

# Death by a thousand cuts: the story of privatising public education in the USA

Joanne Barkan

The ‘pro-choice’ education reform movement is gradually undermining US schools

---

When champions of market-based reform in the United States look at public education, they see two separate activities - government funds education and government runs schools. The first is okay with them; the second is not. Education reformers want to replace their *bête noire* - what they call the ‘monopoly of government-run schools’ - with freedom of choice in a competitive market dominated by privately run schools that get government subsidies.<sup>1</sup>

Public funding, private management - these four words sum up American-style privatisation, whether applied to airports, prisons or elementary and secondary schools. In the last twenty years, the ‘ed-reform’ movement has assembled a mixed bag of players and policies, complicated by alliances of convenience and half-hidden agendas. Donald Trump’s election and his choice of zealot privatiser Betsy DeVos as US secretary of education bolstered reformers, but has also made more Americans wary.

What follows is a survey of the controversial movement - where it came from, how

# Soundings

it grew, and what it has delivered so far to a nation deeply divided by race and class.

## The backstory in brief

In the latter decades of the nineteenth century, consensus grew in the US around an expansive vision of education in which government played a far-reaching role: schooling should be government funded and administered, universal and compulsory until a certain age. In a nation that was increasingly industrialised, and home to new immigrants, citizens expected public schools to accomplish a great deal, including imparting general knowledge and practical skills, preparing young people psychologically and socially for self-sufficient adult lives, educating for democratic citizenship, unifying a diverse population and creating opportunity for upward mobility. Over time, many Americans came to regard public education as a mainstay of democracy.

The US Constitution makes no mention of education, however, so the federal government had no specified role to play. Since the earliest days of the republic, it has been local and state authorities that have shaped elementary and secondary (K-12) public education. Racial segregation in schools, which became the law in 17 states and the norm almost everywhere else, was also a local and state matter. This did not change until 1954, when the US Supreme Court ruled that racially segregated public schools were ‘inherently unequal’ and therefore unconstitutional (*Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka*). When the federal government stepped in to enforce school desegregation, it met with fierce resistance. After several years of only minimal progress, federal authorities resorted to court-ordered desegregation plans, which they imposed on school districts across the country, not only in the South.<sup>2</sup> For the first time, government at the highest level assumed a significant role in K-12 schooling. In the mid-1960s and 1970s, the federal role further expanded to include protecting the civil rights of all students and offering financial assistance to public schools with high percentages of low-income students. But the main control and funding of schools remain at the state and local levels.

In the 1980s, the political climate shifted. An international renaissance of *laissez-faire* economics, updated as ‘neoliberalism’, challenged the dominant Keynesian model of regulated markets. Governments around the world began to act on a

## Death by a thousand cuts

suite of neoliberal principles: competition and choice in the free market are the best organising principles for most human activity because they produce greater efficiency and higher quality; the role of government is to provide a framework that allows the market to function freely; most other government activity merely clogs the system with bureaucracy and special interests. Ruling elites believed that implementing these principles would solve high inflation, stagnation, unemployment, low productivity, and whatever else was ailing an economy.

Neoliberalism led logically to specific policies such as cutting taxes and government spending, deregulating the economy, and transferring as much government activity as possible to the private sector, including education. If ever government funding was necessary to get something done, management should be left to the private sector.

One of neoliberalism's major thinkers, and its most successful populariser, was economist Milton Friedman (1912-2006), who advised Republican candidate Reagan during the 1980 presidential campaign and joined his Economic Policy Advisory Board in 1981. On education policy, Friedman never deviated from the model he presented in his 1955 essay, 'The Role of Government in Education'.<sup>3</sup> Friedman proposed that government get out of the business of running schools altogether. Instead it should fund a voucher worth the same amount of money for every school-age child to use at his or her choice of private school. For Friedman, the choices would include private for-profit schools, private non-profit schools, religious schools, and some 'even' run by the government. A democratic society, he reasoned, required 'a minimum degree of literacy and knowledge on the part of most citizens'. Hence government had a legitimate interest in requiring and paying for what the community decided was the necessary 'minimum amount of education'. But government running schools was not 'justifiable in its own right in a predominantly free enterprise society'.

In this marketised system, competition would, theoretically, eliminate low-performing schools because they wouldn't attract enough customers to stay in business. In the real world, of course, the poor buy necessities at a price they can afford even if the quality is inferior. This is why the free market has always failed to meet the real needs of low-income people: they get what they can pay for. In a school voucher system, wealthy families can (and will) add as much money as they want to their vouchers to pay for their choice of schools; middle-income families

## Soundings

will pull together whatever resources they can for the best schools in their price range. And low-income families without additional resources will 'choose' schools charging the value of the voucher. Almost no higher-quality schools will be available to the poor because such schools will have no incentive except altruism to offer their products at the minimum price. (For example, the value of a government voucher for high school in Washington DC in 2016-2017 was \$12,679, while tuition at Washington's elite private schools exceeded \$40,000 a year.<sup>4</sup>) As a last resort, low-income families can choose a 'government school.' For free-market ideologues, government schools should always be no more than a last resort.

Backtracking for a moment, many Southern states had anticipated the 1954 school desegregation decision, and prepared policies to evade racial integration. Between 1954 and 1959, eight states adopted what were effectively whites-only versions of Friedman's voucher system. They used public funds to pay for white students to attend all-white private schools, which were called 'freedom of choice schools' or 'segregation academies'. States also leased unused public school property to private schools. Shortly before publication of his 1955 essay, Friedman added a footnote to address potential segregationist versions of his proposal. He argued that both forced segregation and 'forced non-segregation' were evil. His solution - for the South and everywhere else - was publicly funded vouchers that could be used for 'exclusively white schools, exclusively colored schools, and mixed schools'. Parents could 'choose which to send their children to'.

