5214F Diamond Heights Blvd #3055
San Francisco, CA 94109

+1 (715) 469-6884
fellowship@yipinstitute.org
www.yipinstitute.org/fellowship/

How Wealth Inequality Drives Educational Disparities in America

Kaitlyn Letien

I. Executive summary

Educational opportunity should not depend on family income or neighborhood wealth. This brief will examine how economic inequality fuels unequal access to quality schooling and outline policy solutions that aim to create a fairer, more inclusive public education system.

II. Overview

Wealth inequality in the United States creates structural barriers in the education system that limit the academic trajectory and future potential of students in low-income communities. This inequity plays out in the form of poor-quality schools, overcrowded classrooms, and restricted access to qualified educators, technology, and rigorous coursework. While progress has been made in changing the educational access narrative in the U.S., including federal funding and reforms to public education, achievement gaps persist, especially between students from affluent and low-income families. Moreover, these gaps are not simply academic but structural, rooted in the ways in which public education is funded and distributed in the U.S. This brief analyzes the relationship between wealth inequality and educational opportunity for the purpose of understanding how different funding structures and systemic barriers have led to a two-tiered education system in the U.S.

A. Relevance

Wealth-based inequities in education have grown more alarming as funding for public schools in the U.S. is still reliant mostly on local property taxes. This has contributed to deep funding discrepancies, with very wealthy districts able to offer better-paid teachers, stronger technology, and more advanced programs, while low-income schools often have little to no access to resources. These inequities continue to worsen cycles of poverty while eliminating opportunities for students to escape poor conditions. The Economic Policy Institute recognized that students who are enrolled in schools with high concentrations of poverty face burdens from systemic inequities that contribute to their inability to achieve academically and pursue meaningful opportunities in life. Addressing these disparities is necessary to improve a public education system that urgently needs it.

III. History

A. Current Stances

Wealth inequality has always been, and still is, a structural issue in the United States, influencing access to basic public services like education. The current system of school funding is largely determined by local property taxes, which privileges wealthier neighborhoods and penalizes low-income communities. As a result, schools serving low-income communities are underfunded, poorly staffed, and provide fewer academic and extracurricular opportunities, and the relatively scarce academic opportunities tend to be of lower quality as well. According to the National Center for Education Statistics, schools with the highest concentration of low-income students spend dramatically less per pupil compared to schools in the highest-income areas, despite the much greater needs often associated with students in poverty.

As Sean Reardon and other scholars note, the academic achievement gap between low and high income students has grown substantially over the past few decades and now exceeds the racial achievement gap. Economic disparities function similarly to racial and ethnic disparities in K–12 and higher education, particularly in relation to admissions, persistence, and graduation. Barriers faced by some low-income students include lack of access to SAT/ACT prep courses, limited financial literacy, and a higher likelihood of dropping out primarily because of financial hardship.

Although policies such as Title I have been, and continue to be, created and implemented to support high-poverty schools, these policies routinely fall short (due to insufficient funding) and are inconsistently applied across states. Debates about "school choice" and charter schools have added to the divide, as advocates argue that they expand options for economically disadvantaged families, while others caution that these initiatives redirect resources away from traditional public schools. The overarching controversy of unequal opportunity based on wealth is not limited to K–12 education but is also an extremely contentious issue with seemingly no bipartisan agreement on solutions.

IV. Policy Problem

A. Stakeholders

The main stakeholders in this matter are the students from low-income communities that experience the most damage from inequitable access to quality education. They are often placed in underfunded schools and less academic opportunities, which only solidifies the opportunity gap that constrains the supplies and tools available to successfully study in school and pursue their desired goals. Even with the best of intentions, the realities of economic disadvantage make it often impossible for them to escape when they have equal access to a public educational system that should afford them as much access to an equitable educational establishment and the same academic goals others are able to pursue.

State and local governments are also valuable stakeholders in this area and are ultimately the ones who allocate public dollars for public education and inform public policy for education. Perhaps for this reason, our current funding structures assume that regional wealth is a definitive factor to distribute equitable funds in education. As policymakers, they must realize the long-term social and economic consequences of these inequities. As stewards, they must ensure they create a better condition for our students and citizens.

B. Risks of Indifference

Becoming desensitized to the educational inequities produced by wealth inequality is dangerous in terms of both deepening systemic inequities and ultimately the cost to society. Complacency to funding gaps or barriers for low-income students by all stakeholders will continue to let the already wide achievement gap grow, inhibiting social mobility and economic opportunity for generations of students to come. The cycle of underfunding will hold and continue the cycle of poverty in traditionally marginalized communities. Indifference can also erode trust in the public education system and, in some cases, cause a decline in academic achievement nationally. Over decades, this also reduces the readiness of our workforce and the country's competitive ability globally. These discrepancies need to be addressed, not only as a moral obligation, but in order to build a more equitable and prosperous society.

C. Nonpartisan Reasoning

Educational inequality caused by wealth gaps is not a partisan issue, it affects students, families, and communities across the country, regardless of political affiliation. Addressing this issue is essential to creating a more functional and fair society, and the benefits of doing so are broad and long-lasting.

1) Improved economic strength and opportunity: A stronger economy starts with greater equitable access. When more students engage with a high-quality education system, it cultivates a more skilled, flexible, and ultimately competitive workforce. More equitable access to education leads to more employment, more household income, and less dependency on government support. Providing opportunity for disadvantaged and more low-income students is not just an equity issue - it fosters sustainable economic growth.

2) Reduced inequality and stronger communities: Mitigating social fragmentation means addressing the primary factors of educational inequity. The longer students in low-resourced schools are left behind, the more communities diverge economically and socially, and geographically. Infrastructure more equitably invested in education helps to break the cycle of poverty and diminish polarization for a more connected, resilient society.

3) A long-term investment in the nation's future: Fair school funding isn't just about improving standardized tests, it's about investing in kids, families, and communities. When students have what they need to be successful they are more likely to graduate, give back, and engage with civic life. A more equitable system provides every student, not only those privileged at birth, the opportunity to contribute to the future of the country.

V. Tried Policy

Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) launched in 1965, is one of the most notable federal attempts to remedy educational inequity. Title I provides resources to schools with a substantial number or percentage of low-income children, for the purposes of providing assistance for schools for those students to reach state academic achievement standards. While Title I was created as an intervention to address inequities, its implementation has been at best, controversial.

One of the concerns about Title I is that funding is often minimal and underfunded. Several states have shifted portions of the funding or diluted the funding to ensure respective schools spend less than intended. Additionally, the program does not reduce the local property tax/financially based local funding situation, which produces huge disparities in the resources available to the districts. While Title I did acknowledge the need for low-income student programming and needs, it has not closed the opportunity gap. Critics argue that to ensure optimal funding for schools we require larger structural change to fund schools, otherwise policy initiatives to impact change like Title I are not enough to create systematic and sustained change.

VI. Policy Options

Reforming school funding models

The most direct approach to reducing educational inequality is to reform the funding structure for public schools. Schools are funded, in part, on local property tax revenues which creates significant divisions in the quality of available schools based on some neighborhoods. Some states are piloting weighted funding formulas which design runtime funding according to poverty population, number of English language learners and number of disabilities, based on a per student basis. Some states are implementing and allocating more funding weight to those schools. More needs to happen on the state and national level to create more financial resources for schools, so that students, no matter where they exist, can attend schools with enough money, teachers and materials to educate with. If the finance model changes from local, the playing field will not necessarily be leveled, but it will start to erode the effects of track record of disinvestment in poor communities, for decades.

Strengthening Title I and increasing federal accountability

Title I was designed to help schools with many low-income students but has become far less successful because of the inconsistent application of funding. To make it more successful, the funding can be increased and targeted better, as well as states and districts held more accountable to federal guidelines regarding how to use the funding. In addition, oversight can be used as a way to provide more assurance that the funding actually results in better use of resources for the intended students. Schools can also be asked to report potential spending, as well as some academic data, while reporting progress to give transparency. These adjustments can help tighten the gap between well-meaning funding and applicable, measurable change for students from disadvantaged communities.

Expanding access to early education and academic support

Education inequity often starts before kids enter kindergarten; students living in poverty often come to school with an educational deficit due to a lack of early learning, limited access to books, and enrichment opportunities. Expanding public funding for preschool, tutoring, and after-school support helps to erase early developmental gaps. For example, free or subsidized pre-K education provided to children in low-income areas results in visible improvements in their literacy and math skills and their long-term success. The benefit of after-school support may also be that students stay engaged in school and fulfill educational expectations. By investing funding in early access to opportunity and out-of-school education supports, we can provide children the opportunities for success before educational inequities are established and entrenched.

VII. Conclusions

In this brief, I examined how wealth inequality drives educational disparities and looked at policy avenues for addressing that inequality. Out of all the suggestions for addressing educational inequality, the most straightforward solutions are modifications to current models of school funding. Appropriately adjusting and enhancing Title IX, expanding early education, and investing in a greater length of time in districts who need it most will potentially increase the effectiveness of current educational systems.

Educational inequality does still present a wide range of issues. By working with policy that incorporates research, investing in equity more quickly, and continuing to focus on fairness, we can begin to close educational gaps. Gaps in inequality still exist; however, being focused on real improvement, we can ensure that every student will receive a quality education regardless of their income.

Acknowledgment

The Institute for Youth in Policy wishes to acknowledge Mason Carlisle, Lilly Kurtz, Asher Cohen, Paul Kramer. and other contributors for developing and maintaining the Fellowship Program within the Institute.

References

[1] American Youth Policy Forum. (n.d.). *Equitable pathways to opportunities for young people*. Retrieved from https://aypf.org/blog/equitable-pathways-to-opportunities-for-young-people/
[2] Brown v. Board of Education, 347 U.S. 483 (1954).
[3] Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Pub. L. No. 89-10, 79 Stat. 27.
[4] Reardon, S. F. (2011). *The widening academic achievement gap between the rich and the poor*: New evidence and possible explanations. Retrieved from https://cepa.stanford.edu/sites/default/files/reardon%20whither%20opportunity%20-%20chapter%205.pdf
[5] San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez, 411 U.S. 1 (1973).
[6] University of Michigan. (n.d.). *Research shows how wealth begets educational disparity*. Retrieved from https://record.umich.edu/articles/research-shows-how-wealth-begets-educational-disparity/#:~:text=Now%2C%20new%20research%20led%20by,intergenerational%20inequality%20than%20income%20alone
[7] Urban Institute. (n.d.). *Wealth inequality is a barrier to education and social mobility*. Retrieved from https://www.urban.org/research/publication/wealth-inequality-barrier-education-and-social-mobility
[8] U.S. Government Accountability Office. (2016). *Better use of information could help agencies identify disparities and address racial discrimination*. Retrieved from https://www.gao.gov/assets/gao-16-345.pdf
[9] Wolff, E. N. (n.d.). *Can educational policies reduce wealth inequality*? Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4909033