

2010

Buying Into Prisons, and Selling Kids Short

Lizbet Simmons

San Francisco State University, lizbet@sfsu.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/tma>



Part of the [Politics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Simmons, Lizbet (2010) "Buying Into Prisons, and Selling Kids Short," *The Modern American*: Vol. 6: Iss. 2, Article 7.

Available at: <http://digitalcommons.wcl.american.edu/tma/vol6/iss2/7>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Washington College of Law Journals & Law Reviews at Digital Commons @ American University Washington College of Law. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Modern American by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ American University Washington College of Law. For more information, please contact fbrown@wcl.american.edu.

Buying Into Prisons, and Selling Kids Short

Keywords

prisons, schools, pipeline, New Orleans, incarceration, discipline

BUYING INTO PRISONS, AND SELLING KIDS SHORT

By: *Lizbet Simmons*¹

There is an increasing need to account for the role of the nation's failing public school system in structuring incarceration risk among minority populations and to link theories of the minority achievement gap with those of disproportionate minority confinement. The minority achievement gap is so named, because, on average, minority students' school performance is much lower than that of White students.² The disparity is greatest between African-American and White students and persists in a range of assessments, including standardized test scores, dropout rates, and graduation rates.³ Disproportionate minority confinement refers to racial disparities in incarceration rates, and again, the disparity is greatest when comparing African-Americans and Whites.⁴

The incarceration rate for minorities is highly disproportionate to their total percentage in the population.⁵ African-Americans represent about 12% of the national population but make up 40% of the U.S. prison population.⁶ If the current trend of incarceration holds, one in three African-American male children born in 2001 will go to prison at some point during their lives.⁷ For Latino males, the ratio is one in seven, and for Caucasian males, the ratio is one in seventeen. These data shows that extant race and gender dynamics put African-American male children at significant risk for incarceration. Educational failure within this population only increases this vulnerability.

The prison system began a massive expansion during the War on Crime era. In 1980, 300,000 people were in prison in the United States.⁸ By 2005, there were 1.5 million individuals in prison. Today, it is estimated that the prison and jail system holds 2.3 million.⁹ One explanation for a steep rise in incarceration rates *should* be a corresponding steep rise in crime. However, crime rates in the 20-year span between 1980 and 2000 either dropped or stagnated;¹⁰ the rapid rise in incarceration does not actually correspond to a rise in crime. A significant factor in prison expansion was a 975% increase in commitments for non-violent offenses, such as drug charges, between 1982 and 1999.¹¹ During that time, African-Americans were at an extreme disadvantage in drug charge processing and were ultimately incarcerated at significantly higher rates than Whites even for virtually identical crimes.¹² The terrain of these data, which is well charted with respect to race and incarceration, undergirds my inquiry into how the war on crime has directly affected minority populations in childhood.

The ideologies and policies of the War on Crime are made manifest in disciplinary arrangements in urban public schools. As French philosopher Michel Foucault

suggests, schools have always been disciplinary institutions.¹³ Schools organize students, control them, grade them, rank them, track them; this is the making of Foucault's docile body.¹⁴ Presently, though, we are experiencing a unique cultural moment in which the gold standard of school discipline is punitive. In this era, youth are exposed to the criminal justice system by way of their public education and prior to criminal activity.¹⁵ The consequences include the expansion of the minority achievement gap and increased risk of incarceration that leads to disproportionate minority confinement. What is at stake here is the loss of educational opportunity, the acculturation of youth to criminalization, and a negative redirection of students' life paths. These risks are borne not only by individual students, but also by their communities and the larger democracy.¹⁶

