today so peep most educators policymakers today think of Title one as kind of a, a set of educational services okay.

So there are Title one schools and those are schools eligible to receive Title one programs there are Title, or Title one funds. There are Title one programs and their Title one students who participate in those programs. And that's something that's come out of this kind of regulation that's changed over time.

But in the beginning of the program I think it's really proper to think of, to think of the it as just a money, transfer in the form of a, a, a restrictive lock grant. But I will talk about the federally mandated evaluations of the program, because these affect I think the public perception and educator perception of the program.

And they're really consistent with this idea of Title one as more like an educational intervention so let me start with this is not any of my work, but let me start just as a brief discussion of that that what people think of as the Title One literature, which is, is, is reasonably large.

What this what these studies show so it also, so there were federally mandated evaluations of this program I think this is something that as social scientists who work with data, we think should be in all legislation. And then you see that 50 years later, we're sitting here, they've done these studies, and we know basically nothing so we need to mandate that there be a research design, I guess.

Or some, but actually I think it's a. It's a really interesting question for us here 50 years later evaluating these programs as you know, what, what should we be how should we be on a, on an ongoing basis judging the success but I guess I've sort of given away the punchline which is I feel these studies are bad but let me tell you what they say.

So right now actually many of the authors to their credit they, they understand the limitations and you know, but they are federally mandated and they have to do something, so they do the best they can. So what do they do they compare students participating in Title one programs to some comparison group and, they generally find that Title one is not so effective.

But it's you know, there is a very difficult selection problem here of you know, who's participating in the Title one programs how do you find a good comparison group and they've different approaches to this but in general it's you know, there is no, there is no quasi-random or random variation that they can exploit.

And these are gonna give you the benefits of Title one overall as a program only if there's, there's no crowd out. Okay, by this I mean that the services received by the tr, the treated students are new services and I'm gonna talk about there's many ways in which.

Crowd out can happen in where you that you could have students participating in programs that are called Title one programs, and are being bought with Title one money. But, their not actually getting any educational services that they wouldn't have gotten in the absence of the program okay or, their not getting not all of that represents these services so, you need that to be true and you also need it to be that there's no spill overs okay so.

It could be that that non-participating students also benefit. Okay now that you know, so for example, the money could be used on educational services for, for students who don't really qualify for Title one. Now that's not the intent of the program, but there could be a benefit to that you could be you know, many would not expect this to be a major mechanism, but many of these programs are pull out programs.

So you can imagine, you know, by taking those kids who are participating out, and giving them extra services that frees up resources for you know the remaining kids, or something like that so there are many ways in which there could be. Spillover so you can think of it as, you know, you're treating your controls, and you may not be treating or treated.

And there's lots of good reasons to believe that, you know, one or both of those don't hold. So so we've argued you know, that conceptually we should take a broader approach to thinking about this, this program. And, and all the different kinds of effects it could have, aside from the issue that even within this approach.

There's this selection problem that nobody has particularly solved. So there's a, I guess, small to medium sized, literature that economists have, have, participated in on Title I. Which basically, I would say, kind of, like, worries about, all kinda crowdout. Okay, so what does that mean? What is crowd out?

Crowd out is just the idea that you might, give new money to schools, to spend on poor kids and they might spend it on poor kids. But then they might reduce some other spending on poor kids. And it can happen in other ways as well. So who can crowd out so remember that the money comes from the federal government and goes to a local school district.

The state doesn't really do anything with the money, but the state also gives money to the local school district okay. So one way that crowd out can happen is that the states, and this actually is illegal but seems quite reasonable in a way. The state might say, look out in the world and say, oh, my poor schools are getting this money from the federal government.

And they're doing better than they would've been doing without that money. And so, I'm going to have a funding formula that's less progressive than I otherwise would have had. Okay? So and, I mean, you could have that in an extreme form where the state has a preference about, you know, what is the progressivity of funding.

