A Status Report on Educational Attainment of People of Color in Two Ohio Cities; Cincinnati and Toledo

UNIVERSITY OF Cincinnati **Institute for Community Partnerships**

3/05

Carter Wilson, Ph.D.
Department of Political Science and Public Administration
Faculty Research Associate, The Urban Affairs Center
University of Toledo

Esther Erkins, Ed.D.
Associate Director
University of Cincinnati Institute for Community Partnerships
Adjunct, University of Cincinnati College of Education, Criminal Justice, and Human Services

UUP The Urban University Program

The Urban Affairs Center is a partner in the Ohio Urban University Program. The Urban University Program is a unique network linking the resources of Ohio's urban universities with the communities and students they serve. The UUP partners work in a cooperative effort to improve Ohio's urban regions

Prepared for Public Release
3/05

By The University of Toledo Urban Affairs Center

The University of Toledo
Urban Affairs Center
2801 W. Bancroft St.
Toledo, Ohio 43606
419•530•3591
E-Mail: uac@utoledo.edu

This publication is available for download at the Urban Affairs Center website:
HTTP://uac.utoledo.edu

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

The educational efforts and attainment of minority-- especially African American--students in Ohio's urban communities is the subject of significant commentary and debate, and some misconceptions. Drawing upon secondary data from numerous sources, the study attempts to set the record straight. It describes, analyzes, and summarizes information about, and the experiences of, people of color in the publicly-supported "K-16" programs and institutions in Toledo and Cincinnati. Analyzing the demographic context and experiences of people of color in Ohio and our respective cities in their public school and local University settings; we identify several starting points for meeting the needs and improving the performance of urban students of color.

Despite gains over the past two decades, people of color from low-income areas face serious and persisting problems of inadequate educational attainment. Although the particulars of these problems occasionally vary within and between communities, a few patterns emerge from this study of Cincinnati and Toledo:

- Despite improvements by both Cincinnati and Toledo Public school districts in attendance, graduation rates, and proficiency scores, both districts continue to have relatively low proficiency scores, very low math and science scores, and high drop-out rates.
- African American and Hispanic American students are less likely to have completed the high school academic core courses and most likely to require remedial courses when in College.
- Compared to other racial/ethnic groups, African Americans had the lowest income, grades, and ACT scores.
- When in college, people of color were disproportionately involved in remedial courses and individualized programs, rather than in traditional disciplines.
- The 4 and 6 year graduation rates for students of color were substantially lower than the norm.
- Although the proportion of African Americans with some college increased dramatically and the proportion with four years of college increased marginally over the past decade, whites age 25 and older were twice as likely as African Americans in Lucas and three times as likely as African Americans in Hamilton County to have a college degree.
- Even when people of color complete a college degree, it does not axiomatically translate into economic opportunity. In Hamilton County in 2000, a higher percentage of Hispanic Americans had the four-year degree than whites, but their median income was lower.

The report offers several policy recommendations to the State government, to local public school districts, and to urban universities, that could help improve the educational preparation and attainment of students of color in our urban public

institutions. They stress the need for; greater research, institutional coordination and alignment, better communication of expectations with students and parents, and targeted strategic planning that both builds upon and mitigates the impacts of the common experiences of urban students of color.

Introduction

It is well known that high school graduates from low-income families are less likely to be prepared for college than other students. They are less likely to have taken college preparatory classes, and more likely to score lower on college entrance tests, to require more remedial college courses, to take longer to complete their degree, and to drop out of college. It is also known that college degrees have an equalizing impact on the earnings of college graduates, regardless of family income. That is, the earnings of college graduates from low-income families are likely to equal the earnings of college graduates from middle-income families. Sheehan, Lechler and Wagner's recent study of Ohio Higher Education Information (HEI) system data confirm these assertions specific to Ohio.[1]

We know little about the experiences of racial and ethnic minorities—African American, Hispanic American, Asian Americans and Native Americans in Ohio. We do not know whether urban schools, with large proportions of African-American or Hispanic students, provide an adequate college preparatory curriculum. We know little about minority students entering college: their test scores, their need for remedial and developmental courses, and their rate of success in college. We know little about the types of jobs they get and the salaries they earn after graduating from college. We don't know enough and lack many particulars, including best practices or career and experiential pathways undertaken by the most successful of students from these backgrounds.

This study explores the entry patterns of various racial and ethnic groups into two large Ohio urban state universities, University of Cincinnati (UC) and University of Toledo (UT). Of particular interest are the experiences of African American students that come from urban K-12 school district and subsequently end up at one or the other these universities. This study explores the question: How well these students are faring once leaving their urban school districts for institutions of higher education. Because African Americans disproportionately live at home while attending college, it is important to focus on them in these urban schools. The study will comparatively examine the educational background of students entering both of these institutions during the Autumn Quarter 1999. Other studies, especially data complied by The University of Toledo and University of Cincinnati Upward Bound programs indicate that African American students more

[1] Robert Sheehan, Andy Lechler and William Wagner, "*A Study of Higher Education Experiences and Outcomes: Focus on Low-Income, Dependent Students*." (2002).

often come from families in which they are first generation college students and have household incomes of less than $20,000 per year.

This study is divided into four parts. Part One examines the statewide trends of minorities in higher education. Part Two examines the demographic conditions of the cities of Toledo and Cincinnati Ohio. Part Three presents the student profiles of both the Toledo Public Schools and the Cincinnati Public Schools. Part Four looks at the minority student experiences at The Universities of Toledo and Cincinnati. In a summary section, we present policy recommendations intended to help improve the educational attainment of minority students in Toledo and Cincinnati.

Research Questions

- What are the general experiences of minority students in Ohio's urban public schools?
- What are the attributes of the urban milieu experienced by students who graduate from urban public schools and who enter urban public universities?
- How well are African American students from urban public school districts in Toledo and Cincinnati fare within baccalaureate-level higher education institutions in their region?
- Finally, what are the implications of these findings for policy-makers seeking to improve the rates of educational attainment for this population of students?

Methodology

This study examines the educational experiences of minority students. We analyze this experience at two levels: state and urban. Using Ohio HEI system data, we look at the college educational experiences of ethnic and racial minorities. We look at ACT scores, the completion of high school academic core courses, the completion of specific college preparatory courses, and the number of college remedial courses needed.

After analyzing the statewide data, we use HEI data to look more carefully at trends occurring on the campuses of The University of Toledo and University of Cincinnati. This campus specific data allows us to examine the status of African American students more carefully.

This data provides an overview of the enrollment trends of African-American students with regard to whether they are matriculating. Also we look at retention rates and grade point averages.

We are unable to track individual students from high school through college and we do not have data on students dropping out of college. Consequently we can only speculate on the extent and strength of the direct connection between

the lack of preparation in high school and failure in college. Nevertheless, the school district data on low high school performance and the OBOR and campus specific data on high need for remedial courses and low retention rates provide strong evidence of this connection. [2]

We next look at the urban school districts and central cities of Cincinnati and Toledo. We review data examining the high school experiences of African Americans in these two cities and contextualize the data within the local conditions. Student Report Card data from the Ohio Department of Education is used to build student profiles for each community. This database includes proficiency test scores, demographic information, graduation rates and rates of per pupil expenditure. The data is available both district-wide and at the building level.

Findings

PART 1: The Status of Minorities in Ohio's Universities

In this section we analyze the educational experiences of racial and ethnic minorities in the state of Ohio. We focus on freshmen. Our primary concern is the preparedness of minority students entering Ohio colleges as freshmen. We use Ohio Board of Regents data from Higher Education Information system reports.

The HEI reports are based on surveys of over 54,000 freshmen in colleges and universities throughout the state of Ohio. The surveys focus on recent high school graduates who were less than 20 years old at the time of the survey and who had entered Ohio public colleges and universities as first year students in the fall of 1999. The data contain variables on the demographics and the educational experiences of students surveyed.

HEI Demographic Data

The HEI demographic information includes race, ethnicity, gender, economic status and enrollment status. The following is a summary of the data.

Race and Ethnicity

HEI reports use the following racial and ethnic categories:

[2] We have been and continue to seek access to the datasets held by OBOR that could allow us to empirically investigate and demonstrate those relationships.

1. Americans Indian or Alaskan Native (Native American),
2. Asian American and Pacific Islanders (Asian American),
3. Black, non-Hispanic (African American)
4. Hispanic Americans,
5. White, non-Hispanic
6. Nonresident Alien

Table 1 - Summary of Racial and Ethnic Groups in Ohio Public Universities

Race/Ethnicity	Mean	Number
American Indian	.3	183
Asian and Pacific Islander	1.6	840
Black/ Non-Hispanic	8.2	4,442
Hispanic	1.5	802
White, Non-Hispanic	85.2	46,081
Nonresident Alien	.2	104
Unknown	3.0	1,620
Total	100	54,072

Of the 54,000 respondents identifying their racial and ethnic heritage in the OBOR HEI data about 85.2 percent of Ohio's college students are White, 8.2 percent are Black, 1.6 percent are Asia or Pacific Islanders, and 1.5 percent are Hispanic. About three-tenths of a percent are American Indian and two-tenths of 1 percent are nonresident aliens.
Only 1,620 or three percent did not identify their race or ethnicity. This gives us a low error factor.

Gender and Other Demographics

The majority of college students are women. However, there are a few gender differences among racial and ethnic groups. Table 2 shows that Asian American and nonresident alien students (two of the 3 smallest groups, together totaling only 1.8% of all student groups) are disproportionately men. The ratios of women to men are similar among Native Americans, Hispanic Americans and White Americans, with 53 women and 47 percent men—a small difference. A major finding is that among the major "ethnic" groups in Ohio, only African American college students are predominantly female, as close to 60 percent are women and about 40 percent are male.

Table 2 – Race/Ethnicity and Gender

Race	Female	Male	Number
American Indian	53%	47%	183
Asian or Pacific Islander	49%	51%	840
Black/Non-Hispanic	58.9%	41.1%	4,442
Hispanic	53%	47%	802
White, Non-Hispanic	53%	47%	46,081
Nonresident Alien	43.3%	56.7%	104

Economic Status

HEI data provides two ways to identify students by economic status: family income and financial aid status. The information on family income is straightforward.

