Program to close learning gap leaves children 3-4 years behind

BY STANLEY POGROW

Despite research claims of dramatic improvements among disadvantaged children who took part in a schoolwide reform program, independent examination of actual test results shows no such improvement, with disadvantaged children performing poorly and/or even worse than their peers.

Since the research was used as the basis for shifting Title I funds to schoolwide intervention programs and away from individual disadvantaged children, this represents a major misdirection of school reform efforts.

Background

Title I is the primary federal effort to reduce the learning gap and equal opportunity by boosting the performance of disadvantaged children. Traditionally, these funds were given to schools to give additional assistance directly to low-income students.

But Congress re-targeted Title I funding after top researchers reported that a program geared to comprehensively improving the school as a whole dramatically boosted test scores for the disadvantaged.

The new legislation allowed Title I funds to be used for schoolwide programs. However, the independent examination of actual test results shows no such improvement, with disadvantaged children performing poorly and/or even worse than their peers.

Stephanie Vanegas (left) is read to by Vanessa Ulloa (right) in a partner reading program at a Los Angeles charter school. In Illinois, charter schools are under attack by local school boards and the Chicago Teacher Union. See stories on page 18. L.A. Times Photos.

High School Crisis: 3 in 10 Drop Out

Study casts doubt on rosy reports of graduation rates

BY ROBERT HOLLAND

More than three of every 10 U.S. students drop out of high school, thereby lessening their chances of becoming productive, economically successful citizens.

For blacks and Hispanics, the situation is even worse: Almost half do not complete high school. The national graduation rates were 55 percent for African-American students, 53 percent for Hispanics, and 57 percent for Native Americans. The highest graduation rates were 79 percent for Asians and 76 percent for whites.

The national graduation rates were 55 percent for African-American students, 53 percent for Hispanics, and 57 percent for Native Americans. The highest graduation rates were 79 percent for Asians and 76 percent for whites.
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New Congress Sets Priorities

BY DON SOIFFER

Special education, Head Start, and higher education programs will be among the top education priorities when the 108th Congress convenes in January.

But before lawmakers turn their attention to these areas, they will first need to resolve a host of potentially thorny domestic spending issues, including several on education. Congress faces a potential slowdown over spending ceilings set by the White House, having failed to advance a number of nondefense appropriations bills in the previous session, with education looming large among them. The outcome and tone of these proceedings is expected to largely set the tone for other education business.

The House and Senate education committees have already held numerous hearings on different aspects of special education, and they now aim to proceed with the business of reauthorizing the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. (See “Presidential Commission Reports on Special Education,” School Reform News, September 2002.) With an increase in federal special education spending widely anticipated, some researchers have expressed concern that the new funding not result in an increase in the number of children erroneously labeled as disabled by school districts seeking increased revenue.

Higher Education on the Agenda

With its scheduled review of the Higher Education Act, Congress will consider the effect rising college costs have on access to postsecondary education. This is expected to lead to an examination of student financial assistance programs and a discussion of possible reforms. The proceedings will likely provide lawmakers with an opportunity to consider changes addressing teacher preparation and certification as well.

A Head Start in Literacy?

Head Start also is scheduled for reauthorization in 2003. House and Senate Education Committee leaders have expressed an interest in strengthening the academic aspects of the program, with an emphasis on results similar to the orientation that forms the basis for the No Child Left Behind Act.

Dr. Wade Horn, Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services for Children and Families, testified before the House Education Committee in July on reform possibilities for Head Start, which last year was budgeted to serve more than 900,000 children. He described a reorientation of the program to focus on better preparing children to enter kindergarten with stronger literacy skills.

"Head Start needs to focus more on such indicators of early literacy as children's knowledge of letters," Horn suggested.

DoEd Pursues Management Improvements

One area where the Bush administration has had its greatest impact on the way the federal Department of Education (DoEd) does business is in improved financial management of the department. The extent of this impact will be known more fully this month, when independent auditors issue their opinion on whether these improvements have been sufficient to earn DoEd a clean annual audit. In its last four yearly audits, the department received only “qualified opinions” that cited a variety of problems.

In testimony before the House Education Committee in 2001, the General Accounting Office described “severe weaknesses” in the department’s internal financial controls. At that time, Education Secretary Rod Paige established a Management Improvement Team that included senior department officials and career managers to fix the problems and meet President Bush’s mandate for a clean audit.

In a status report released October 30, 2002, the team described changes made to date, including requiring executives and managers to adhere to performance contracts with clear individual job performance expectations, and ending abuse of purchase and travel credit cards by issuing specific penalties to be taken against employees.

Rees Selected to Head Office of Innovation

In September, Paige announced the appointment of former School Reform News contributing editor Nina Shokrai Rees to serve as Deputy Undersecretary of Education and head of the department’s new Office of Innovation and Improvement. Rees earned a reputation as an influential school reformer during her tenure as senior education analyst for The Heritage Foundation, and subsequently served as a senior education analyst for The Heritage Foundation, and subsequently served as a domestic policy advisor to Vice President Dick Cheney.

The new office will consolidate programs for public school choice, charter schools, and magnet schools. According to Paige, it also will work with other department offices to coordinate the supplemental services and public school choice provisions of the No Child Left Behind Act.

Don Soifer is executive vice president of the Lexington Institute. His email address is soifer@lexingtoninstitute.org.
**GRADUATION RATES BY STATE AND RACE**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>STATE</th>
<th>NATIVE AMERICAN</th>
<th>ASIAN</th>
<th>HISPANIC</th>
<th>AFRICAN AMERICAN</th>
<th>WHITE</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>89%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>INS</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NA = Data Not Available
INS = In sufficient Information for Calculating Graduation Rate

Source: Public School Graduation Rates in the United States, Table 1, November 2002.

**CRIS S continued from page 1**

Senior Fellow Jay Greene, a prominent school choice researcher, and Marcus Winter coauthored the study, which reports on the Class of 2000.

The Manhattan analysis threw into question the soundness of government reporting of graduation and dropout rates. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), an arm of the federal Department of Education, found a high school completion rate of 86.5 percent for the Class of 2000. By contrast, the Manhattan study concluded the national graduation rate was just 69 percent.

Much of the difference results from the NCES practice of counting as high school graduates the recipients of high school equivalence certificates, such as the GED. The Manhattan researchers counted only recipients of regular diplomas. The person who acquires a GED cannot properly be credited to the ledger of a particular high school, they note. Moreover, some respected researchers question the worth of a GED.

A second reason the government’s graduation numbers may be inflated is that the NCES depends on states correctly self-reporting their dropouts. But many states do not even attempt to track what happens to individual students, and some apply definitions guaranteed to minimize dropout numbers. For instance, Washington State reports as dropouts only those students who have filled out official dropout paperwork. Others who left school without completing the forms are classified as “unknowns,” of whom there are many.

On a federal district/state-by-state basis, Manhattan placed Florida public schools in the cellar with an overall graduation rate of 55 percent, followed closely by Georgia (56 percent), the District of Columbia (38 percent), and Arizona and South Carolina (each 59 percent). New Jersey could boast of the highest overall graduation rate at 87 percent, followed by North Dakota and Utah (each 86 percent), and Iowa (85 percent).

**Black-White Gap**

Disparities between majority and minority graduation rates were among the most disturbing findings, according to Greene and Winters. For instance, although Wisconsin had an overall graduation rate of 81 percent, it had the lowest graduation rate for African-Americans (41 percent). And Nebraska, which had the fifth best overall graduation rate was in the lower third for African-American graduates and dead last in graduation rate for Native Americans at 40 percent. Some other highs and lows:

- Highest rate of graduation for black students: 74 percent in West Virginia.
- Lowest graduation rate for Hispanics: 23 percent in Mississippi. Highest: 73 percent in Louisiana.
- Highest graduation rate for Native-American students: 86 percent in Alabama.
- Lowest graduation rate for Asian public school students: 66 percent in Rhode Island. Highest: 95 percent in Illinois.
- Lowest graduation rate for white students: Florida at 60 percent. Highest: 89 percent in North Dakota.

The results caused a bit of a stir in Florida, which in 1998-99 switched to a system of tracking individual students through high school rather than comparing a raw number of graduates against a ninth-grade enrollment four years earlier. Tracking is considered to yield more precise results. In order to obtain state-by-state comparisons, the Manhattan team compared federal data on the size of freshman classes in each state—adjusted for population shifts and transfers—with diploma numbers four years later. A spokesperson for the Florida Board of Education asserted: “We don’t do estimates, we do calculations, and it’s a world of difference.”