And it completely offsets what the feds are doing, okay? So that's one possibility. Another possibility, which is what, you know, those sorta fiscal federalism literature tends to focus on in in general. Is that local school districts might reduce their own effort. Okay? So local school districts and, and this is what you would get in in the model that the, that Hillary.

The picture that Hillary had with the median voter who who wants to spend on education and who wants to spend on other goods. You give them some income. They spend a little bit of that on education but then they also can reduce taxes. You wouldn't expect them to spend every dollar of new income on education.

So you, you would see you would see either a reduction in tax in local property taxes. Or increase in spending on, other local services, depending on, kinda whether the school district, was part of another government or not. You can also see this happen at the school level. So, you know, schools can, they were already doing, service, extra services for poor kids.

They should just start using Title I funds for that and then using, using their other, the funding that's freed up, from that for other things. Okay, so, where might the money, go? It could go to educational services for ineligible kids or schools. It could go to ineligible educational expenditures.

So, for example, capital. And so it's meant to be, current instruction. Or it could go, you know, just to private consumption so it could be paid back to local taxpayers or, state taxpayers. There's probably more things I could, list out here. And it's important to keep in mind that,uh, the funds could be nominally used for intended purposes but still not increase, educational services.

For poor children and this, you know, this is why you can't just yeah, yes there is tons of documentation about how these funds are spent. Although, I'm actually becoming increasingly interested in looking at. But even though you don't know if that was the actual additional sources that were provided.

>> Mm-hm.

>> And given that, there's lots of anecdotal evidence of nominal misuse of funds. Okay? So districts just basically report that they're using no funds on things that aren't allowed. So there's good reason to, worry about that. So, so what the, there's a few papers in this.

We're not sure that they're going to, try to look at when you, when the federal government gives this money. How does it actually increase, instructional, spending? So when we show you one graph from from a paper that was. Looking at the introduction of of Title I in the south, and how that affected spending.

So I'll just walk through this a little bit. I'm now embarrassed by Ken that I have my vertical line, but I feel like,.
>> At least in A, you would have been able to place it. But not all of us have as much data as you. You know, so we have to resort to this.

But so what this is showing is each, each of these points is the coefficient from a regression on. In this case, per people federal revenue, per pupil federal revenue on the poverty rate. Okay so let's say what is the relationship between poverty and federal revenue? And you can see that initially it was slightly negative.

Okay? And then after 1965 or starting in 1965 it becomes positive. And basically the slope is roughly equal to the per poor student, title one allocation, okay. So those I actually. I don't have the graph, but that Martha had but we have it in the paper. Which, basically shows like did they follow the formula.

>> Right.

>> And, yes, and they more or less did follow the formula. One thing that's interesting and I'll, I'll, I'll comment to, to Martha in, inappropriately in my own talk. That in, in 1965, the reason that it's not that, that coefficient is lower is probably cuz the per poor kid grant was lower at that time.

But also districts in the south didn't receive their money. And so there, you have a certain amount of districts who are not receiving their money. Because of, desegregation non-compliance, and that just creates noise. And makes it look like the formula wasn't, wasn't implemented and reduced the R-squared and things like that.

And then you know, after we get out a few years districts are, are receiving their money. Okay, so that's just the first stage thing, yes. It, was, the money was distributed as expected. And then this second graph shows per person current expenditure. Okay? So you can see first of all it's interesting that.

Before, in the early '60s, spending was regressive. So poor places spend less within states, though these all have state fixed effects in them. And, and you actually find the same thing without state fixed effects, within this, this is within the south. But then you see, an, an increase after 1965 in the relationship between poverty and spending.

And it becomes, actually progressive. And, but the, the change there is just about half of the change over there. And interestingly you don't see, there's just nothing going on at the state level. Like It's moderately, it is moderately progressive and it stays say so. It's like a non-result, but it's actually a result.

Because the state could have said, you know, hey we're gonna offset this but they're just not changing what they're doing. So the offset is coming in, in a reduction in the progressivity, progressivity of local revenue. And if you look really carefully you'll see there's like \$0.20 we don't account for and I.