Table 3 - Race/Ethnicity and Median Income

Race/Ethnicity	Median Income
American Indian or Alaskan Native	$50,584
Asian or Pacific Islander	$55,168
Black/Non-Hispanic	$33,000
Hispanic	$51,454
White, Non-Hispanic	$60,439
Non-Resident Alien	$38,255

Table 3 compares the median income of the six racial and ethnic groups. The median income of African Americans is the lowest among the six groups. At $33,000 it is almost half the median income of White American families of Ohio college students at $60,439. The median income of White Americans is the highest among the six, followed by Asian Americans at $55,168, Hispanic Americans at $51,454 and Native Americans at $50,584. The extent to which African American students are disadvantaged compared to other students is best illustrated by examining Black median income as a percentage of the median income of other racial and ethnic groups. Black median income is 54.6 percent of White American, 59.8 percent of Asian American, 64.1 percent of Hispanic American and 65.2 percent of American Indian median income.

We identified college students from low-income families by their eligibility for the Ohio Instructional Grant (OIG). OIG is a program for the economically disadvantaged and its recipients are similar to participants in the federal Pell Grant program. About 15 percent of all the students surveyed indicated eligibility for OIG. Eligibility varied widely among racial and ethnic groups, as shown in Table 4. African Americans were most likely to qualify for OIG, as 41.4 percent indicated they were eligible. Hispanic Americans were the second most likely to qualify, as 23.7 % were eligible, followed by Asian Americans at 22.0%, Native Americans at 21.3%, and 12% of Whites qualifying.

The larger percentage of Asian Americans compared to Native Americans qualifying for financial aid seems inconsistent with data on median income. The median income of Asian Americans is about five thousand dollars more than the median income of Native Americans. However, this apparent anomaly is explained by Ohio census tract data. The distribution of income among Asian Americans is bimodal and the disparity between low-income and high-income Asian families is extreme. The incomes of Japanese and Korean Americans tend to be high. Cambodian Americans in Ohio have the highest poverty rate than any other ethnic group, including African Americans. The high proportion of Asian Americans qualifying for financial aid can be explained by this high poverty rate among Southeastern Asian Americans.

Table 4 - OIG Eligibility by Race/Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Eligible OIG	Ineligible OIC	No OIG Test Applied	Total Number
American Indian	21.3%	40.4%	38.3%	183
Asian or Pacific Islander	22%	41.95	36.1%	840
Black, Non-Hispanic	41.4%	36.5%	22.1%	4,482
Hispanic	23.7%	50.2%	26.1%	802
White, Non-Hispanic	12.1%	50.6%	37.3%	46,081
Non-Resident Alien	5.8%	5.8%	88.5%	104
Unknown	-	-	-	1,602

Full-time/Part-time Status

Table 5 summarizes the data on a student's race, ethnicity and full-time or part-time status. In all groups, more than eighty percent of students were full-time. However, there were some differences. Ninety-three percent of Asian Americans were full-time, compared to about 88 percent for White Americans and Hispanic Americans. A higher percentage Native Americans, 19.1 percent, and African Americans, 16.1 percent, were part-time, compared to other groups; 12 percent for Hispanic Americans, 11.3 percent for White Americans, and only 6.7 percent for Asian Americans. The higher percentage

of Native Americans and African Americans enrolled part-time may be a reflection of the lower family income and an increased need to work while taking classes.

Table 5 - Race/Ethnicity and Full-time/Part-time Status

Race/Ethnicity	Full-time Student	Part-Time Student	Total Number
American Indian	80.9%	19.1%	183
Asian or Pacific Islander	93.3%	6.7%	840
Black, Non-Hispanic	83.9%	16.1%	4,442
Hispanic	88%	12	802
White, Non-Hispanic	88.7%	11.3%	46,081

Special Case of Minority Students

Native American, Black and Hispanic students are more likely to be low-income, to qualify for financial aid and to attend part-time. Native American students have the highest proportion attending part-time and the second lowest median income. Hispanic students have median incomes higher than Native American and African American student, but the second highest proportion qualifying for financial aid. This trend is most striking among African American students who have the lowest median income, the highest proportion qualifying for financial aid and the second highest proportion attending part-time.

Academic Preparedness

Now that we have discussed demographic data, we can now use this information to contextualize student academic preparedness. We examine academic preparedness by looking at ACT test scores, completion of high school academic core courses, and completion of remedial courses. We should note that some students take the SAT test rather than the ACT.

Race, Ethnicity and ACT Scores

Table 6 summarizes mean ACT scores for our six racial and ethnic groups. Not all of the students took the ACT test. The percentage of respondents reporting that they took the ACT test ranges from a low of 65 percent for Native Americans to a high of about 80 percent for White Americans and Asian Americans. Only 68.1 percent of African Americans and about 70 percent of Hispanic Americans took this test.

The mean ACT score for African Americans was 17.77, the lowest mean score of the five groups. Asian Americans had a mean score of 22.68. White Americans had a score of 21.59 and Hispanic Americans, 20.43.

Three caveats must be noted in any discussion of race, ethnicity and ACT scores. First, the mean score does not tell the range of scores. Although the mean ACT score for African Americans is low, the range of scores is wide with a low of 3 and a high of 32.[3] Second, ACT scores correlate strongly with income. Racial and ethnic differences in ACT scores generally disappear when income is taken into account.

The third point is minor. There is some association between a group's mean ACT score and the percentage of its members reporting scores. That is, the groups with higher mean ACT scores have higher percentages reporting scores. The significance of this point is unclear. It is likely that those not reporting scores are less prepared for college and less aware of the importance of the score. It is not clear that these scores would be significantly below the group mean.

Table 6 - ACT Scores

Race/Ethnicity	ACT Mean Score	Number reporting Test Score	% reporting test score	Total Number
American Indian	20.52	119	65%	183
Asian or Pacific Islander	22.68	673	80.15	840
Black/Non-Hispanic	17.7	3,027	68.1%	4,442
Hispanic	20.43	563	70.2%	802
White, Non-Hispanic	21.59	37,032	80.4%	46,081
Unknown	21.41	1,258	77.75	1,620

High School Academic Core

Table 7 summarizes the completion of high school academic core courses. The academic core is equivalent to a college preparatory curriculum. It includes courses such as chemistry, physics, biology, algebra, geometry, and literature.

[3] Charles Clark, "*Selected Characteristics of African-American Undergraduate."* The University of Toledo Office of Institutional Research, Report No. SR 2003-003.

Table 7 - Completion of HS Academic Core

Race/Ethnicity	HS Academic Core Completed	HS Academic Core Not Completed	Unknown	Total
American Indian	41%	29.5%	29.5%	183
Asian & Pacific Islander	67.3%	18%	14.8%	840
Black/ Non-Hispanic	44.6%	29.1%	26.2%	4,442
Hispanic	48.1%	25.4%	26.4%	802
White, Non-Hispanic	56.6%	26.5%	16.9%	46,081
Unknown	57.3%	26.5%	18.6%	1,620

The high percentage of respondents not answering this question is a subject of concern. No doubt some students did not respond to avoid the embarrassment of appearing unprepared for college, while others were probably unaware of core courses.

The principle indicator that stands out in this table is the high percentage of Asian Americans completing the core. Over sixty-seven percent of Asian American respondents indicated having completed the high school academic core. Fifty-six percent of White Americans indicated having completed the core. Native Americans were the least likely to complete the core, followed by Black and Hispanic Americans.

Financial Aid Status and High School Core Completion

We examined the interaction effect of race/ethnicity and income on the propensity to complete a high school academic core. Tables 8 and 9 allow us to exam the association between financial status and academic preparedness. Table 8 provides data on OIG eligible students and completion of high school core. Table 9 provides data on OIG *in*eligible student and completion of the high school core.

With the exception of Asian American students, those students eligible for financial aid have low rates of non-completion of the high school core. For the OIG eligible, only 46.2 percent of Native Americans and 46.1 percent of White Americans report completion of the high school score. Core completion rates were lower among Blacks and Hispanics, with completion rates of 43.4 percent and 41.1 percent respectively.

Table 8 - OIG Eligible and Completed HS Academic Core

Race/Ethnicity	HS Core Completed	Number Completing Core	HS Core NOT completed	Number NOT Completing	Unknown	Number Unknown	Total Number
American Indian	46.2%	18	29/5%	10	28.2%	11	39
Asian or Pacific Islander	66.5%	123	18%	37	13.5%	25	185
Black/ Non-Hispanic	43.4%	797	29.1%	563	26%	478	1838
Hispanic	41.1%	78	25.4%	58	28.4%	54	190
White, Non-Hispanic	46.1%	2564	26.5%	1711	23.2%	1292	5567
Unknown	48.9%	135	26.5%	80	18.6%	61	276

Table 9 - OIG Ineligible and Completed HS Academic Core

Race/Ethnicity	HS Academic Core Completed	Number
American Indian or Alaskan Native	47.3%	35
Asian or Pacific Islander	76.7%	270
Black/Non-Hispanic	55.5%	900
Hispanic	57.8%	233
White, Non-Hispanic	64.2%	14,980
Unknown	48.9%	135

As Table 9 shows, a majority of the students who are ineligible for financial aid (except Native Americans)—and by extension, being of higher income--report having completed the high school core curriculum. Yet, even among this group, there are significant differences between racial groups. Only 55.5 percent of African Americans students and 57.8 percent of Hispanic students report having completed the core, compared to 64.2 percent for White and 76.7 percent of Asian American students.

Remedial Courses

We examined whether the students were required to take remedial courses and if so, how many they were required to take. African Americans were most often required to take remedial course and more frequently required to take more than two courses. Table 10 shows that only 47.5 % of African Americans were not required to take any remedial courses, compared to 60% for Hispanic Americans, 61% for Native Americans, 70% for White Americans, and 82% for Asian Americans. Thus while deficient in completing the core curriculum while in high school, African American students were willing and actively undertook courses to upgrade their skills.