**The national graduation rates were 55 percent for African-American students, 53 percent for Hispanics, and 57 percent for Native Americans. The highest graduation rates were 79 percent for Asians and 76 percent for whites.**

Even so, the states official graduation rate of 62.3 percent was just 7.3 percentage points higher than the Manhattan figure. The state counts GED recipients as graduates, while the think tank did not.

“When you add the GED in there, it tends to make the problem look less critical in peoples eyes,” Jay Smink, executive director of the National Dropout Prevention Center, told the Orlando Sentinel. “Although there is value to getting a GED, I don’t want to downplay that, but it is not a high school diploma and it sends a different message to employers.”

State officials noted Florida’s graduation rates have been rising in recent years. Governor Jeb Bush added that comparisons of states using varied methods of calculation are problematic.

“If other states don’t have exit tests, and they have low standards and they have grade inflation and they are just passing kids along, it doesn’t necessarily mean they are teaching much value,” said Bush.

Manhattan issued its first dropout study in 2001, but refined its methodology for the 2002 report. Winters said that with annual updates, the researchers will be able to document whether Governor Bush’s education reforms, which include vouchers for students in chronically failing public schools, are having an impact on Florida graduation rates. Manhattan maintains a research office in Davie, Florida to study the impact of that state’s school reform measures.

Robert Holland is a senior fellow at the Lexington Institute, a public policy think tank in Arlington, Virginia. His email address is rholl1176@yahoo.com.
Small Schools Are Cost-Effective

Yet communities keep building larger and larger schools

By George A. Clowes

A new review of research on school size concludes investing in smaller rather than larger schools is a wise move when the cost per graduate is taken into account.

In making the case that small schools are not cost-prohibitive, the report identifies educational and social benefits of small schools and contrasts these with the negative effects large schools have on students, teachers, and members of the community.

"Many decision-makers ... are reluctant to embrace small schools for fear they are not economical and place an unnecessarily heavy burden on taxpayers," note the authors of the report, Dollars and Sense: The Cost-Effectiveness of Small Schools, published in September 2002 by the KnowledgeWorks Foundation. The report shows "there are many economic arguments in support of small schools and that it is fiscally responsible to spend school construction dollars on small school facilities."

As a consequence of school district consolidation between 1950 and 1975, the number of public schools in the U.S. has declined dramatically over the past half century, and the size of the average school increased from just over 100 students to well over 600. Many high schools now enroll more than 1,000 students.

Benefits of Small Schools

Studies have shown small schools can operate more flexibly and more responsibly than large schools. Besides having smaller facilities, they "operate more efficiently and more responsively than large schools," the report states.

The report suggests the following ideal upper limits of "small size" for schools with conventionally wide grade spans:
- Elementary grades 1-6: 25 students per grade level; 150 total enrollment;
- Elementary grades 1-8: 50 students per grade level; 200 total enrollment;
- Middle grades 5-8: 50 students per grade level; 200 total enrollment;
- High school grades 9-12: 75 students per grade level; 300 total enrollment.

Enrollment Per Grade Is Key

The Dollars and Sense report points out that a 500-student school with grades K-8 is not the same "size" as a school with 500 students in grades 3-4. The first is a "small" school with 56 students per grade; the second is a "large" school with 250 students per grade.

"Including a wider rather than narrower grade span configuration is a better way to reap the advantages of small schools," argue the report's authors, noting research has identified "social and academic liabilities" to having narrow grade spans.

The report suggests the following ideal upper limits of "small size" for schools with conventionally wide grade spans:
- Elementary grades 1-6: 25 students per grade level; 150 total enrollment;
- Elementary grades 1-8: 50 students per grade level; 200 total enrollment;
- Middle grades 5-8: 50 students per grade level; 200 total enrollment;
- High school grades 9-12: 75 students per grade level; 300 total enrollment.

Although the trend towards larger and larger schools continues to this day, it has not been driven by studies showing the benefits of larger schools. In fact, it has been more than three decades since a study was published recommending larger schools, according to Indiana University researcher Tom Gregory. What drives the creation of larger schools, the report suggests, are the following state policies:
- minimum enrollment qualifications for state funding of school facilities;
- excessive acreage requirements, which tend to push officials to consolidate smaller schools;
- policies that discourage renovation and maintenance of older schools by triggering new construction when renovation costs exceed a certain level.

State policy can be contradictory, too. While North Carolina's facilities planning guidelines recommend a minimum school size of 450 students, the same publication lists much smaller school sizes for improved safety and violence reduction: elementary, 300-400; middle, 300-600; and high school, 400-800.

"Most researchers have determined a measurable positive relationship of smaller school size to safety, climate, and order," state the North Carolina facilities planning guidelines.
Colorado Parents Want More Choices in Education

BY PAMELA BENIGNO

A group of 18 minority parents and grassroots leaders in the Colorado school choice movement met with Representatives Don Lee (R-Littleton) and Nancy Spence (R-Centennial) over lunch in November to discuss a need for voucher bill in the Centennial State. The meeting, hosted by the Independence Institute, drew participants from Denver, Greeley, and Colorado Springs.

Spence, chairman of the House Education Committee, explained she is planning to sponsor legislation that would provide an "Opportunity Scholarship" to low-income students who attend low-performing schools in the Denver Public Schools system. A large contingent of attendees from Colorado Springs, who had traveled 60 miles to participate in the discussion, expressed their desire for a school choice program to serve their children in their community, too.

"My concern is for the parent's choice," stated Cynthia Gant from Colorado Springs. "I know what is best for my child."

Tuition scholarship organizations have waiting lists overflowing with applications from hundreds of low-income children, according to Kathy Porter of Denver's Alliance for Choice in Education and Evelyn Taylor of Parents Challenge in Colorado Springs. Those scholarships are attracting not the best students in the public schools— as critics charge— but children who are not succeeding there. The majority of scholarship recipients are thriving in independent schools, reported Taylor.

"They are outperforming their counterparts in the public schools," she said.

Currently, the independent schools achieve these results without being subject to government reporting requirements for student performance and financial accounting, but that could change if students came with publicly funded scholarships, such as vouchers. For religious schools, that raises concerns over the entanglement of church and state. Silver State Baptist School Principal Rudy Gomez, one of several independent school officials present at the meeting, expressed his concern over having to meet government accountability standards.

"We expect parents to keep us accountable," he said.

While Spence agreed parents have kept the independent schools accountable, she maintained that schools choosing to participate in a government school choice program would have to be subject to additional accountability measures.

The Colorado General Assembly convenes in January, and at least five school choice bills have been proposed. Besides Spence's "Opportunity Scholarship" legislation, Rep. Shawn Mitchell (R-Broomfield) plans to sponsor a universal voucher bill. Rep. Keith King (R-Colorado Springs) and Sen. Bob Hagedorn (D-Aurora) plan to sponsor two very different tax credit bills, and Sen. Bruce Cains (R-Aurora) will introduce, for the second year, legislation he calls a "Property Tax Offset."

School choice activists hope the Supreme Court's decision in Zelman v. Simmons-Harris will influence the Assembly to approve school choice options like these for Colorado's children.

Pamela Benigno is director of the Education Policy Center at the Independence Institute in Golden, Colorado. Her email address is pam@i2i.org.
Panel Faults Research Critical of NBPTS Certification

But qualitative research supporting NBPTS is left unquestioned

BY ROBERT HOLLAND

Teachers certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) make a difference in raising student achievement? "Yes," said NBPTS officials, who just a year ago issued an open call for research to answer the question, saying they were "not just looking for feel-good research."

But when a study of Tennessee teachers came back with a "No" answer last summer, a review panel organized by the Education Commission of the States (ECS) quickly found fault with the research.

ECS President Ted Sanders, who served on a Carnegie-funded national commission that recommended a vast expansion of NBPTS's influence, asserted in a letter that an ECS panel had found the Tennessee study by Professor J.E. Stone, founder of the Education Consumers Clearinghouse, to be based on "inadequate data." Stone had found NBPTS-certified teachers in the Volunteer State were no more effective than non-NBPTS-certified teachers in raising student achievement.

"Until the Tennessee study questioned the value of NBPTS certification, ECS has never questioned nor seen the need to review studies, commissioned by the NBPTS, that assert the effectiveness of national certification."

