**Contemporary Issues Example**

At a school in northwest England, the weather is bitterly cold. Many children wear a brand of jacket called “Canada Goose” jackets. The jackets display the brand name on the shoulder of each sleeve. They have a coyote fur collar and are filled with goose down. An adult size Canada Goose jacket costs $1,000, but the children’s sizes are a bit less.

One school has told parents that after the winter break, the jackets, along with two other high end jackets, will not be worn at school because the jackets are “egregious signal of wealth, incompatible with the school’s values”.

One teacher reported that the banning of these jackets was a “poverty-proofing our school environment.” This had been attempted several years before by requiring a common bag that all students had to carry.

Some parents were very supportive, but one parent tweeted that this was a “hideous can of worms.” Another stated that “to counteract "poverty shaming" they introduce wealth shaming, If they really wanted to solve the problem they'd introduce a new coat as part of their uniform, I hope these poor children never have to spend a day in the real world”.

This brand of coat is often seen in the media because they are the gold standard for keeping people warm. Many celebrities wear them while filming in cold climates. The first Canadian to climb Mount Everest was wearing a Canada Goose jacket. In 2016, Marc Jacobs’ featured the coats as outerwear for models in his New York Fashion Week show.

My question: Do you think banning the wearing of the Canada Goose jacket will really “poverty proof” the environment of the school? Why or Why not?

https://www.washingtonpost.com/nation/2018/11/16/uk-school-bans-pricey-canada-goose-jackets-effort-poverty-proofing/?utm\_term=.49eb694a4560