Bothers me but I'm not going to go into it now. Okay so that's from one of the studies, that's one study that we worked on in this physical federalism literature. Marty Feldstein had one of the early ones in the 70's. Nora Gordon worked on this in a later time period.

This is from the study that I just talked about. And there's a range of estimates but they, they all find evidence of economically significant crowd out. So there's not a one-for-one increase in spending with, with the grant. But they, it tends to be less crowdout than you would expect from the neoclassical model.

I, I should mention also, the, the, these studies are in a slightly different spirit, but related. There's some regression discontinuity studies that try to use the fact that there's there's a poverty threshold. That to qualify to be a title one school and so they try to use that to identify the effects of Title I on outcomes.

But what ends up happening is they find no discontinuity in resources at the threshold. Which, you know, suggests that there's some form of, of crowding out going on. Because the money's supposed to be layered on top of whatever the school would have had. So in the one hand that seems like a major lack of compliance.

I also look at that though and I think like it can't possibly be optimal to like spend to have this huge discontinuity in resources that are allocated. And so maybe what districts are doing is they're I mean it's equally possible they're undoing it at the school level in a way that makes sense.

Although anyway you can't tell that in the data but and I don't know that they do anything that makes sense but. But, so this raises the question of what's the incidence, you know, if you're, for for an economic perspective. It's not like this money that was crowded out just disappeared from the world, it went into tax relief or whatever.

From a perspective of understanding this program I think you know this is clearly not the intent and it's not, you're not gonna get. The effects you want, in terms of improving education if the money's not going for that, or you won't get as much as you want. We find in this paper is, you know, what I would call suggestive evidence.

It's mainly the data aren't that great. That there were improvements in educational attainment for southern whites in this period but not for blacks, which is also something that. Is disappointing and, cuz you would have maybe expected more for, for blacks. We speculate that, that might be because, still in the '70s it was probably, or in the late '60s.

It was probably possible to allocate that funding, inequitably by race. Whereas starting in, in the 70s, that would have been much, much harder.

>> Yeah. That, that's all it is, just the basics. Can we move on?

>> That's correct. Yeah. This study ends in 1969. Yeah. And we, we don't have estimates going after that.

Okay. So let me this, this part is from the chapter we did for the legacies book. And were just gonna, im just gonna show you how at the state level relationships. Among educational spending, attainment, poverty, and income have, have changed over time. Okay and this can be at the state level.

Its as I said the state is pretty important in school finance and we're gonna see some pretty striking relationships. But, you know, this is a, a, a purely, descriptive analysis to kinda understand what's been happening the last fifteen years. So I have to chart, start with this graph.

By way of background. This, the purple line is current expenditure per pupil in real terms from. The mid 50s through they have very long lags on releasing these data. But through the mid two thousands in federal revenue per people. So there's basically two points I want to make about this graph.

One is we spend a lot more on education then we did in the past. I think you know, Rick Handysack has this graph for some form of it and many if his papers. And, you know then goes on to argue that we're wasting a lot of money. And we're not we're not we're not getting, you know there's inefficiency.

I actually think that you can't tell that from this graph, but we need to take seriously that argument. But but in any case, there's a big increase over time. The other thing I wanna point out is how small this is. How you can barely see. I mean, I could put this on a scale where you would really see a jump in 65.

But I think a relevant scale is this one. Now that said in the average southern school district the 1965 grant was 20% of preprogrammed spending. So it was, it was substantial for some districts. But federal revenue as many people have pointed out has never been a super important part of K-12 spending.

Okay.

>> Okay you'll tell.

>> Right, I know yeah. Well we'll, you know, we should figure it out cuz. Okay so let me show you how the relationship between spending and poverty has changed. So I, I, I knew that Gavin would be here and so I almost didn't even I got in trouble last time for saying there was no self effect.