Rare Scrutiny

As a result of this experience, said Sanders, "we have had our belief reinforced" that education research on key issues "must be subjected to rigorous scrutiny prior to its dissemination."

"When a certification process is checked 16 times and found wrong every instance, any reasonable person would say it isn't trustworthy regardless of what might be inferred about others who have been certified by the same process," Stone commented.

For more information...

The ECS reaction to the Stone study suggests the ECS panel supports the NBPTS' definition of great teaching, which does not require evidence of measurable impacts on students.

The ECS fault-finding panel also took a swipe at the use of teacher effects data from the Terra Nova test, from which the Tennessee value-added system draws data for analysis of teacher impact. The panel commented that "some teachers increase student scores on multiple-choice tests like Terra Nova by narrowly focusing on the specific knowledge and skills it covers. If teachers recognized by the NBPTS do not focus so narrowly while other teachers do, their students may not perform as well as the students of other teachers." That statement not only implies a disdain for objective testing, but also suggests the ECS panel supports the NBPTS' definition of great teaching, which does not require evidence of measurable impacts on students.


Robert Holland is a senior fellow at the Lexington Institute in Arlington, Virginia. His email address is rholl1176@yahoo.com.
The value-added concept of educating a child is like constructing a 13-story building one floor at a time, starting with the kindergarten entry level on the ground floor.

Under the direction and guidance of teachers, each child finds, grasps, and puts into place the elements of the educational framework necessary to support the next level of learning. When the framework for each level is firmly bolted in place and passes inspection, the child is permitted to climb atop the assembly and begin construction of the next floor of learning. After 13 such operations, a high school graduation ceremony marks the topping out of the child’s individual educational building.

If a soundly built floor is added at each level—one year of learning for each year of schooling—then each child’s educational structure would have 13 stories. But the 69 percent U.S. high school graduation rate in 2000 means almost one in three students abandons work on the 69 percent U.S. high school graduation rate in 2000 means almost one in three students abandons work on their own 13-story educational structures has been a staple of federal education policy since passage of the 1965 Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) in the “Great Society” administration of President Lyndon B. Johnson. The focus of federal policy has been on helping low-income children develop the foundation required to support a 13-story building and to provide them with assistance in getting the initial floors under way. Those efforts were expected to raise educational achievement overall and especially that of low-income, predominantly minority children.

But when the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reviewed the long-term educational performance of America’s youth some 35 years after passage of ESEA, two conclusions were most striking:

• how little overall student performance has changed over three decades; and
• how achievement gaps between different groups of students persist despite the attention and resources specifically devoted to closing those gaps.

Although scores for white students in three subject areas for three different age groups are higher than those for black and Hispanic students throughout the three decades of testing, the learning gap narrowed in almost all areas during the 1980s. But since then, the gap has again widened. The NAEP reading data, for example, show that by 1990, the average 17-year-old black student had improved to the point where his or her reading skills were about the same as a 13-year-old white student. In other words, the reading structure for 17-year-olds was 12 stories high for whites and only eight stories high for blacks. The 1990s saw no further improvement. Yet, excuses are legion—with inadequate funding, large class sizes, low student quality, and uninvolved parents taking the brunt of the blame. The University of North Carolina Research Fellow William L. Sanders instead points to teacher effectiveness as the key to educational improvement. Teacher effectiveness researchers and Social Promotion advocates have focused on the notion that all students are capable of creating their own educational success if they are given a year’s worth of learning in a year of schooling. Whether or not this happens depends largely on the quality of the student’s teacher.

Effective schooling trumps socioeconomic circumstances, declared Sanders in a September 20 address to Chicago United. “Schooling matters,” he added. “It matters a lot.”

Value-added assessment measures what fraction of each student’s expected one-year learning gain is actually delivered by each teacher. The pattern of gains achieved by differently skilled students provides insight into how well a teacher’s lessons are reaching different students—the high and the low performers as well as the average performers.

“The biggest factor affecting student achievement is teacher effectiveness,” said Sanders, who emphasizes that class size effects and differences in ethnicity, family income, and urban-suburban location fade into insignificance when compared to teacher effects.

The way Sanders’ system works can be seen by applying the concept of value-added to data published by the National Center for Education Statistics in the most recent edition of its Digest of Education Statistics, 2001. Table 4B provides Spring and Fall test scores, sorted by child and family characteristics, from the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study for children in kindergarten and first grade.

The test scores reported for general knowledge and mathematics with children grouped by socioeconomic status are shown in the accompanying table, together with calculations by School Reform News to convert the Fall-to-Spring test score gains to percentages of the average gain.
Teaching to the Middle
When the relative achievement gains for each socioeconomic group are placed on a chart, the pattern of gains in general knowledge in kindergarten exhibit what Sanders calls a “tent” pattern, where gains are higher for average-performing students than for low- or high-performing students. This “tent” pattern is the result of a teacher’s lesson being targeted to average students.

If repeated for several grades, the long-term result of this teaching pattern is that low-performing students fall further behind, and the achievement of once high-performing students regresses to the average.

Teaching to the Top
The pattern of gains in mathematics in kindergarten exhibits what Sanders calls a “reverse shed” pattern, where higher gains are achieved by previously higher-performing students. This is the result of a teacher’s lesson being aimed at challenging the top-performing students.

If repeated for several grades, the long-term result of this teaching pattern is to raise the achievement of low-performing students at the expense of once high-performing students, whose achievement levels fall back to the average.

Teaching to the Bottom
The pattern of gains in mathematics in first grade exhibit what Sanders calls a “shed” pattern, where higher gains are achieved by previously lower-performing students. This is the result of a teacher’s lesson being aimed at bringing up the lowest-performing students.

If repeated for several grades, the long-term result of this teaching pattern is to raise the achievement of low-performing students at the expense of once high-performing students, whose achievement levels fall back to the average.

According to Sanders, this is a pattern often seen in urban and rural school systems. In those systems, this erosion in the performance of early high performers historically has been attributed to cultural influences. Value-added assessment shows educational practices also contribute significantly to the erosion.

“We cannot overlook these [previously high-scoring] children,” urged Sanders. “We have to give them the opportunity to make progress from where they are.”

The Ideal Pattern
According to Sanders, an ideal gain pattern would be a downward-sloping “shed” pattern with the previous top scorers achieving a gain of 100 percent, the previous bottom scorers achieving gains in the range of 120 to 130 percent, and average students achieving gains somewhere between those two extremes.

“This is how you close achievement gaps and do it the right way,” said Sanders.

George A. Clowes is managing editor of School Reform News.
Friedman fellow with a penchant for puns chips away at voucher opponent lies

BY LAURA J. SWARTLEY

Dan McGroarty always has a catchy title for his incisive works that tear apart voucher opponents’ arguments and expose misinformation campaigns directed against parental freedom of choice—“Gameplan: The Teachers’ Unions’ Strategy for Defeating the Voucher Movement,” “Voucher Wars,” and recently, “The Blaine Game” and “The Red Tape Wars.”

McGroarty’s talent with language led him from graduate school to writing commentary for The Voice of America, and into the White House speechwriting office under President George H.W. Bush. He has also been the behind-the-scenes wordsmith for such public officials as Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and Senator Frank Carlucci.

Today, McGroarty writes from his home office in Chevy Chase, Maryland, a “converted back bedroom with enough electronic equipment to run a local phone company, with a small sign hanging on the knob reading GO AWAY,” he said. “Which I mean in the nicest sense.” McGroarty is now senior director of the White House Writers Group, founded with colleagues from his Bush administration days.

As a young White House speechwriter, McGroarty had the opportunity to meet Milwaukee’s passionate school choice crusader, Polly Williams. “I was immediately fascinated with the Milwaukee story,” he said.

After Bush Senior’s defeat in 1992, McGroarty says his time was freed up to get a book on school choice “off the drawing board and onto paper.” That book, Break These Chains: The Battle for School Choice (Prima), was published in 1996. The title was inspired by a quote from Polly Williams: “We’ve got to break these chains before the system turns our children into slaves.”

His next book, Trininita Gets a Chance: Six Families and Their School Choice Experiences (The Heritage Foundation, 2001), put a human face on school choice at a time when abstract legal and constitutional principles were being debated in the U.S. Supreme Court. Since his side won that argument in June 2002, McGroarty has focused his energies on combating lies about school choice propagated by teacher unions and other foes. He has written a series of briefs for the Friedman Foundation on accountability of private schools and misuse of the archaic Blaine Amendments by opponents of school choice at the state level.

