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Executive Summary

Economic and racial segregation in Ohio’s schools threaten the educational outcomes for many of Ohio’s students. In the state’s six major urban counties, 40% of students attend high poverty schools. This report provides an overview of the racial and economic segregation in the six largest metropolitan areas of Ohio and the causes and consequences of this segregation. We look at those districts which are labeled high and extreme high poverty, and their school designation as determined by No Child Left Behind. The relationship between economic and racial segregation is discussed, using maps to illuminate the location of these schools. Most are located in inner-cities and communities of color. We also discuss factors in these impoverished schools which have proven to be detrimental to student achievement, including historical and present day factors which continue to perpetuate educational inequities, and we examine a remedy being increasingly implemented in districts such as Wake County, NC – socioeconomic desegregation. Finally, we offer a short set of broad-based recommendations that have the potential to redress the fundamental problems of economic segregation and stimulate meaningful dialogue on these issues. We feel that it is crucial to continue with efforts to racially integrate our schools, but as nationwide attempts at this have stalled, we also feel it is important to examine other areas that are showing promise in lifting up not only poor students and students of color, but all students, and consequently all Americas.
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More than fifty years of research has documented the negative effects of racial segregation. More recently, it has become clear that economic segregation may be even more harmful than racial segregation. In urban America, they often go hand in hand. As racial desegregation plans have stalled and in some cases have even been reversed, a number of school districts are looking for an alternative to offset some of the injuries associated with racial segregation. One of the most promising is attacking economic segregation. Research shows that educational opportunity is depressed for students attending extremely high poverty schools (60% or more of the students eligible for free or reduced lunch). This is true for middle class students as well as low income students. A middle class student attending a high poverty school will, on average, fare less well than a low income student attending a low poverty school. This report suggests that Ohio should adopt policies that promote the elimination of segregated, high poverty schools throughout the state. Current policies have allowed and even contributed to the presence of high poverty schools in virtually all of Ohio’s major urban areas. With the gap between high performing schools and low performing schools widening, and the increasing pressures and threats from NCLB, school officials are seeking new ways to improve student performance and remedy their increasingly ailing schools. These challenges and opportunities have led some school districts across the country to use income as a proxy to sort students through economic integration plans. While racial integration should continue to be pursued, socioeconomic integration has shown some promise as an additional way to remedy our flawed and failing public school system for all students.

In order to illustrate the current segregation of schools and school districts in Ohio by income, and the resulting impact on student performance, The Kirwan Institute has contributed to the presence of high poverty schools in urban areas of Ohio.
Institute gathered data for the six largest urban counties in Ohio: Cuyahoga (Cleveland), Franklin (Columbus), Hamilton (Cincinnati), Lucas (Toledo), Montgomery (Dayton) and Summit (Akron). This data is used to demonstrate the performance gap between high poverty and non-high poverty schools across the State. This research brief also addresses the nexus between economic segregation and racial segregation, some of the factors driving the achievement gap, and it illuminates some of the consequences of the current economic (and racial) segregation impacting Ohio’s public schools.

Economic Segregation In Ohio’s Schools

Economic segregation in Ohio’s schools is evident in Ohio’s metropolitan regions. In Ohio’s six largest metropolitan regions, over half of all poor students are segregated into high poverty schools (defined as those with more than 60% of the student body economically disadvantaged). Additionally, more than half of Ohio’s poor students in the six largest metropolitan areas would need to move to a low poverty school to economically integrate the region’s school districts.1 For the Cleveland region this figure is even higher, with nearly 2/3’s of poor students segregated into high poverty schools.2

During the 2004-2005 academic year, in Ohio’s six largest urban counties (Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Lucas, Montgomery and Summit), 40% of students attended high poverty schools.