So but let me tell you what this what this graph shows and have a slightly more nuanced way of describing it. So this is the 1960 child poverty rate. This actually based on data we've used for Title I. So this is the the poverty rate that's implied by the way that they allocated the Title I funds.

But it's very closely related to anything else you would use. And this is the log of per person spending in the state. So you can just see that there's this incredibly tight relationship and really steep slope at the state level. Poverty is very predictive of, of state level spending and in 1963 the the, the south which for me the south is the former Confederacy.

So the, the states of the former Confederacy in red they're very much on the line. But I think it's totally correct and so if you were to put a south fixed effect in this regression, it, it, you know, it is not significant. So, not since there's no self effect, but I think it's completely right.

But you have noticed how much the red states are here and the green states are there. But I figure, over here is showing the same thing in 2006. You can see that, two things. One, there's still a slope. Three things, there's still a negative slope. It's much flatter, and there's all this, kind of, unexplained variation.

So, particularly you see that the the among the low poverty states they're just doing the different things. Okay now some of it you might understand like California's gonna be lower down. And New York and New Jersey are you know these, these. These, these higher spending states so, so, poverty has become less predictive of spending over time.

But it, it's still, there's still a very strong relationship. This is the same 1960 child poverty rate. Actually a few you use the contemporaneous poverty rate. It basically looks the same, with a sort of shift in the poverty rates are really persistent over time within states. So this will be my closest in this section to, I'll, I'll, I'll suggest a causal effect of of, ESEA.

So this is just showing the gradients of the slope, from those. The, the, those two endpoints that I presented before. This is plotting that slope, every year, okay? And you do see. I mean, there's this, like, I don't need to put the line here. There's a big break in 1965.

So, spending becomes a lot more progressive, as, as you'd expect, but it's just that the, gradient is so huge. So, Liz and I estimate that, to, to flatten that slope, assuming, you know, no crowd out of any kind. The program would've needed to be seven times larger than it was.

And that's, so that's at the state level. You know, using the grading in at the state level. So there, and if you, you know, if you kinda said, okay, I'm gonna take this as the counterfactual and then project that out. Then kinda what it looks like is that ESEA kinda moved ahead, by ten or 15 years, this, reduction in, or increase is progressivity of, of school spending.

Okay. So what happened to outcomes? I think Sean is gonna talk more about this. I was glad he was by discussion, cuz, he knows more about it. And, but this is from the census and the ACS, looking at. I'm just trans entertainment. And, you, so the blue lines are high school graduation rates.

And the, the white rate is above the non-white rate. And the, so if you, this is by cohort, so, here these cohorts were not exposed, these cohorts were partially exposed, and then these cohorts were fully exposed so you would expect if you know, if there were a large effect of Title 1 and also nothing else going on, you would expect sort of flat and then up and like, like Hilary had that nice graph.

But we don't, we see something that is consistent like that for college. But not for high school and we really, it would

just be really surprising if Title 1 had effect on college attainment without having some effect on high school attainment so we don't really want to make too much of that.

But you can see also just the trends in what's been happening. There's a lot of convergence between blacks and whites in high school but not so much in college. And you know there's a big increase in educational attainment across the board. I don't have it here, but we looked at the correlation on the geographic inequality in outcomes and that also has declined dramatically.

So the you know the gradient of attainment in the poverty rate of the state has fallen quite a lot too. So, I think, you know, those are are, are good developments but they're still a lot of left. Okay so, I'm just to summarize the trends in funding entertainment the spending is incredibly unequal across states and strong, strongly negatively correlated with poverty.

Like I said we would have needed really a much larger program. So that's the sense in which I think this program was very large when you look at it from the perspective of what the federal government had been doing for K-12 education, but it was a tiny compared to the inequities in funding that existed.

Poverty is less predictive and this slope's less steep over time. We, we looked at what, what might explain the variation. And it does, over time, income, the median income of a place, becomes more predictive than poverty. Where as in the early periods poverty is just really and, but there is just more unexplained variation.