Friedman's essay prefigured the indifference of today's pro-market reformers to racial segregation in education as long as the trade-off is private schools. The essay still functions as a touchstone for them.<sup>5</sup>

### **Sowing the seeds of market-based reform**

Education policy advisors in Reagan's administration hoped to wean Americans off public schools while also weakening the teachers' unions, which were a significant source of power for the Democratic Party. Starting the weaning process required convincing Americans that public education was failing. In 1983 the administration released 'A Nation at Risk', a report aimed at generating support for radical reform.

The rhetoric was hyperbolic: '... the educational foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity that threatens our very

## Death by a thousand cuts

future as a Nation and a people'.<sup>6</sup> Apocalyptic claims were backed up by what one researcher called 'a golden treasury of spun statistics'.<sup>7</sup> The media hyped the report to the point of stoking a panic about failing schools. Politicians across the political spectrum called for higher standards, better test results and greater performance accountability from public schools; and conservatives simultaneously aimed for deep spending cuts.

This sky-is-falling panic about public schools, and the 'standards and accountability' demands, attracted bipartisan support. Neoliberal thinking had influence far beyond ideological devotees. It tinged political moderates, self-identified liberals, media people and think-tank opinion makers; and it permeated what became the dominant wing of the Democratic Party - the 'New Democrats'. Their jargon included choice, competition, efficiency, and downsizing government; they often competed with Republicans for pro-market credibility.<sup>8</sup>

In the 1990s, the escalating drive for tougher education standards, better test scores and more accountability coincided with a declining commitment to racial desegregation. Public school integration, on the rise since the mid-1960s, peaked in 1988, when 43.5 per cent of all black students attended schools that were at least 50 per cent white.<sup>9</sup> Although research showed that integrated schools narrowed the achievement gap between minority and white students without harming the latter, the dedication of most government officials to proactive desegregation had dissipated.<sup>10</sup> Decisions of the US Supreme Court in 1991, 1992 and 1995 made it easier for school districts to abandon their court-ordered plans.<sup>11</sup> Resegregation began immediately. In just ten years, the percentage of black students attending schools that were at least 50 per cent white dropped to 32.7 per cent. By 2011, that figure had fallen to 23.2 per cent.<sup>12</sup>

Highly segregated schools attended by low-income minority students were notoriously under-resourced compared to public schools attended by white middle-class and wealthy students. Schools in poor urban neighbourhoods needed much greater support. Moreover, although the achievement gap between minority and white students had been narrowing, it still existed. Politicians might profess a commitment to reducing racial inequality, but most acted within neoliberal boundaries and with no interest in pushing integration further.

Glorification of the market along with the vogue for standards and accountability led to a new approach: government could commit to improving education for low-

## Soundings

income minority students with market tools while leaving schools segregated. The mainstream political world seemed to slide easily from the ostensible goal of racial integration to aiming for something like 'separate but improved' for low-income minority children. Government would hold public schools to high standards, monitor how well they were doing and help students in inadequate public schools move to better schools of their choice. The primary measure of school quality would be student scores on standardised tests, despite the fact that most education scholars agreed that the scores reveal little about education success.

Thus the seeds for twenty-first century market-based reform were sown.

### **Building a movement from the top down**

Neoliberal innovations in education policy took hold slowly. Reagan proposed several voucher-type programmes, but they died in Congress. He did, however, cut the federal government's portion of total public education spending from 12 per cent to 6 per cent. The George H.W. Bush administration (1989-1993) produced no major education laws, but some policy ideas were picked up by Bill Clinton (1993-2001). In 1994, Clinton signed the Improving America's Schools Act, which provided federal funds to states to create a new type of school: publicly funded, privately operated 'charter schools'. These schools would have more autonomy than district (traditional) public schools and, advocates claimed, be more innovative. The first charter school in the United States had already opened in St Paul, Minnesota, in 1992, under state law. Clinton's Act was designed 'to increase the number of charter schools nationwide'.

In 1999, Florida Republican governor Jeb Bush signed into law the nation's first statewide voucher plan. Still in operation, the Florida Opportunity Scholarship Program allows students in 'failing' public schools to use state funds to pay for private schools, including religious schools.

After the turn of the twenty-first century, pro-market education reformers began to attract enough support and funding to build organisations, and to operate like - or at least look like - a movement. Charter schools and voucher programmes appealed to conservatives and centrists of all stripes, though to few progressives. By 2010 'reform-think' dominated the national conversation on K-12 education. Still, market-based reform never became a grassroots movement. It attracted

## Death by a thousand cuts

elites: billionaire philanthropists, private mega foundations, finance and high-tech entrepreneurs, politicians at every level of government, business leaders, media figures and think-tank associates. The players have been overwhelmingly white; their methods consistently top-down. Notably missing have been teachers, school administrators, parents and students.

With elite support, education reformers collected enough money to build an ed-reform industry of organisations employing same-thinking researchers, programme designers, consultants, lobbyists, campaign organisers and media producers.<sup>13</sup> A cadre of super-wealthy donors regularly gives millions of dollars to pro-ed-reform candidates for state and local offices; they fund ballot initiatives around the country and pour hundreds of thousands of dollars into local school board races. The right-wing American Legislative Exchange Council (ALEC), which drafts model legislation for conservative state lawmakers, has been an important ally of the ed-reform movement. Some states have adopted ALEC model education legislation verbatim.

Help has also come from the White House. President George W. Bush (2001-2009) advanced both charter schools and vouchers. His signature education law, No Child Left Behind (signed in 2002), established that students in low-testing, low-income public schools could transfer within their district to another public school or to a charter school. In 2004, Bush signed into law a voucher programme that Congress designed for Washington DC (Congress has final jurisdiction over the District of Columbia). The Opportunity Scholarship Program offers every low-income student in the District a federally funded voucher to use at a participating private school, secular or religious.

President Barack Obama (2009-2017) opposed school vouchers, but he quickly became charter-advocate-in-chief. In the depths of the 'Great Recession' in 2009, his Department of Education (DOE) launched a \$4.35 billion competitive grant programme called Race to the Top. The rules stipulated that each competing state submit a public school reform plan, taking into account a long list of DOE pet policies. States that scored highest on the DOE's point system would win millions of dollars to implement their plans. DOE criteria included not limiting the growth of charter schools (some states had capped the number). States were also required to give charter schools free use of public facilities or help them pay for facilities. Public school supporters fiercely opposed the measures because they diverted resources

# Soundings

from already stretched-to-the-limit education budgets. But state governments were desperate for money from anywhere; all but four eventually entered the contest. Obama's Race to the Top gave the entire charter school enterprise a substantial boost.

## **Anatomy of vouchers and charter schools**

Both voucher programmes and charter schools channel public funding to private entities, but in different ways. When students receive a government-funded voucher for a set amount of money, they give the voucher to a private or religious school as payment or partial payment for tuition. This means that all of the taxpayer funds that end up in private and religious schools are funds that are no longer available for public education. In the charter school system, the private entities that run the schools receive an allotment of public funds for each student who enrolls. The allotments are transferred directly from district schools to the charter schools, thus shrinking the district public school budgets. The public schools are left with the same fixed expenses but fewer students and therefore less money coming in. They almost inevitably deteriorate: a school that could previously afford, say, a librarian, art teacher, nurse, or smaller classes, can no longer cover costs.

Ed-reformers do not promote vouchers and charter schools to the public as strategies to privatise public education. Instead, they pitch their reforms as ways to create choice in K-12 schooling. Reformers claim that charter schools and vouchers give low-income students 'trapped' in low-performing schools new choices: their parents - just like wealthy parents - have the power to choose the schools they know are best for their children. Who could object? Reformers have successfully made 'choice' the subject of the policy debate. A candid description of vouchers and charter schools - for example, these policies drain public funds from district public schools and channel the money to private entities student by student, school by school - would attract little support (see the analysis of public support below).

While conservatives consciously aim to shift control over K-12 education from government to the private sector, moderates in the ed-reform camp do not have privatisation as their main goal. Instead, they want to move as many students as possible, as quickly as possible, out of schools with low standardised test scores. They see their twenty-year-old alliance with conservatives as tactical. Yet not only

## Death by a thousand cuts

have they ended up buttressing conservatives politically; they also practise a kind of triage, without thinking through the consequences. By steadily draining resources from district public schools, they undermine the very schools that the overwhelming majority of American children, including low-income children, still attend. Yet both conservatives and moderates call school choice ‘the civil right issue of our time’.

Charter schools claim to be public schools because they receive tax-payer money, and, in theory, are overseen by state-approved authorities. But private-sector entities - boards of directors and charter management organisations - manage the schools and control finances. And private management - which can be for-profit or non-profit - allows charter schools to avoid the transparency and accountability required of district public schools. When the public or press asks for documentation, managers can claim private status. They regularly refuse access to their financial records, data and internal communications - information that public entities are required to make available. In September 2017, for example, investigative reporters requested some emails from Eva Moskowitz, CEO of Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc., a charter management organisation that runs 46 schools in New York City. The company’s lawyer responded that the charter management organisation ‘is not itself a charter school or a government agency ... it is not in and of itself subject to FOIL [Freedom of Information Law] or required to have an appeal process’.<sup>14</sup>

Charter school lobbies press state governments for as little supervision as possible. For example, in California, where more than 1200 charter schools operate, government audits are neither regular nor proactive; they take place only when a county official suspects fraud and requests an audit. Some 90 per cent of charter schools nationwide are not unionised, so unions cannot provide general oversight. Predictably, inadequate transparency and oversight have led to widespread malfeasance in the sector (more on this below).

Pro-market reformers also champion online (virtual) schools, most of which are privately run, for-profit, and notably lucrative. They use the same funding mechanism as charter schools - the operators get public funds for each child who signs up - but they do not have to maintain buildings, provide transportation or pay for full staffs. One teacher can follow scores, even hundreds, of students as they tap their way through digital lessons on their own computers.

# Soundings

## Charter school performance

According to the National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, charter enrolment increased from 1.2 million students in 2006-2007 to an estimated 3.1 million in 2016-17.<sup>15</sup> This number is still tiny compared to the overall size of the US K-12 system. For example, the federal government projected that about 50.7 million students would attend public and charter schools in fall 2017.<sup>16</sup> (About 5.2 million would attend private schools. In addition, about 1.7 million were home-schooled in 2016.<sup>17</sup>)

But charter schools are highly concentrated geographically, and wield substantial political clout. About 92 per cent of K-12 students in New Orleans attend charter schools; the figure is 53 per cent in Detroit, and 45 per cent in the District of Colombia.<sup>18</sup> And charter networks run well-funded lobbying efforts in most states. As of November 2017, only six states did not allow charter schools.

To justify the existence of charter schools, ed-reformers have always claimed they outperform the district public schools attended by most low-income and minority students. Indeed, unless charters perform better, they serve no purpose other than choice for the sake of choice, regardless of quality. To measure performance, both government and ed-reformers still rely on student scores on standardised tests.

Since 2009, a pro-privatisation research centre located at Stanford University has regularly conducted nationwide studies comparing the test scores of charter school students to the scores of demographically similar students at district public schools; these have generated a fairly consistent, albeit very rough, picture of average performance nationwide. About one half of all charters perform at the same level as district schools, about one quarter perform worse, and about one quarter perform better although often by minuscule amounts. A much clearer picture of performance comes from state and district studies, rather than national averages. In 2016, for example, a study of charter schools in Texas found that 'at the mean, charter schools have no impact on test scores and a negative impact on [future] earnings'. These mediocre results fall far short of reformers' claims and hardly justify undermining district schools.

As for the higher-performing charter schools, research has shown that these schools often boost test scores by 'counselling out' the most challenging students - those with cognitive and physical disabilities or behaviour problems, or English

## Death by a thousand cuts

language learners. Such students remain in district schools, increasing the concentration of at-risk students in precisely the districts that have lost funding to charter schools. In the 2013-14 school year, the Budget, Facilities, and Audit Committee of the Los Angeles Unified School District reported that 1.2 per cent of charter school students were severely disabled; the figure for the district overall was 3.8 per cent - more than three times as large.<sup>19</sup> In December 2017, the American Civil Liberties Union of Arizona released the results of its investigation of 471 charter schools, which found that 56 per cent had enrolment policies that clearly violate the law or discourage at-risk students. For example, Spanish is the most commonly spoken language after English, but only 26 per cent of these schools provide enrolment documents in both languages.<sup>20</sup> It is notable that attrition rates (that is, how many students drop out of a school or class in a given period) are strikingly high for high-testing charter schools. In 2006, Moskowitz launched Success Academy Charter Schools, Inc., with 73 first-graders. In 2018, this class became the first to graduate from the academy's high school - but only 17 of the early enrollees remained, representing an attrition rate of 77 per cent.<sup>21</sup>

### A closer look at vouchers

The goal of staunch voucher advocates is to replicate the system that Milton Friedman proposed in 1955: a tax-payer funded voucher for every student to use in a free market of secular and religious private schools. Several states now offer vouchers to all families regardless of income, but public support for such 'universal' programmes is low. To get around this obstacle, ed-reformers promote programmes limited to low-income students, students in low-performing schools, or students with special needs.

They have also devised several variations on vouchers, all of which channel public funds to private schools but avoid using the unpopular 'v' word. 'Private-school tuition tax credits' allow families to subtract the cost of tuition from the taxes they pay. 'Tax-credit scholarships' give tax credits to donors (corporations included) who fund scholarships for other people's children to attend private schools; the donors cycle their money through private non-profit 'school tuition organisations'. Rerouting the money this way, reformers argue, prevents any violation of the separation of church and state in cases where the donated money ends up

## Soundings

in the hands of a faith school: the school tuition organisation acts as a ‘middleman’ separating the government funding (the tax credit) from the religious institution (the school). In reality, the process works like money laundering: funds pass through a private entity and arrive at a religious school scrubbed clean of their taxpayer origin. Another tool - ‘education savings accounts’ - gives families government-funded debit cards to use for various private education expenses in addition to tuition.

According to the Milton and Rose Friedman Foundation (which changed its name in 2016 to the less politically charged EDChoice), there were 64 voucher and voucher-type programmes in thirty states and the District of Columbia as of January 2018.<sup>22</sup> Most of the money ends up at religious schools. For example, 82 per cent of the nearly 100,000 students in the Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Program chose religious schools in 2017.<sup>23</sup>

Republicans, who control a large majority of state governments as well as the White House and Congress, aim to expand voucher programmes. Paradoxically, the promised expansion comes after the release of several studies showing that voucher programmes actually hurt student performance. In late 2015, researchers reported that Indiana’s voucher students who transferred to private schools ‘experienced significant losses in achievement’ in maths and no improvement in reading.<sup>24</sup> In June 2016, a study of a large Ohio voucher programme, published by the pro-reform Thomas B. Fordham Institute, found: ‘The students who use vouchers to attend private schools have fared worse academically compared to their closely matched peers attending public schools ... Such impacts also appear to persist over time ...’<sup>25</sup>

Voucher supporters (Milton Friedman included) have always assumed that transferring from a public school to a private school would mean transferring to a better school. But in recent years, public schools in the United States have closed the achievement gap with private schools. Since government vouchers never cover the cost of higher-quality private schools, most low-income students end up at schools that are academically no better or even worse than the public schools they leave.

### **Corruption and segregation**

Both charter school management and voucher programmes are rife with fraud. This is something that comes with the territory when states hand out millions of dollars to private-sector actors without adequate vetting or ongoing oversight.

## Death by a thousand cuts

The pro-public-school Network for Public Education posts a feature on its website called ANOTHERDAYANOTHERCHARTER SCANDAL, which keeps a running account of charter misconduct along with links to source material.<sup>26</sup> In a four-week period in fall 2017 the site listed a number of such scandals. For example, it reported that the founder and former administrator of Southwest Learning Centers, which ran four charter schools in Albuquerque, New Mexico, had pleaded guilty to pocketing over \$2 million by having his schools pay fake invoices to a fake company he set up in Las Vegas. He had also billed parents for online credits that their children never earned, and charged his schools double the actual rent for a building he leased. Meanwhile, the Pennsylvania Ethics Commission fined the former chief executive officer of the defunct Pocono Mountain Charter School in Coolbaugh Township for four years of deficient financial statements. The commission also cited him for asking the charter board to raise his wife's salary at the school and hire his children for school positions. And the former principal of a Delaware charter school - the Academy of Dover - pleaded guilty to embezzling \$145,480. The case went to federal court 'due to the significant [federal] funding received by the Academy'.

The case of Ohio's Electronic Classroom of Tomorrow (ECOT) - once Ohio's largest online charter school - epitomises the corruption in the virtual charter sector. ECOT was notorious for its low graduation rate (under 39 per cent in 2014) and its dropout numbers (the highest in the nation, according to federal data).<sup>27</sup> But despite the school's abysmal performance, Ohio's Republican establishment gave it unwavering support. According to an exposé in *Mother Jones* magazine, ECOT's founder and the CEO of its management company, William Lager, took home about \$153 million from the school between 2000 and 2017.<sup>28</sup> In the same period, he contributed \$1.9 million to political candidates, mostly Republicans. In 2016 and 2017, the state's Department of Education found that ECOT had overcharged taxpayers about \$80 million in just two years for 'truant' students - students who had not logged into the online instruction system for even the required minimum of once every thirty days. On 18 January 2018, the board overseeing ECOT voted to close the school immediately because it could not repay its \$80 million debt. ECOT's 12,000 students were left scrambling to find places at other schools - a problem created whenever a charter school suddenly shuts down.

There are some interesting connections when it comes to the flows of voucher

# Soundings

money. The Arizona Christian School Tuition Organization (ACSTO) is one of the state's largest groups giving out vouchers, called tax credit scholarships, for private schools. From 2010 to 2014, private donors contributed \$72.9 million to ACSTO. Arizona law allows families of all income levels to use these vouchers - and it also allows voucher-granting groups to keep 10 per cent of all donations to cover overheads. ACSTO's founder and executive director, Steve Yarbrough, is also president of the Arizona State Senate and a long-time voucher promoter. ACSTO outsources much of its work - from data entry to customer services - to HY Processing, a private for-profit company owned by Yarbrough, his wife and another couple. ACSTO also pays \$52,000 a year in rent to its landlord, who is Yarbrough. When Yarbrough bought a \$16,000 car in 2012, ACSTO reimbursed him for the full amount.<sup>29</sup>

Vouchers and charter schools create still another problem: they increase racial and socioeconomic segregation. A March 2017 report by the Century Foundation, which analysed longitudinal data from the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program, found that 68.4 per cent of voucher-participating private schools had enrolments that were either 90 per cent white or 90 per cent black. Overall, 90 per cent of voucher transfers 'increased segregation in private schools, public schools, or both sectors'.<sup>30</sup>

According to a 2016 comprehensive report by the Brookings Institution, 'charter schools enroll more black and poor students than traditional public schools in the same areas and are more likely to be at one extreme or the other of the racial and economic demographic spectrum than traditional public schools'.<sup>31</sup> In the 2016-17 school year, charter students comprised about 6 per cent of the combined enrolment of all district and charter schools nationwide; the figure for black students was over 12 per cent.<sup>32</sup>

## **Conclusion: the shifting landscape**

Given disappointing academic results, endemic corruption and growing segregation, why does anyone interested in equal and excellent education for all still support vouchers and charter schools? One reason is money. Entrepreneurs recognised early on that market-based ed-reforms could be a source of substantial profits. Private operators quickly found ways to tap into the vast public resources - now more than \$600 billion a year - spent on K-12 education. Equally important, ideology trumps evidence for free-market boosters, and ed reformers have developed a culture of

## Death by a thousand cuts

true-believers. In January 2018, a government-solicited audit revealed that school officials in Washington DC had knowingly allowed 34 per cent of high school seniors to graduate in 2017 without fulfilling all requirements.<sup>33</sup> The news triggered an uproar, because reformers, private funders and the media had been touting Washington DC - with its voucher programme and high penetration rate of charters - as education reform's great success story.

Reflecting on the gulf between triumphalism and facts, Frederick Hess, director of education policy studies at the conservative American Enterprise Institute and one of the few reformers who confront problems publicly, wrote:

... so many in the world of school reform tend to clamber aboard the bandwagon of the moment while parking their scepticism ... reformers have tended to circle their wagons, fueling a 'with-us-or-against-us' dynamic. That leaves little ground for friends to offer tough-minded public appraisal without being labeled an enemy of the movement ... it's time for the reformers, funders, and pundits to ask ourselves how we've contributed to a culture that's heavy on cheerleading and light on scepticism - and how to find a better balance going forward.<sup>34</sup>

In another case of ideology *über alles*, pro-reform members of Congress went so far as to ban rigorous evaluation of Washington DC's voucher programme. In spring 2017, the Institute of Education Sciences, which is the independent research arm of the US Education Department, released a study showing that, on standardised maths tests, DC students who used vouchers to attend private schools fell behind their peers who remained in public schools. The research was a randomised controlled trial considered the 'gold standard' experimental design. A week later, the Republican-led Congress approved a budget that included 'a prohibition on the use of the experimental design evaluation method in any future federally funded studies of the DC voucher program'.<sup>35</sup>

Given the overall record of charter schools, support in the general public and among minorities has been slipping. According to the most recent survey conducted by the pro-reform journal *Education Next*, support among all respondents dropped from 51 per cent to 39 per cent from 2016 to 2017. Among African Americans,

## Soundings

support for charter schools dropped from 46 per cent to 37 per cent; among Hispanics, from 44 per cent to 39 per cent.<sup>36</sup>

Education reformers also suffered a major defeat when they tried to increase the number of charter schools in Massachusetts using a ballot initiative. The state has the strongest oversight system in the country and a relatively small number of charters. The ballot initiative drew national attention because of the outsized campaign spending - \$25 million on the 'yes' side, \$17 million on the 'no' side. On 8 November 2016, voters rejected the charter increase by an overwhelming margin, 62 per cent to 38 per cent.

Many African-American advocacy organisations have taken a stand against market-based reforms. In a 2014 resolution, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) pledged to 'continue to advocate against any state or Federal legislation which commits or diverts public funding, allows tax breaks, or establishes preferential advantages to for-profit, private and/or charter schools'.<sup>37</sup> The 2016 NAACP national convention passed a resolution supporting 'a moratorium on the proliferation of privately managed charter schools'.<sup>38</sup> Shortly after this vote, the Movement for Black Lives - a network of more than 50 organisations representing African Americans - released a platform that included a moratorium on new charter schools.<sup>39</sup> In 2017, the largest and best known African American ed-reform organisation - the Black Alliance for Educational Options - closed down, after it had 'struggled to remain financially viable and relevant over the last several years'.<sup>40</sup>

Unfortunately, not all Americans know enough about market-based ed-reform to evaluate it. Despite two decades of heated public debate, many do not understand how charter schools and vouchers are funded. According to a 2017 poll by the independent research company SSRS, a little more than half of Americans supported charter schools until they learned that the funding is taken from district public schools. Then support plummeted to 30 per cent.<sup>41</sup> For participants in the 2017 Education Next survey, support for vouchers hinged on whether the survey questions contained the phrase 'wider choice' or 'use government funds'. A proposal to 'give all families with children in public schools a wider choice, by allowing them to enroll their children in private schools instead, with government helping to pay the tuition' received 45 per cent support. But a proposal to 'use government funds to pay the tuition of all students who choose to attend private schools' received

## Death by a thousand cuts

only 27 per cent support. Neither question contained the word ‘voucher’.<sup>42</sup> It turns out that when Americans know that market-based reforms drain funds from public schools, most oppose the policies. The success of the ed-reform movement so far has depended on their not knowing.

The survival of public education in the United States is a political choice. Opposition to market-based reform is growing stronger, but it needs to be transformed quickly into electoral activism. Privatisers now control the Trump administration, Congress and most state governments.

Running for president, Donald Trump promised sweeping privatisation policies for K-12 education, but so far his programme has stalled in Congress. Some Republicans object to expanding federal influence and squelched the administration’s proposals in the 2018 budget. Secretary of Education Betsy DeVos has not been a strong asset. She quickly made herself the most publicly reviled member of Trump’s controversial cabinet with her combined ignorance of and scorn for public education. But effective power over public education still belongs to the state governments, and here the situation is more worrying. As of April 2018, Republicans held a near-record 34 governorships and 32 state legislatures; they have continued to approve new voucher programmes and more charters.

Draining resources from public schools has already undermined districts around the country, especially those serving low-income and minority students. Time is short for rescuing and improving public education. Destroying it will not require privatising the entire system or anything near that. We are watching death by a thousand cuts.

**Joanne Barkan** is an editorial board member of *Dissent* magazine and is based in New York City and Truro, Mass. She has written articles for many publications on public education reform, the intervention of private foundations in public policy, and the relationship between philanthropy and democracy.

---

### Notes

1. M.J. Brouillette, ‘Conclusion: Restoring a Free Market in Education’, *The Case for Choice in Schooling*, 29.1.2001: [www.mackinac.org/3243](http://www.mackinac.org/3243).

2. J.T. Patterson, *Brown v. Board of Education: A Civil Rights Milestone and Its Troubled*

# Soundings

Legacy, Oxford University Press 2001.

3. M. Friedman, 'The Role of Government in Education', in R.A. Solo (ed), *Economics and the Public Interest*, Rutgers University Press 1955: <http://la.utexas.edu/users/hcleveland/330T/350kPEEFriedmanRoleOfGovtable.pdf>

4. T/ Toch & P.W. Jordan, 'The Weakness In D.C.'s Voucher Program', *The Washington Post*, 1.9.17: [www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-weakness-in-dcs-voucher-program/2017/09/01/09a61694-8cd5-11e7-84c0-02cc069f2c37\\_story.html?tid=ss\\_mail&utm\\_term=.48220918d51a](http://www.washingtonpost.com/opinions/the-weakness-in-dcs-voucher-program/2017/09/01/09a61694-8cd5-11e7-84c0-02cc069f2c37_story.html?tid=ss_mail&utm_term=.48220918d51a)

5. Walter F. Murphy, 'Private Education with Public Funds?', *The Journal of Politics* 20, No 4, November 1958: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2126801>.

6. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED226006.pdf>. Very similar rhetoric was promoted in the UK by the authors of the Black Papers on education: C.B. Cox and A.E. Dyson, *Black Papers on Education 1-5*, Harper Collins 1971. In fact developments in the UK and the US have many parallels. For an analysis of the effects of neoliberalism on the UK schools system see Myra Barrs and Michael Rustin, 'What has happened to our schools?', *Soundings* 67, winter 2017: [www.lwbooks.co.uk/sites/default/files/s67\\_02barrs\\_rustin.pdf](http://www.lwbooks.co.uk/sites/default/files/s67_02barrs_rustin.pdf).

7. G. Bracey, 'Disastrous Legacy: Aftermath of *A Nation at Risk*', *Dissent*, 80-83, Fall 2008: [www.dissentmagazine.org/article/disastrous-legacy-aftermath-of-a-nation-at-risk](http://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/disastrous-legacy-aftermath-of-a-nation-at-risk).

8. T.I. Palley, *From Financial Crisis to Stagnation: The Destruction of Shared Prosperity and the Role of Economics*, Cambridge University Press 2012.

9. G. Orfield, *Schools More Separate: Consequences of a Decade of Resegregation*, The Civil Rights Project, Harvard University, July 2001: <https://civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/schools-more-separate-consequences-of-a-decade-of-resegregation/orfield-schools-more-separate-2001.pdf>.

10. D.L. Kirp, 'Making Schools Work', *New York Times*, 19.5.12: [www.nytimes.com/2012/05/20/opinion/sunday/integration-worked-why-have-we-rejected-it.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2012/05/20/opinion/sunday/integration-worked-why-have-we-rejected-it.html).

11. For an account of US Federal Court decisions on desegregation see: [www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/litigation/materials/aba-annual-2013/written\\_materials/20\\_lessons\\_in\\_leadership.authcheckdam.pdf](http://www.americanbar.org/content/dam/aba/administrative/litigation/materials/aba-annual-2013/written_materials/20_lessons_in_leadership.authcheckdam.pdf).

12. G. Orfield, E. Frankenberg, J. Ee & J. Kuscera, *Brown at 60: Great Progress, a Long Retreat and an Uncertain Future*, Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles, UCLA, 15.5.14: [www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-051814.pdf](http://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu/research/k-12-education/integration-and-diversity/brown-at-60-great-progress-a-long-retreat-and-an-uncertain-future/Brown-at-60-051814.pdf).

13. K. Welner, 'Free Market Think Tanks and the Marketing of Education Policy', in M.B. Katz & M. Rose (eds), *Public Education Under Siege*, University of Pennsylvania Press 2013.

14. M. Disare, 'Private Managers of Public Schools, Charter Leaders Enjoy Extra Buffer From Public-Records Laws', *Chalkbeat*, 21.9.17: [www.chalkbeat.org/posts/ny/2017/09/21/private-managers-of-public-schools-charter-leaders-enjoy-extra-buffer-from-public-records-laws](http://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/ny/2017/09/21/private-managers-of-public-schools-charter-leaders-enjoy-extra-buffer-from-public-records-laws).

15. National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, *Estimated Charter Public School*

## Death by a thousand cuts

- Enrollment, 2016-17 (Report), Washington DC 2017: [www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/EER\\_Report\\_V5.pdf](http://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/EER_Report_V5.pdf).
16. <https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372>.
17. <https://nces.ed.gov/pubs2017/2017102.pdf>.
18. National Alliance for Public Charter Schools, *A Growing Movement: America's Largest Charter Public School Communities and Their Impact on Student Outcomes* (Report Eleventh Annual Edition), Washington DC 2016: [www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/CharterSchoolEnrollmentShareReport2016.pdf](http://www.publiccharters.org/sites/default/files/migrated/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/CharterSchoolEnrollmentShareReport2016.pdf).
19. M.K. Reilly & D.N. Reed, *Establishment of All-Charter Districts: Waivers and Autonomies and Fiscal Impact*, Presentation to the Budget, Facilitates, and Audit Committee, Los Angeles Unified School District, 19.1.16: <https://boe.lausd.net/sites/default/files/01-19-6BFAAllCharterDistrictPresentation.pdf>.
20. G. Zetino, *Schools Choosing Students: How Arizona Charter Schools Engage in Illegal and Exclusionary Student Enrollment Practices and How It Should Be Fixed*, American Civil Liberties Union of Arizona, 14.12.17: [www.acluaz.org/sites/default/files/field\\_documents/schools\\_choosing\\_students\\_web.pdf](http://www.acluaz.org/sites/default/files/field_documents/schools_choosing_students_web.pdf).
21. G. Rubenstein, 'Who Survives Success?', 27.3.18: <https://garyrubinstein.wordpress.com/2018/03/27/who-survives-success/>.
22. EdChoice, *School Choice in America Dashboard*, 16.3.18: [www.edchoice.org/school-choice/school-choice-in-america/](http://www.edchoice.org/school-choice/school-choice-in-america/).
23. Florida Department of Education, *Florida Tax Credit Scholarship Program*, June 2017 Quarterly Report: [www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7558/urlt/FTC-June-2017-Q-Report2.pdf](http://www.fldoe.org/core/fileparse.php/7558/urlt/FTC-June-2017-Q-Report2.pdf).
24. K. Carey, 'Dismal Voucher Results Surprise Researchers as DeVos Era Begins', *New York Times*, 23.2.17: [www.nytimes.com/2017/02/23/upshot/dismal-results-from-vouchers-surprise-researchers-as-devos-era-begins.html?\\_r=1](http://www.nytimes.com/2017/02/23/upshot/dismal-results-from-vouchers-surprise-researchers-as-devos-era-begins.html?_r=1).
25. A. Churchill & C. Aldis, 'Foreword' in D. Figlio, & K. Karbownik, *Evaluation of Ohio's EdChoice Scholarship Program: Selection, Competition, and Performance Effects*, Thomas B. Fordham Institute, July 2016 (p2): [https://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/FORDHAM Ed Choice Evaluation Report\\_online edition.pdf](https://edex.s3-us-west-2.amazonaws.com/publication/pdfs/FORDHAM_Ed_Choice_Evaluation_Report_online_edition.pdf).
26. Network for Public Education, *#ANOTHERDAYANOTHERCHARTERSCANDAL*.<https://networkforpubliceducation.org/9734-2/>.
27. M. Rich, 'Online School Enriches Affiliated Companies if Not Its Students', 18.5.15: [www.nytimes.com/2016/05/19/us/online-charter-schools-electronic-classroom-of-tomorrow.html](http://www.nytimes.com/2016/05/19/us/online-charter-schools-electronic-classroom-of-tomorrow.html).
28. T. Pogue, 'The GOP's Biggest Charter School Experiment Just Imploded: How a Washed-Up Lobbyist Built a Charter School Empire and Siphoned Millions from Public Schools', March/April 2018: [www.motherjones.com/politics/2018/01/the-gops-biggest-charter-school-experiment-just-imploded/](http://www.motherjones.com/politics/2018/01/the-gops-biggest-charter-school-experiment-just-imploded/).

## Soundings

29. K. Carey, 'DeVos and Tax Credit Vouchers: Arizona Shows What Can Go Wrong', *New York Times*, 2.3.17: [www.nytimes.com/2017/03/02/upshot/arizona-shows-what-can-go-wrong-with-tax-credit-vouchers.html?emc=edit\\_tnt\\_20170302&nlid=34274273&tntemail0=y](http://www.nytimes.com/2017/03/02/upshot/arizona-shows-what-can-go-wrong-with-tax-credit-vouchers.html?emc=edit_tnt_20170302&nlid=34274273&tntemail0=y).
30. H. Potter, *Do Private School Vouchers Pose a Threat to Integration?*, Century Foundation, 21.3.17: <https://tcf.org/content/report/private-school-vouchers-pose-threat-integration/>.
31. J. Grover, R.V. Reeves & E. Rodrigue, *Segregation, Race, and Charter Schools: What Do We Know?* Center on Children and Families at the Brookings Institution, October 2016: [www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/ccf\\_20161021segregation\\_version-10\\_211.pdf](http://www.brookings.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/10/ccf_20161021segregation_version-10_211.pdf).
32. NAACP Task Force on Quality Education, *Quality Education for All ... One School at a Time*, Hearing Report, July 2017: [www.naacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Task\\_ForceReport\\_final2.pdf](http://www.naacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/Task_ForceReport_final2.pdf).
33. Alvarez & Marsal, *Final Report: District of Columbia Public Schools, Audit and Investigation*. Report prepared for Office of the State Superintendent of Education, Washington DC, Contract Number #CW57247, 26.1.18: [https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/release\\_content/attachments/Report on DCPS Graduation and Attendance Outcomes – Alvarez%26Marsal.pdf](https://osse.dc.gov/sites/default/files/dc/sites/osse/release_content/attachments/Report%20on%20DCPS%20Graduation%20and%20Attendance%20Outcomes%20-%20Alvarez%26Marsal.pdf).
34. F. Hess. & B. Bell, 'D.C. Graduation Scandal Shows How an Uncritical Gaze Leads Reformers Astray', *The Hill*, 26.3.18: <http://thehill.com/opinion/education/380283-dc-graduation-scandal-shows-how-an-uncritical-gaze-leads-reformers-astray>.
35. U. Boser, M. Benner & E. Roth, *The Highly Negative Impacts of Vouchers*, Center for American Progress, 20.3.18: [www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2018/03/20/446699/highly-negative-impacts-vouchers/](http://www.americanprogress.org/issues/education-k-12/reports/2018/03/20/446699/highly-negative-impacts-vouchers/).
36. Education Next, Tables 13a, b, c & d, in *Program on Education Policy and Governance—Survey 2017* (pp12-13): <http://educationnext.org/files/2017ednextpoll.pdf>.
37. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, *2014 NAACP Resolution Results*: [http://action.naacp.org/page/-/resolutions/2014\\_Resolutions\\_Results.pdf](http://action.naacp.org/page/-/resolutions/2014_Resolutions_Results.pdf).
38. National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, *Resolutions, Ratified by the National Board of Directors Under Article IX, Section 1 of the Constitution of the NAACP*, 2016: [www.naacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Resolutions.2016.pdf](http://www.naacp.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/03/Resolutions.2016.pdf).
39. Movement for Black Lives, *A Vision for Black Lives: Policy Demands for Black Power, Freedom & Justice*, 2016: <https://policy.m4bl.org>.
40. C. Bauman, 'Unable to reinvent itself, Black Alliance for Educational Options to shut down after nearly 20 years', *Chalkbeat*, 25.10.17: [www.chalkbeat.org/posts/us/2017/10/25/unable-to-reinvent-itself-black-alliance-for-educational-options-to-shut-down-after-nearly-20-years/](http://www.chalkbeat.org/posts/us/2017/10/25/unable-to-reinvent-itself-black-alliance-for-educational-options-to-shut-down-after-nearly-20-years/).
41. K. Hefling, *Politico-Harvard Poll: Americans Favor Charter Schools - But Not At Public Schools' Expense*, 3.5.17: [www.politico.com/story/2017/05/03/politico-harvard-poll-americans-favor-charter-schools-but-not-at-public-schools-expense-237940](http://www.politico.com/story/2017/05/03/politico-harvard-poll-americans-favor-charter-schools-but-not-at-public-schools-expense-237940).
42. Education Next, Tables 13a, b, c & d (see note 36).