McGroarty’s philosophy of school choice is one of an empathetic parent. A father of four, he and his wife Jacky have chosen public schools for their children. McGroarty himself attended public schools, K-12.

“Partial vouchers” would handle this kind of development, suggested Milton Friedman in a recent interview with Pearl Rock Kane published in the Winter 2003 issue of Education Next. The Nobel Laureate questioned the assumption that a child should get all of his or her schooling in one brick building and suggested a school voucher could be divided among different vendors of educational services.

“Why not let [parents] spend part of a voucher for math in one place and English or science somewhere else?” asked Friedman. “Why should schooling have to be in one building? Why can’t a student take some lessons at home, especially now, with the availability of the Internet?”

“Indeed, McGroarty’s reverence for the Constitution informs his view on school choice as an issue of fundamental equity of opportunity. “Public education,” he said, “on a philosophical level means an education that serves the general public.”

McGroarty always has a catchy title for his incisive works that tear apart voucher opponents’ arguments and expose misinformation campaigns directed against parental freedom of choice—“Gameplan: The Teachers’ Unions’ Strategy for Defeating the Voucher Movement,” “Voucher Wars,” and recently, “The Blaine Game” and “The Red Tape Wars.”

McGroarty’s talent with language led him from graduate school to writing commentary for The Voice of America, and into the White House speechwriting office under President George H.W. Bush. He has also been the behind-the-scenes wordsmith for such public officials as Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger and Senator Frank Carlucci.

Today, McGroarty writes from his home office in Chevy Chase, Maryland, a “converted back bedroom with enough electronic equipment to run a local phone company, with a small sign hanging on the knob reading GO AWAY,” he said. “Which I mean in the nicest sense.” McGroarty is now senior director of the White House Writers Group, founded with colleagues from his Bush administration days.

As a young White House speechwriter, McGroarty had the opportunity to meet Milwaukee’s passionate school choice crusader, Polly Williams. “I was immediately fascinated with the Milwaukee story,” he said.

After Bush Senior’s defeat in 1992, McGroarty says his time was freed up to get a book on school choice “off the drawing board and onto paper.” That book, Break These Chains: The Battle for School Choice (Prima), was published in 1996. The title was inspired by a quote from Polly Williams: “We’ve got to break these chains before the system turns our children into slaves.”

His next book, Trininita Gets a Chance: Six Families and Their School Choice Experiences (The Heritage Foundation, 2001), put a human face on school choice at a time when abstract legal and constitutional principles were being debated in the U.S. Supreme Court. Since his side won that argument in June 2002, McGroarty has focused his energies on combating lies about school choice propagated by teacher unions and other foes. He has written a series of briefs for the Friedman Foundation on accountability of private schools and misuse of the archaic Blaine Amendments by opponents of school choice at the state level.

McGroarty’s philosophy of school choice is one of an empathetic parent. A father of four, he and his wife Jacky have chosen public schools for their children. McGroarty himself attended public schools, K-12.

“Partial vouchers” would handle this kind of development, suggested Milton Friedman in a recent interview with Pearl Rock Kane published in the Winter 2003 issue of Education Next. The Nobel Laureate questioned the assumption that a child should get all of his or her schooling in one brick building and suggested a school voucher could be divided among different vendors of educational services.

“Why not let [parents] spend part of a voucher for math in one place and English or science somewhere else?” asked Friedman. “Why should schooling have to be in one building? Why can’t a student take some lessons at home, especially now, with the availability of the Internet?”

“For more information...
School Choice Roundup

BY GEORGE A. CLOWES

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Action Urged on Vouchers for DC Students

The Supreme Court's Zelman v. Simmons-Harris decision gave Republicans the permission to implement school vouchers; the change in the political landscape after last November's midterm elections gave Republicans the power to implement school vouchers; but how can Republicans show they now have the will to implement school vouchers?

President George W. Bush could "set off a chain reaction of policy decisions that will slowly but surely erode the public school system," said Sol Stern in a recent Wall Street Journal column.

"Come January, the president should stand on the steps of one of our nation's great public schools and say, 'This is where we begin the long march to school choice,'" said Stern. "We won't do it in a month or in a year, but we will do it if we have to."

The Wall Street Journal's editors echoed Stern's proposal, saying, "The President has a historic opportunity to give the nation a clearer vision of the future of American education." The Wall Street Journal's editors pointed out the federal government's constitutional amendment to reduce class size they approved last November. With first-year costs alone conservatively estimated at $1.1 billion and the state facing a potential $4 billion deficit, implementation won't be easy.

Rep. Stan Jordan (R-Jacksonville), who served for 16 years on the Duval County School Board, wants to offer vouchers to students in any school district that can't meet the class-size mandate "within the student's established attendance zone." The vouchers, which would be available only to students enrolled in public school for at least a year, would be worth 60 percent of the average per-student cost, or about $1,200.

Jordan's proposal, which he plans to introduce as the Constitutional Compliance Assistance Act, found support from House Speaker Designate Johnnie Byrd (R-Plant City) and from Democratic Gov. Dick Posthumous, a strong advocate of school vouchers.

Vouchers Could Reduce Class Size

If it costs the state of Florida $13,000 to $19,000 per student to create the space to put a student in a public school, and $3,000 to $4,000 to put a student in a private school, which is the better deal for the taxpayers of the Sunshine State? That's no longer an academic question in Florida, because voters left it up to lawmakers to figure out how to implement a constitutional amendment to reduce class size they approved last November. With first-year costs alone conservatively estimated at $1.1 billion and the state facing a potential $4 billion deficit, implementation won't be easy.

Rep. Stan Jordan (R-Jacksonville), who served for 16 years on the Duval County School Board, wants to offer vouchers to students in any school district that can't meet the class-size mandate "within the student's established attendance zone." The vouchers, which would be available only to students enrolled in public school for at least a year, would be worth 60 percent of the average per-student cost, or about $1,200.

Jordan's proposal, which he plans to introduce as the Constitutional Compliance Assistance Act, found support from House Speaker Designate Johnnie Byrd (R-Plant City) and from Democratic Gov. Dick Posthumous, a strong advocate of school vouchers.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Elected on a platform of change to become the first Republican Governor in South Carolina with a Republican-controlled legislature, Mark Sanford has called for a major restructuring of government in the Palmetto State, including changes to the choices available to parents in K-12 education. Among Sanford's education proposals are the following:

• Establish mandatory school choice in districts and voluntary choice between districts.
• Change the state's charter school law to remove the racial quota provision, allow multiple charter school sponsors, and give charter schools fiscal autonomy.
• Facilitate homeschooling.
• Award state grants of up to $3,550 a year to families with children in private schools, under certain circumstances.

The Greenville News
November 17, 2002

Voucher Revival Likely with GOP Control

When the Texas legislature convenes this month, it will have a political constellation unseen for more than a hundred years, with Republicans in charge in the Governor's mansion, in the House, and in the Senate—Gov. Rick Perry, Speaker-elect Tom Craddick, and Lt. Gov.—elect David Dewhurst respectively.

Since all three are on record as supporting a pilot voucher program, that gives hope to a Democrat from Houston, Rep. Ron Wilson, that the pilot voucher bill he has introduced in past sessions will finally win passage.

Wilson sees vouchers as a way for inner-city students to get out of ineffective public schools. That kind of pilot program is supported by Texans by a margin of 47 percent to 44 percent, according to a Scripps Howard Texas Poll of 1,000 adult Texans conducted last October. In a 1999 poll, support was slightly lower at 45 percent.

"Among African-Americans in prison, you'll find that most of them never completed their high school education," Wilson told the Austin American-Statesman. "I know that we have to break the cycle and the best way to do that is by educating our children. Right now, the public schools aren't doing that."

But even with a favorable political constellation, vouchers aren't a sure thing, warn the editors of the American-Statesman. Wilson plans to reintroduce a bill he and Mike Krusee (R-Williamson County) introduced last year and is allying with other voucher supporters, such as Glenn Lewis (D-Fort Worth) and Kent Grusendorf (R-Arlington). But the Democratic majority's opposition to vouchers has found receptive ears among rural Republicans concerned about the loss of public school jobs and tax revenue that vouchers might bring.