I think this is interesting, there's the school finance equalization movement. I think part of what's going on is just as, states are changing a lot what they're doing and they're changing it in, in different ways. And the ed, educational attainment gaps between high and low poverty states are, are narrowing over time.

Okay, so let me talk about the st, the, the strings. So, we have a federal system. The constitution prohibits the federal government from telling states or local governments what to do. So if the Federal Government wants to actually influence non-fiscal aspects of policy, they have to tie that to money.

And they did that in K-12 education with Title 1 and, and have initially and, and since. So for this reason that the effects of Title 1, extend beyond the grant-making, let me just put these up. There's, there's several ways that I think are important. I'm gonna talk primarily about desegregation in the remaining eight minutes.

So initially, Title 1 was tied to desegregation in the same way that the hospital desegregation was tied to the receipt of medicare funds and in, in the south there was it was more mixed outside of the south. I think it was also important that the experience of Title 1 has influenced the design of programs since then and either Marguerite Roza and some other school finance scholars feel that now funding is, is, is regulated that, basically, when you find yourself with lawyers des, designing your instructional program, you're not in a good place.

And that's kind of, you know, this is a very indirect link but that's sort of one of the legacies of, of Title 1, I think needs to be addressed. Title 1 received more recently when reauthorized at NTLB type two accountability and and now implicitly of maybe say a little bit more of this later types of common core teacher evaluation the other kinds of things that the Department of Education now wants states to do.

Okay so let me give this paper in one slide. So the when when Title 1 fund was first available in 1965, the Department of Health Education and Welfare issued guidelines that said this is what you need to do in terms of desegregation in order to get these funds.

Okay, so in 1965 they basically said you need to put a black kid in school with a white kid. In 1966 they, it was complicated, but they said you need to transfer two to 6% maybe up to 12% of of students black students to white schools. Starting in 67 they started to say you can't have black schools and white schools you need to have just schools.

Actually that's language that is in green and was actually originally in the HEW guidelines. So over time, the, the guidelines got, more stringent. So, this, this figure is showing, if you, we start with this line the, the sheriff's school

districts in, in, in the south. The former Confederacy that had any desegregation.

And you can see there's a huge increase following the Civil Rights Act, and Title 1. It's just, is there any black student in school with a white student, in the entire school district. Since the extensive margin. This one is the fraction of blacks in all-black schools, and then you have the more usual, dissimilarity index, okay?

So the, these are really dramatic changes. This is CRA ESEA, Green is an important Supreme Court decision. Swan was another important Supreme Court decision that that basically said you could do busing. So we have a paper that looks explicitly at the, the using you know the districts that have more money on the line, where they are more likely to desegregate.

We find that that's the case, in a, you know, a statistically significant way, but that does not explain very much of that huge trend, so, there's, let me go on the slide. So so there's clearly something going on this, at this time. It may not be explicitly the financial incentives.

There's also the aspect of, you know, having HSW saying this is what it means to desegregate the courts. We're having trouble by all accounts, figuring out what Brown meant. And so, you know, I think there was an interaction among the Congress, the courts, and the executive. So, it, it required the efforts of all three.

And the Title 1 and the Civil Rights Act were a really important piece of that. And we, we do find that, more districts vol, districts who had more money on the line were more likely to de, desegregate voluntarily, and that, that, and were less likely to be under court order eventually.

So that, you know, sort of freed up the resources of the court. After Johnson left office, the courts became really super important, like they stopped enforcing these, these parts of the Civil Rights. The fund withholding provisions of the Civil Rights Act. And so then there, I'll summarize the medium-size literature.

Basically, seems to all point to the idea that desegregation was helpful for blacks in terms of educational attainment and, and other outcomes. So, I think, this is a, a, a really, it's really important to consider this to be part of the legacy of Title 1. Okay, so I would say.

You know, over all the ESEA has, you know, a, a mixed legacy. So if we think about it as a, an instructional intervention which I think is actually not the right way of thinking about it but how many people do it's it's a weak program. So as a structural intervention I think these programs are considered to be poorly designed, and weak, and, you know, not, not, consistent enough.

So, it wouldn't be surprising if that wasn't super helpful, but then also the evidence about that is basically weak. So, you know, we kind of, don't, I wouldn't expect these programs to be to have, you know, very large effects, but we don't really know. So as being a little broader and thinking of it as a, a funding stream, I think it's first of all important to consider that, you know, this was a program that was pretty big but way too small in terms of the, you know, if you just, if you think that money matter for education and that is the solution you need to equalize it, and you look at those the inequalities of outcome and spending that existed it before hand it just you know it's just tiny.

So you know having said that on top of that there was, there was some crowd up a some of what we would call fly paper effect which means definitely some of the money did, did seem to increase spending and, you know, over time there is this weakening of the relationship between poverty and spending.

At the state level I have been collecting for about the past ten years data you know, at the school district level outside the south and you know maybe five years. Maybe at the 60th anniversary I can present that to you. I think there's another thing lurking in the background which is really important which is you know, that, that literature is kind of called this one, does money matter?

I would like to revise that to be sort of like how and when can money matter? It's clear that you cannot educate children without some resources. But there are serious questions about, you know, how the marginal dollar is spent and

how much it matters. And, in fact, this is, you know, this was a problem for Title 1 from the get go.

That, you know, soon after this soon after this legislation began. Are these programs began, the Coleman Report came out and sort of suggested that, well, you know, first of all the black schools aren't that much worse than the white schools and money doesn't, you know, money doesn't matter.

It's all about family, and basically we still don't know the answer to that question but you know, that has been going on in the background the whole time. Ok, in terms of, the, the strings. The more than money aspect of this program. I think this is really important.

It, it, the, it did fundamentally alter the federal role. I think that desegregation is, a clear success especially in the south. And the courts were really important, I have other work that shows the courts were important, and so I have to, you know I have to say that also, but I think that this was, this was important, it's not a coincidence that after ten years things started happening in the south in 1965.

It still, you know, took some time, but I mean, really in five years, it, you know, it was delayed and then in five years the schools desegregated and became you know, the, the least segregated region in the country. The, I mentioned about the regulation. So I feel the accountability, so you know if you want to think about the legacy of this legislation, you need to have a view on, you know, basically, all of the strings that have been attached to it over time.

There is some evidence that NTLB has has increased achievement. And so more recently I mentioned that that legislation has not been authorized. So basically, what's going on now is that you, there are, there's this waiver process. And so the strings are, you need to do what department of education wants you to do to get a waiver on basically to get your money because none of them can really comply.

You know that this is the year that we closed the, that we got everybody proficient? So these so you know now it's kind of the common core teacher evaluation we don't have, we don't know what the effects of these things are but you know that's kind of what's being tied to this now.

And you know so I started with the picture and I'll end with the we're not done with this work slides. So there have been a lot of changes in school funding since 1965. I think, you know, one of the most dramatic is just the level, Spending on K-12 education has, has, has quadrupled since 1960.

There's a more progressive distribution of funding, and I put that in, in in italics, because I'm not at all sure, how closely that's related to the progressivity of the distribution of, you know, opportunity or resources more properly measured. There's less flexibility on, in local control. There's persistent racial gaps in attaining achievement and wages.

And growing SCS achievement gaps, which af, you know, which after all, were the things that were targeted by this legislation oh, what a drag to end on that note but thank you.

>> I'm Ann Stevens the director of Center for Poverty Research at UC Davis. And I want to thank you for listening.

The Center is one of three federally designated poverty research centers in the United States. Our mission is to facilitate non-partisan academic research on domestic poverty. To disseminate this research. And to train the next generation of poverty scholars. Core funding comes from the US Department of Health and Human Services.

For more information about the center visit us online at Poverty.UCDavis.edu.