AT THE CROSSROAD: VENTURE PHILANTHROPY OR A DEMOCRATIC ETHICAL VISION FOR EDUCATIONAL LEADERSHIP?

Steven Jay Gross, *Temple University*
Joan Poliner Shapiro, *Temple University*

Introduction

Today powerful philanthropies exercise considerable influence over U.S. educational policy. Referred to as venture philanthropies (Scott, 2009; Saltman, 2010), foundations, such as the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, The Eli and Edythe Broad Foundation, and the Walton Family Foundation, have emphasized high-stakes accountability and privatization as a recipe for our nation's public schools. Venture philanthropists are only a most recent voice in a long-standing American policy tradition of blaming schools for economic problems at home and failure to compete internationally, beginning as early as the 1930's (Kliebard 2004). In the 1950's the same chorus of blame broke out in the wake of the USSR's success in launching the first orbiting satellite, Sputnik. Current neo-liberal policy has followed the same pattern flows from the 1983 Nation at Risk report (1983 National Commission on Excellence in Education) (Hursh 2005, 2007). This pattern persists despite the questionable quality of studies conducted to establish its premise (Cookson, Molnar, & Embree, 2001). It also flies in the face of mounting evidence that "out-of-school factors" are highly relevant to academic success (Berliner, 2009).

We argue that venture philanthropies place our public school system in jeopardy by exposing it to increased turbulence and a painful ethical dilemma: *Should the schools accept needed funds at the expense of giving up on their independence, or should they languish?* Our article critiques the current approach of the venture philanthropists, and analyzes their impact through Turbulence Theory and the Multiple Ethical Paradigms. It also discusses international concerns about privatization of schools. We conclude by offering the New DEEL vision for a leadership model as a possible alternative choice for educators seeking to escape the venture philanthropists' education policies.

Traditional Philanthropies and the rise of today's Venture Philanthropists

Philanthropy's role in education has existed for over a century, and its mission is evolving. Traditional philanthropies, such as Ford and Carnegie, funded research that responded to community aspirations without challenging the foundational issues of poverty and inequality themselves (Scott 2009). In this way, they supported an existing social arrangement wherein small modifications to American capitalism could be made without altering its essential nature.

Over the past two decades, venture philanthropies (VP) have replaced this approach with a more aggressive replica of entrepreneurial business practices. Together with their allies, the Gates, Broad, and Walton foundations have been called "the powerbrokers of neo-liberalism" (Baltodano 2012) because of

their condemnation of public schools, their demands for heightened accountability, and their use of market forces to create change. This new twist on philanthropy also emphasizes the transition of education for citizenship to schooling for consumption, described by Saltman (2010):

> The VP approach to schooling … largely imagines the possibilities of individual agency not through collective citizen participation but rather through consumerism. For the venture philanthropists, hierarchical, disciplinary, anti-intellectual, and positivistic school reform is justified on the basis of the promise of consumption. (p.10)

The venture philanthropists embrace a type of curriculum most closely related to William Bagley's theory of Essentialism (Bagley 1938, 1939). Bagley argued that American society was mobile, thereby requiring a curriculum that was the same wherever a student went to school. In addition, he warned that we needed to sharpen our curricular focus, emphasize rigorous subjects, and test frequently, lest we fail to compete internationally. The connection between Bagley's Essentialism and the current accountability movement is strong and can be seen in policies such as No Child Left Behind (NCLB). NCLB has enjoyed support from the venture philanthropists and marks their alliance with state and federal policy leaders (Hursh, 2005). In fact, members of the venture philanthropist community have moved from the sidelines into direct curriculum policy development. Witness the direct intervention of Bill Gates and the Gates foundation in the development of the Common Core State Standards (Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 2010).

While there is a long history of Essentialist philosophy in American education, its current partner, market forces, is a more recent arrival on the policy scene. Over the past decade, this approach, that includes school choice, charter schools, pay for performance for teachers, and the privatization of teacher and administrator preparation programs, has gained favor with venture philanthropists (Hursh, 2007). These proposals are central to neoliberalism.

Charter schools, in particular, are strongly supported by venture philanthropies (Scott. 2009). Of note, charter schools replace boards of education with more corporate-styled educational management organizations, commonly known as EMO's. Despite the infusion of dollars from philanthropies and claims that charters perform better, results are often mixed (Baker & Ferris, 2011).

In several cities, such as New York, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and post-Katrina New Orleans, charter schools have been part of a larger strategy, supported by philanthropies, called charter districts. Saltman (2010a) describes such districts in this way:

> The portfolio district approach merges four strategies: 1) decentralization; 2) charter school expansion; 3) reconstituting/closing "failing" schools; and 4) test-based accountability. Additionally, portfolio district restructuring often involves firing an underperforming school's staff in its entirety, whether or not the school is re-constituted as a charter school. (p.1)

In this way, portfolio districts replicate the neoliberal capitalist emphasis on "creative destruction." They are typically non-union workplaces, mimicking the corporate move away from organized labor and the diminishing power of workers.