Houston Chronicle—November 15, 2002

Austin American-Statesman—November 24, 2002
ACTS SCHOOL SUPPLIES

ACTS
549 North Route 83
Grayslake, IL 60030
800-889-2287 (ACTS)
www.actstextbooks.com

K-12 Grade Curriculum Packages
All under $250.00!!
WE SELL PRODUCTS FROM:
Christian Liberty Press; Modern Curriculum Press; ISHA
Easy Grammar; PowerGlide Foreign Language; Cram
Publications (Globes, Maps); Leap Frog Learning Toys;
Crayola Crayons; Bob Jones University Press; Trend
Enterprises (Decorations, Posters); ETA Cuisenaire
(Math, Sci, Manipulatives); Pearson Learning (Sing,
Spell, Read, Write).

SAXON MATH
S58000 Math K $52.00
S58001 Math 1 $79.00
S58002 Math 2 $79.00
S58003 Math 3 $80.00
S58054 Math 54 Kit 2nd Ed. $41.00
S58065 Math 65 Kit 2nd Ed. $41.00
S58076 Math 76 Kit 3rd Ed. $42.00
S58087 Math 87 Kit 2nd Ed. $44.00
S58090 Alg. 1/2 Kit 3rd Ed. $45.00
S58010 Alg. 1 Kit 3rd Ed. $46.00
S58020 Alg. 2 Kit 2nd Ed. $47.00
SOL90 Alg. 1/2 Sol. Manual 3rd Ed. $22.00
SOL10 Alg. 1 Sol. Manual 3rd Ed. $22.00
SOL20 Alg. 2 Sol. Manual 2nd Ed. $22.00
SFC1 FIRST GRADE FACTCARDS $29.00
SFC2 SECOND GRADE FACTCARDS $29.00
SFC3 THIRD GRADE FACTCARDS $29.00
SMBK KINDERGARTEN MEETING BK. $10.00
SMB1 FIRST GRADE MEETING BK. $10.00
SMB2 SECOND GRADE MEETING BK. $10.00
SMB3 THIRD GRADE MEETING BK. $10.00

- Quality Curriculum At Affordable Prices: math; science; history; phonics; reading; spelling;
  handwriting; foreign language; grammar literature; geography.
- Teacher Supplies At Great Prices: crayons; glue; construction paper; poster board; drawing paper;
  reward stickers; name tags; classroom aid posters; yarn; pens; pencils; craft bags; cellophane paper;
  art tissue paper; presentation boards; birthday announcements; award certificates; modeling clay;
  water color paints; glitter; notepads; handwriting pads; thin-line notebook paper; thick-line notebook paper.
- Classroom Essentials: globes; maps; computers; banners; posters; border decorations.
- School Fundraising: www.dollarsforscholars.com; afréecollegescholarship.com; actstextbooks.com.

ATTENTION HOMESCHOOL FAMILIES!
Bring this add to our booth and save $5.00 off any purchase of $70.00 or more!

800-889-2287
www.actstextbooks.com; www.afreecollegescholarship.com
Homeschoolers Harassed in Illinois and California

Despite state laws creating exceptions to compulsory school attendance requirements when parents educate their children at home, public education officials in California and Illinois have begun to treat homeschooled children as truants and in one case threatened to have the children taken away from their parents. When Roger Channell's two boys heard Illinois's truant officer Merle Horwedel issue that warning, they took off to hide, according to Channell.

"Now, when anyone rings the doorbell, they're gone," Channell told WorldNetDaily. "They won't even go to the door. They're afraid to look out the windows. It's ridiculous to traumatize kids that way."

During their five years of homeschooling, the Channels responded to queries from public education officials like most Illinois homeschoolers: By stating they complied with state law by teaching the same branches of education as the public schools, and that they did this in English.

But soon after school started last year, a truant officer contacted the Channelis and at least 23 other families in the northeastern Illinois counties of Bureau, Henry, and Stark, demanding to speak to the children and review their educational materials.

When the Channels refused to comply, the regional superintendent of the three-county area, Bruce Dennison, referred them to a state's attorney for prosecution for not being "in compliance with the requirements of the Illinois compulsory attendance law."

A regional superintendent does not have the power to regulate homeschooling nor to investigate compliance, according to Chris Klicka, senior counsel for the Home School Legal Defense Association.

Until last summer, homeschool parents in California could comply with state law simply by filing an affidavit with their county department of education, certifying they were teaching their children in a private school. The law didn't change last summer, but Superintendent of Instruction Delaine Eastin's interpretation of the law did: Henceforth, parents who homeschool must be credentialed teachers.

"The classic 'home school'—where children are taught by their parent who does not have a teaching credential—is not a legal means of complying with compulsory education law, which means that home-schooled children are truant," she wrote.

California homeschoolers have resisted the idea of legislation to clear up the definition of homeschooling because they fear additional restrictions may result. But as Orange County Register senior editorial writer Steven Greenhut points out, without such clarification "the rights of home-schoolers are subject to this ongoing petty harassment by state officials."

Orange County Register — September 15, 2002
WorldNetDaily.com — November 22, 2002

More Blacks Turn to Homeschooling

While the number of homeschooling families almost doubled from 1999 to 2002, the number of black homeschooling families jumped almost 10-fold during that same period, according to estimates by Brian Ray, president of the National Home Educators Research Institute.

Of the 850,000 homeschooling families in 1999, blacks made up only 1 percent, or 8,500. Of the estimated 1.6 million homeschooling families in 2002, blacks made up 5 percent, or 80,000.

While some observers argue black parents should work to improve public schools rather than leaving to homeschool, Sonya Wright of Henrico County told the Richmond Times-Dispatch she wasn't willing to sacrifice her children. She started homeschooling when she found her children were two years behind private school children.

"I couldn't believe it," she said. "They were bringing home honor-roll report cards, but they weren't really top students."

When Baltimore City Community College professor Arnita Hicks McArthur surveyed the 1,200 homeschooled children in Baltimore in 2002, she found 500 were black, more than 40 percent. She also found black parents homeschooled their children for pretty much the same reasons other homeschool parents do:

• increased student violence in the public schools, which disrupts the classroom environment and prevents teachers from teaching;
• lack of religious or biblical values in public school instruction;
• homeschooling parents can focus one-on-one on their child's weak points.

Milton Friedman on Homeschooling

"There is no other complex field in our society in which do-it-yourself beats out factory production or market production. Nobody makes his or her own car. But it still is the case that parents can perform the job of educating their children, in many cases better than our present education system."

Education Next, Winter 2003
"We don't need school choice as a lifeboat; we need it as a reform catalyst. We have a low-performing educational system where some schools are better than others, but few are good. So when we talk about duplicating escape hatch programs [like Milwaukee or Cleveland or Florida], we're defining too limited a role for school choice in our reform efforts. That may put school choice in a rut it'll never get out of, because there's nothing harder to change than a government program."

JOHN D. MERRIFIELD CAN TELL YOU IN AN INSTANT how many years ago Milton Friedman came up with the proposal to dramatically restructure incentives in publicly funded K-12 education by distributing schooling funds directly to all parents with vouchers redeemable at both government-run and privately run schools.

That's because Merrifield was born in 1955, the same year Friedman first published the idea of universal vouchers. It's a happy coincidence, since Merrifield also is a strong advocate of universal vouchers.

An economics professor at the University of Texas-San Antonio, where he has been on the faculty since 1987, Merrifield received his doctorate in economics from the University of Wyoming at Laramie in 1984. While best known for his work on school choice, Merrifield's research interests and publications also include natural resource and environmental economics, international economics, and urban-regional economics. He is a frequent expert panelist/guest on television and radio, commenting on topics such as school choice, water resource management, the Endangered Species Act, clean air, and off-budget government spending.

Although he has been a long-time student of Friedman's ideas, Merrifield's interest in school choice grew as he observed an alarming lack of basic skills among many incoming students at UT-San Antonio. The day-to-day experiences of his wife, a special education and kindergarten teacher, added fuel to his school choice advocacy.
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the same problem we have in our education system now. It's like having a choice of different franchise outlets of the same provider.

Clowes: What would a genuine market-based education system look like?

Merrifield: The two key things we need to have are non-discrimination and the freedom to set prices.

Non-discrimination means no longer discriminating against families that prefer schools not run by the government. To do that, the school system needs to become child-based: Whatever amount of government support a child is entitled to under the law should follow the child to the accredited school of their choice—whether that school happens to be owned and operated by the government, or a church, or a nonprofit organization, or a for-profit business.