Table 10 - Remedial Courses

Race/Ethnicity	No Remedial Course Required	1 Remedial Course Required	2 Courses Required	2+ Courses Required	Total Number Students
American Indian	61.7%	21.3%	7.7%	9.3%	183
Asian or Pacific Islander	82.1	8.9%	5.1%	3.8%	840
Black/Non-Hispanic	47.5%	20.5%	14.4%	17.6%	4,442
Hispanic	60.6%	18.1%	12.6%	8.7%	802
White, Non-Hispanic	70.7%	16.4%	7.4%	5.5%	46,081
Unknown	71.4%	14.6%	8.2%	5.8%	1,620

Over 17 percent of African American students report having to take more than two remedial courses. This requirement imposes a tremendous and often overwhelming burden on low-income Black students. Because financial aid does not cover remedial classes, students pay out of pocket for these courses. Moreover, students must carry a full-time load of regular non-remedial courses in addition to the remedial ones in order to keep their financial aid. These students need to take some remedial courses because they are under prepared, at the same time they take some matriculating courses—for which they are by definition unprepared. This both burdens their efforts, and it discourages them, since their ability to do well is obviously inhibited by their limited preparation. Having to pay for some courses that do not count for graduation, taking others for which they are ill-prepared, and having to deal with the frustrating effects of these, constitute “three strikes” for many students and they disproportionately leave school before their second year.

Space and Academic Preparedness

So far we have examined variations in academic preparedness by race and ethnicity. Data from a special OBOR report, "Making the Transition from High School to College in Ohio 2000," allow for spatially-based descriptive analysis. This data allows us to examine variations in college enrollment and college preparedness among students from several types of geographical and income areas:

Table 11 summarizes OBOR data on the type of district, the number of high school graduates, percentage of graduates enrolled in college, percentage taking the ACT or SAT tests, and percentage of test takers who completed the high school core courses.

Table 11 - Fall 2000 First Year Direct from High School College Enrollment and Experience by District Type[4]

Type of District	# grads previous yr.	% grads enrolled college	% enrolled took ACT/SAT	% ACT/SAT w/ H.S. Core
Major City extreme poverty	12,699	34%	82%	64%
Urban Moderate SES	11,955	45%	84%	64%
Suburban/Urban high SES	24,566	56%	88%	72%
Suburban/very high SES	10,100	59%	92%	78%
Small town extreme poverty	10,172	38%	89%	65%
Small town moderate SES	16,897	46%	89%	65%
Rural high poverty	8,392	37%	88%	59%
rural	13,395	43%	90%	61%

Several points emerge from Table11. First, major city, extremely high poverty districts have the lowest percentage of graduating high school seniors going to college, followed by rural high poverty districts. Second, major city, extremely high poverty districts have the lowest percentage of their college bound graduates taking the ACT or SAT tests. Third, college bound students from rural high poverty and rural areas are less likely to complete high school core courses than students from other areas including major city, extreme high poverty areas. In sum, poverty restricts opportunity, while affluence (or

[4] Data from Ohio Board of Regents. *Making the Transition from High School to College in Ohio 2002.*

high SES) encourages students to engage in the activities that are highly correlated to post-secondary success, regardless of type of district. [5]

Table 12 compares data on the percentages of college bound students from Toledo and Cincinnati public school districts and from a suburban high SES district nearby to each. It examines their students' need to take remedial courses and the association between completion of the high school core and this need to remediate.

Table 12 - Math and English Remediation Rate by Select School Districts

	% needing Math remediation			% needing English remediation		
District	**All enrollees**	**w/ HS Core**	**< HS Core**	**All Enrollees**	**w/ HS Core**	**< HS Core**
Toledo	50%	34%	58%	37%	21%	42%
Sylvania	22%	13%	30%	14%	6%	18%
Cincinnati	33%	24%	39%	30%	24%	34%
Sycamore	16%	10%	42%	11%	5%	27%

This table indicates that about half of Toledo school graduating seniors who entered colleges in the fall of 2002 needed to take remedial math courses, despite the fact that almost 60% of Toledo students had not completed the high school core classes. About forty percent of Cincinnati students who had not completed the core had to take remedial math courses. While completion of the core courses reduce the tendency toward needing remedial courses, the math proficiency remained a problem for 34 percent of Toledo and 24 percent of Cincinnati students who had completed the high school core. Interestingly, the percent not completing the core was greater than the percentage needing remediation in each City and for both math and English subject areas.

Overall Status of Students of Color in Ohio's Universities

Overall, the status of students of color in Ohio's universities varies widely. On average, African Americans entering Ohio's colleges have multiple and cumulative disadvantages, compared to other students. They are more likely to come from

[5] The Ohio State Supreme Court DeRolph decision verifies this trend, as the Court decided that rural and urban high poverty school districts had substantially inadequate funding and fewer resources than other types of districts, thereby placing their students at an educational (and subsequently occupational) disadvantage.

high poverty urban areas, to have low incomes, to need financial aid, to have low-test scores and to required remedial courses. They have the lowest median family income and the highest rate requiring two or more remedial courses. This does not mean that all or most African Americans are doing poorly. Many have high test scores and almost half report needing no remedial courses. In sum, a disproportionately high percentage have multiple and cumulative disadvantages.

Native Americans and Hispanic Americans have some disadvantages similar to African Americans. They have higher median incomes than African Americans; but they too have high rates of not completing the high school core and high rates of needing remedial courses, although overall not as high as African Americans.

Asian Americans are doing well compared to African, Hispanic and Native Americans. Compared to all other groups of students, including White Americans, Asian Americans have the highest rate of completion of the high school core, the highest rate requiring no remedial courses, and the highest mean ACT scores. Nevertheless, Asian Americans do not constitute a homogeneous group. Asian Americans consist of Japanese, Korean and Indian Americans, all of whom are doing well financially and academically. Cambodian Americans are not doing well. They have the highest poverty rate in the state and the lowest median income. However, because there are so few Cambodian Americans in Ohio, they have only a small impact on the mean for Asian Americans in the state.

PART 2: Demographic Conditions in Cincinnati and Toledo, Lucas and Hamilton Counties

Having discussed statewide trends, we turn our attention to our two select cities: Cincinnati and Toledo. Statewide data is limited and it provides little detail about variations in income, and nothing about the social and urban context from which most minority students emerge.

Population Distribution by Race

Because minorities, particularly African Americans and Hispanic Americans, are concentrated in the major cities, much can be learned about statewide trends by looking at select urban areas. We examine Cincinnati and Toledo because; these are two of the largest cities in the state, so many minority students attend college while living at home, and they are major urban universities. As Table 13 indicates, half of the undergraduate students and about two-thirds of the graduate students at The University of Toledo come from urban areas.

Table 13 - Number and Percentage of UT Students by Geo-Cultural Background, fall 2003

	Urban		Suburban		Rural		TOTAL	
	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%
Undergraduate	7497	50.3%	4582	30.8%	2817	18.9%	14896	84.7%
Graduate	1781	66.4%	644	24.0%	258	9.6%	2683	15.3%
Total	9278	52.8%	5226	29.7%	3075	17.5%	17579	100.0%

We use Census Tract data to analyze the social and economic context of our two urban areas, including data on the racial and ethnic demographics, and on disparities in income and educational attainment. We later turn our attention to the two urban school districts and to individual school level data. Finally we use university data to understand the impacts of the urban setting on these students.

Tables 14 and 15 summarize demographic data for the state of Ohio, Hamilton County, Lucas County, Cincinnati and Toledo. With a population of over eleven million, Ohio has a Black population of 1.3 million, a Hispanic American population of 217,123 and an Asian American Population of 132,633. Black, Hispanic, and Asian Americans constitute totals of 11.5%, 1.9%, and 1.2% percent of the state population respectively.

Cincinnati is located in Hamilton County. The city has a population of 331,285. Fifty-three percent of the population is White, 43 percent Black, 1.3 percent Hispanic, and 1.5 percent Asian. The largest Hispanic population in the city is Puerto Rican American.

Hamilton County has a total population of 843,303 residents. Seventy-three percent of the population is White, 23.4 percent Black, 1.1 percent Hispanic, and 1.6 percent Asian.

African Americans of Hamilton County are concentrated in the city of Cincinnati. About 71.78 percent of the county's Black population lives inside the city. Only 28.47 percent of the county's White population lives inside the city. Hispanic Americans are also concentrated in the city, but less so than African Americans.

Toledo is located in Lucas County. The city has a population of 313,619. Seventy percent is White, 24 percent Black, 5 percent Hispanic, and 1 percent Asian. The largest Hispanic population in Toledo is mainly Mexican American.

Lucas County has a population of 455,054. Whites constitute 77.5 percent of the county population. Seventeen percent of the county population is Blacks, 4.5 percent Hispanics, and 1.2 percent Asian.

Table 14 - Ohio, Hamilton/Lucas County, Cincinnati/Toledo Populations

Race/Ethnicity	Ohio	Hamilton	Lucas	Cincinnati	Toledo
Total	11,353,140	845,303	455,054	331,285	313,619
White	9,645,453	616,487	352,678	175,492	220,261
Black	1,301,307	198,061	77,268	142,176	73,854
Hispanic	217,123	9,514	20,670	4,230	17,141
Asian	132,633	13,602	5,527	5,132	3,233

Table 15 - Ohio, Hamilton/Lucas County, Cincinnati/Toledo Percent Population by Racial Category

Race/Ethnicity	Ohio	Hamilton	Lucas	Cincinnati	Toledo
White	85%	73%	77.5%	53%	70.2%
Black	11.5%	23.4%	17%	43%	24%
Hispanic	1.9%	1.1%	4.5%	1.3%	5%
Asian	1.2%	1.6%	1.2%	1.5%	1%

Lucas County African Americans are most concentrated within the central city of Toledo. In fact, this county is unique in the state of Ohio in having the highest concentration of blacks within its inner city. Over 95 percent of the county's Black population resides within the city of Toledo. This high concentration of Blacks living within the central city is no doubt a function of the city's history and the absence of substantial urban sprawl in the county. Unlike other cities, Toledo annexed areas of growth during the 1960s.

Income: White, Black and Hispanic Differences

Tables 16 and 17 summarize data on race, ethnicity and income. Whereas income for all groups increased each decade from 1980 to 1990 to 2000, adjusted income figures—which account for the rising cost of living—indicate that income

declined for all groups from 1980 to 1990, but increased significantly from 1990 to 2000.[6] However, the increase for Lucas County residents between 1990 and 2000 did not compensate for the losses from 1980 and 1990. The net result was that Lucas County residents lost ground from 1980 to 2000.

