

**“A FAIR TEST: BACKGROUND PAPER ON EDUCATIONAL EQUITY IN NYS”**  
**JANUARY 27, 2015**  
**Thoughts to Ponder**

“The conception of education as a social process and function has no definite meaning until we define the kind of society we have in mind.” (John Dewey)

“A merely well-informed man (sic) is the most useless bore on God’s earth.” (Alfred North Whitehead)

"Education...is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." (Chief Justice Earl Warren, in *Brown vs. Board of Education*, 1954)

“Demography is destiny.” (Mark Hare. *City Newspaper*, January 7, 2015)

### INTRODUCTION

Issues surrounding public education, especially its financing, will be vigorously explored in the New York State 2015 legislative session. While there has been much heat generated by various controversies, there has been little light shed on the real issues and the complicated context in which they are debated. This paper suggests that the quality of public education is a “fair test” for New York State. A passing grade is not inevitable.

Interfaith Impact’s Policy Principles state: “Quality integrated primary and secondary education should allow equal opportunity for each child to develop to his or her fullest potential including provision for those with special needs. A strong public school system (in which academic freedom, diversity and multi-cultural educational opportunities are protected) is fundamental to the democratic form of government and the development of good citizenship.

“While public education benefits from some measure of local supervision and sensitivity to local needs, its financing needs to assure that all school systems are capable of providing quality education.

“Schools created by and accountable to private interests should be the subject of careful study before any experimentation or implementation.

“State financial support for students and public and private institutions of higher education should be given in such a way as to protect academic freedom, provide a diversity of program and enrich cultural and educational opportunities.”

### **U.S. Public Schools: The National Context**

The public school is arguably one of the most important contributions of the United State to education world-wide. While the first schools in America were predominately run by churches, starting in 1837 Horace Mann spear-headed the first truly public school system in Massachusetts. “(H)e transformed the state’s system of normal schools, which were really charity schools for the

poor, into the modern system of free public schools organized on principles that promoted the natural curiosity and goodness found in every child.”<sup>1</sup>

Since that time public schools have become simultaneously the most revered and most berated institution in society. They have been asked to bridge gaps between Protestant and Catholic, new immigrants and mainstream America, blacks and whites, rich and poor. And teachers have become the most controversial profession in America.<sup>2</sup> As writer Dana Goldstein says, they have been “attacked and admired in equal proportion.”

In 1966 James S. Coleman headed a study of *Equality of Educational Opportunity* which found that “...the social composition of the student body is more highly related to achievement, independent of the student’s own social background, than is any school factor.”<sup>3</sup> Commissioned by the U.S. Department of Education, the report concluded “student background and socioeconomic status are more important in determining educational opportunity than school funding. Differences in the quality of schools and teachers have a small positive impact on student outcomes. Coleman determined that various achievement tests “do not measure intelligence, nor attitudes, nor qualities of character. Furthermore they are not, nor are they intended to be ‘culture free.’ Quite the reverse: they are culture bound. What they measure are the skills which are among the most important in our society for getting a good job and moving to a better one, and for full participation in an increasingly technical world.”<sup>4</sup>

Education historian Dean Paton claims that until about 1980 public school teachers were iconic as they were portrayed in a kind of Norman Rockwell patina. They made democracy possible. In 1980 Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman, in his “Free to Choose” public television series, devoted one program to school vouchers: public money, he said, should follow K-12 students wherever they went, even to private/parochial schools. While education author Jonathan Kozol called vouchers the “single worst, most dangerous idea to have entered education discourse in my adult life,” they were advanced by President Ronald Reagan.

In 1983 the Reagan-appointed National Commission on Excellence in Education issued *A Nation at Risk*, which gave a very negative critique of American public education which “threatens our very future as a Nation and as a people.” In a much less publicized response, the Sandia National Laboratory was commissioned to find out why. It discovered that while overall *average* scores on tests had gone *down*, they had actually gone *up* in *every demographic group*. Why? Because there were many more disadvantaged students taking the test, pulling the average score down. This report was never officially released.

In 2001 President George W. Bush succeeded in getting his “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB) education package enshrined in law. Supporters described it as launching a new era of accountability. NCLB tied federal funding to standardized tests and increasingly involved corporations in developing and selling textbooks and tests. In 2009 President Barack Obama promoted his “Race to the Top” program, putting public schools in competition for federal money. Charter schools became one response to this educational effort. Philanthropist Bill Gates’ Foundation developed “Common Core” standards which were adopted by many state governors and became the criteria for “Race to the Top,” with more testing and the development of more charter schools.

How are U.S. schools faring in 2015? The states and federal government spend about \$500 billion annually on primary and secondary schools, about \$79 billion from the federal government. While much public rhetoric finds them failing, the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education ranked the U.S. high, relative to other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries in reading, math and science (especially in reading, and in all areas better in 4<sup>th</sup> grade than in 8<sup>th</sup> grade.)<sup>5</sup> Remarkably, "...schools with less than 25% free-lunch eligibility scored higher than the average in ALL OTHER COUNTRIES."<sup>6</sup>

How can that be explained? The Southern Education Foundation concluded that the "(m)ajority of U.S. public school students are in poverty." Fifty-one percent of K-12 students were eligible for free and reduced-price lunches in the 2012-13 school year – that eligibility being a rough proxy for poverty.<sup>7</sup>

Furthermore, the U.S. ranks near bottom of the developed world in the percentage of 4-year-olds in early childhood education. Head Start has been hit with its worst cutbacks. Funding for K-12 education declined in 2011 for first time since the Census Bureau began keeping records. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that "(s)tates' new budgets are providing less per-pupil funding for kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade than they did six years ago – often far less." New York came out minus 5.1% (percentage change in student funding per student adjusted for inflation FY 08-FY14.)<sup>8</sup> One reason cited was that state taxes from wealthy people and corporations have been deferred to the tune of \$44 billion. Warren Buffett's Berkshire Hathaway, Boeing, Caterpillar and Verizon are only a few of the non-payers of state taxes.

### **New York State Public School Funding: History and Context**

The New York State Constitution requires that every student in the state be given a "sound, basic education." In 2006 the Campaign for Fiscal Equity (CFE) won a court case which determined that New York State was not providing the constitutionally mandated education for New York City students. The Alliance for Quality Education was founded to argue that the principle of the CFE case should be extended to the rest of the state.

In 2007 Governor Spitzer and the state legislature promised added funding, but ultimately reneged on that promise. The State had promised to phase in \$5.5 billion of new school aid over 4 years, mostly directed at poor districts, but froze it in 2009 during the so-called "Great Recession. Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman said the State promised more generous funding than State Court of Appeals deemed necessary.

In 2015 there are two lawsuits against the State on the same basis. The New Yorkers for Students' Educational Rights claims the State is still \$5.6 billion short of its commitment under the 2006 decision. The other suit is brought by several small cities who claim they are still short from \$2500 to \$6300 per student. These schools have a 72% student poverty rate.

There are some terms that must be understood for full comprehension of the predicament of New York State school funding.

New York State's **Foundation Aid Formula** is a method of distributing funds to high needs districts based on over 50 state aid formulas – books, computer software, etc. The funding stream is based on a very complex **Combined Wealth Ratio**, a measure of both property taxes and income in each district, though some districts have low income and high property taxes and some the other way around.

The **Gap Elimination Adjustment** is the deduction from state school aid to help the State fill its revenue shortfall. In 2010 Governor David Paterson cut aid to schools to close the State's \$10 billion budget gap. There have been efforts since to eliminate the GEA.

New York State spent \$22 billion on K-12 public education in Fiscal Year 2014, \$1.1 billion more than the year before, an increase of 5.4%. In 2015, with a possible increase of \$3.3 billion which various advocacy groups want, the total expended from federal, state and local sources would be \$62.9 billion. A \$2 billion Smart Schools Bond Act passed by voters in the 2014 election will provide computers, Internet upgrades, security improvements and classrooms for pre-K students.

The New York State Board of Regents (the policy-making body in the State) wants a \$2 billion increase to support Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, improve services for English language learners, and assist recent immigrants in getting an education. Additionally they request \$251 million to expand the upstate Statewide Universal Full-Day Pre-Kindergarten program. The New York Association of School Business Officials says a \$384 million grant could help districts respond to a surge in unaccompanied minors – undocumented immigrants.

The New York State Educational Conference Board (NYSECB), a coalition of groups including teachers, superintendents and other advocates, wants a \$1.5 billion increase to reduce GEA and provide Foundation Aid increases. NYSECB calls for additional investments in professional development to address Common Core implementation and expansion of Universal pre-K. The \$2.2 billion increase to \$62.9 billion (up 3.7%) would maintain programs at their current level.<sup>9</sup> NYSECB notes that districts have shed more than 30,000 staff members since 2009 in response to reduced spending.

In making this request NYSECB states these principles: (1) adequacy: enough financial effort to maintain present levels of program; (2) equity: fairness in distribution especially to high needs districts; (3) stability: informing districts in a reasonable time frame with consistency over the years to enable responsible planning; (4) flexibility to meet ever-changing needs like influx of immigrants and loss of tax base; and (5) simplicity: a formula that is easily explained to all stakeholders.

The Educational Law Center of the Rutgers Graduate School of Education has published a *National Report Card: Is School Funding Fair?*, which evaluates state funding with four criteria. In their January 2014 edition they rank New York as follows:

\*In funding level New York is number 2 behind Wyoming in terms of state funding per student.

\*In funding distribution by investing in the most needy students in the most needy schools, New York receives Grade F – funding patterns are regressive.

\*In terms of effort by funding education as a ratio of state economic product, New York receives an A.

\*In terms of coverage; that is, in getting aid to a wide variety of students, New York ranks 45<sup>th</sup>.<sup>10</sup>

New York State has the highest per-pupil funding in the nation – \$19,396 (U.S. average \$10,667 in the 2011-2012 school year. However, this does not take into account cost of living, or the nature of the student or the ratio of poor to rich students or districts. Forty-eight per cent of public school students in New York State were from “low income” families in the 2012-2013 school year, meaning they qualified for free and reduced-price lunches, a rough proxy for poverty.<sup>11</sup> It would seem logical that these students would need substantial funding to overcome this deficit. Finland, for example, which ranks at the top in international comparisons, has less than 4 % of its children living in poverty. It should be noted that its teachers are unionized. Those U.S. districts with less than 10% of their children in poverty outperform Finland.<sup>12</sup>

Thus there are wide actual gaps in per student funding. For example, in 2012-2013, per pupil funding in Utica was \$15,323, compared to a state-wide average of \$21,118, and in stark contrast with Great Neck and Briarcliff Manor which expended more than \$30,000 per student. In Utica there are 10,700 students, 1800 of them foreign born, speaking 42 languages. The district has laid off more than 200 teachers. Utica received \$4,438 less than the state Foundation Aid formula would allow, a 41% shortfall. Utica has joined with Poughkeepsie, Jamestown, Port Jervis, Niagara Falls, Mount Vernon, Kingston and Newburgh in suing the state for more adequate funding in *Maisto v. New York*. Wealthy school districts spend on average \$8,733 more per student than poor districts. Since 2011 state aid has been at historically low levels as a share of total school funding.

In January of 2015 State Comptroller Thomas DiNapoli’s Fiscal Stress Monitoring Program reported that 90 school districts out of 672 (13%) were at least “susceptible” to fiscal stress,<sup>10</sup> were found to have “significant” stress. This does not include the so-called “Big Five” districts: New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers.<sup>13</sup> Why? Declining property values, high rates of poverty and low school budget support, reductions in state aid (down 4% from 2002-2013), a decrease in federal funding from 7% to 5%, decreased rainy day funds and a 2% tax cap on local property taxes which help fund the schools.<sup>14</sup>

In his 2015 State of the State/Budget Address, Governor Andrew Cuomo proposed a \$1.1 billion increase in school aid contingent upon the Legislature approving changes in teacher evaluation and retention policies/tenure (see teacher evaluation below). His central proposals are:

\*Universal Pre-K: for four-year olds: \$365 million for FY 2016 (projected \$1.5 billion over five years) with \$25 million in new funds for Pre-K in “targeted” high needs districts.

\*“Get On Your Feet Loan Forgiveness:” A two-year buffer on college loans, with certain conditions.

\*Funding the New York State DREAM Act: \$27 million. Governor Cuomo has tied it to passage of legislation providing for educational tax credits for contributions to private, including parochial schools (see below).

\*Increase in the current 460 cap for charter schools to 560, ending limits on where the schools can be opened, giving students in underperforming schools preference in charter school lotteries and promoting “anti-creaming” legislation to ensure charter schools include their fair share of high-needs students.

Criticisms of those proposals were quick to come: the universal Pre-K program still does not cover all eligible students; no restoration of the GEA (currently at negative \$1.037 billion; no increase in Foundation Aid (\$4.88 billion is still due to underfunded districts); no increase in Reimbursable or Expense driven aids like BOCES, Transportation Aid, etc. (due for an increase of \$368 million); objection to the trade-off between the DREAM Act and educational tax credits; and increasing pressure on teacher evaluation and tenure. There was continued criticism over the 2% property tax cap which precludes high-needs school districts from raising increased local public school funding. Exceeding that cap requires a 60% voter approval. The Governor said the “runs” (estimates of funds schools could count on for the next fiscal year) would not be available until his reforms were passed with the budget. School officials responded that this did not give them adequate time to prepare budgets for the May school budget vote.

The Governor has engaged in strong rhetoric about the schools and their teachers, calling public education in New York State an “industry” and a “monopoly” which must be disassembled. Critique of the Governor’s grasp of educational policy contains the following:

\*There seems to be no recognition that New York State schools which are in non-poverty areas are among the best in the nation. To take the average achievement means balancing high-achieving schools with low-achieving schools in poverty areas. This appears to reflect mediocre results to the whole system. High needs schools in poverty areas require greater overall funding than high-spending districts to create the semblance of an even start for New York students. As one teacher put it “The job of teacher has expanded to ‘counselor, therapist, doctor, parent, attorney.’”<sup>15</sup>

As columnist Mark Hare puts it: “...socioeconomic integration of our schools is essential, though not sufficient to reverse the catastrophic outcomes in the city schools....School is not just a place where information gets poured into your head; it is a community where children and parents learn from each other and learn to appreciate each other....demography is destiny.”<sup>16</sup>

\*The Civil Rights Project at UCLA charged that New York has the most racially and economically segregated schools in the nation and concluded that the State had given up on the problem: “The children who most depend on the public schools for any chance in life are concentrated in schools struggling with all the dimensions of family and neighborhood poverty and isolation.”<sup>17</sup>

**Policy Recommendation:** *Interfaith Impact joins other groups as listed above in advocating increased spending for public education, including restoration of the Foundation Aid formula,*

*eliminating the Gap Elimination Adjustment, and funding of the DREAM Act – approximately \$2.2 billion.*

**Charter Schools** are funded by taxpayers but administered by private entities. They have been promoted as an alternative to traditional public schools. These schools operate with fewer regulations and have the flexibility to implement longer school days. Criticisms are manifold. Since they receive contributions from private individuals and corporations, the same contributors may also be campaign funders for state officials. As noted above, there are currently 460 charter schools in New York State. It should be noted that 97% of New York’s K-12 students are in the public school system.

There have been many studies comparing charter public schools with non-charter public schools. While some have made much of periodic differences, the consensus seems to be that there is little difference in achieving a quality education for children. There is some criticism of charter schools for a student selection process that constitutes the so-called “creaming” process, selecting the best students while leaving poorer students and those with disabilities to the non-charter public school. There is a natural “creaming” effect in the tendency for parents of better students to seek out alternatives to normal public schools, while students from poorer families do not have strong parental advocates.<sup>18</sup> In New York City charter schools show lower rates of attrition but serve fewer students with special needs. Some 12.75% of kindergarteners in traditional public schools have some kind of disability requiring special services, compared with 8.9% at charter schools. For example, 9.5% of students at the Harlem Success Academy 2 charter schools are in temporary housing; the figure is 26.7% at the district school that shares the same building.<sup>19</sup>

One critic wrote, “The charter school movement was born out of a desire to creatively address the many obstacles teachers faced.” Since they are part of the school district, it was hoped that anything learned that was valuable could quickly be translated into the public school system. “The charter school movement began as a grassroots attempt to improve public education. It’s quickly becoming a backdoor for corporate profit.

A champion of this reformist movement is Michelle Rhee, former head of the Washington, DC, public schools and founder of StudentsFirst. She claims that the cause of poor educational results is not poverty, but bad teachers and bad schools. She claims poverty is used as an excuse for poor schools.

StudentsFirstNY promotes charter schools, stricter teacher evaluations and changes to teacher tenure. Its stated purpose is “to make sure every student in America has access to great schools and great teachers. We are driven by the belief that every child – regardless of background – can succeed if put in the right school environment.” The group ran \$500,000 in ads to support Governor Cuomo’s 2014 campaign. Families for Excellent Schools is another private group with a similar agenda. There are other indications that some charter schools are an avenue for private sector economic growth. *Forbes* magazine stated: “The charter school movement (is) quickly becoming a backdoor for corporate profit.” In Michigan 80% of charter schools are for profit.<sup>20</sup> The *Wall Street Journal* wrote: “As states race to implement the Common Core academic

standards, companies are fighting for a slice of the accompanying testing market, expected to be worth billions of dollars in coming years.”<sup>21</sup>

**Policy Recommendation:** *Interfaith Impact believes strongly in a public school system which is democratically governed and views with concern any attempt to privatize New York State public schools. We recognize the need for experimentation, but it should be done within the confines of a public school system accountable to the public. Existing and future charter schools should be scrupulously supervised by public officials to maintain their public nature, eliminate profit as a primary motive, and avoid the tendency to “creaming” in selection of students.*

### **Educational tax credits (Vouchers)**

The United States has a long history of church and state separation. A series of Supreme Court decisions has traced a course that is somewhere between a bright line and a hazy boundary between government and religious organizations. Nowhere has the issue been more intensely joined than when that distinction relates to education. Section 7 Article 7 of the New York State Constitution requires that all appropriations must be “distinctly specified.”

At the federal level, Senator Lamar Alexander has interpreted Title 1 to include “portability” in which public funds follow students no matter what school they attend. Currently it refers to public schools, but adherents want to eventually include private schools.

Governor Cuomo has proposed a \$100 million program of tax credits for those who provide money for scholarships in private (including religious) schools. Does this violate church/state separation? Should the State delegate its spending authority to private individuals? Critics find this proposal a backdoor voucher program that directs tax dollars to non-public schools.

Private schools are free to discriminate against students they accept on the basis of disability, gender, religion, economic status, or sexual orientation and may refuse to admit students who have a history of poor academic performance or disciplinary issues. They drain the school of public funds.

**Policy Recommendation:** *Interfaith Impact believes that a program of educational tax credits not only threatens religious liberty but also potentially diverts money from the public to the private sector. Such a program lacks accountability. Citizens are free to establish private, including religious, schools, but they must be funded with private funds. Public schools are the great leveler, open free to all students and must be the priority of the State.*

### **Teacher Evaluation and the Common Core**

In his 2015 State of the State report, Governor Cuomo stirred up a hornet’s nest when making recommendations on teacher evaluation and tenure. He dismissed the current evaluation in which 41.9% were rated highly effective, 53.7% effective, 3.7% developing and only 0.7% ineffective according to the State Education Department. These figures came from the Approved Teacher Practice Rubric (APPR) in evaluating teachers, based on 60% observation and 40% standardized tests. The Governor, noting the “failure” rate of students on the first round of Common Core

testing and the “success” rate of teachers has recommended changing that ratio to 50% observation and 50% tests. Is this fair to teachers? And is it educationally defensible?

The emphasis on tests stems from the Common Core – initiated by the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, elaborated in the “No Child Left Behind” of President George W. Bush and “Race to the Top” promoted by President Barack Obama and adopted by many state governors. The Common Core had a rough rollout with many administrators, teachers and students objecting to the very concept of standardized tests as well as inadequate time to prepare for them. It has been noted that relatively few parents seek out the evaluation score for the teachers.<sup>22</sup>

Governor Cuomo refused to sign legislation which would have held teachers and students “harmless” in the first round of scores although he had initially endorsed it. Many felt that with the abrupt roll out, such scores would be meaningless. The Governor disagreed and cited the failure rate.

Criticisms from educators were: (1) the tests are a snapshot in time of a student’s score on a particular exam. They are designed to measure student achievement, but do not reflect student progress. For example, which is more important – that a student goes from an 85 to 86 or from 49 to 60? The former score is higher, but the latter shows more progress. How does one evaluate that? (2) the tests are designed to measure student achievement; they were not designed to evaluate teachers; (3) the heavy emphasis on frequent testing is not educationally sound. Teachers will tend to “teach to the test” at the expense of learning skills.

The Governor also proposed an extension from 3 to 5 years for a teacher to be eligible for tenure. Teachers object, in part fearing that such a process, in combination with emphasis on testing, means that higher-paid veteran teachers may be fired to save money by hiring new and lower-paid teachers. State law requires laying off teachers by seniority rather than ability.

The Horace Mann League and the National Superintendents Roundtable have warned of the so-called “iceberg effect.” Their thesis is that the public looks at the tip of the iceberg – in this case test scores – instead of all that lies below.<sup>23</sup> Even the test scores are good at points. However, single-minded focus on test scores has led policymakers to overlook other important trends that affect U.S. public education, including high levels of economic inequality and social stress. Child poverty here is much more prevalent than in any other comparison nation except China.

The data- and test-driven philosophy of education is well summarized in *The Horn Book*. “Perhaps this (philosophy)... is not surprising when the emphasis through school is very apt to be on preparation for tests which prepare for more tests, which if one is lucky, pave the road to college. In rebellion one high school student asked, ‘Once in college will we then be able to learn for the sake of learning, or must we continue to prepare for tests to prepare us for more tests to prepare us for more tests. When does this testing end and real learning begin?’”<sup>24</sup>

**Policy Recommendation:** *Interfaith Impact calls for the depoliticizing of public education so that professional educators have the prime role in policy-making. The Common Core should be thoroughly reviewed as to its educational benefits. Testing must not become the prime means of evaluating educational effort by students or by teachers.*

## Conclusion

Interfaith Impact affirms public education as a priority responsibility of the State. While no public problem can be solved “by throwing money at it,” we believe investment in our children and youth is our best investment. We implore state officials and educators to tone down the “war mentality” rhetoric around public education and fulfill the constitutionally-mandated obligation to provide a “good, sound education” for every student in New York State.

## Resources

Ravitch, Diane. *The Reign of Error: The Hoax of the Privatization Movement and the Danger to America's Public Schools*. New York: Vintage Books, 2013.

New York State Educational Conference Board  
[www.nyscoss.org/img/news/advocacy\\_6fxfk01x6m.pdf](http://www.nyscoss.org/img/news/advocacy_6fxfk01x6m.pdf)

Alliance for Quality Education

Opportunity Action (demanding equity and excellence in public

Public Policy Educational Fund of New York

Statewide School Finance Consortium. [www.statewideonline.org/wordpress/](http://www.statewideonline.org/wordpress/)

[www.schoolfundingfairness.org/National\\_Report\\_Card\\_2014.pdf](http://www.schoolfundingfairness.org/National_Report_Card_2014.pdf)

United Teachers:

200 law – 39% tax credit for giving to charter schools and more advantages

Of the ten poorest cities in the U.S. Rochester and Buffalo are two. Rochester is # 1 in concentrated poverty.

---

<sup>1</sup> Mark Harris. *Historical Dictionary of Unitarian Universalism*. Latham, Md. and Oxford: The Scarecrow Press, 2004, p. 317.

<sup>2</sup> Dana Goldstein: “How Did Being a Public School Teacher Become So Controversial?” *Alternet*. September 17, 2014. See also *The Teacher Wars: A History of America's Most Embattled Profession*.

<sup>3</sup> *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, 1966.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid*.

<sup>5</sup> *The Condition of Education 2014*. May 2014.

<sup>6</sup> Paul Buchheit, *Alternet*, January 11, 2015.

<sup>7</sup> Lyndsey Layton. Southern Education Foundation.

<sup>8</sup> Michael Leachman and Chris Mai. “More States Funded Less than Before the Recession.” May 20, 2014.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Turning the Corner*: NYS Educational Conference Board

<sup>10</sup> Bruce. D. Baker, David G. Sciarra, Danielle Farrie. *Is School Funding Fair? A National Report Card*. Education Law Center, Rutgers Graduate School of Education, third edition, January 2014.

<sup>11</sup> Lyndsey Layton. "Majority of U.S. public school students are in poverty." Washington Post, January 16, 2015. Citing a study by the Southern Education Foundation.

<sup>12</sup> Teacherken. "What You Absolutely Must Understand About How Poverty Impacts Education." *Daily Kos*, January 23, 2015.

<sup>13</sup> Jon Campbell. "DiNapoli: 90 school districts facing fiscal stress." *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, January 30, 2015 (Albany Bureau Gannett Newspapers).

<sup>14</sup> "School districts facing fiscal stress." *Legislative Gazette*, January 21, 2014.

<sup>15</sup> Teacherken. "What You Must Absolutely Understand About How Poverty Impacts Education." *The Daily Kos*, January 23, 2015.

<sup>16</sup> Mark Hare. *City Newspaper*, Rochester, NY, January 7, 2015.

<sup>17</sup> UCLA report.

<sup>18</sup> Paul Buchheit. "The 4 Most Profound Ways Privatization Perverts Education." *Alternet*. February 16, 2014. (He cites studies from the Credo study at Stanford and a study from the National Education Policy Center) See also Erik Kain. "80% of Michigan Charter Schools are For-Profits." *Forbes*, September 29, 2011, and "Charter School (New York) *Wikipedia*.

<sup>19</sup> Karen Matthews. "Study: NYC charter schools have lower attrition rates." Associated Press, February 2, 2015. Citing a study by the Independent Budget Office.

<sup>20</sup> *Forbes*, September 28, 2011.

<sup>21</sup> "Fight Is on for Common Core Contracts." *Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2015.

<sup>22</sup> Carolyn Thompson. Associated Press. "Few parents seek evaluation scores." *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, January 19, 2015.

<sup>23</sup> *School Performance in Context: The Iceberg Effect*.

<sup>24</sup> *The Horn Book*, June 1961.

Just for Fun?????

"Are you sick of highly-paid teachers?" Let's give them \$3 an hour and only the hours they worked; not any of that silly planning time, or any time they spend before or after school. That would be \$19.50 a day (7:45 am to 3:45 pm with 45 minutes off for lunch and planning – 6.5 hours. So each parent should pay \$19.50 a day for these teachers to baby-sit their children. Now how many students do they teach in a day – may 30? So that's \$19.50 X 30 = \$585 a day. However, remember they only work 180 days a year. I am not going to pay them for any vacations. Let's see. That's \$585 X 180 = \$105,300 per year." Average teacher salary nationwide is \$50,000. *Daily Kos* sboucher Feb. 21, 2011.