The criminal justice system has significantly influenced schools nationally in terms of policy, cultural practice, staffing and technology.¹⁷ School disciplinary policies are increasingly designed to mirror criminal justice enforcements, and zero-tolerance measures originating in the war on crime are now common in the education system.¹⁸ In fact, zero-tolerance became a requirement for school funding by way of the Gun-Free Schools Act of 1994.¹⁹ Though the term "zero-tolerance" is not used in the Gun-Free Schools Act, the law dictated an automatic punishment of school expulsion of at least one year for gun possession on school grounds.²⁰ In time, this kind of strict disciplinary enforcement came to be known as zero-tolerance and began to play a significant role in regulating a wide range of student behaviors, including tardiness, disrespectful language, the expression of violent threats, and inadvertent transgressions of school rules.²¹

Zero-tolerance policies sponsor exclusionary school disciplinary practices, such as suspension and expulsion. Because these policies do not allow for discretion, even minor offenses can be deemed intolerable. Fairly recently, an adolescent boy with a hyperactive diagnosis was punished under a zero-tolerance policy for saying during a cafeteria conversation, "I am going to get you," to classmates whom he suspected of eating potatoes intended for him.²² The child was suspended from school, placed in the custody of the local police, charged with "terrorist threats," and incarcerated for two weeks while awaiting his trial.

The penchant for youth criminalization has sponsored increased police presence at schools, including uniformed and armed guards. The field of school policing is expanding faster than every other division of law enforcement.²³ Carceral technologies have also been

employed at schools, and surveillance cameras are now common features of school security.²⁴ A large majority of newly built schools are fully equipped with surveillance systems.²⁵ With the addition of metal detectors, biometric devices, and similar technologies, the school security market has grown into a multi-billion dollar industry – big business in the neo-liberal state.²⁶ This privatization of the public sphere supports capital expansion and sponsors social control ideologies. Further, it reinforces a shift in governance away from the social welfare state and toward the penal state.²⁷

The new punitive culture of public schools is deeply troubling, because it negatively affects the lives of children. While children are vulnerable, it is a gross error to reduce their vulnerability to the “problem” of crime – especially when doing so masks more significant challenges.²⁸ We should also be clear that children are victims of crime less frequently in school than out of school. Less than 1% of child homicides happen in school, and non-fatal school crime has been reduced over 60% between 1992 and 2004.²⁹ While it would be convenient to interpret this crime decline as proof that school security is effective, it would be inaccurate.³⁰ Crime began dropping in school prior to the institutionalization of zero tolerance policies and prior to advances in school surveillance and fortification. Crime against youth continued to drop in schools just as it dropped in society at large, suggesting that school security features were not the catalyst.³¹

Is it possible that crime in schools could have dropped further had it not been for the ramping up of school security? Pedro Noguera, an expert in urban education, has argued that punitive school disciplinary policies dehumanize students and, thereby, produce a harsh school climate that sponsors violence.³² Recently, other scholars have joined Noguera in focusing on the negative effect of criminalizing school cultures. The sociologist Paul Hirschfield claims that the harsh school disciplinary policies that result in student suspension and expulsion label youth as “future prisoners in need of coercive control or exclusion” and generate “a self-fulfilling prophesy.”³³ This claim is supported by the work of educational scholars, Richard Arum and Irene Beattie, who have statistically proven that punitive treatments in school, such as suspension, increase the risk of adult incarceration.³⁴ In short, these data suggests that we are expanding childhood vulnerability with the very measures we have employed to provide safety.

The research on school discipline indicates that punitive policies, practices, and ideologies are magnifying the vulnerability of our most marginalized student groups.³⁵ Compared to Whites in their peer group, African-American students experience nearly 6% more school surveillance,

24 % more campus security guards, and navigate five times more metal detectors.³⁶ African-American students comprise about 17% of all students but are over 33% of those suspended from school for disciplinary reasons.³⁷ This punishment falls disproportionately on African-American males and has significant consequences for incarceration risk.³⁸ The experience of school suspension more than doubles the likelihood of adult incarceration.³⁹ In other words, punitive school disciplinary policies further the expansion of the prison system itself, largely at the expense of the African-American community.