Table 16 - Median Income; Lucas & Hamilton County (1980-2000)[7]; constant dollars

Median income by race	1980			1990			2000		
	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic
Hamilton	$43,724	$24,492	$35,791	$42,857	$20,675	$34,953	$46,871	$25,074	$34,733
Lucas	$42,908	$26,140	$33,582	$39,373	$19,670	$29,999	$41,462	$23,204	$32,749

Table 17 - Race and Percentage Change in income, 1980-2000

County	White	Black
Hamilton	+7.2%	+2.38%
Lucas	-3.37%	-11.23%

As Table 17 indicates, adjusted median income for both White and Black Hamilton County residents increased from 1980 to 2000, but the rate of increase was faster for Whites than for Blacks. Adjusted median income for Lucas County residents declined from 1980 to 2000, but Black median income declined by a greater margin than White median income.

Interestingly, as Table 18 indicates, racial disparities in median income increased substantially from 1980 to 1990, but declined between 1990 and 2000. Although the data indicate that racial disparities declined between 1990 and 2000, the disparities were greater for 2000 than they were for 1980. Specifically, Black median income was 61 percent of White median income for Lucas County and 56 percent for Hamilton County, for 1980. These figures declined to 50 percent for Lucas County and 48 percent for Hamilton County for 1990. The 2000 figures indicate modest gains over 1990 figures. Black median income rose to 53 percent of White median income for Hamilton County and 56 percent for Lucas County.

[6] The adjusted figures were calculated by *The Toledo Blade, March 2002*.
[7] U.S. Census 1980 1990, 2000

Data also indicate disparities in Hispanic-White median income, but there was little variation or change in the amount of these disparities over time. In 1980 Hispanic income was 82 percent of White income for Hamilton County and 78 percent for Lucas County. In 1990 the Hispanic median income was still 82 percent of White median income for Hamilton County and 76 percent for Lucas County. By 2000, Hispanic median income had declined to 74 percent of White median income for Hamilton County, but had increased to 79 percent of White median income for Lucas County.

Table 18 - Median Income Black & Hispanic, Lucas & Hamilton County (1980-2000)

	Black median income as % of White median income			Hispanic median income as % of White median income		
County	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**	**1980**	**1990**	**2000**
Hamilton	56%	48%	53%	82%	82%	74%
Lucas	61%	50%	56%	78%	76%	79%

Educational Attainment

Educational levels increased for all groups from 1980 to 2000. The Black/White education gap increased, especially for individuals holding the baccalaureate degree. Table 19 presents Census Tract data on the percentage of Hamilton and Lucas County residents 25 years and older (adults) with the four year college degree, by race. Clearly, levels of educational attainment increased for Blacks in Hamilton and Lucas Counties. In 1980, for Hamilton County, only 7.5 percent of Blacks 25 years or older (adults) had attained the four-year baccalaureate degree. This figure increased to 9.7 percent by 1990 and to 12.4 percent by 2000. In 1980, for Lucas County, only 6.5 percent of adult Blacks had completed the four-year degree. This figure increased to 7.8 in 1990 and 10.2 by 2000.

Table 19 - Percentage of Those 25 yrs+ With 4 Year college degree

	1980			1990			2000		
Race/ethnicity	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**
Hamilton	20.6%	7.5%	19.8%	26.5%	9.7%	42.9%	33%	12.4%	36.2%
Lucas	14.9%	6.5%	7.5%	18.2%	7.8%	7.3%	23%	10.2%	10.1%

Levels of educational attainment increased for Whites. For Hamilton County, for 1980, 20.6 percent of Whites 25 years or older had attained the baccalaureate degree. By 2000, 33 percent had attained this degree. For Lucas County, for 1980, 14.9 percent of Whites attained the four-year degree. By 2000, this figure had increased to 23 percent.

The White-Black gap in educational attainment increased. We measured this gap by taking the difference between the White and Black percentages. Zero indicates no difference. Table 20 summarizes the White-Black gap for the three Census Tract years—1980, 1990, and 2000. In 1980 the differences between the percentage of Whites and the percentage of Blacks with the baccalaureate degree was 13 for Hamilton County and 8.4 for Lucas County. This gap had increased to 20.6 for Hamilton County and to 12.8 for Lucas County.

Table 20 - White-Black Differences in Proportions with 4 or more Years of College

County	1980	1990	2000
Hamilton	13.1%	16.8%	20.6%
Lucas	8.4%	10.4%	12.8%

Table 21 - Percent Increase of Persons 25 years+ with 4 year college, 1980 to 2000

County	White	Black
Hamilton	+60.1	+65.2
Lucas	+54.3	+56.9

As Table 21 shows, between 1980 and 2000 the percentage of people with the four-year degree increased by over 50% for both Whites and for Blacks. For Hamilton County the rate of increase during this time period was 60.1 percent for Whites and 65.2 percent for Blacks. For Lucas County the rate was 54.3 percent for Whites and 56.9 percent Black. The Black-White gap increased not because Whites had a faster rate of increase. They clearly did not. The gap increased because Whites had a higher initial starting point.

The Special Case of Hispanics

For Hamilton County, Hispanics have a higher rate of college degree attainment than Blacks and Whites, for 1990 and 2000. For 1990, 42.9 percent of Hispanic 25 years or older had attained the four-year degree, compared to 9.7 for Blacks

and 26.5 percent for Whites. This figure declined to 36.2 percent by 2000 and compares to 12.4 percent for Blacks and 33 percent for Whites. The most interesting finding in this comparison is that Hispanics for Hamilton County have higher rates of attaining college degrees than Whites, but lower median incomes.

The figures are different for Lucas County, as Hispanics have lower levels of educational attainment than Whites. For the four-year degree, the Hispanic attainment rate of 10.1 percent is comparable to the Black rate of 10.2 percent. However, for "some college," (Table 22) the Hispanic rate of 34.5 percent is less than the Black rate of 41.4 percent. Interestingly, for Lucas County the median income of Hispanics was higher that the median income of Blacks for 2000, even though educational levels were equal or better for Blacks. Black median income was $23,204 compared to $32,749 for Hispanics.

Table 22 - Percentage of Those 25 Years+ with *Some* College

	1990			2000		
Race/Ethnicity	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**	**White**	**Black**	**Hispanic**
Hamilton	50.6%	35.2%	66.1%	58.3%	40.8%	57.8%
Lucas	44%	35.7%	27%	52.2%	41.4%	34.5%

Black/White Differences in Attainment of Some College

Blacks have fared better in acquiring some college. The White-Black gap increased, but only marginally. In 1990, for Hamilton County, 35.2% of Blacks 25 years or order had" some college" compared to 50.6 percent for Whites. The White Black difference was 15.4 percent. For the same year, for Lucas County, 35.7 percent of Blacks had "some college," compared to 44 percent for Whites. The gap was 8.3 percent. By 2000, this gap had increase by roughly two percentage points for both counties. See table 23.

Table 23 - White/Black % Difference in 25 Year+ Population with *Some* College

Race/Ethnicity	**1990**	**2000**
Hamilton	15.4%	17.5%
Lucas	8.3%	10.8%

The Overall Status of Minorities in Hamilton and Lucas Counties

The overall status of minorities in Hamilton and Lucas counties is mixed. African Americans are concentrated within the central cities of these two counties. They are most concentrated in the Toledo area, as more 95 percent of Lucas County Blacks reside within the central city. Hamilton County African Americans as also concentrated in the central city but less so than those of Lucas County. This trend of Blacks concentrated within the central city is typical throughout the state of Ohio, although the concentration is greatest in the Toledo area.

There was some progress over the past two decades. However, the position of African Americans relative to White Americans worsened. Although African Americans made progress in Hamilton and Lucas counties, relative to White Americans, they lost ground. Black median income is well below 60 percent of White income for both counties. Although, the percentage of Blacks with a college degree increased and increased at about the same rate as for Whites, the Black-White income gap widened.

The status of Hispanics differed within these two counties. Overall, Hispanics were worse off than Whites, but better off than Blacks in some respects. Hispanics tended to be concentrated in central cities, although less concentrated than Blacks. For both counties, the family income of Hispanics was below the figure for whites, but above the figure for Blacks. The percentage of Toledo Hispanics with a four year college degree was comparable to the figure for Blacks in this city. However, the percentage of Hispanics with a college degree, compared to Blacks, was much higher in Cincinnati.

PART 3: Student Profiles in Toledo and Cincinnati Public Schools

In this section we focus on the Cincinnati and Toledo public school systems. Each school system reflects the demographic characteristics of its respective city. Cincinnati School District has a slightly larger population and a higher proportion of African Americans than Toledo. (See page 15). There is a disproportionately higher percentage of African Americans within each school system than there is within each city. African Americans constitute 24 percent of the Toledo city population, but 46 percent of the Toledo Public Schools population. Similarly, African Americans constitute 43 percent of the Cincinnati city population, but 70.8 percent of the Cincinnati Public Schools population. No doubt Whites are more likely to send their children to parochial and private schools.

Data for this section comes primarily from the Ohio Department of Education website, particularly from EMIS (Education Management Information System) reports. Summaries of these reports are found in the local report cards. Since we focus on the connection between high school and college, we use mostly 12th grade proficiency test scores. However,

recent report cards provide scores only for the 4th, 6th and 9th grade tests. The most recent report cards report on the performance of 10th graders on the 9th grade proficiency tests.

One point that comes across loud and clear with the most recent report card data is this: The performance of both the Cincinnati and the Toledo Public School systems has improved remarkably. In the past, like most urban school districts, Cincinnati and Toledo had been given the lowest grades. Both were rated academic emergency for several years in the late 1990s and early 2000s. As of 2004, Cincinnati was rated academic watch and Toledo, continual improvement. Table 24 summarizes changes in the ratings of these two school districts from 2002 to 2004.