You would take the government budget, deduct some money for administering choice-based systems, deduct some more money to pay off old remaining bonded indebtedness, and divide what's left by the number of children. You also might make it a little higher for students in high school and a little less for students in elementary school. That everybody would be wearing the same price tag, and they would carry that cash, that voucher, or tax credit—whatever the delivery mechanism for the government money—to the school of their choice.

The second key element is that the providers must be able to choose the price they charge for their educational services. If that price is a little bit more than the voucher or tax credit—however the public subsidy is delivered—then schools must be allowed to charge above and beyond that subsidy level. Many current systems, like those in Florida and Milwaukee, disallow such add-ons, and that's a devastating limitation.

People talk about how we can't afford voucher programs, but the current expenditures on education already are enough to send every child in America of school age to all but the very, very best private schools. What we need out of the school system that we're not getting now are incentives and specialization, and we can't have either of those without choice.

Clowes: For schools to specialize in serving specific groups of students, they have to be able to set admission criteria. Don't lottery-based admissions and first-come, first-served admissions make it difficult to specialize?

Merrifield: That's right. It's built into the legislation in places like Milwaukee, Cleveland, and Florida. That's a mistake.

I forgot in part because we had a history in our country of people choosing things and doing things because of the color of somebody's skin. But, first, we've come a long way from those kinds of attitudes; and, second, if the schools specialized, they would have many differences other than the composition of the student body that would affect parental choice.

In the current system, we have less diversity in school composition than we ever have had. If a parent is trying to choose where to live and which school their child is going to attend, the only difference in the schools, in many cases, is in the composition of the student body. All whereas— the curriculum, the textbooks, and so on—is dictated by the government.

But if schools could specialize, then we'd have academic differences and pedagogical differences, and all kinds of other reasons to choose or not choose a school.

Clowes: Almost all of the voucher programs in place right now are targeted to children in low-income families. Some people think that if the income restrictions were lifted, the rich would take all the seats in private schools and leave none for the poor.

Merrifield: That's the “Static World Fallacy,” the idea that there's a fixed supply out there. That goes against everything we know about economics.

If there's an increase in demand, the price will temporarily rise, entrepreneurs will flood in with new supply to meet that demand, and then the price will generally go down to where it was before, if not lower. That's why prices need to be allowed to be flexible to drive that process and have the initial increase to attract the entrepreneurs, which then bring the prices back down.

Existing programs are targeted to specific groups, but that's a mistake. It's not in anyone's interest to target freedom. It's least of all in the interests of low-income people to limit the increase in freedom or choice to themselves, because, if everyone has freedom, choice, and portability of the government money that supports them, the schools will get better faster, they'll specialize more, and they'll be more innovative.

Allowing the wealthy to use government money—that's not the same, in fact—to provide their children with greater school choices doesn't hurt anybody. It also doesn't make anybody worse off to let people spend more money on education by allowing add-ons.

I feel confident that a $5,000 or $6,000 voucher or tax credit per child per year would entitle every child in America to a very, very high level of education. But if some want to spend $9,000 or $10,000 by adding a few thousand dollars more to their voucher, that doesn't harm anyone.

Clowes: How do the different school choice options—vouchers, tax credits, charter schools, and so on—stack up in terms of their ability to deliver what you call the reform catalyst of competition?

Merrifield: One of the things that privately funded vouchers lack, in addition to just sheer dollars per student, is the likely staying power entrepreneurs need to make investments. You just can't count on some philanthropists continually donating millions of dollars a year to private vouchers. An entrepreneur is not going to break ground on a new campus for that kind of money, given that it might evaporate in a few years.

Charter schools are a school choice option, but they're still government institutions. There's no provision for changing a price above the taxpayer amount, and they're limited in how much they can specialize. That's because they're not allowed to exclude customers. Part of the problem with charter schools is we keep wanting to pretend that every school should be capable of serving every child. We need to give up that notion. Human beings are too diverse for that to happen.

We need to have choices, we need to have specialization, and we need to have some schools say, “Look, we're specializing in special ed children, or children that like geography. Your child isn't one of those, so we can't admit him. But here's the name of a school that does what he likes. Take him there.” It's far better to have a school system with an outstanding choice for everyone than to have a school system that pretends that every school is OK for everyone.

With tax credits, the problem in the past has been that they've been defined to be non-refundable. Most families don't have very sizable state and local tax liabilities to top into, and so non-refundable credits cannot deliver very much money to provide incentives to entrepreneurs or to eliminate the discrimination problem.

However, a refundable tax credit would provide incentives and eliminate the discrimination problem. A $5,000 per child tax credit, for example, would work like this: “OK, Mr. Jones. You sent two children to a private school for $5,000 each. Since you paid $1,000 in state income taxes, here's a $9,000 refund.”

I think that's identical to a voucher. Voucher, tax credit—it's all the same to me. Either method of delivering equal treatment of all children, regardless of which school they use, is OK with me.

Clowes: In developing legislative proposals for school choice programs, which model would you recommend legislators use as a basis to build on? I think that's identical to a voucher. Voucher, tax credit—it's all the same to me. Either method of delivering equal treatment of all children, regardless of which school they use, is OK with me.

Merrifield: Wouldn't well-funded vouchers do that?

Clowes: Yes, vouchers would change the system's underlying elements dramatically, and that's what is needed. That would change the incentives overnight.

If we allowed the money that schools currently spend—more than $8,000 per student—to be child-based, that would produce an explosion of entrepreneurship, and there would be so many schools available they probably all would be about half full. That kind of vast overcapacity is an unmistakable signal that the price is way too high, and so I suspect we wouldn't see any pressure to raise the level of per-pupil funding for a long time.
used to help all students in a school, even where the disadvantaged are a minority of the student body. The U.S. Department of Education (DoEd) backed the shift in a variety of ways, from funding the dissemination of the research to pushing schools and states to adopt schoolwide programs over traditional interventions.

There was only one problem. Subsequent independent investigations revealed that all the key research on schoolwide reform— which was produced by the co-developers and associates of the leading schoolwide improvement model, Success for All— was not scientifically valid. The disadvantaged students in the supposedly successfull schools were in reality performing far below grade level.

These findings have significant implications for federal reform efforts:

- First, it appears much of the $100 billion in federal and state reform funds was misdirected towards an intervention approach that provides no help to disadvantaged children; in fact, learning gaps nationally actually widened during the 1990s, despite major increases in reform funding.
- Second, in Title I schools, funds intended to help the disadvantaged disproportionately helped advantaged students.
- Third, DoEd did not perform due diligence on research it funded, the practices it validated, and the programs it advocated.

Responding to these concerns is critical, since the No Child Left Behind legislation mandates the use of scientifically validated practices, and a federal “What Works Clearinghouse” is being established to define such practices.

How could Congress and the whole education profession change course based on results from questionable research? The short answer is: The results were never independently verified. A small group of researchers with interrelated interests and potential conflicts of interest conducted and disseminated scientifically invalid research that seriously misdirected education reform efforts to help needy and disadvantaged children.

Here’s how it happened.

“[I]t appears much of the $100 billion in federal and state reform funds was misdirected towards an intervention approach that provides no help to disadvantaged children...”

Influential Studies

The original studies on schoolwide reform were done by Robert Slavin and Nancy Madden, who reported the success in Baltimore of the schoolwide Success for All program the districts they had co-developed. This program is, according to its authors, “one of the greatest success stories of educational research and reform.” Since Slavin is a highly regarded researcher and the studies were published in prestigious research journals, the studies had credibility. Then another researcher reported dramatic gains for Success for All schools in Memphis. Although both districts ultimately dropped the program, those initial results of dramatic success led Congress to consider changing the Title I law to favor the use of the school-wide strategy. DoEd was asked to study the effectiveness of traditional versus school-wide interventions. The study concluded schoolwide models were better and that Success for All was the best school-wide model. The two researchers who conducted the DoEd study were in the center at Johns Hopkins University where Success for All had been developed; the wife of one of the researchers is an officer in the Success for All Foundation.

One of the two researchers from the DoEd study then headed another study commissioned by the five major national teacher and administrator professional organizations to determine which interventions were research-based. That study concluded there were only three research-based programs, and that the most validated was Success for All. Slavin, co-developer of Success for All, also was co-director of a center at Johns Hopkins University, called the Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At-Risk (CRESPAR), the sole national federally funded center for disseminating research about disadvantaged students. CRESPAR conducted another evaluation that concluded Success for All was the most research validated of the schoolwide intervention programs.