New Orleans, where I have conducted research since 2002, provides the quintessential example of school and prison coordination. The disciplinary culture of New Orleans Public Schools is influenced by the war on crime’s priority for law and order in governance. I began my research in New Orleans when a small group of local students were suspended or expelled from their schools – most for minor and non-violent offenses such as insubordination or tardiness. The students were reassigned to a new school that

punitive school disciplinary policies further the expansion of the prison system itself, largely at the expense of the African-American community.

opened at the Orleans Parish Prison, and this institution became the center of my interpretive case study and the focus of my field note observations and locally conducted interviews, which spanned approximately two years. I contextualized the

qualitative data I gathered with statistical information on school performance and school punishment from local school and district archives, and I supplemented the data set with a vast collection of local documents including school board minutes and newspaper clippings.

The school was in a building on the grounds of the prison complex, and the students were there for twelve hours a day. At the school, the law and order paradigm was palpable. There were surveillance cameras at every corner, bars on the windows, and armed deputies to keep the students in line. Educational advancement was de-prioritized. There were no credentialed teachers, no textbooks, and no courses leading to high school graduation. This program was actually a school reform initiative designed by the Criminal Sheriff and supported by the superintendent of schools, who was a former colonel in the Marines.

In 2002, the year the prison school opened, there were many signs of socioeconomic distress in New Orleans that preceded Hurricane Katrina and then exacerbated the storm’s effects. The severely underperforming Orleans Parish Public Schools were serving a student population that was 93% African-American and 80% low-income, and the schools ranked at the bottom of the nation.⁴⁰ In 2000, only 25% of third graders and 29% of ninth graders in New Orleans met national averages on the standardized Iowa Test

of Basic Skills.⁴¹ Two of the young boys I came to know in my research reflected these larger patterns. They were low-income, African-American boys, each with a long history of academic failure. Both attended a middle school where 40 % of the eighth grade class in one year did not advance to the ninth grade. When I asked the students what traditional school was like for them, one explained that he always felt behind in his lessons and could not seem to catch up in his classes, where the student-teacher ratio was as high as thirty-three to one.⁴² His mother said he often came home in tears.

The academic failure of New Orleans Public Schools is further revealed by school disciplinary measures. On the district level in 2000-2001, almost 16% of all district students were suspended during the school year.⁴³ When these data is analyzed by race and gender, however, the numbers become even more striking. In the 2002-2003 school year, for example, over 25% of African-American males in the New Orleans Public School System were suspended at least once and lost instruction time as a result.⁴⁴ One of the students in my research was suspended and sent to the prison school because he had skipped classes; another because he had often been late to homeroom. Neither saw their disciplinary offenses as warranting a prison-style punishment.

The space and experience of the school in the prison were completely baffling to the New Orleans public school students who found themselves constantly restricted, regimented and surveilled. One student explained that the security arrangements at the school forced him to confront a negative image of himself, which he rejected. He explained that he was the exception in this regard, as most kids responded to the aggressive treatment in kind and started acting even more “crazy.” There is a great deal of educational research on the powerful role that expectations play in youth identity development. The theory of the self-fulfilling prophecy suggests that when we treat children like criminals, we help them construct a sense of themselves that aligns with the criminal identity we have assigned to them. What motivation is there for them to behave otherwise? Even students who find ways to resist the criminalizing power relations at school must struggle to cast themselves in a more positive light.

As the story of the students at the prison school suggests, tough on crime policies in school exacerbate societal and educational disenfranchisement. The low-income, underperforming, African-American male students from New Orleans were socially, economically, and educationally disadvantaged before they were ever sent to school at a prison. By obsessing over their disciplinary infractions rather than addressing their academic challenges, we nearly ensure that these students will drag further behind.

Incarceration poses the ultimate risk of harsh disciplinary treatment in school because imprisonment marks an individual for his or her lifetime, as well as his or her family

and community. Imprisonment means total confinement and a loss of identity, and it is attended by deprivation and violence. In his research on incarceration and the life course, sociologist Bruce Western has shown that a prison term shapes an individual’s job, marriage, and family prospects.⁴⁵ Incarceration also significantly shapes voting rights, as Jeff Manza and Chris Uggen and have shown in their study of felon disenfranchisement.⁴⁶ They reveal that one in forty Americans cannot vote due to a past felony. When you consider voter disenfranchisement along the axis of race, an even larger problem emerges. In some states one in four African-American men are ineligible to vote. Suddenly, the problem is not one borne solely by the individual or even by the group. Voter disenfranchisement is a problem for democracy, since it poses a threat to full representation.

There are many ways to interrupt the trend of disproportionate minority confinement, beginning with a rethinking of our priorities for public education. The first step is in the direction of schools that reflect educational priorities and serve as positive sources of social capital. Positive social capital, according to sociologist Loïc Wacquant, are those accrued institutional resources that promote a community.⁴⁷ For schools to be positive sources of social capital they must embrace tenets of inclusion rather than exclusion and build school communities that students and their families can be proud of and want to be a part of. A further step in the right direction is engendered by a commitment to high expectations for all students. Roslyn Mickelson’s work on the achievement gap has shown that students who have clear and positive future goals are more successful in school.⁴⁸

Punitive school discipline does not engender a positive student trajectory, while an elaboration of positive school resources does. A recent study by scholars, Richard Arum and Gary LaFree, proves a theory long-held by school advocates that “states and schools with higher teacher-student ratios produce adults who face lower risks of incarceration.”⁴⁹ Similar investments in education—focusing on teaching staff and classroom resources—could have the same positive result. These investments are costly, but the financial and social cost of school security may, indeed, be even higher. In New Orleans post-Katrina, the Recovery School District spent nearly \$22 million dollars for school security.⁵⁰ The students in New Orleans needed this investment in academic opportunities, and not in the technologies and tactics of criminalization.

Ultimately, the students I studied in New Orleans left the prison school when local activists, some of whom had been formerly incarcerated, protested the institution and pressured the school board to shut it down. None of the students I worked with ever re-enrolled in traditional public schools, and they now formally occupy the status of the African-American male high school dropout. The

chances that they will end up in prison are higher than the chances that they won't. So far, they've defied the odds.

Endnotes

¹ Lizbet Simmons is an Assistant Professor of Criminal Justice Studies at San Francisco State University. She holds a MA and a Ph.D. from University of California, Berkeley.

² PEDRO A. NOGUERA, CITY SCHOOLS AND THE AMERICAN DREAM: RECLAIMING THE PROMISE OF PUBLIC EDUCATION 42 (James A. Banks ed., 2003); LAURIE OLSEN, MADE IN AMERICA: IMMIGRANT STUDENTS IN OUR PUBLIC SCHOOLS (1997); Gene I. Maeroff, *Withered Hopes, Stillborn Dreams: The Dismal Panaroma of Urban Schools*, 69 PHI DELTA KAPPAN 632, 635 (1988).

³ See ANN ARNETTE FERGUSON, BAD BOYS: PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND THE MAKING OF BLACK MASCULINITY 55 (2000) (comparing the results of the California Test of Basic Skills); MICHELLE FINE, FRAMING DROPOUTS: NOTES ON THE POLITICS OF AN URBAN PUBLIC HIGH SCHOOL 17 (1991) (discussing the dropout and graduation rates of New York City's predominantly African American and Latino Comprehensive High School); DOUGLAS G. GLASGOW, THE BLACK UNDERCLASS: POVERTY, UNEMPLOYMENT AND ENTRAPMENT OF GHETTO YOUTH 159 (1981); NOGUERA, *supra* note 2, at 86 (explaining that Oakland schools' dropout rates reinforce the idea that Oakland schools are failing); Pedro A. Noguera, *The Trouble with Black Boys: The Role and Influence of Environmental and Cultural Factors on the Academic Performance of African American Males*, 38 URB. EDUC. 431, 432 (2008) ("When compared to their White peers, middle-class African American males lag significantly behind in both grade point average and on standardized tests").

⁴ See OUR CHILDREN, THEIR CHILDREN: CONFRONTING RACIAL AND ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN AMERICAN JUVENILE JUSTICE 351-355 (Darnell F. Hawkins & Kimberly Kempf-Leonard eds., 2005) (providing a historical background for disproportionate minority confinement).

⁵ See TODD R. CLEAR, IMPRISONING COMMUNITIES: HOW MASS INCARCERATION MAKES DISADVANTAGED NEIGHBORHOODS WORSE 55 (2007) (using the War on Drugs to illustrate the disparity incarceration rates); MARC MAUER, RACE TO INCARCERATE 139 (The Sentencing Project ed., 1999) ("For property crimes, African Americans constituted 27 percent of arrests in 2003, disproportionate to their share of the overall population."); BRUCE WESTERN, PUNISHMENT AND INEQUALITY IN AMERICA 16-18 (2006) (detailing the "black-white difference in incarceration rates").

⁶ WILLIAM J. SABOL, HEATHER C. WEST, & MATTHEW COOPER, PRISONERS IN 2008, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS (2009); U.S. Census 2000, <http://www.census.gov/main/www/cen2000.html>.

⁷ See generally THOMAS P. BONCZAR, PREVALENCE OF IMPRISONMENT IN THE U.S. POPULATION, 1974-2001 (2003).

⁸ CORRECTIONAL POPULATIONS, BUREAU OF JUSTICE STATISTICS (2010), available at <http://bjs.ojp.usdoj.gov/content/glance/tables/corr2tab.cfm>.

⁹ SABOLET ET. AL., *supra* note 6; INCARCERATION, THE SENTENCING PROJECT (2010), available at <http://www.sentencingproject.org/template/page.cfm?id=107>.

¹⁰ See, e.g., RUTH GILMORE, GOLDEN GULAG: PRISONS, SURPLUS, CRISIS AND OPPOSITION IN GLOBALIZING CALIFORNIA 9 (2007) (detailing the decline in crime rates in California); FRANKLIN ZIMRING, THE GREAT AMERICAN CRIME DECLINE 172 (2007) (illustrating decrease in crime in New York).

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² See DAVID COLE, NO EQUAL JUSTICE: RACE AND CLASS IN THE AMERICAN CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM 141-146 (1999) (examining the impact of crack cocaine drug laws on the rate of African American incarceration); Doris M. Provine, *Creating Racial Disadvantage: The Case of Crack Cocaine*, in THE MANY COLORS OF CRIME: INEQUALITIES OF RACE, ETHNICITY AND CRIME IN AMERICA 277-295 (Ruth D. Peterson, Lauren J. Krivo & John Hagan eds., 2006) (discussing the racial disparity in incarceration and sentencing under crack cocaine laws).

¹³ MICHEL FOUCAULT, DISCIPLINE AND PUNISH: THE BIRTH OF THE PRISON (Alan Sheridan trans., 1979).

¹⁴ See Lizbet Simmons, *The Docile Body in School Space*, in SCHOOLS UNDER SURVEILLANCE: CULTURES OF CONTROL IN PUBLIC EDUCATION 55 (Torin Monahan & Rudolfo D. Torres eds., 2010) (analyzing Michel Foucault's docile body theory).

¹⁵ See, e.g., JONATHAN SIMON, GOVERNING THROUGH CRIME: HOW THE WAR ON CRIME TRANSFORMED AMERICAN DEMOCRACY AND CREATED A CULTURE OF FEAR 207-208 (2007) (discussing the criminalization of schools); Lizbet Simmons, *End of the Line: Tracing Racial Inequality from School to Prison*, 2 RACE/ETHNICITY MULTIDISCIPLINARY GLOBAL PERSP. 215, 215 (2009) (explaining the criminal justice system's interactions with the public education system).