Table 24 - Report Card Rating 2002-04

	2002 rating	# standards met	2003 rating	# standards met	2004 rating	# Standards met
Cincinnati	Academic Watch	8 out of 27	Academic Emergency	4 out of 22	Academic Watch	5 out of 18
Toledo	Academic Watch	5 out of 27	Academic Emergency	6 out of 22	Continual Improvement	7 out of 18

Academic emergency is the lowest rating, followed by academic watch and continual improvement and effective school. The Ohio Department of Education established the rating system, which is based primarily on school district performance in the state proficiency test, attendance and graduation rates.

Initially, the state set a standard, which required 75 percent of the students to pass each of the five sections of the 4th, 6th, and 9th grade proficiency tests and 60 percent of the students to pass each of the five sections of the 12th grade proficiency tests. It also included graduation and attendance rates. There were 27 categories. Later the state eliminated the 12th grade standard, which reduced the number of categories down to 22 in 2003 and to 18 in 2004. Although the state rating system has changed, the Cincinnati and Toledo school districts have indeed improved.

Table 25 --Percentage of Students Passing Math and Science Section of 10th Grade Proficiency Test, 2002-04

	Math 2002	Math 2003	Math 2004	Science 2002	Science 2003	Science 2004
Cincinnati	91.1	90.8	94.8	57.6	60.2	61.0
Toledo	90.9	93.3	93.1	62.7	65.1	75.0

Table 26-- Attendance and Graduation Rates, 2002-2004

	Attendance 2002	Attendance 2003	Attendance 2004	Graduation 2002	Graduation 2003	Graduation 2004
Cincinnati	91.1	90.8	94.8	57.6	60.2	61.0
Toledo	90.9	93.3	93.1	62.7	65.1	75.0

Table 25 summarizes tenth graders' pass rates on the math and science sections of the ninth grade proficiency tests, the two most problematic subject areas for most urban school districts in the state of Ohio. This table indicates continual and substantial improvements in these subject areas for both school districts. For example, for Cincinnati, pass rates on the math section increased from 62.3 percent in 2002 to 67.6 percent in 2003 to 76.7 percent in 2004. Pass rates for science increased from 68.9 percent in 2002 to 75.2 percent in 2003 to 83.8 percent in 2004. Toledo demonstrated similar improvements. Toledo's math test pass rates increased from 67.2 in 2002 to 68.1 in 2003 to 78.6 in 2004. Toledo's science pass rates increased from 73.5 in 2002 to 76.5 in 2003 to 85.6 in 2004.

As table 26 indicates, both school districts improved in terms of their attendance and graduation rates. Attendance rates increased for both schools from just above 90 percent to 94.8 percent for Cincinnati and 93.1 percent for Toledo. Graduation rates increased from a dismal 57.6 percent for Cincinnati in 2002 to 61.0 percent in 2004, and from 62.7 percent for Toledo in 2002 to 75 percent in 2004.
In the following sections we examine our two school districts in more details. We look at the demographics more carefully and focus on individual high schools. Going in alphabetical order, we begin with Cincinnati.

Cincinnati Public Schools[8]

Table 27 – Cincinnati Enrollment by Race & Ethnicity, 2002-03

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percentage
American Indian	42	0.1%
Asian or pacific Islander	318	0.8%
Black/Non-Hispanic	26,690	70.8
Hispanic	285	0.8%
Multi-racial	1,148	3.0%
White, Non-Hispanic	9,226	24.5%
Total	43.874	100%

Table 27 summarizes the racial and ethnic make up of the Cincinnati student body. As noted, Blacks constitute over 70 percent of the public school population, although they barely make up 43 percent of city population. Whites make up 24.5 percent of the student population. About three percent of the students are classified as multi-racial, .8 percent are Asian American and .8 percent Hispanic.

High Schools

Cincinnati has about eight high schools – five are traditional and three are alternative. The alternative schools have specialized admissions criteria while the traditional schools have open enrollment. As indicated in Table 28, six high schools are clearly identifiable by race. Five of the schools are predominantly Black. Four schools—Aiken, Hughes, Taft, and Woodward—have student populations that are more than 90 percent Black. Two schools, Walnut and School for the Creative and Performing Arts, are predominantly White. These figures indicate that Cincinnati has a dual school system, evident at the high school level with schools that are identifiable by race.

[8] Most of the data for the Cincinnati Public Schools comes from EMIS (Education Management Information System) reports, including demographic, proficiency test and other information. We supplement EMIS data with other reports.

As indicated in Tables 28 and 29, the pattern of teacher assignments follows the pattern of student enrollment by race. Black teachers tend to be concentrated in schools with high proportions of Black students. This pattern reinforces the dual school system.

Table 28 – Cincinnati Public School *Student Enrollment* by High School and by Race/Ethnicity, 2002-3

School	White	Black	Number
Aiken	7.5%	90.4%	895
Hughes	6.2%	91.0%	1,397
School For Creative and Performing Arts*	52.2%	37.4%	1008
Taft	4.9%	94.45	623
Walnut	59.9%	33.5%	1,878
Western	34.6%	63.4%	934
Withrow	9%	88.3%	493
Woodward	2.3%	96.3%	800

Table 29 - Racial Distribution of *Teachers*

School	White	Black	Number
Aiken	69.3%	28.1%	75
Hughes	73.5%	25.7%	114
School For Creative and Performing Arts*	86.2%	12.2%	65
Taft	57%	43%	44
Walnut**	80.3%	14.5%	107
Western	79.1%	17.2%	67
Withrow	33.9%	66.1%	30
Woodward	68.2%	29.7%	47

**Grade 4-12 School, ** Grade 7-12 School*

Proficiency Test Scores

As noted above, the Cincinnati Public School district has been on and off academic emergency, although it has been rated academic watch as of the end of the 2004 school year. In the late 1990s and early 2000, the Cincinnati School District scored below the state standard on almost all sections of the 4th and 6th proficiency tests and all sections of the 9th grade tests, except for reading and writing. It is the poor performance on the 4th through 9th grade tests and on other standards that placed the school district on academic emergency. By 2001, those students who took the 12th grade proficiency met the state requirements in all but one subject area.

Table 30 - Cincinnati Public School 12th Grade Proficiency Scores 2001

	2000 Subject Areas					2001 Subject Areas				
	Citiz	**Math**	**Read**	**Writ**	**Sci**	**Citiz**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Sci**
Cincinnati	58.5%	52%	57.7%	87.1%	52.9%	63.6%	56.6%	73.3%	88.8%	61.6%
Ohio	68.1%	59%	65.9%	82.9%	60.9%	71.6%	61.9%	74.1%	87.8%	70.8%
State Standard	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%

Since our concern is with the connection between high school and college, we focus on the 12th grade proficiency tests. It is worth noting that at the time of the writing of this paper this test has been discontinued. The state standard for the 12th grade proficiency test is a pass rate of 60 percent of the students taking the test. Table 30 summarizes district wide results of both the 2000 and the 2001 12th grade proficiency test. In 2000, the district failed to meet the state standard in all areas, except writing. In other words most high Cincinnati high school students failed the citizenship, math, reading and science sections of the state 12th grade proficiency test in 2000. However, the 2001 test scores had improved and the district met the state standard in all areas except mathematics. Over seventy percent of the students passed the reading and writing sections and over sixty percent passed the citizenship and science sections.

Table 31 summarizes the results of the 2000 12th grade proficiency test by race. The scores of Black students are most striking. Only 37.4 percent of the districts Black students passed the math section of this test. The White pass rate for math was 77.1 percent. Less than 47 percent of the district's Black students passed the citizenship and science sections. About 80 percent of the White students passed.

Table 31 - Cincinnati Public School 12th Grade Proficiency Scores 2001 by Race

Race/Ethnicity	Citiz	Math	Read	Writ	Sci
Asian or Pacific Islander	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Black/Non-Hispanic	46.4%	37.4%	44.6%	84.1%	38%
Hispanic	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
White, Non-Hispanic	80.8%	77.1%	81.8%	92.7%	79.6%

Table 32 - Cincinnati 12th Grade Proficiency Test Scores 2001 by High School

School	Citiz	Math	Read	Writ	Sci
Aiken	35.6%	32.2%	57.8%	84.4%	42.2%
Hughes	58.6%	50.5%	6.5%	95.9%	51.8%
School For the Creative & Performing Arts	76.0%	66%	86%	95%	76%
Taft	20%	16.7%	26.7%	43.3%	23.3%
Walnut	96.5%	95.5%	96.5%	98.3%	95.5%
Western	45.5%	35.3%	61.1%	83.2%	46.1%
Withrow	46.3%	32%	61%	79.7%	38.2%
Woodward	14.3%	10.7%	25%	46.4%	14.3%

Attendance and Graduation

Another reason for Cincinnati Public Schools' initial poor performance has been its low attendance and graduation rates. The attendance rate is the percentage of enrolled students who actually attend school. An attendance rate of 95 percent means that only five percent of the students were absence. The state average attendance rate is 93.5 percent. The attendance rate of every high school in the Cincinnati Public School system, except for one—Walnut—had been below the state average. Some schools fell well below that average. Taft and Woodward had attendance rates below 75 percent, which indicates that on average about 25 percent of the students were absent on each day.

Table 33 – Cincinnati Public High School Attendance Rates, 2000-1

School	Attendance Rate
Aiken	75.7%
Hughes	91.3%
School For the Creative and Performing Arts	92.8%
Taft	72.8%
Walnut	95%
Western	86.2%
Withrow	80.4%
Woodward	73.6%

Cincinnati Public Schools had suffered from low graduation rates, as shown in Table 34. These rates had declined in the late 1990s. For example, Cincinnati reports a graduate rate of 77.7 percent for 1998, 65.6 percent for 1999 and only 51.0 percent for 2000. The graduation rate had increased to 60.1 percent by 2002. This rate varies among the high schools. For the same year, Walnut reports a graduation rate of 98.7 percent, compared to a low of 29.6 percent for Taft. Aiken, Withrow and Woodward all have graduation rates below fifty percent. Since 2002, these rates have increased slightly. As of the end of the 2004 school year, it had increased to 61 percent.

Cincinnati's graduation rates may be lower than those of other central cities because of the method of recording them. Some school districts record the graduation rate based on the percentage of 12 graders who graduate. Others, delete - like Cincinnati, base the graduation rate on the percentage of 9th graders in 2000 who stayed in school and graduate in 2004. This method would yield a lower graduation rate. The graduate rate of 30 percent means that only 30 percent of the ninth graders are graduating after four years.