Preponderance of Evidence

Convinced by the preponderance of evidence produced by this small group of researchers, Congress changed Title I to favor, though not mandate, the school-wide approach. DoEd, however, promoted the school-wide approach and discouraged using Title I funds for serving disadvantaged students directly. By the late 1990s, virtually all of the discretionary grants from DoEd and its Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI) went to researching, disseminating and developing schoolwide reform models, with approximately one-third— roughly $62 million over a five-year period— going to the Johns Hopkins’ centers where Success for All was developed and the Success for All Foundation.

Other organizations, including Edison Schools, adopted the Success for All program. The superintendent of Memphis was named Superintendent of the Year for the districts reported “gains” from the program, which were documented by a professor who had an interest in distribution of the program. In the Abbott school finance ruling, the New Jersey Supreme Court mandated the program for the states 277 high-poverty elementary schools, based solely on the advice of a University of Wisconsin professor who was a consultant to New American Schools, whose most prominent model was Success for All, according to Forbes magazine.

Unraveling Story

But the supposed research-based success story began to unravel when independent researchers examined the “success.” When Richard Venekly of the University of Delaware looked at student records in Baltimore, he was “shocked and disappointed” by how poorly the Success for All students had actually done. Projecting Venekly’s data, after five years of Success for All, students reached the sixth grade reading the equivalent of 3 to 4 years below grade level.

Another independent analysis by the present author showed the Success for All schools in Memphis also had not gained in achievement as reported but had actually declined during 1998-99. More than half of them— some 24 schools— were ranked among the lowest 77 in reading in the state. When district staff confirmed the lack of progress in Success for All and other schoolwide reform programs, the superintendant threw out all schoolwide reform programs.

Ineffective, but Still Funded

Additional independent research studies continued to surface, now involving more than 250 Success for All schools, showing the program to be ineffective and/or less effective than the districts’ own initiatives. An evaluation of the comprehensive schoolwide strategy by the RAND Corporation also found no effects. An analysis by the present author showed how the methodology demonstrating the apparent success of the schoolwide program was scientifically invalid.

In spite of these findings, DoEd re-funded CRESPAR without competition and has provided Slavin with another multi-million dollar grant to carry out a further self-evaluation of his program. As a result, the same scientifically invalid research continues to be disseminated at taxpayer expense as evidence of “success.” For example, in November 10, 2002 article in The New York Times Sunday Magazine discussed a new study by a University of Wisconsin professor who once again concluded Success for All was one of three research validated intervention programs.

This latest study was funded by CRESPAR, and the author was until recently an employee of CRESPAR. In addition, the researcher from two of the studies referred to earlier was just made project director for the new Federal “What Works Clearinghouse.”

Dr. Stanley Pogrow is a professor of education at the University of Arizona, where he specializes in school reform and improvement policy and practice. He is the developer of the HOTS (Higher Order Thinking Skills) program for Title I and LD students, and the pre-Algebra Supermath curriculum. His email address is stanpogrow@worldnet.att.net.
Questions Concerning School Vouchers

Not a panacea, but not a poison, either

By Lynn Harsh

QUESTION: Would educational vouchers solve all of America’s education problems?

ANSWER: No, but we can’t “fix” education until we “fix” who makes the decisions about education. The people who make the decisions are those who control the money.

Vouchers move us toward marketplace competition and the right of individuals to make choices for themselves and their families. The freedom to enter and exit particular schools must become a right of education consumers, and creating options for students must become a right of educators and entrepreneurs, before schools will begin to reform themselves into more effective institutions of learning.

QUESTION: Would vouchers be a boon for private schools?

ANSWER: Not necessarily. In a competitive education marketplace, vouchers would cover only the cost of delivering a quality education to students. There would be no windfall profits.

Voucher programs operating today in Milwaukee and Cleveland cover less than the amount spent by typical private schools.

Many private schools, particularly non-religious institutions, would quickly accept the vouchers. But voucher programs would pose serious dilemmas for others. Admitting students with vouchers means accepting money with strings—strings that have some consequence to particular private institutions. The first “string” would likely be: testing the second would be an open enrollment requirement.

QUESTION: Would vouchers undermine religious private schools?

ANSWER: Religious schools are allowed to accept vouchers in Milwaukee and Cleveland and they have not been forced to abandon the religious elements of their curriculum. Of course, curriculum is not the only concern; other key elements of private schooling may be affected by vouchers. That is why it is important that voucher programs be designed differently from city to city and state to state. There is no single right voucher program, just as there is no single right answer to the question.

Some schools would probably accept public money even if it requires that they compromise their religious or academic standards. That is their choice to make. The parties responsible for balancing government requirements for vouchers against a private school’s mission are the school’s governing board and the school’s patrons.

It is not government’s job to keep private institutions from making unwise decisions or to protect them from competition. We have far too much of that “nanny nonsense” now. Should we allow government to continue running an education monopoly because some private schools will make what we consider to be bad decisions?

COMMENT: Don’t vouchers mean government control of private schools? Doesn’t this mean, in the end, nobody will really have free-market choices?

RESPONSE: History does not favor this prediction. Government schools replaced private schools during the nineteenth century by claiming a monopoly on public funding, not by tempting private schools with public funding and then controlling them. The way to restore private schools is to break the government school monopoly on public funding with vouchers.

When the free market has been allowed to operate in other fields, choices spring up all over, often in unusual and unexpected places.

Highly motivated people in a free society find ways to meet their needs and the needs of others—even when that means bucking government and the status quo. Vouchers will inspire the same variety of options in education.

QUESTION: Vouchers would leave in place a system of coercive taxation to fund schools, right?

ANSWER: Yes. But that problem is worsened today, when the education decision-makers take our money and then are nearly unreachable and untouchable. It is less of a problem as we move closer toward putting consumers in the driver’s seat.

For the “public good,” this nation mandates education for all children, collects taxes from most every citizen, and enforces the mandate through the power of law. As long as this is the case, parents and children affected by the law must have genuine choices.

QUESTION: Why don’t we just separate the state and school altogether?

ANSWER: Except for deeding property to communities so they could build schoolhouses, our forebears did not envision government getting involved in the education of children. But here we are, and the question is, where do we go from here?

Many people believe children will turn into uneducated delinquents if government doesn’t assume the responsibility to educate them. They won’t support complete separation of school and state. We recognize this is an elitist attitude, but they do not. Now that civil rights legislation protects equal opportunity, it seems to me we have little to worry about if the private sector assumes more responsibility for educating children.

QUESTION: How can you expect parents to make wise choices about the schools their child attend when most of them don’t even care enough to show up for parent-teacher conferences?

ANSWER: The high quality and relatively low prices I pay for food are the results of a small percentage of consumers who take the time to be aggressive price shoppers. Grocery stores operate on a small profit margin and cannot afford to lose even 5 percent of their business, so they compete vigorously to provide what their shoppers want. The majority of us, therefore, benefit from the wise choices made by a very small number of people.

Likewise, schools cannot afford to lose even a small percentage of their revenue base. If the money follows the child to the school chosen by his or her parents, and leaves at the same time the child does, the school will respond to deficiencies immediately. This means many children will benefit from the active and conscientious involvement of a relatively small number of parents.

QUESTION: Don’t vouchers violate the separation of church and state guaranteed by the First Amendment?

ANSWER: What constitution are you reading?

The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution says “Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.” Government is not establishing religion when it gives money to parents. It is the parent who will make the decision as to whether the voucher will be used in a religious institution.

“...the school’s governing board and the school’s patrons even in unexpected and unusual places.”

We recognize this is an elitist attitude, but they do not. Now that civil rights legislation protects equal opportunity, it seems to me we have little to worry about if the private sector assumes more responsibility for educating children.

The current system of financing schools, not vouchers, violates the First Amendment. Many parents are denied an opportunity to freely exercise their religion because, while the law (and their own conscience) tells them they must educate their children, government schools are prohibited from teaching religion, and many heavily taxed families do not have the economic wherewithal to enroll their children in private schools that conform to their religious beliefs.

Former high school teacher and principal Lynn Harsh is executive director of the Evergreen Freedom Foundation in Olympia, Washington, whose website is http://www.effwa.org. Her e-mail address is effwa@effwa.org.