¹⁶ See generally WILLIAM LYONS & JULIE DREW, PUNISHING SCHOOLS: FEAR AND CITIZENSHIP IN AMERICAN PUBLIC EDUCATION (2006).

¹⁷ See generally RONNIE CASELLA, AT ZERO TOLERANCE: PUNISHMENT, PREVENTION AND SCHOOL VIOLENCE (2001); AARON KUPCHIK, HOMEROOM SECURITY: SCHOOL DISCIPLINE IN THE AGE OF FEAR (2010); Torin Monahan, *The Surveillance Curriculum: Risk Management and Social Control in the Neoliberal*

School, in SURVEILLANCE AND SECURITY: TECHNOLOGICAL POLITICS AND POWER IN EVERYDAY LIFE (Torin Monahan & Rodolfo D. Torres eds., 2006); SCHOOLS UNDER SURVEILLANCE: CULTURES OF CONTROL IN PUBLIC EDUCATION (Torin Monahan & Rodolfo D. Torres eds., 2010); Paul J. Hirschfield, *Preparing for Prison? The Criminalization of School Discipline in the USA*, 12 THEORETICAL CRIMINOLOGY 79, 80 (2008) (explaining schools with “rule-breaking and trouble-making students are more likely to be defined as criminals... and treated as such in policy and practice).

¹⁸ CASELLA, *supra* note 17.

¹⁹ Pub. L. No. 103-227 §1031 (1994).

²⁰ *Id.*

²¹ See, e.g., *id.*; Pedro A. Noguera, *Preventing and Producing Violence: A Critical Analysis of Responses to School Violence*, 65 HARV. EDUC. REV. 189, 190 (1995); Simmons, *supra* note 14, at 216.

²² RALPH C. MARTIN, ZERO TOLERANCE REPORT, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION JUVENILE JUSTICE POLICIES (2001), *available at* <http://www.abanet.org/crimjust/juvjus/zerotolreport.html>.

²³ Hirschfield, *supra* note 17, at 82.

²⁴ See Monahan, *supra* note 17, at 121 (discussing the video surveillance system at Statford High School in South Carolina).

²⁵ *Id.*; Aaron Kupchik & Torin Monahan, *The New American School: Preparation for Post-Industrial Discipline*, 27 BRIT. J. OF SOC. OF EDUC. 617, 624 (2006) (“...of the 950 new public schools built across the country in 2002, surveillance cameras were installed in 75% of them.”).

²⁶ PACKAGED FACTS, THE U.S. SCHOOL SECURITY MARKET (2000), *available at* <http://academic.marketresearch.com/product/display.asp?productid=143377>.

²⁷ See SIMON, *supra* note 15, at 88 (describing the role that capitalist society plays in encouraging punishment rather than social welfare).

²⁸ *Id.* at 175.

²⁹ THE CONDITION OF EDUCATION 2007, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (2007), *available at* <http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2007/2007064.pdf>.

³⁰ Rebecca Gordon, Libero Della Piana & Terry Keleher, *Zero Tolerance: A Basic Racial Report Card*, in ZERO TOLERANCE 165 (William Ayers, Bernadine Dohrn & Rick Ayers eds., 2001); Russ Skiba & Reece Peterson, *The Dark Side of Punishment: Can Punishment Lead to Safe Schools?*, 80 THE PHI DELTA KAPPAN 372, 376 (1999) (suggesting zero tolerance policies do not reduce violence in schools).

³¹ See WESTERN, *supra* note 4, at 40-44; THE CONDITION OF EDUCATION 2007, *supra* note 29.

³² See Noguera, *supra* note 21, at 197 (discussing teachers’ realization that the practice of “terror of degradation” will not create a productive environment).