Table 34 - Graduation Rates by Cincinnati High School 2001-2[9]

School	Graduation Rate
Aiken	46.0%
Hughes	84.1%
School for Creative and Performing Arts	*
Taft	29.6%
Walnut	98.7%
Western	71.5%
Withrow	49.5%
Woodward	37.2%

Toledo Public Schools[10]

The Toledo Public School system has a student population of about 36,792, almost evenly divided between Blacks (46%) and Whites (45%). It has a Hispanic student population of about 2,475 (7%) of all students. It has a small Asian American and Native American student population of less than one percent each (See Table 35).

Table 35 - Enrollment by Race & Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percent
Asian or Pacific Islander	246	0.7%
American Indian	37	0.1%
Black	16,916	46%
Hispanic	3,475	6.7%
Multi-Racial	500	1.4%
White	16.617	45%

[9] Data from the Ohio Department of Education (ODE) *Local School Reports*, posted on ODE's website.
[10] Most of the data for the Toledo Public Schools comes from EMIS (Education Management Information System) reports. We use this data for demographic, proficiency test and other information. We supplement data with other reports.

Although the entire Toledo Public School student population is evenly divided between Blacks and Whites, and all of its high schools have racially and ethnically mixed student populations, a few high schools can be identified as either predominantly White or predominantly Black. For example, Scott High School stands out with a Black student population of over 95.5 percent. Waite High School has a Black population of only 13.7 percent, but a White population of 73 percent. Bowsher has a White population of over 79 percent, with a Black population of 21.3 percent. Hispanic students are concentrated in four out of the system's seven high schools: Waite (12.2%), Libby (11.3%), Woodward (8.6%), and Bowsher (5.9%).

Table 36 - Toledo Public School Enrollment by High School and by Race/Ethnicity

School	Total	White	Black	Hispanic	Other or Asian	Unknown
Bowsher	1,353	993	267	74	19	-
Libby	1,056	329	596	120	-	11
Rodgers	1,110	381	692	24	11	2
Scott	1,389	51	1,327	-	-	11
Start	1,761	1,196	425	76	14	3
Waite	1,261	922	173	154	-	12
Woodward	1,208	475	618	104	10	1

Table 37 - Toledo Public School Enrollment by High School & by Race/Ethnicity

School	White	Black	Hispanic
Bowsher	73.39%	19.73%	5.47%
Libby	31.16%	56.44%	11.36%
Rodgers	34.32%	62.34%	2.16%
Scott	3.67%	95.54%	-
Start	67.91%	24.13%	-
Waite	73.12%	13.72%	12.22%
Woodward	39.32%	51.16%	8.61%

It is worth noting the distribution of teachers by high schools, since Black teachers are also unevenly distributed. For example, Table 38 shows that at Scott High School where over 95.54% of the students are Black, 31 percent of the

teachers are Black. At Bowsher where 73.39 percent of the student population is White, only 3.8 percent of the teachers are Black. At Waite, where Whites constitute 73.12 percent of the student population, only 5.6 percent of the teachers are Black. Fewer Black teachers are found at schools that have predominantly White student populations. These figures point to two dimensions of racial segregation in the Toledo Public School system; segregation in the distribution of students, and segregation in the distribution of teachers.

Table 38 - Racial Distribution of Teachers

School	Number White	Number Black	Percent Black
Bowsher	76	3	3.8%
Libby	57	17	12.3%
Rodgers	65	7	10.8%
Scott	61	19	31.1%
Start	86	3	3.5%
Waite	72	4	5.6%
Woodward	64	9	14.1%

Proficiency Test Scores

As noted earlier, the Toledo Public Schools went from academic emergency to continual improvement. The rate in which tenth graders passed the 9th grade proficiency test increased. This section examines pass rates of the 12th grade proficiency test, since our concern is with the connection between high school and college.

Table 39 - Toledo Public School 12th Grade Proficiency Scores, 2001

	Subject				
	Citiz	Math	Read	Write	Sci
Toledo	40.6%	23.8%	48.1%	64.2%	42.9%
State wide	71.6%	61.9%	74.1%	87.8%	70.8%
St. Standard	60%	60%	60%	60%	60%

For the 12th grade proficiency test, Toledo Public School students scored substantially below the state standard on every subject except writing. Over 65 percent of the district 12 graders failed the math section; 59 percent failed the citizenship and 57 percent failed the science sections.

As in Cincinnati, twelfth grade proficiency test scores for the district vary along racial lines (Table 40). The scores of Black students are most striking. Only 17.7 percent of the districts Black students passed the math section of this test; significantly less than one-half the White pass rate of 45.8 percent, and the White pass rate was substantially below the state standard. The Black pass rate was a disaster. Only about a quarter of the district's Black students and a little more than half of the White students passed the citizenship and science sections.

Table 40 - Toledo Public School 12th Grade Proficiency Scores by Race & Ethnicity, 2001

	Subject				
Race/Ethnicity	**Citiz**	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Sci**
Asian	50.0%	64.3%	78.6%	78.6%	57.1%
Black	24.7%	17.7%	32.8%	55.3%	25.1%
Hispanic	31.7%	27%	47.6%	69.8%	41.3%
White	51.2%	45.8%	67.3%	68.9%	54%

Twelfth grade proficiency scores varied among the seven high schools. Bowsher High School had the highest pass rate, exceeding the state standard in reading, writing and science. It missed the state standard for math by 9.5 percentage points and for citizenship by 2.3 percentage points. Scott High School has the worst pass rate. Only 26 percent passed the reading section. Less than a quarter passed the citizenship and science sections. Most disturbing is the fact that only 14.3 percent of Scott's 12th graders passed the math proficiency test. For Waite High School, with a student body that is 73 percent White, less than 40 percent of its students passed the citizenship, math, reading and science sections. When we examined White students only, we found that only 46 percent passed the math section. Only 18 percent of the Black students passed the math section.

Table 41 - Toledo 12th Grade Proficiency Test Scores by High School, 2001

	Subject				
	Citiz	**Math**	**Read**	**Write**	**Sci**
Bowsher	57.7%	51.5%	70.5%	80.3%	62.4%
Libby	32.6%	27%	50.6%	66.3%	34.8%
Rogers	35.8%	29.6%	46.5%	64.2%	40.3%
Scott	22.4%	14.3%	25.9%	54.4%	24.7%
Start	45.5%	43.4%	51.7%	60.3%	46.2%
Waite	37.3%	29.9%	38.8%	58.2%	35.8%
Woodward	30.1%	22%	30.9%	56.9%	34.1%

The Toledo Public Schools are in academic emergency because of the district's low academic performance. The district's math education program is a disaster.

Attendance and Graduation

Another reason the Toledo Public Schools is on academic emergency is because of low attendance and graduation rates. The attendance rate is the percentage of enrolled students who actually attend school. An attendance rate of 95 percent means that only five percent of the students were absence. The state average attendance rate is 93.5 percent. Table 42 summarizes attendance rates for public high schools in the city of Toledo. This table indicates that the attendance rates for every high school in the Toledo Public School system fell below the state average and there was wide variation among the high schools. Scott High School had the lowest rate of 78.5 percent. This means that on an average, 21.5 percent of the students were absent. Libby had a rate of 80 percent, Woodward, 81.6 percent, and Waite 83.4 percent. Bowsher had the best attendance rate among the seven schools with 91.4 percent, 2.2 points below the state average.

Table 42 - Attendance Rate by Toledo High School 2002

School	Attendance Rate
Bowsher	91.4%
Libby	80.1%
Rogers	85.5%
Scott	78.5%
Start	88.9%
Waite	83.4%
Woodward	81.6%

Toledo also has a low graduation rate. For 2002, the district rate of 65.9% was well below the state standard of 74.8%. This rate varies among the high schools, although it is not reported in the EMIS report.

The high school dropout rate varies among the schools, although we are not confident in the data as there as some discrepancies. What we learn from Toledo School district report is that Waite's dropout rate of 45.1 percent was the highest in the district. Start with a rate of 13.5% was the lowest. Woodward had a drop out rate of 32.0, Libby 28.4 and Bowsher 19.8%. We were unable to obtain a drop out rate for Scott. (Local School Report Cards, taken from the Ohio Department of Education website).

Other Issues: Counseling and Resources

When examining the Toledo Public School System, we looked at sources and reports other than EMIS. We examined an unpublished Upward Bound proposal for a pilot program targeting Libby High School. The proposal noted an additional problem in the Toledo School district—guidance counseling. The problem was two-fold: not enough counselors and poor counseling about academic curriculum and processes.[11] The school district has an extremely high ratio of students to counselors. For example, the proposal notes that the American School Counselor Association recommends a student to counselor ration of 100 to 1 and a maximum ratio of 300 to 1. The Toledo Public School ratio is 401 to 1. The proposal

[11] The ethnographic PhD dissertation of Pamela Bettis, detailed numerous examples of the failures of effective career and academic counseling at one TPS high school. 1994. "*Constructing Futures on Fault Lines; Urban Working Class High School Students' Perceptions of School, Work, and the Future in a Post-Industrial City*." College of Education, UT.

states that students are getting inadequate academic counseling in preparation for college. The proposal bases this claim on a survey of high school students. The report reached the following conclusion:

> Further, it was found in over 50% of our students interviewed, that even when students expressed an interest in being advised of a college prep course of study they were given the minimum TPS graduation requirement which would not get them accepted to any of Ohio's state universities (page 7).

Because of the high student to counselor ratio, Toledo Public School students do not have adequate access to counselors. Moreover, when they do see a counselor, they are likely to be given inadequate advice for taking the courses they need to prepare for college. The Toledo Public School district is not doing an adequate job preparing its students for college.

Toledo Public School resources may be inadequate, according to a 2000 Urban University Program report by Marquette, Erkins, and Johnson.[12] The report focused on the eight urban school districts in the State of Ohio. It concluded that urban school districts have higher nonacademic costs than suburban and rural school districts. Toledo and Cincinnati both have higher costs for building maintenance, security, transportation and other nonacademic factors. These higher nonacademic costs may explain some of the financial problems that these two school districts face.

PART 4: Minority Student Experiences at the Universities of Toledo and Cincinnati

In this section, we turn our attention to the two major universities, which anchors these two cities: The University of Toledo and the University of Cincinnati. Since our previous discussion ended with the Toledo School System, we begin our discussion with The University of Toledo.

The University of Toledo

The University of Toledo (UT) is the major university for the city. Other colleges in the area include Owens Community College--a two-year state institution and Lourdes College and Mercy-Toledo (small, private colleges). Bowling Green State University, another major university in Northwest Ohio, is located thirty miles to the south of UT. There are a few small, private trade schools and two year institutions.

[12] Marquette, J., Erkins, E. & Johnson, L. 2000 " *Education*," in "State of Ohio's Urban Regions", Ohio Urban University Program. Cleveland: UUP.

The University of Toledo Colleges

The University of Toledo (UT) has seven colleges. They are as follows:

Arts and Sciences
Business
Education
Engineering
Pharmacy
Health and Human Services
University
Law

A brief description of the colleges helps explain the distribution of students. Arts and Sciences is the largest college. It contains the natural sciences (biology, chemistry physics, geology, etc.), social sciences (anthropology, economics, geography, political science, sociology and others), and humanities (English, literature, theatre, music, film, foreign language, performing arts, fine arts etc.). The College of Health and Human Services contains programs such as counseling, criminal justice, social work, physical therapy and others. Arts and Sciences, Education, Engineering, Pharmacy, and Health and Human Services offer baccalaureate, masters and doctoral degrees in various programs. The College of Law offers the Doctors of Jurisprudence degree. The University College houses remedial courses and individualized BA degree programs. The college used to house non-majors (students who have not decided on a major), but it is in the process of reorganization.

The University of Toledo has open admissions. However, there are grade point averages and prerequisite course completion requirements for the colleges of Engineering and Pharmacy, and select professional programs such as nursing, physical therapy and others. The Law School has limited admission and selects students on the basis of LSAT scores, grade point averages, and letters of recommendation.

In 1999, the university closed its two-year community college. It is currently phasing out its two-year programs.

Profile of Students

The University of Toledo has a total of 20,889 students, as of the fall of 2002. Women constitute 51.6% of the student body, men constitutes 48.4%. About eleven percent of UT students are African Americans. The university has a much higher percentage of African American students than the state average and higher then most other major universities in the state, no doubt because of its strategic location in Toledo and because of the university's aggressive recruitment efforts. Less than two percent of its students are Asian Americans; a little more than the Lucas County proportion of 1.2. About 2.1 percent of UT students are Hispanic Americans--a proportion that is less than half of the Lucas County proportion of Hispanic Americans of 4.5 percent.

Table 43 - Most Recent the University of Toledo Profile by Gender/Race/Ethnicity, Fall 2002

Attribute	Number	Percent
Gender		
Male	10,116	48.4%
Female	10,776	51.6%
Race/Ethnicity		
Native American	51	0.3%
Asian	346	1.7%
Black	2,321	11.2%
Hispanic	446	2.1%
White	15,453	73.2%
Unknown	1,157	5.7%

Table 44 – Distribution of African American UT Students by College

College	Total Number of Black Students	Total Number of Students
Arts & Sciences	449	3,033
Business	346	2,887
Education	246	2,063
Engineering	114	2,653
Health & Human Services	426	2,623
Pharmacy	70	1,203
University	380	1,515
Student Success Center	162	1,411
Law	25	508

Source: Census point database maintained by the University of Toledo Office of Institutional Research, March 5, 2004.

A high proportion of the total African American student population is concentrated in the University College and the Student Success Center. About 24 percent of the University's Black student population is concentrated in these areas. This concentration is explained by the fact that this college houses remedial programs and individualized degrees. The Student Success Center, which used to part of University College, houses students' undecided about their majors.

Table 45 - The University of Toledo African-American and Hispanic Enrollment as Percent of each College[13]

College	African-American as % of College's Enrollment	Hispanics As % of College's Enrollment
Arts & Sciences	12.36%	2.51%
Business	10.65%	1.91%
Education	8.24%	1.87%
Engineering	3.74%	1.54%
Health & Human Services	14.57%	2.98%
Pharmacy	5.31%	1.67%
University	25.08%	1.67%
Law	4.92%	1.97%

Source: Census point database maintained by the University of Toledo Office of Institutional Research, March 5, 2004

[13] Fall 2003 enrollment figures

Table 45 summarizes data on African American and Hispanic students as percentages of each college. Several points emerge from this table. First, there is a high percentage of both African Americans and Hispanic Americans within University College. More than a quarter of the students in this college are African American. As noted above, almost a quarter of all African American students are housed in this college.

Second, African American and Hispanic American students are disproportionately under-represented in the professional colleges: Engineering, Law and Pharmacy. Less than four percent of the College of Engineering students are African American and only 1.54 percent of them are Hispanic Americans.

Retention and Graduation Rates

The University of Toledo, like other urban institutions, has a low four-year graduation rate. However, compared to other Ohio urban universities with open admissions, its graduation rate is not as low as these comparable institutions. The four-year graduation rate is low among students of all races; 17 percent among White students, 36 percent for Asian Americans, only 6 percent for American Indians, and 8 percent among African American students. This is due in part to many students attending part-time and/or dropping out for a semester to secure funds for a next semester's tuition.

Table 46 - Freshmen Return and Graduation Rates[14]

	Return Rates							Graduation Rates		
Race/Ethnicity	**Number**	**Yr 1**	**Yr 2**	**Yr 3**	**Yr 4**	**Yr 5**	**Yr 6**	**Yr 4**	**Yr 5**	**Yr 6**
Native American	17	64%	59%	53%	41%	25%	0%	6%	18%	24%
Asian	38	63%	81%	72%	42%	28%	17%	36%	44%	53%
Black	222	73%	54%	47%	34%	16%	11%	8%	20%	25%
Hispanic	52	58%	55%	39%	37%	21%	12%	10%	21%	25%
Non-Resident Alien	29	79%	66%	47%	2%	7%	10%	28%	42%	45%
Unknown	17	53%	53%	55%	29%	18%	18%	12%	24%	29%
White	1,918	73%	60%	54%	36%	16%	9%	17%	36%	42%
Total	2,291	73%	60%	54%	36%	27%	9%	16%	34%	40%

[14] Year Beginning 1995

Two-fifths of students who enter The University of Toledo in 1995 had graduated by 2001, after six years. However, only 25 percent of African American and Hispanic students and only 24 percent of American Indian students entering in 1995 had graduated by 2001.

The University of Cincinnati

The profile of the University of Cincinnati (UC) is similar to The University of Toledo (UT), except that UC is much larger than UT and that UC has selective admissions for most of its programs. UC has over thirty-two thousand students and 17 different colleges. Its four-year programs and colleges have selective admissions. It has open admissions in select two-year career oriented programs and in University College and Raymond Walters College. The colleges are listed below:

Cincinnati University Seventeen Colleges

Adult Credit Education
Allied Health Sciences
Applied Science
Arts and Sciences
Business Administration
Clermont College
College-Conservatory of Music
Design, Architecture, Art and Planning
Education
Engineering
Law
Medicine
Nursing
Pharmacy
Raymond Walters College
Social Work
University College*

Table 47 summarizes Fall 2002 enrollment for the University of Cincinnati by ethnicity. The University of Cincinnati's student population is 11.2 percent Black. Hispanics constitutes 1.1 percent and Asian Americans 2.8 percent. It is similar to The University of Toledo, except that Toledo has a higher percentage of Hispanic American students and a lower percentage of Asian American students.

Table 47 - University of Cincinnati Student Enrollment by Ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Percentage
Native American	125	0.4%
Asian or Pacific Islander	921	2.8%
Black/Non-Hispanic	3,680	11.2%
Hispanic	376	1.1%
Non-Resident Alien	1,884	5.7%
White, Non-Hispanic	24,153	73.2%
Other	381	1.2%
Unknown	1,455	4.4%

Arts and Sciences is the University of Cincinnati's largest college. And like UT, African American students are unevenly distributed throughout the university. Twenty-four percent of all of the Cincinnati University's African American students are concentrated in University College,[15] a pattern identical to The University of Toledo. Twenty-five percent of the University's African American students are found in the College of Arts and Sciences.

When we look at Blacks as a percentage of the student population of each college (Table 48), we find that African Americans are disproportionately over-represented in University College, but underrepresented in the College of Business. African Americans are woefully underrepresented in Pharmacy, Engineering, College of Design, and the Clermont College, constituting less than three percent of the student body.

.

[15] This college is now defunct at the University of Cincinnati. Some programs have been absorbed into other colleges. The Center for Access and Transition has replace University College as a program for students in need of remediation prior to entering a four-year degree granting program

Table 48 - Number and Percentage of African American Students Distributed by each UC College

College	Number	Percentage
Adult Credit Education	113	3.2%
Allied Health Sciences	42	1.1%
Applied Science	231	6.3%
Arts and Science	940	25.5%
Business Administration	148	4.0%
Clermont College	54	1.5%
College-Conservatory of Music	47	1.3%
Design, Architecture, Art & Planning	56	1.5%
Education	366	9.9%
Engineering	88	2.3%
Law	30	0.8%
Medicine	52	1.4%
Nursing	60	1.6%
Pharmacy	6	0.2%
Raymond Walters College	477	13.0%
Social Work	74	2.0%
University College	893	24.3%

Table 49 - UC African-American Enrollment by College

College	Percentage African American
Adult Credit Education	10.1%
Allied Health Sciences	8.9%
Applied Science	12.8%
Arts and Science	14.5%
Business Administration	6.1%
Clermont College	2.2%
College-Conservatory of Music	3.2%
Design, Architecture, Art & Planning	2.8%
Education	16.1%
Engineering	3.0%
Law	8.2%
Medicine	5.3%
Nursing	8.5%
Pharmacy	2.2%
Raymond Walters College	11.9%
Social Work	26%
University College	29.7%

It seems clear that for both urban universities, Blacks are over-represented in University College. This college houses the remedial courses, individualized programs, and students' who are undecided about their majors. It is also clear that at both universities, Black students are underrepresented in professional colleges, especially Engineering and Pharmacy.

There are some differences in colleges between the two universities, which suggest that some colleges may be more effective at recruiting Black students. The University of Cincinnati's law school is eight percent Black, compared to a figure of less than five percent for The University of Toledo. The University of Cincinnati's College of Education is about 16 percent Black, compared to about 8% for The University of Toledo. Of course, The University of Toledo College of Business and College of Pharmacy have figures of 10.65 percent Black and 5.31 percent Black respectively, compared to The University of Cincinnati's figures of 6.1 percent Black for Business Administration and 2.2 percent for Pharmacy colleges.

Retention and Graduation Rates

The University of Cincinnati, like other urban universities, has low retention and graduation rates. Table 50 shows return and graduation rates for the fall 1995 freshman class.

Table 50 – Graduation Rates – University of Cincinnati

Race/Ethnicity	Number	Yr 4	Yr 5	Yr 6
Native American	7	14.3%	28.6%	28.6%
Asian	56	14.3%	42.9%	53.6%
Black/Non-Hispanic	175	11.4%	27.4%	34.3%
Hispanic	19	15.8%	42.1%	52.6%
White, Non-Hispanic	2,198	12.7%	43%	53.1%
Non-Resident Alien	9	33.3%	33.3%	33.3%
Unknown	17	5.9%	35.3%	41.2%

Table 50 indicates that it takes most students six years to graduate. That is, at the end of the six years (1995-2001), most students who entered the University of Cincinnati had graduated. Cincinnati's graduation rate is substantially higher than UT's rate; a fact undoubtedly due to UC's selective admission policy.

The Hispanic American graduation rates require special attention. It is important to note that the UC's Hispanic American 6 year graduate rate was comparable to the White and Asian American rates. Indeed, Hispanics had a higher four-year graduation rate of 15.8 percent, which was higher than the rate for Whites and Asian Americans, which was 12.7 and 14.3 respectively. The Cincinnati graduation rates for Hispanic Americans were much higher than the rate for The University of Toledo.

The major area of concern is the extremely low graduation rates for African American students. About 11 percent of African American students graduated in four years. Of course, less than fifteen of all students graduated in four years and only about 12.7 percent of White students had graduated in 4 years (by 1999). Only about 27 percent of Black students graduated in five years and only about 34 percent had graduated in six.

Overall Status of Students of Color at UT and UC

There is a wide variation in the performance of all groups of students. Although there are many outstanding African American and Native American students, on average they are not doing well at our two universities. At both universities a high proportion of Black students, about 24 percent of the total Black student population, tend to be concentrated in the University Colleges, the remedial courses, and the individualized programs. They are more likely to be among the non-majors. The more serious problem is the low graduation rate among African Americans and Native Americans at both universities. Hispanic students have low graduation rates at The University of Toledo, but at the University of Cincinnati these rates are comparable to the rate of White students. Asian students are doing well at both universities.

Summary and Conclusions

We have examined several data sets in order to trace developments in three areas pertaining to the educational attainment and income of people of color. We focused on two major Ohio cities: Cincinnati and Toledo. We looked at Ohio Higher Education Information (HEI) data to trace the educational experience of students entering universities in the state of Ohio. We examined Census tract data to outline changes in patterns of income among Whites, Hispanics and African Americans from 1980 to 2000. We used Ohio Department of Education data, primarily from Education Management Information System (EMIS) reports to investigate Toledo and Cincinnati school systems. Finally, we utilize data from the University Of Cincinnati's Office of Institutional Research (IR) and University of Toledo Office of Institutional Research to outline what was occurring once African-American and other students were experiencing once they enrolled. With these several data sets we were able to sketch out issues and problems confronting students of color from grade school forward.

Data from this study point to three sets of problems: problems with urban school systems, within urban universities, and within the job market. Policy recommendations emerge from the discussion of these problems.

1. - Problems in the Schools: Failing Math and Science and Persisting Segregation

Cincinnati and Toledo schools, like other large Ohio urban school districts, are on academic emergency. They have low proficiency test scores, low attendance rates, and high dropout rates. Although Cincinnati has improved in all areas, its 12th graders continue to score well below state performance standards on math. The most distressing fact about Cincinnati's schools is the fact that more than sixty percent of Cincinnati Black 12th graders failed the math and the science sections of this test. Cincinnati schools, like other urban school districts, are failing.

The Toledo public school system is in worse shape. Its test scores are particularly dismal. In one high school, more than 85 percent of its 12th graders failed the math portion of the 12th grade proficiency test. District wide scores indicate that 82 percent of Black 12th graders failed the math section of the 12th grade proficiency test. Both Toledo and Cincinnati are failing its Black students, especially in the areas of math and science.

Both school systems have marks of a segregated system. They both have significant minority populations. Whereas 43 percent of the Cincinnati city population is Black, over 70 percent of the public school population is Black. Whereas 24 percent of the Toledo city population is Black, 46 percent of the Toledo school population is Black. Two factors contribute to this disproportionate Black representation in public schools. First, demographics of the city contribute to its student population: a larger population of older Whites without school-aged children and a larger population of younger Blacks with school-aged children. Second, White families in both cities are more likely to put their children in private or parochial schools.

Both school systems have high schools that are identifiable by race. Even though Cincinnati student population is 70 percent Black, four schools—Aiken, Hughes, Taft and Woodward have Black student populations of over 90 percent—and one school with a White student population of about 60 percent. Cincinnati still has schools that can be identified by race.

Even though Toledo has a student population that is 46 percent Black, most of its schools can be identified by race: Bowsher, Waite and Start are identified as predominantly White schools with White populations of about seventy percent or more. Scott with a Black population of over 95 percent and Rodgers with a school population of over 60 percent are Black schools.

In sum, Black students tend to be racially segregated in both public school systems. Moreover, they graduate ill-prepared for college--especially in math and science--and seemingly not guided toward college attendance.

2. - Failure in the Universities: High Mediation, Concentration in University Colleges, Low Graduation Rates

Given the problems in the local public schools, it is not surprising to find problems at the urban university levels in these locales. Ohio HEI data indicate that a larger proportion of African American students entering Ohio colleges, about 18 percent, require two or more remedial classes.

The Universities of Cincinnati and Toledo Institutional Research data indicate a couple of major problems. The first problem has to do with the distribution of Black students, overrepresentation in some areas, but under-representation in others. Black students tend to be crowded in some areas but under-represented in others. More than a quarter of Black students are crowded in the University Colleges of both universities. The University College houses remedial classes, individualized programs and non-majors (students undecided about their majors). Black students are under-representation in professional Colleges; constituting less than four percent of the student populations in Engineering and Pharmacy Colleges in both Universities. Blacks also are under-represented in Law, Business, and Nursing. The second problem is the extremely low graduation rates, especially among African Americans and American Indians. Thus, while universities have remedial courses, they do not have the impact of raising skills to a sufficient level as to equalize graduation rates, although the extent to which this is insufficient skill development vs. a residual impact of low income and competing economic demands, is an issue that is beyond the scope of this inquiry.

Policy Implications and Recommendations

We have presented primarily descriptive data that gives us a snap shot view of the educational experiences of people of color in Toledo and Cincinnati. Four sets of recommendations emerge from this snap shot, a set for future researchers, the school system, urban universities, and the state government.

Research

More research needs to be conducted on the special problems of urban school districts in the state of Ohio, with the goal of developing specific programs to assist the districts in getting off academic emergency, and increasing the skills and career development efforts of individual students.

School Districts

Urban school districts need to put more effort in mathematics and science education. The Toledo Public Schools need an enormous boost in its math education program. It needs to also target problematic high schools, particularly Scott High School and its feeder schools, for accelerated math education programs. There also seems to be a lack of guidance and counseling, directing students to appropriate preparatory curriculum. By extension, there may be a need to more

effectively communicate with parents and community members about the level and types of scholarship and daily attendance needed to participate in a 21st century economy.

Urban school districts need to develop clear math objectives for each grade level, to establish plans and programs for achieving these objectives. Although not related to the data, but need, urban school districts and city governments need to develop educational task forces for developing strategic plans for getting out of academic emergency, for improving math and science, and for addressing the nagging problem of *de jure* segregation.

Urban Universities

Urban universities and urban school systems should seek private funds to provide scholarship incentives for public school students who exhibit promise in math and science. Similarly, there needs to be more effective information about the real costs of college so that more students are encouraged to attend college.

Urban Universities need to establish two types of special task forces. One task force should involve directors or administrators of university programs that connect with the local school system. It should include directors of Upward Bound, Excel, Prep-Tech, Science/Math Tech, and other special programs. It should also include faculty members who do research on schools. The task force should be charged with the responsibility of developing a strategic plan for the university and the local school district to coordinate programs and efforts to improve student performance, to develop new initiatives of improving the math, science and reading skills of public school graduates, and to raise more money for scholarships, for incentives public school students, especially minorities, to achieve in math and science.

The second task force should be charged with the responsibility of developing and implementing plans for the recruitment of capable minority students to the professional colleges and to studying the best practices for minority recruitment and retention in use at other universities.

The University of Toledo has done commendable work through its Commission on Diversity, as this commission has collected diversity plans for each college. However, this commission needs to move to the next step in monitoring its colleges and working with them in focusing and revising its plans and in implementing them.

The State of Ohio

The State of Ohio needs to rethink its policies for financing both public and higher education. Public school funding is uneven and ironically it rewards students from more economically advantageous and more culturally mainstream communities. This has the effect of providing a poor quality education for the least affluent, who then ironically have to personally pay for the remedial courses that attempt to compensate for the insufficiently funded courses in the public school curriculum.

Higher education resources have shifted from universities to community colleges. Moreover, recently the state has reduced funding for universities. With the rising cost of four-year colleges and the availability of the cheaper community colleges, more high school graduates from urban areas are going to community colleges, a trend supported by our census tract data. The extent of the strain of financing a college education is inversely related to family income. It is especially severe on African American families, as their median income is about half of the White median family income. The availability of financial aid provides some relief to this strain. No doubt more effective counseling can assist students in getting the financial aid they need. However, students from low to moderate-income families often have to work to cover living expenses. This need to work explains why a higher percentage of African American students are taking classes part-time.