Critics of venture philanthropy warn of a deterioration of democratic values (Saltman, 2010) in a world where privatization turns students into customers and where profits trump authentic community engagement. Community schools in urban areas are turned into scapegoats for the causes of poverty rather than artifacts of its devastating impact and, as such, are to be avoided rather than helped (Shiller, 2012). Yet, the pattern of essentialism and market forces has gained ascendance in the US and abroad (Skerrett & Hargeaves, 2008). Today there is a nearly seamless connection between state and national policy makers and venture philanthropists supporting these twin approaches. The result causes heightened turbulence and dramatic ethical dilemmas for public schools, as we will discuss next.

A Framework for Reviewing the Venture Philanthropists' Agenda.

For public schools, the work of the venture philanthropists represents an ethical dilemma. On the one hand, schools across the nation are starved for funding. On the other hand, accepting funding from the venture philanthropists seems antithetical to the continuation of the public schools, at least in their current form. This is due to the venture philanthropists' support for strictly enforced accountability policies combined with market forces' use of charter schools and their belief in portfolio districts. Below we will consider the ethical dilemma facing public education through the use of Turbulence Theory (Gross, 1998, 2004, 2006; Shapiro and Gross, 2008) and the Multiple Ethical Paradigms (Shapiro and Gross, 2008, 2013; Shapiro and Stefkovich, 2011).

Here, Turbulence Theory rests on two central concepts: first, the idea that not all disruptive conditions are of the same magnitude, and second, that the levels of turbulence are similar to those found in flight. Accordingly, Gross uses the four levels of turbulence employed by pilots to gauge turbulence in flight: light, moderate, severe, and extreme. As in flight, light turbulence is associated with small disruptions and may hardly be noticed. In moderate turbulence, the seat belt sign goes on. Similarly, in organizations facing moderate turbulence, people are constantly aware of a disturbance but still work as closely as possible to perform their tasks. In severe turbulence, a loss of control occurs, at least temporarily. In organizations, this means a sense of panic may set in. Finally, in extreme turbulence, structural damage to the aircraft is likely. Organizations facing extreme turbulence often are in the terminal stage of their existence.

Gross (2004) created a turbulence gauge in the form of a table to graphically connect these four levels. Table 1 below not only illustrates the structure and nature of the turbulence gauge but it also shows how it can be applied to the previously described situation currently confronting public schools. It is our belief that the condition of severe turbulence (in bold) most accurately describes the challenge facing public education, in part, due to the influence of the venture philanthropists.

While the turbulence gauge is useful to establish the level of turbulence facing public education, given the rise of the venture philanthropists, further examination of the underlying forces of turbulence will add greater clarity to the analysis. To this end, Gross (Gross 2014) identified three such forces: *positionality, cascading,* and *stability*. As one might imagine, these three forces are connected and act upon one another to aggravate or calm down the level of turbulence. Several important patterns emerge from applying these concepts to the situation facing public education due to the influence of the venture philanthropists.

Positionality raises the idea that we experience turbulence differently depending on where we stand in relation to a particular issue. The position of the venture philanthropists is very different from that of the public school community. The sustained critiques of the philanthropists seem to put them in a diametrically opposed stance wherein they support a vastly different kind of educational system marked by an essentialist curriculum that is hierarchically managed and controlled along with heightened inclusion of market forces. These take the form of more charter schools, school vouchers, pay for test results schemes for teachers, a diminished or eliminated role for teacher unions, and alternative routes for certification. In

this way, the position of the venture philanthropists, and that of the public school community, is similar to that of two people playing on a seesaw. For one to be up, the other must be down.

Cascading describes the cumulative impact of turbulent forces. Public schools in the US have been under a steady stream of attack for the past thirty years, starting with the Nation at Risk report (National Commission on Excellence in Education 1983). This document's warning of a "rising tide of mediocrity" can be seen as initiating the current cascade of turbulence facing today's schools. It has been followed by steady attacks on school performance, the rise of the accountability movement, ever greater demands for testing, centralization of the curriculum and criticism of the public school establishment, including colleges of education, who have been blamed for producing inadequately trained teachers and administrators. While scholars have referred to these attacks as a "manufactured crisis" (Berliner & Biddle 1995),

and the Waltons have the ear of policy makers, thereby gaining precious advantage in the competition. Forgetting nothing of the strategies that led to their own business successes, these philanthropists and their allies have taken advantage of the decades-long critique of public schools and have added their own essentialist and market force plans, each of which adds to the cascading turbulence. All of this destabilizes the current system and has led to the near break-up of traditional systems in cities such as Philadelphia and New Orleans where coherent public systems have been replaced by a potpourri of charter schools, not-for-profit schools, and pubic schools, all overseen by emergency boards.

Thus, it is easy to see why we categorize the current level of turbulence facing America's urban schools as severe in our turbulence gauge. We contend that the venture philanthropists play no small role in escalating the level of turbulence; in fact, our analysis leads us to conclude that this escalation is their

Degree of Turbulence:	General Definition:	Applied to this Situation:
Light	Little or No Disruption to the Organization	Philanthropists support public education and fund projects designed to encourage the best in existing structures. They also defend public education from politically charged criticism
Moderate	Widespread Awareness of the Issue facing the Organization	Philanthropists show mild support of current public education but push for structural changes that modify but do not transform school curricula, instruction, and assessment.
Severe	A Sense of Crisis for the Organization	Continued criticism, High Stakes Tests and Market Forces erode confidence in American pubic education. The aggressive policies of the venture philanthropists further move public opinion toward ever-greater privatization.
Extreme	Structural Damage to the Organization	Public confidence in schools is lost. Market Forces and essentialist accountability policies lead to the replacement of traditional public schools with a privatized system led by venture philanthropists.

Table 1: The turbulence gauge applied to the situation facing public education due to the influence of the venture philanthropists

the combined impact of this cascade is quite real and has led to ever-greater degrees of uncertainty. Taken in combination, there is a consistent and rising gust of turbulence, each attack building upon the previous ones. By joining the critics of public education and by taking a leading position in demanding fundamental policy changes, the venture philanthropists have amplified this cascading effect.

Stability is the third force that drives turbulence. Communities, like organizations, display varying degrees of stability. In affluent communities, where public schools have a long history of fulfilling public aspirations, there may be enough stability to manage in their current forms for the moment. This is not the case for urban districts such as New York, New Orleans, Chicago, Washington, D.C., and Philadelphia. In these cities, the weight of poverty in the form of neglected infrastructure, limited access to health care, and high unemployment rates, exacerbated by the Great Recession, and decreasing public sector budgets for social services, eat away at the social foundation needed to support functioning public school systems. This makes for weakened stability. Each of the cascading forces described above further erodes the stability of these systems in their current form. From the position of the venture philanthropists, this is a desirable outcome, since it creates conditions ripe for the "creative destruction" that their market forces brand of neo-liberalism advocates (Baltodano, 2012; Saltman, 2010)

Taken together, the diametrically opposed positions of traditional public school supporters and their venture philanthropist critics cause a win-lose dynamic. In the current economic climate, characterized by declining public resources, it is no mystery why wealthy philanthropists like Gates, Broad

logical goal, given their Essentialist and Market Forces' beliefs. In the next section of this article, we will describe the severe dilemma facing our schools using the Multiple Ethical Paradigms of the ethics of justice, critique, care and the profession for analysis.

The Ethical Challenges of Current Philanthropic Approaches

Shapiro and Stefkovich (2001, 2005, 2011) introduced the Multiple Ethical Paradigms. Initially, they turned to the work of Starratt (1994) who wrote of the ethics of justice, critique and care. They provided deep descriptions of these ethics and then developed another lens, the ethic of the profession for educational leaders.

Among the four lenses of the Multiple Ethical Paradigms, the ethic of justice (e.g., Beauchamp & Childress, 1984; Sergiovanni, 2009; Strike, 2006; Yodof, Kirp & Levin, 1992) is concerned with the legal system, fairness, and freedom. It takes into account questions such as: Is there a law, right, or policy that relates to a particular case? If there is a law, right, or policy, should it be enforced? Is the law enforced in some places and not in others? Why or why not? And if there is not a law, right, or policy, should there be one?

The ethic of critique (e.g., Apple, 2003; Freire, 1970; Giroux, 2006; Rapp, 2002; Reitzug & O'Hair, 2002; Shapiro, 2009; Shapiro & Purpel, 2005), inherent in critical theory and critical pedagogy, is aimed at awakening all of us to inequities in society and, in particular, to injustices in education at all levels. It asks us to deal with the difficult questions regarding social class, race, gender, and other areas of difference, such as: Who makes the laws, rules, and policies? Who benefits from them? Who has the power? Who is silenced?

The ethic of care (e.g., Beck, 1994; Ginsberg, Shapiro, & Brown, 2004; Grogan, 1996; Marshall & Gerstl-Pepin, 2005; Marshall & Oliva, 2006; Noddings, 2003) directs us to contemplate the consequences of our decisions and actions. It asks us to consider questions such as: Who will benefit from what I decide? Who will be hurt by my actions? What are the long-term effects of a decision I make today? And if someone helps me now, what should I do in the future about giving back to this individual or to society in general?

Finally, the ethic of the profession (e.g., Beckner, 2004; Begley & Johansson, 2003; Frick, 2009; Greenfield, 2004; Normore, 2004; Stefkovich, 2006; Strike, Haller & Soltis, 2005) expects educational leaders to formulate and examine their own professional codes of ethics in light of individual personal codes, as well as standards set forth by the profession, and then calls on them to place students at the center of the ethical decision-making process. It also asks them to take into account the wishes of the community. It goes beyond the ethics of justice, critique, and care to inquire: What would the profession ask me to do? What do various communities expect me to accomplish? What about clashes of codes—does this exist, and is there a problem? And what should the professional educator take into account to consider the best interests of the students, who may be diverse in their composition and their needs?

Now let us take a look at the current state of P-12 education as well as the venture philanthropic approach through the Multiple Ethical Paradigms lenses. Turning first to the ethic of justice, we need to ask: What is the law? Currently, in the US, No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is the law that each state is required to follow, unless it has obtained a waiver, which tends to be as strict as the law itself. NCLB keeps public schools focused on standardized testing with a narrow curriculum, moving towards a Common Core. If students in public schools do not test well, then the options tend to be harsh, requiring a turn-over of the principal and staff or a movement toward charter schools. The proliferation of diverse charter schools, often assisted by venture philanthropists, appears to provide parents/consumers with the possibilities of shopping for their children's education. The lack of flexibility for public schools in NCLB means that essentialism and market forces can dominate.

Turning to the ethic of critique, we might ask: Who made the law? In whose best interests does the law support? Those who designed NCLB would say that it was developed with students in poor urban communities particularly in mind. They would argue that it will make certain that students' learning is reviewed often, and if they fall behind, the school will know and be able to help. However, with limited resources, this has not always been the case. With the increase in charter schools, there are also fewer resources for the public schools. Additionally, with this constant emphasis on testing, dropout rates have increased, not decreased (Levin & Rouse, 2012). While the law was passed with the best of intentions, the unintended consequences have led to teaching to the test and to the narrowing of the curriculum. As a result, the law does not serve the best interests of the specified students but, rather, those who wish to use the test results for political purposes.

Moving to the ethic of care, we could ask: Who will be helped? Who will be hurt? While the desire of the law, as already stated, was to assist students in poverty, this has not been what has always occurred. The students who test well have no problems with NCLB. They also tend to be allowed to move on to a more creative curriculum than those who fail the test. Those who tend to do poorly on the standardized tests (e.g., late bloomers, children of poverty, second language learners) suffer a great deal and, all too often, lose their self-esteem, and many drop out of school. Privatization should help these at-risk students through charters. But do they? The

answers, thus far, are very mixed (Baker & Ferris, 2011; Vanourek, 2005; Wilson, 2005).

Finally, turning to the ethic of the profession, the focal point is: What is in the best interests of the student? It could be argued that parents know what is in the best interests of their children. They may, but market forces are operating in high poverty areas where families are already under extraordinary pressure. The concepts of vouchers, lotteries, and specialized learning, associated with charters, ask parents to be discerning consumers in a market that is very complex and opaque. It is also a market without sufficient objective data with which parents can make informed decisions.

What would really be in the child's best interests? It might be argued that local, comprehensive, good schools, offering not simply rote memorization for passing of standardized tests, but also asking students to analyze and synthesize learning, might be a way to help all children achieve. Venture philanthropists, who wish to assist students to think and grow, could choose to assist these public schools rather than put all of their emphasis on charters, and they could help create a much healthier, learned society.

However, when viewing the current venture philanthropic approach aligned with the current educational policy, through the lenses of the Multiple Ethical Paradigms, it becomes clear that Bagley's essentialism and market forces are very much alive and well today in U.S. schools. The high-stakes testing not only limits the curriculum, but it cannot help but produce students, who know how to answer low-level questions, but do not know how to respond to the challenging critiques that must be answered in a democracy.

The New DEEL's Alternative Approach

We hold that a competing perspective, based on the foundational priorities of democracy and ethical behavior, can successfully repel the enterprise of the venture philanthropists in the long run. We conclude our article by explicating this alternative approach.

Responding to the precipitous rise in the accountability movement and its consequent dependence on a narrowed curriculum and high stakes testing, the authors began to build an alternative community called the New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership). It seemed to us that our field of educational administration was facing the kind of existential challenging threat that it faced in the 1930's when threats from fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and Imperial Japan led to the establishment of the democratic administration movement. The nature of these threats may have been different, but the impulse to press for democracy when confronted was the same.

Hence, the premise of the New DEEL is that the first responsibility of schools is to educate the next generation of citizens capable of sustaining and enhancing a democratic society. This priority is even more crucial today, when spiking income inequality, at a level not seen since the 1920's, threatens democracy itself (Stiglitz, 2012). From its humble beginning in 2004, the New DEEL has become an international movement and includes scholars and practitioners from the US, Canada, Australia, Sweden, Hong Kong, New Zealand, U.K., and Jamaica all inspired and guided by the following Mission Statement:

> The mission of the New DEEL is to create an action-oriented partnership, dedicated to inquiry into the nature and practice of democratic, ethical educational leadership through sustained processes of open dialogue, right to voice, community inclusion, and responsible participation toward the common good. We strive to create an environment to facilitate democratic ethical decision-making in educational theory and practice which acts in the best interest of all students (Gross & Shapiro, 2005).

Unlike the venture philanthropists, who imagine a world composed of competing customers and private markets, our mission is based on the inherent rights and responsibilities of democratic citizenship. A person may be a customer only to the extent that she or he has the resources to purchase goods and services. Since financial resources are unequally distributed across any society, customers are always in an unequal position, thereby creating hierarchies of privileged access, in this case to education. On the other hand, democratic

dictates. This is because we hold educational leaders to be responsible democratic actors capable of working with turbulent forces to support students and the wider community (Glassner 2013). This means developing a deep understanding of ethical perspectives and turbulence itself in order to connect democracy, social justice, and social responsibility into a dynamic vision of school reform that can successfully compete with that of the venture philanthropists. This means that being an educator is a calling requiring a clear sense of a democratic

New DEEL Vision for Leaders	Behavior of Traditional School Leaders
One: Guided by an inner sense of Responsibility to students, families, the community and social development on a world scale.	Driven by an exterior pressure of accountability to those above in the organizational/political hierarchy.
Two: Leads from an expansive community- building perspective. A democratic actor who understands when and how to *shield* the school from turbulence and when and how to *use* turbulence to facilitate change.	Bound by the system and the physical building. A small part of a monolithic, more corporate structure.
Three: Integrates the concepts of democracy, social justice and school reform through scholarship, dialogue and action.	Separates democracy and social justice from guiding vision and accepts school improvement (a subset of school reform) as the dominant perspective.
Four: Operates from a deep understanding of ethical decision making in the context of a dynamic, inclusive, democratic vision.	Operates largely from perspective of the ethic of justice wherein obedience to authority and current regulations is typically unquestioned despite one's own misgivings.
Five: Sees one's career as a calling and has a well developed sense of mission toward democratic social improvement that cuts across political, national, class, gender, racial, ethnic, and religious boundaries.	Sees one' career in terms of specific job titles with an aim to move to ever greater positions of perceived power within the current system's structure.

Table 2. New DEEL Vision for Leadership

citizenship means inclusion and access to services by right. One does not claim a right to access a private academy or a charter school. However, all citizens have access to the public schools in their communities. Losing this right is a serious proposition, and in our opinion, a devastating possibility for the prospect of democracy itself. Therefore, we have acted in the ways described previously.

Our position is distinct from the current policy doctrines described earlier in this article.

> New DEEL members believe that the first job of the school is to help young people become effective citizens in a democracy. Learning how to earn a living is crucial but it is a close second, in their opinion. Democratic citizenship in any era is a complex task but it seems especially difficult in our era where international conflict and growing economic and social inequality are the rule. New DEEL members consider the either/or choice among school improvement, democracy and social justice critiqued above to be a false dilemma. They believe instead, that there is no democracy without social justice, no social justice without democracy, and that these mutually inclusive concepts are indispensable ingredients to school improvement worthy of the name. (Gross, 2009)

To crystallize the differences we see between the accountability/market forces perspective and our own, Gross (2009, p.263) created a New DEEL vision for leadership, shown below (Table 2). Note that in each of the five areas, the New DEEL leader is distinguished from her/his counterpart in critical ways. For instance, we support educational leadership that is guided by an inner sense of responsibility rather than the external pressures of accountability. This is because we believe that mere accountability is not a strong enough motivator, given the weighty responsibilities educators face, especially those serving challenged urban communities.

Likewise, we believe that educational leaders need to be community builders who reach beyond the school walls to create alliances rather than corporate soldiers bounded by the school's, or the educational management organization's,

ethical mission as opposed to a job title guided by the pursuit private ambition.

While the Venture Philanthropists hold that their approach is innovative, we believe that their adherence to corporate organizational hierarchy and high stakes testing puts them at odds with the New DEEL Vision for Leadership and places them, perhaps ironically, on the side of traditional school leaders.

An Issue of International Concern

While this article centers on an analysis of the neoliberal policies of the venture philanthropists in the US, there are clear international implications since neoliberal is hardly unique to America (Harvey 2005). In fact these policies are in evidence in countries across North America, Europe, and Australia and New Zealand. Ungerleide (2006)describes its impact on Canadian educational policy and media over the past two decades. He further illustrates how distrust of public education by neoliberals in the US easily crosses the border. Portelli and Konecny (2013) conclude that neoliberalism is at odds with a democratic way of life in their review of current conditions in Canada and suggest subversion of such policies. In response, resistance from teacher unions in British Columbia to neoliberal educational policies has been described in the literature (Poole 2007).

Marketization of elite private schools in Australia creates an environment in which the pursuit of equity becomes a commodity to be sold through such programs as environmental awareness. Students may practice social justice learning but only within the protected walls of their academies (Windle and Stratton 2013). The question of government funding of non-public schools in Australia also raises questions of the contested political ground on which democracy is based (Morsy, Gulson, Clarke 2014). This is not a simple political exercise but part of a transition of Australian society from a citizenry to a collection of consumers with inherently unequal access to power through what is called a "cascade of

neoliberal reforms" in many sectors, education being prime among them (Connell 2013a, 2013b).

The Free School policy in the UK, which shares many common features to American charter schools, has been critiqued for its unequal treatment of applications from privileged and disadvantaged communities. This comes despite policy goals of empowering poorer communities with the chance to establish their own schools. As with charter schools in the US, Free Schools also have been criticized for taking funding away from local schools. Again, similar to charter schools, Free Schools allow less access to power for citizens and are, therefore less supportive of democratic engagement (Hatcher 2011). Demonstrating the transportability of policies like Free Schools, Street (2012) warns of the risks to New Zealand's public education if that nation were to borrow the UK's model. Snook (2012) amplifies this warning to New Zealand educators by reviewing charter school policies and their results in the US, UK, and Sweden concluding that this is a mistaken approach.

Cross-national variations on the impact of neoliberal inspired education policies are important to note. Even in areas that appear to have similar approaches to the role of government, such as Scandinavia, such differences have been noted. Wiborg (2013) emphasizes this point in a comparison of neoliberal education agendas in Norway, Denmark, and Sweden. She notes that different approaches within each nation's social democratic parties explains the greater impact of neoliberalism in Sweden compared to its Scandinavian neighbors. The impact of the Swedish experience in for-profit government funded schools is described by Arreman and Holm (2011). They describe a cycle of what they call *boom* and *school death* wherein school choice policies create destabilizing growth and frequent demise of schools reminiscent of the venture philanthropists' concept of churning of schools in a portfolio system described earlier in this article. Finally, West (2014) explores the question of heightened segregation in independent schools in Swedish and academies in England. While she argues against a cause and effect relationship, this question relates to the US experience with charter schools run by education management organizations (EMO's) showing that there is increased segregation (Miron, Urschel, Mathis, & Tornquist. 2010).

Conclusion

Over almost a decade, we have used the New DEEL vision of leadership to focus our efforts in helping aspiring and veteran educational leaders craft meaningful careers in the face of daunting policy challenges. We know that we are in a prolonged struggle for the future of education in the US and in much of the developed world because of the pendulum swing that created severe turbulence and troubling ethical dilemmas that were long in the making. The role of today's venture philanthropists only heightens the pressure experienced by democratic ethical educators and the communities they serve. While we do not expect these powerful economic elites to quit the field any time soon, we do believe that pendulum swings never favor one position forever.

We believe that caring educational leaders, at every level, will find the New DEEL vision for leadership to be a useful guide that will ultimately help turn the tide. We also acknowledge that these same leaders have a right to ask our ideas for action, consistent with this vision, that might shorten the time between the neoliberal policy world we now have and the policies we would like to see.

First, our work and the work of colleagues around the world to create an alternative scholarship is one important step. To this end New DEEL members have written numerous books and articles and have guided doctoral dissertations to investigate New DEEL areas of scholarship. Further, we have developed

new graduate level courses such as one that explores the role that democratic ethical exemplars can play to inform current practice in P-20 education. Likewise gathering colleagues from P-20 together in conferences helps to foster a supportive community, thereby defending against isolation. These gatherings have also helped to spur new graduate courses that raise the sights of tomorrow's leaders beyond narrowed curricula and unending testing of children. To date we have sponsored six New DEEL conferences. Over the past decade, we have made great progress in each of these areas but more needs to be done.

Second, we support renewed efforts to connect the work of scholars with that of community organizers, families, and local educators. New models that challenge neoliberal ideology have appeared in the literature. For instance Clandfield (2010) details radically enhanced school-community ties in Ontario, Canada. We have also seen the start of organized protests including teachers, principals, students, and families. These events are already documented in the academic literature (Poole 2007) and in the press (Lahey 2014). If we are right in saying that the vision of the venture philanthropists is anti-democratic, then direct action of this type may be the next logical step.

Our New DEEL mission statement begins with the phrase, "an action-oriented partnership." Partnership implies dynamic, community building relationships like those just described. We believe our vision and those relationships will lead us beyond the crossroads of venture philanthropy towards democracy.

References:

Apple, M. W. (2003) *The State and the Politics of Knowledge*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Arreman, I.E., Holm, A.S. (2011). Privatization of public education? The emergence of independent upper secondary schools in sweden. *Journal of Education Policy*. Vol. 26, No. 2, 225–243.

Bagley, W C. (1938) An Essentialist's Platform for the Advancement of American Education, *Educational Administration and Supervision* 24 (April): 241–256.

Bagley, W.C. (1939) The Significance of the Essentialist Movement in Educational Theory. *The Classical Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 6 pp. 326-344.

Baker, B.D., and Ferris, R. (2011). *Adding Up the Spending: Fiscal Disparities and Philanthropy among New York City Charter Schools*. Boulder, CO: National Education Policy Center. Retrieved [9/12/12] from: http://nepc.colorado.edu/publication/NYC-charter-disparities.

Baltodano, M. (2012) Neoliberalism and the demise of public education: The corporatization of schools of education. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education v 25 n 4 pp 487-507*. P 496

Beauchamp, T. L., and Childress, J. F. (1984) "Morality, ethics and ethical theories." In P. Sola (ed.), *Ethics, Education, and Administrative Decisions: A Book of Readings*. New York: Peter Lang.

Beck, L. G. (1994) *Reclaiming Educational Administration as a Caring Profession*. New York: Teachers' College Press.

Beckner, W. (2004) *Ethics for Educational Leaders*. Boston: Pearson Education.

Begley, P. T., and Johansson, O. (eds.) (2003) *The Ethical Dimensions of School Leadership*. Boston: Kluwer Academic Publishers.

Berliner, David C. (2009) *Poverty and Potential: Out-of-School Factors and School Success.* Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved [9/14/12] from: http://epicpolicy.org/publication/poverty-and-potential

Berliner, D., and Biddle (1995) *The manufactured crisis: Myths, fraud, and the attack on America's public schools*. New York: Perseus Books.

Clandfield, D. (2010). The school as community hub: A public alternative to the neo-liberal threat to ontario schools. *Our Schools / Our Selves*. Vol. 19 Issue 4, p7-74.

Connell, R. (2013a) The neoliberal cascade and education: An essay on the market agenda and its consequences. *Critical Studies in Education*. Vol. 54, No. 2, 99–112,

Connell, R. (2013b) Why do market 'reforms' persistently increase inequality? *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*, Vol. 34, No. 2, 279-285.

Cookson, P., Molnar, A., and Embree, K. (2001) *Let the buyer beware: An analysis of the social science value and methodological quality of educational studies published by the mackinac center for public policy (1990-2001)* Educational Policy Research Unit, Educational Studies Policies Laboratory. Arizona State University.

Freire, P. (1970) *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, trans.). New York: Continuum.

Frick, W.C. (2009). "Principals' value-informed decision making, intrapersonal moral discord, and pathways to resolution: The complexities of moral leadership praxis." Journal of Educational Administration, 47(1), 50-74.

Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation (2010) *Fewer, clearer, higher: Moving forward with consistent, rigorous standards for all students.*

Ginsberg, A. E., Shapiro, J. P., and Brown, S. P. (2004) *Gender in Urban Education: Strategies for Student Achievement*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Giroux, H.A. (2006). *America on the edge: Henry Giroux on politics, education and culture.* New York: Palgrave MacMillan.

Glassner, S. (2013) *If not us–Who?* Helen Oakes Citizen Service to Education Lecture. New DEEL (Democratic Ethical Educational Leadership) Conference. May 3 &4, 2013. Temple University, Philadelphia.

Greenfield, W.D. (2004) "Moral leadership in schools." *Journal of Educational Administration*, 42(2); 174-196.

Grogan, M. (1996) *Voices of Women Aspiring to the Superintendency*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Gross, S.J. (1998) *Staying centered: Curriculum leadership in a turbulent era.* Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Gross, S.J. (2004) *Promises kept: Sustaining school and district leadership in a turbulent era.* Alexandria, VA: The Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD).

Gross, S.J. (2006) *Leadership mentoring: Maintaining school improvement in turbulent times*. Lanham, MD*:* Rowman and Littlefield.

Gross, S.J. (2009) (Re-) Constructing a Movement for Social Justice in our Profession. In A. H. Normore (Ed.) *Leadership for Social Justice: Promoting Equity and Excellence Through Inquiry and Reflective Practice.* Charlotte, N.C. Information Age Publishing 257-266

Gross, S.J. (2014). Using turbulence theory to guide actions. In C.M. Branson & S.J. Gross (eds.), *Handbook of ethical educational leadership* (pp.246-262). New York: Routledge.

Gross, S.J., and Shapiro, J.P. (2005) Our new era requires a new deel: Towards democratic ethical educational leadership. *The UCEA Review*, 1-4.

Harvey, D. (2005). *A brief history of neoliberalism.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hatcher, R. (2011). The Conservative-Liberal Democrat Coalition government's "free schools" in England. *Educational Review*. Vol. 63, No. 4, 485–503.

Higham, R. (2013). Free schools in the Big Society: The motivations, aims and demography of free school proposers. *Journal of Educational Policy.* Vol.29, number 1, 122-139.

Hursh, D. (2005) The growth of high-stakes testing in the usa: Accountability, markets and the decline in educational equality. *British Educational Research Journal* Vol. 31, No. 5, October 2005, pp. 605–622

Hursh, D. (2007) Marketing education: The rise of standardized testing, accountability, competition, and markets in public education. In *Neo-Liberalism and Education Reforms.* Ross, E.W., Gibson, R. (Eds.) Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press pp 15-34.)

Kliebard, H. M. (2004). *The struggle for the American curriculum: 1893-1958*. New York: Routledge Falmer.

Lahey, J. (2014). Why Students Are Tested, and Why Some Parents Opt Out*. New York Times* April 10, 2014. Retrieved May 30, 2014 from: http://parenting.blogs.nytimes.com/2014/04/10/why-students-are-tested-and-why-some-parents-opt-out/.

Levin, H.M. & Rouse, C.E., New York Times, Opinion, The true cost of high school dropouts, Jan. 25, 2012 .
(www.nytimes.com/2012/01/26/opinion/The-true-cost-of-high-school-dropouts.html?_r=0)

Marshall, C., and Gerstl-Pepin, C. (2005). *Re-framing Educational Politics for Social Justice*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Marshall, C., and Oliva, M. (2006) *Leadership for Social Justice: Making Revolutions in Education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Miron, G., Urschel, J. L., Mathis, W, J., & Tornquist, E. (2010). *Schools without*

Diversity: Education Management Organizations, Charter Schools and the Demographic Stratification of the American School System. Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved [May 30, 2013] from http://epicpolicy.org/publication/schools-without-diversity

Morsy, L., Gulson, K., Clarke, M. (2014). Democracy, 'sector-blindness' and the delegitimation of dissent in neoliberal education policy: a response to Discourse 34(2), May 2013. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education,* Vol. 35, No. 3, 444–461.

National Commission on Excellence in Education National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983) *A nation at risk: A report to the nation and the Secretary of Education.* Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

Noddings, N. (2003) *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education* (2nd ed.). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Normore, A. H. (2004) "Ethics and values in leadership preparation programs: Finding the North Star in the dust storm." *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*, 2(2); 1–8.

Poole, W. (2007). Neo-liberalism in British Columbia Education and Teachers' Union Resistance, 11(24). *IEJLL: International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning,* North America, 11, jan. 2007. Available at:
<http://iejll.synergiesprairies.ca/iejll/index.php/ijll/article/view/679>
Date accessed: 29 May. 2014

Portelli, J., Konecny, C.P. (2013). Neoliberalism, subversion, and democracy in education. *Encounters/Encuentros/Rencontres on Education.* Vol. 14, 87-97

Rapp, D. (2002) "Social justice and the importance of rebellious oppositional imaginations." *Journal of School Leadership*, 12; 226–245.

Reitzug, U. C., and O'Hair, M. J. (2002) "From conventional school to democratic school community: The dilemmas of teaching and leading." In G. Furman-Brown (ed.), *School as Community: From Promise to Practice*. New York: SUNY Press.

Saltman, K.J. (2010) *The gift of education: Public education and venture philanthropy.* New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Saltman, K..J. (2010a). *Urban school decentralization and the growth of "Portfolio Districts".* Boulder and Tempe: Education and the Public Interest Center & Education Policy Research Unit. Retrieved [9/14/12] from: http://epicpolicy.org/publication/portfolio-districts.

Scott, J. (2009) The politics of venture philanthropy in charter school policy and advocacy. *Educational Policy* v 23 n 1 pp 106-136.

Sergiovanni, T.J. (2009). *The Principalship: A Reflective Practice Perspective (6th edition)*. Allen & Bacon, Boston: MA.

Shapiro, J.P. & Gross, S.J. (2008) *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)solving moral dilemmas.* New York: Routledge.

Shapiro, J.P. & Gross, S.J. (2013) *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times: (Re)solving moral dilemmas.* (2nd ed.) New York: Routledge.

Shapiro, J. P., and Stefkovich, J. A. (2001) *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Shapiro, J. P., and Stefkovich, J. A. (2005) *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas* (2rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Shapiro, J. P., and Stefkovich, J. A. (2011) *Ethical Leadership and Decision Making in Education: Applying Theoretical Perspectives to Complex Dilemmas* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Shapiro, H.S. (Ed.). (2009) *Education and hope in troubled times: Visions of change for our children's world* . New York: Routledge.

Shapiro, H. S. and Purpel, D. E. (Eds.). (2005). *Social issues in American education: Democracy and meaning in a globalized world* (3rd ed.)*.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Snook, I. (2012) Charter schools: An investigation. *New Zealand Principals' Federation Magazine*. Vol. 27 Issue 2, 5-7.

Starratt, R. J. (1994) *Building an Ethical School*. London: Falmer Press.

Starratt, R. J. (2004) *Ethical Leadership*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Stefkovich, J. A. (2006) *Applying Ethical Constructs to Legal Cases: The Best Interests of the Student*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Street, S. (2012) Public interest threatened by private gain: Learning from the UK experience of charter schools. *New Zealand Principals' Federation Magazine*. Vol. 27 Issue 4, p11-13, 3p

Shiller, J. