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We have known that income level negatively impacts cognitive functions for over a decade.
There are links between family income and memory and attention

How are the brains from poverty different?

Effect Sizes

- Language
- Work Memory
- Cognitive Control
- Reward Processing
- Memory
- Spatial Cognition
- Visual Cognition

But newer research is specifying why and how the impact of poverty affects learning.
Among children from lower income families, small differences in income were associated with relatively large differences in surface brain area.

Among children from higher income families, similar income increments were associated with smaller differences in surface area.
Brain structure and poverty (Noble et al, 2015)

- Brain Structure and income level relationships were most prominent in regions supporting language, reading, executive functions, and spatial skills.
• This research implies that *income relates most strongly to brain structure among the most disadvantaged children.*
April 2015 – Dr. John Gabrielli’s Lab at MIT

- Published research that corroborates Noble 2015 and clarifies the income/achievement gap

- Showing that High Income versus Low Income achievement differences directly correlate to measures of cortical thickness in adolescents
Neuroanatomical Correlates of the Income-Achievement Gap

Corroborated by Pollak et al, in June

- 20 percent of the gap in test scores between poor children and middle-class children may be a result of poor brain development in the frontal and temporal lobes

In October, differential effects of SES on kinds of memory (working versus procedural memory).

**Procedural Memory (probabilistic learning)**


**Working Memory**
So… SES does not affect intelligence or ability to learn in general

• Rather SES affects those types of learning important for academic success
• But, why????
A key feature is toxic stress associated with poverty
Excessive Stress Disrupts the Architecture of the Developing Brain

http://developingchild.harvard.edu/resources/wp3/
**Effects on Brain Development**

- The neural circuits for dealing with stress are particularly malleable (or “plastic”) during the fetal and early childhood periods
  - the regions of the brain involved in fear, anxiety, and impulsive responses may overproduce neural connections
  - those regions dedicated to reasoning, planning, and behavioral control may produce fewer neural connections
Damage to health and well-being

• Extreme exposure to toxic stress changes the stress response system
  – Responds at lower thresholds to events that might not be stressful to others,
  – Activates more frequently and for longer periods than is necessary, like revving a car engine for hours every day.

This wear and tear increases the risk of stress-related physical and mental illness later in life.
**Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACES)**


given as $n = 1007$ [Jimenez et al, 2016]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>% (No.)</th>
<th>Total ACEs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Child maltreatment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>16 (162)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>13 (132)</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical</td>
<td>15 (154)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual</td>
<td>0.6 (6)</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Household dysfunction</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternal depression</td>
<td>12 (121)</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance use</td>
<td>15 (149)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incarceration</td>
<td>18 (181)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence toward mother</td>
<td>11 (111)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jimenez et al. Adverse Experiences in Early Childhood (ACES) and Kindergarten Outcomes
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Study Involved A Racially Balanced Population (Jimenez et al, 2016)
Table 3 Teacher Ratings of Below Average Academic Skills – percentages (Jimenez et al, 2016)
Table 5. Teacher Ratings of Behavior – Percentages (Jimenez et al, 2016)
Conclusion (Jimenez et al, 2016)

- Children experiencing adverse childhood experiences (ACES) places students at significant risk for
  - Poor school achievement
  - And is associated with poor health
ELL enrollment in schools more than doubled between 1997 and 2008 (National Clearinghouse for English Language Acquisition, 2010).
Hispanic children constitute an urgent demographic imperative (Garcia and Jensen, 2009)

- Hispanic children, who speak Spanish as their first language (L1), make up the largest proportion of ELL students in today’s schools (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010).
  - (a) Hispanics are the largest and fastest growing minority group in the United States;
  - (b) disproportionately high numbers of Hispanic children live in poverty (Chau, Thampi, & Wight, 2010)
  - (c) Hispanic children, as a group, struggle with relatively poor educational achievement
Disadvantages ELL students may face

- Parenting challenges associated with non-conventional work hours
- Cognitive, language and brain effects of poverty – see especially Noble, 2005 and 2015
- Cognitive, language and brain effects of stress
ELL students often also have a high proportion of unidentified learning disabilities

- Standardized test scores alone cannot distinguish between learning disabilities and other factors
  - such as a student’s low level of proficiency in his or her first language,
  - limited prior schooling, and
  - low levels of English proficiency, which may cause an English learner student to perform below standards
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There is a need for greater synergy between advances in neuroscience and the formulation of innovative policies to improve life outcomes for children experiencing significant adversity. Translational developmental neuroscience can inform new theories of change to catalyze more effective interventions that lead to a more productive and healthier society.
Solutions: Neuroscience – Moving from Why to *What and How*

- Positive experiences after infancy have been shown to compensate to some degree for the negative behavioral consequences
  - Being exposed to an environment rich in opportunities for exploration and social play,
  - Caring and positive relationships with adults
- Computer activities designed to target the skills that are impacted can turn around some effects of poverty
  - *Fast ForWord* exercises, because of their specific emphasis on language, attention and memory are particularly effective and offer a cost effective valuable solution
The Role of Neuroscience Technology

- Well designed neuroscience-based technology
- builds the underlying capacities that are reduced in some children of poverty or with learning issues
And the Brain Structures affected most by Poverty
LANGUAGE AND READING AREAS
ARE ACTIVATED AFTER SIX WEEKS OF FAST
FORWARD TRAINING

Typically reading children
Reading Impaired Children
before remediation

Reading Impaired Children
after remediation

Left anterior inferior frontal gyrus IFG
Angular Gyrus AG
Left Medial Temporal Gyrus

Gabrieli, 2009
Attentional Skills are also improved after FFWD

In a large urban district with high poverty and ELL students Accelerating Growth – District Wide

Percent of Fourth Graders Basic or Above (Initial Testers)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary Parish School District</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fast ForWord

Reading Assistant

2009 2010
Students who believe intelligence is malleable (growth mind-set) earned higher math grades in the fall of 7th grade than those who believe in static intelligence (fixed mind-set) even though the groups had equivalent math achievement test scores in the sixth grade. From Implicit Theories of Intelligence Predict Achievement, Backwell et al., CHILD Devel., Vol. 78, No. 1