Our Certified/Licensed Professionals work with your school staff as a team to deliver quality services to your students.

- Itinerant Related Service Specialists (Speech and Language, Adapted Physical Education, etc.)
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- On-site and itinerant special education teachers
- Over 25 years of experience
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Charter School Setbacks in Illinois

Attacks on the continuing growth of charter schools come from three directions, according to Bruno V. Manno in the latest issue of Education Next: state policymakers, local school systems, and organized public education interest groups. Recent events in Illinois provide examples of such attacks and illustrate just how effective they can be in side-tracking charter school reform.

Rockford Paradox

When Rockford Public Schools in Illinois denied the YouthBuild Charter School proposal, it argued the district needed no such program of choice, and also that it would be unable to absorb the budgetary impact of the proposed school—estimated to be less than 1/10th of 1 percent of the district's budget. Since denying the charter, the district has applied for and received a grant from the public school choice program, and it has announced a $7.5 million surplus.

Appeal Nullification Allows School Board to Kill Top Charter

“The state’s hostile environment for charter schools left Illinois in a unique position at the start of the 2002-2003 school year—with one fewer charter than the state had a year earlier…”

Chicago Teachers Union Aims for Charter School Restrictions

The Chicago Teachers Union (CTU) lost bargaining powers as part of 1996 legislation giving the mayor of Chicago control of the city’s public schools. But a bill (Senate Bill 1240) that came close to being approved during the “lame-duck” session of the Illinois legislature last December would have restored limited bargaining power to the union. The bill also would have lifted the cap on charter schools in Chicago from 15 to 30, but at the price of four other amendments imposing severe restrictions on charter school operations.

The legislation had won strong support not only from the CTU and most Chicago labor unions but also business groups and Mayor Daley. While the ban on strikes would have continued, CTU bargaining rights over schedules, staffing, layoffs, student assessment, and class sizes would have been restored. But retiring Senate President James “Pate” Philip refused to allow a vote on the bill, saying it “waters down school reform.”

The bill’s promise to lift the charter cap was welcomed by charter proponents, since the existing 15 charters in Chicago have all been granted additional proposals for schools have been waiting for an opportunity to apply. Also, there are some 4,000 children on Chicago charter school waiting lists.

Although raising the cap is not something the Chicago Teachers Union would normally favor, the other amendments were concessions to the union view that charter schools are institutions in need of regulation and restriction. The union influence was most obvious in the amendment requiring existing charter schools to a single campus. That would have halted one of the most promising innovations spawned under the current charter school law.

Another amendment would have imposed a 30-month moratorium on Chicago charter schools engaging the services of for-profit management companies. By law, Illinois charter schools must be operated by not-for-profit organizations but, like conventional public schools, they may contract with for-profit and other not-for-profit corporations for goods and services. Senate Bill 1240 would have restricted that right.

Finally, Chicago charter schools would have been required to annually administer any other nationally recognized standardized tests administered by the Chicago Public Schools. Charter schools are already required to annually administer the Illinois State Board of Education (ISBE), which would then convene a review panel to make a recommendation to the state superintendent to pass back to the ISBE. If the ISBE reversed the local decision, the ISBE would then act as the sponsor for the proposed charter school.

Although the State Board approved two suburban charter schools immediately after the law was changed, it has approved no additional schools out of the numerous appeals it has received. In fact, only one school besides Governor’s State—the Rockford YouthBuild Charter School proposal—has made it through the appeals panel. But the State Board acted against its superintendent’s recommendation and denied the YouthBuild charter, with Board members citing their lack of faith in charter schools in general and their reluctance to overturn local decisions.

That view contradicts the purpose for which the appeals process was enacted and effectively nullifies the charter school appeal law.

In the past, Illinois has approved only one new charter school, the Tomorrow’s Builders Charter School in East St. Louis. The state’s hostile environment for charter schools left Illinois in a unique position at the start of the 2002-2003 school year—with one fewer charter than the state had a year earlier, 22 versus 23, and one fewer charter school site, 27 versus 28.

Paul Seibert is director of Charter Consultants, Inc., a division of The Governor French Academy, Inc., of Belleville, Illinois. His email address is seib@gfacademy.com.

Paul Seibert is director of Charter Consultants, Inc., a division of The Governor French Academy, Inc., of Belleville, Illinois. His email address is seib@gfacademy.com.
Achievement Gap by Reading Materials at Home*

High School Graduation

0-2 Items

All 17-Year-Olds

6+ Hours Per Day

Some Education

3-5 Hours Per Day

Male

Less than High School Graduation

4 Items


Achievement Gap by Gender*

TV and Reading Materials

Beyond High School

Female

All 17-Year-Olds

Male


Achievement Gap by TV Watched Per Day*


Achievement Gap by Parents’ Education*


Achievement Gap by Reading Materials at Home*


*NAEP Long-Term Reading Trend for 17-Year-Olds

JUST THE FACTS: Test Scores by Gender and Other Characteristics

BY GEORGE A. CLOWES

Since 1969, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) has periodically conducted assessments to provide a report card on what the nation's students know and can do in various subject areas, and how these achievement levels are changing over time. As well as reporting achievement trends by subject by age and grade level, the NAEP also reports by different groupings of students, such as male compared to female, white compared to black, etc.

In 2000, NAEP published Trends in Academic Progress: Three Decades of Student Performance, a summary of the trends through 1999 in reading, mathematics, and science for students at ages 9, 13, and 17. Since reading is fundamental to all education and the reading skills of 17-year-olds represent the cumulative effect of 11 years of schooling, comparisons here will be limited to reading scores for 17-year-olds.

Gender and Ethnic Group

Girls consistently outscore boys in reading, although the situation is reversed in mathematics and science.

Although the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) does not report the breakdown of students by sex by grade level, data from the 2001 Digest of Education Statistics shows female high school graduates have out-numbered males in all but four of the last 30 years. For example, 1.51 million girls, and only 1.25 million boys, completed high school in 2000.

Although white students still outscore black and Hispanic students in the NAEP long-term reading test, the latter groups’ dramatic gains in the 1980s almost halved the gap. However, the 1990s saw no further narrowing of the gap.

TV and Reading Materials

The NAEP reading scores suggest two things parents can do to help their children do better in school: Cut television viewing to less than two hours a day and have plenty of reading materials around the house. Students who watch less than two hours of television a day consistently score above the average in the long-term NAEP reading test, as do children who live in homes where newspapers, magazines, books, and an encyclopedia are available.

Parent Education

The NAEP reading data also suggest that when parents earn their own high school diploma and pursue further education after high school, these accomplishments help their children outscore the average in the long-term NAEP reading test. However, parents’ high school diplomas in 1999 apparently don't confer the same benefits to their offspring as high school diplomas did in 1971.

Divorce

Children of divorced families not only had lower test scores than children from intact families, but this gap widened over time, according to a new national study from Ohio State University. Another study found that adults exposed to unilateral divorce as children are less well educated and have lower family incomes.

George A. Clowes is managing editor of School reform News.

For more information...


The cited research on divorce and educational attainment is available from the National Bureau of Economic Research at http://papers.nber.org/papers/W7968 and from Ohio State University at http://www.acs.ohio-state.edu/researchnews/archive/childdiv.htm.
Join us for the
10th Annual California Charter Schools Conference
March 27 - 29, 2003
Anaheim Marriott

You don’t want to miss the 10th Annual California Charter Schools Conference, the nation’s largest and oldest statewide charter schools conference. Members of the state and national Charter School Community will come together to share ideas, consider future development plans, receive technical assistance and attain practical advice from others involved in the charter schools movement. We hope you join us for this exciting, annual event!

About the Conference Program:
The California Network of Educational Charters (CANEC) has organized a wide range of breakout sessions, general sessions and networking opportunities designed to meet the needs of a diverse group of participants. Regardless of the type of session, each is intended to provide participants with detailed and relevant information about specific issues. These sessions allow important topics to be addressed in depth and with participant interaction.

Early Registration Deadline: Friday, February 7, 2003
Registration Deadline: Friday, March 7, 2003 (late fee after this date!)
Hotel Reservation Deadline: Friday, March 7, 2003

For conference information, contact CANEC: 650 654-6003, 650 654-4267 (fax)
E-mail: conference@canec.org • Web site: www.canec.org
Conference registration also available on-line at www.canec.org.