Economic isolation is strongly correlated with lower performance levels on standardized testing and a lower school designation in Ohio’s public school classification system. This system includes the following categories: effective, excellent, continuous improvement, academic watch and academic emergency. Of all high poverty schools in Ohio’s six largest urban counties, 94.4% are classified in one of the lowest three categories (academic emergency, academic watch or continuous improvement). In contrast, only 27.3% of non-high poverty schools in Ohio

1 Research by the Lewis C. Mumford Center at the University of Albany in New York.
fall into these three categories (See Table 1). In NO instance in the seven major metropolitan areas in Ohio did the high poverty schools outperform the non-high poverty schools (See Table 2). For extreme high poverty schools in Ohio’s largest urban counties (with more than 80% of the student body economically disadvantaged), these disparities are even more compelling. Almost half of the extreme high poverty schools (42%) were designated as in Academic Emergency (See Table 1). On average, standardized test scores were more than 40% lower in these extreme high poverty schools than test scores in non-high poverty schools (See Table 2). This data suggests that instead of looking at inputs and searching for evidence of individual malicious intent in order to prove and remedy discrimination, we should consider outputs – how students, and subsequently schools, are performing along racial and economic lines.

The Nexus between Economic Segregation and Racial Segregation

In most urban counties in Ohio, there is a significant correlation between economic segregation and racial segregation in public schools. Neighborhood schools and fragmented school districts reproduce and exacerbate the residential segregation found in Ohio’s urban areas. Schools are largely segregated by race, but with that, nearly all schools with a majority of students of color are high poverty schools. In metro Boston for example, 97% of the highly concentrated minority schools have concentrated poverty. Data for Ohio’s six largest metropolitan areas illustrates this phenomenon. As seen in Table 3, African American students in the Akron, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton and Toledo metropolitan areas attend schools that are 2 to 3 times more impoverished than those of their White counterparts. In these regions, the average White student attends a school with student poverty ranging from 23 to 30%. For the average African American student in these regions, school poverty ranges from 61 to 78%.

As illustrated in the maps contained in this report, both high poverty and extreme high poverty schools are clustered in African American neighborhoods in the six largest urban counties in Ohio. This phenomenon is evident in all the counties

Spatial segregation (both racial and economic) in schools is self-perpetuating included in our analysis. Perhaps even more alarming is the fact that this segregation (both racial and economic) in schools is self-perpetuating, and left unchecked will continue even in the absence of overt discrimination. Data assessing racial segregation in Ohio’s six largest metropolitan regions supports this observation. Between 1990 and 2000, for example, African American student segregation increased in all of Ohio’s six largest metropolitan areas (Table 4).

Consequences of Racial and Economic Segregation

Unlike Brown v. Board of Education, which focused on the damage done solely to children of color, we think it is important to illuminate and emphasize the damage done to all students and to the larger society by these inequitable social and structural arrangements. Our current fractured system of public education is not only leaving a large portion of the children behind, it is also robbing us of a true democracy. One of the fundamental tenants of public education is the preparation of students for citizenship, to allow all to partake in the shaping and imagining of our society, yet this is an impossibility when public education fails. Extreme drop out rates are a clear indication of this failure. The Urban Institute Education Policy Center estimates that in 2001, less than 38% of students in the Cincinnati, Cleveland, Columbus, Dayton and Toledo public school districts would graduate on time. In the six largest urban school districts in Ohio, only the City of Akron public school district graduates more than 54% of its students on time.

It is also a myth that economic segregation is hurting only poor students and students of color. These arrangements are hurting all students, including those in the middle-class. In 2004, The Century Foundation found that low-income students attending middle-class schools perform higher, on average, than middle-class students.

children attending high-poverty schools.6 This means that it is not only the 60-80% of children living below the poverty line who suffer in our high and extreme high poverty schools; the 20-40% of children who live above the poverty line are also disadvantaged. Furthermore, in today’s new economic age where education is critical to economic advancement, this disparity can have significant statewide impacts. Research conducted by the Harvard University School of Government found that among the nation’s Snow Belt (or Rust Belt) regions, only regions with highly educated workforces have been able to stem the loss of population to the Sunbelt and western states.7