³³ Hirschfield, *supra* note 17, at 92.

³⁴ See Richard Arum & Irene R. Beattie, *High School Experience and the Risk of Adult Incarceration*, 37 CRIMINOLOGY 515, 527 (1999) (“Individuals with 12 years of education who reported being suspended were 2.2 times more likely incarcerated than students reporting no suspensions...”); Hirschfield, *supra* note 17, at 92.

³⁵ Gordon et al., *supra* note 30, at 165.

³⁶ DIGEST OF EDUCATION STATISTICS: 2004, NATIONAL CENTER FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS (2004), <http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d04/>.

³⁷ Daniel J. Losen & Christopher Edley, *The Role of Law in Policing Abusive Disciplinary Practices: Why School Discipline is a Civil Rights Issue*, in ZERO TOLERANCE 230 (William Ayers, Bernadine Dohrn & Rick Ayers eds., 2001); Robert C. Johnston, *Federal Data Highlight Disparities in Discipline*, 41 EDUC. WEEK 3, 3 (2000), *available at* <http://www.edweek.org/login.html?source=http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/06/21/41zero.h19.html&destination=http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2000/06/21/41zero.h19.html&levelId=2100>.

³⁸ Russ Skiba, *When is Disproportionality Discrimination?*, in ZERO TOLERANCE 176 (William Ayers, Bernadine Dohrn & Rick Ayers eds., 2001).

³⁹ Arum & Beattie, *supra* note 34, at 527.

⁴⁰ PLANNING, ANALYSIS AND INFORMATION RESOURCES 2002 DISTRICT ACCOUNTABILITY RESULTS, LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (2002), *available at* <http://www.doe.state.la.us/lde/pair/1355.html>.

⁴¹ SCHOOL PERFORMANCE LABEL, GROWTH LABEL, CORRECTIVE ACTION STATE, AND REWARDS ELIGIBILITY BY DISTRICT, LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (2002), *available at* <http://www.leadr.info/runreport.php?did=149372>.

⁴² DISTRICT COMPOSITE REPORT ORLEANS PARISH, 2001-2002, LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (2003), *available at* <http://www.louisianaschools.net/lde/pair/DCR0102/DCR036.pdf>.

⁴³ DIGEST OF EDUCATION STATISTICS: 2004, *supra* note 36.

⁴⁴ DISTRICT COMPOSITE REPORT ORLEANS PARISH, 2001-2002, *supra* note 42.

⁴⁵ See generally WESTERN, *supra* note 4, at 131-68.

⁴⁶ See generally JEFF MANZA & CHRISTOPHER UGGEN, LOCKED OUT: FELON DISENFRANCHISEMENT AND AMERICAN DEMOCRACY (2006).

⁴⁷ See Noguera, *supra* note 3, at 433 (asserting community organizations’ involvement with African American male students may be essential to improving academic outcomes and keeping such students out of prison); Loïc J.D. Wacquant, *Negative Social Capital: State Breakdown and Social Destitute in America’s Urban Core*, 13 NETH. J. OF HOUSING AND THE BUILT ENV’T. 25, 27-29 (1998) (discussing resources and values that people may turn to by virtue of membership).

⁴⁸ Roslyn Arlin Mickelson, *The Attitude-Achievement Paradox Among Black Adolescents*, 63 SOC. OF EDUC. 44, 55 (1990) (stating “The more optimistic students feel about the potential value of education for their future, the better their performance in school.”).

⁴⁹ Richard Arum & Gary LaFree, *Teacher-Student Ratios and the*

Risk of Adult Incarceration Among U.S. Birth Cohorts Since 1910, 81 SOC. OF EDUC. 397, 413 (2008).

⁵⁰ Ellen Tuzzolo, *Homegrown Heroes Fight for Support Not Security*, in EDUCATION ORGANIZING 3, available at <http://www.jjpl.org/edorg07.pdf>.