**Socioeconomic Integration**

As mentioned earlier in this report, one solution to this problem is to pursue economic desegregation in our public schools. It is important to note that we are not suggesting that efforts directed at racial integration should be abandoned; we are proposing another remedy which is already showing promise in decreasing disparities in student achievement. Economic desegregation has already been implemented in numerous districts across the country: La Crosse, WI; San Lucie County, FL; San Francisco, CA; Cambridge, MA; Charlotte-Mecklenburg, NC and Wake County, NC.8 Since 2000, Wake County, which encompasses Raleigh and its surrounding suburbs, has been assigning students to schools to ensure that no school has a low-income student population higher than 40%. Since the implementation of this strategy, the district has seen dramatic improvements on its standardized reading and math tests. Ten years ago, 40% of Black students scored at grade level on state-wide standardized tests; last year that number was 80%. Similarly, 79% of Hispanic students scored at grade

---


level ten years ago, while 91% did so last year. The Wake County Public School System achieved these improvements because of a variety of factors including the support of parents, teachers, school administrators and the community, as well as support from a county-wide school district.

**Effects of Economic Segregation in Schools**

What produces these dramatic disparities in student performance in economically (and consequently racially) segregated schools? An extensive body of research has identified both out-of-school and in-school factors.

**Out-of-School Causes**

Concentrating high numbers of low-income students in one school or one school district ultimately leaves those schools and districts at a disadvantage; not only are there fewer resources available for the school, but schools must also contend with the fact that their students will likely have higher needs than their affluent peers. This is due in large part to factors that are outside of the schools’ control such as poor or inadequate nutrition, untreated health problems – which are often caused by exposure to environmental toxins prevalent in low-income urban areas – and the impact of neighborhood violence and a heightened state of fear on learning and cognition. When these factors are compounded, they leave high poverty segregated schools with a greater incidence of high-need students. Without adequate district resources to serve these students, teachers end up spending significantly less in-class time teaching. Thus by third grade, the instructional time in high poverty schools declines dramatically as compared to low poverty schools, and by high school these students are in an academic crisis.

---
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In-School Causes

Economic segregation is also correlated with in-school factors that impact an individual’s achievement level: the economic background of the student’s peers, the economic resources available to the school, and teacher quality.

Peer Group Effects

Put simply, students learn less when surrounded by only low-income peers. Research has shown that the “socioeconomic composition of a school’s student population is an even stronger predictor [of achievement] than an individual’s home background.”\(^{11}\) We cannot ignore the positive effects of economic integration for both high- and low-income students. Economically disadvantaged students benefit from integration in part because of exposure to students with higher educational and occupational goals. Studies have also found significantly lower drop out rates in schools with diverse socio-economic enrollments.\(^{12}\)

Also of importance are the social and democratic benefits of exposing high-income students to their less advantaged peers, particularly students of color. This can lead to increased perspective taking, higher levels of reasoning, and opportunities to interact with others in deeper and more meaningful ways.\(^{13}\) Our society is populated by individuals from all backgrounds; just as it is important to learn to function in a racially and ethnically diverse population, so too is it important to learn to function in a society that is economically diverse. When students are economically integrated, a host of other benefits are available, including middle-class parents who have the resources and are able to advocate for their children. These resources improve schools overall.\(^{14}\)

---


Economic Resources of the School

The economic status of a school is one of the best predictors of student success. Nationally, a middle-class school is twenty-four times more likely to be consistently high performing than a high-poverty school. The physical condition of a school is a clear indicator of its economic status. A study conducted in 1996 shows that Ohio ranks 48th in the nation among state’s whose schools need significant upgrades. A whopping 95.2% of Ohio’s schools need some type of building assistance, and $10.3 billion dollars is needed to bring schools in Ohio up to code. This is not a specific, stringent code written only for schools, but the standard that dictates if buildings are considered safe and habitable in Ohio.

Although the funding designated for impoverished versus affluent districts is not always significantly disparate, the starting line for students is staggered. Even at comparable funding levels, high poverty districts often lack important resources including learning materials such as computers, new textbooks, library books, and equipment for science classes. The physical condition of our schools and the lack of resources and materials transmit a negative message to students, both explicitly and tacitly. On one hand, we send the message to students that we expect them to learn and to “pull themselves up by their bootstraps;” at the same time, unsafe buildings and inadequate resources send the message that we are not willing to invest in their futures. Students concentrated in low-income districts get the message that they are not expected to succeed and that they are less valuable than their peers in suburban districts. If we expect all students to succeed, and no child is to be left behind, then we need to provide all students with the means to be successful.

Teacher Quality

Finally, teachers are a critical factor in the dialogue on student success. The National Center for Education Statistics found that schools with high levels of low-income students had more inexperienced teachers, more academically weak teachers, teachers teaching subjects they were not trained for, and a higher number of educators that did not receive sustained professional development.\textsuperscript{17} This is particularly troubling given that schools with high percentages of low-income students have a greater need for more highly trained teachers. Eric Hanushek, reporting on a study of the effect of teacher quality on student performance, concluded that: “…having an above average teacher for five years running can completely close the average gap between low-income students and others.”\textsuperscript{18}

Economic integration would provide schools with high quality teachers, as research has shown that schools with diverse socio-economic enrollments are more conducive to attracting and retaining these teachers.\textsuperscript{19}

The Sources of Economic Segregation

It is important that we consider what historic factors have created racially and economically segregated schools, and what factors perpetuate segregation today. Residential arrangements are a key element in the mix of factors that explain school segregation. Unless measures are implemented to offset the impact of neighborhood segregation on schools, segregated residential arrangements, both racial and economic, lead to segregated schools. As overt racism was gradually eliminated in the United States through the courts, it became inscribed in the land; the more the legal arrangements which upheld racial segregation were disturbed, the more they became socially and geographically enforced.

As the *Brown* decision declared that we must racially desegregate our schools, other arrangements were constructed which made that decision more and more impossible to implement. White flight from urban areas and the out-migration of both the White and African American middle class from our central cities worked to resegregate our schools. This new segregation was codified with the 1974 *Miliken v. Bradley* decision in which the Supreme Court found that suburban districts did not have to be involved in desegregation plans. These demographic trends, the unwillingness of the courts to address this new form of segregation, and the fragmentation of our school districts in metropolitan regions not only rendered these neighborhood schools racially segregated, but economically segregated as well. Despite the limited measures of success in those districts that managed to achieve desegregation following *Brown* and into the early 90’s, and the proven positive benefits of diversity in schools, we have largely given up and returned to segregated, neighborhood schools.

The new waves of urban revitalization that have brought people (and their resources) back to the central cities have not produced a viable remedy to this situation. In-migrants to revitalized urban areas are often childless and, if they have children, they avoid the public school system by enrolling their children in private education. While this return of middle-class residents to our cities may provide increased tax revenue to local school districts, it is not producing significant social benefits.

**Summary**

The goal of American public education is not to educate Cleveland or Toledo citizens or even Ohio citizens, but rather to educate American citizens who are citizens of the world. Disparities that have their nexus in race and economic standing are not only the concern of a single district or region, and not just the concern of parents who have school-age children; true citizenship and a concern for the welfare of our country requires each of us to take some responsibility for fixing the problems that are robbing poor students and students of color of the opportunity
to succeed and participate fully in the promise of America. Numerous reports compare education in the U.S. to that in the rest of the world. The message is clear: when it comes to public education, we are failing. In a society that is becoming increasingly diverse and increasingly interconnected to the rest of the world, it is not enough to provide quality education to only a small portion of our population. As a country, we are responsible for the welfare of our children – not just our rich children or our White children, but all of our children. A recent UN report found the state of our inner-cities to be so depressed and devastated that they are compared to third world countries.\textsuperscript{20} It is education, although not education alone, that can provide a remedy for this. It is not entirely accurate to say that we are leaving children behind, as this would indicate a passive arrangement. We are keeping children behind, and the economic, social, spiritual, and democratic implications of this are enormous.

It is important that we continue to fight for racial integration in our nation’s public schools; however, as increasing challenges emerge to impede racial desegregation, we must continue searching for additional remedies that have been successful in improving education for poor students and students of color. Overall, socioeconomic integration has proven to be one way to achieve a more diverse, democratic, and successful education system. Socioeconomic integration in public schools is a sound public educational policy which promotes the recognition of our common humanity and the intricately entertained nature of human destinies.

\textbf{Recommendations}

Based on this initial research on economic segregation in Ohio and the compelling body of research identifying the harms of economic segregation, we make the following recommendations:

\begin{itemize}
  \item Pursue additional research to more fully understand the consequences of economic segregation in Ohio’s public schools.
\end{itemize}

• Expose education policy makers and members of key education committees in the Ohio General Assembly to qualitative and quantitative data that highlights the negative consequences of racial and economic segregation in Ohio’s public schools.

• Identify policies that have been effective in redressing socioeconomic segregation in other states and explore the applicability of these initiatives to Ohio.

• Frame arguments to convince policy makers, educational administrators and elected officials that reducing the number of high poverty schools in Ohio is in the State’s best interest.

• Encourage school boards and the state to limit high poverty schools where possible, and when not possible provide special provisions for high poverty schools.

• Engage civic organizations and education advocacy groups in a collective effort to increase public awareness of the benefits of socioeconomic integration.
### Appendix: Tables and Maps

**Non High Poverty Schools**  
(Less than 60% of Students Economically Disadvantaged)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emergency</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Watch</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>33.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>39.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>787</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**High Poverty Schools**  
(More than 60% of Students Economically Disadvantaged)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emergency</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>37.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Watch</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>432</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Extreme High Poverty Schools**  
(More than 80% of Students Economically Disadvantaged)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic Emergency</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Watch</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous Improvement</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>309</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 1:** School designation by poverty status in the 2004-2005 school year for schools in Cuyahoga, Franklin, Hamilton, Lucas, Montgomery and Summit Counties.

*Source: Analysis of Ohio Department of Education local report card data for individual schools in the 2004-2005 school year.*
### Percentage of Students Proficient or Exceeding Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Non-High Poverty Schools</th>
<th>High Poverty Schools</th>
<th>Extreme High Poverty Schools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading 3rd Grade</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 3rd Grade</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
<td>52.2%</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship 4th Grade</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 4th Grade</td>
<td>72.8%</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read 4th Grade</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
<td>56.2%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 4th Grade</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>59.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science 4th Grade</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 5th Grade</td>
<td>84.2%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizenship 6th Grade</td>
<td>81.6%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
<td>41.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 6th Grade</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>45.1%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 6th Grade</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing 6th Grade</td>
<td>88.5%</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>71.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science 6th Grade</td>
<td>75.4%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 7th Grade</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>31.4%</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading 8th Grade</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math 8th Grade</td>
<td>68.3%</td>
<td>32.7%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Studies OGT</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Math OGT</td>
<td>81.9%</td>
<td>60.5%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading OGT</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing OGT</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>63.3%</td>
<td>53.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Science OGT</td>
<td>72.5%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2:** Average rate of student’s proficient or exceeding in standardized tests for schools based on degree of student poverty in the 2004-2005 school year.  
*Source: Analysis of Ohio Department of Education local report card data for individual schools in the 2004-2005 school year.*

### Average School Poverty Rate for the Average Student by Race in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>White Non Hispanic Students</th>
<th>African-American Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>25.7%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>25.3%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>74.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>77.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 3:** Poverty rate for the Average Student by Race in 2000.  
### African American-White School Segregation: Regional Dissimilarity Index for 1990 and 2000 for African American and White Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metropolitan Area</th>
<th>1990 Dissimilarity</th>
<th>2000 Dissimilarity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Akron</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus</td>
<td>0.668</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>0.686</td>
<td>0.723</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toledo</td>
<td>0.728</td>
<td>0.749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4:** Dissimilarity Index for African American and White School Children by Region in 1990 and 2000.  
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This map displays the spatial pattern of distribution of school poverty over the distribution of African American population.
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This map displays the spatial pattern of distribution of school poverty over the distribution of African American population in Franklin County, OH.
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This map displays the spatial pattern of distribution of school poverty over the distribution of African American population in Montgomery County, OH.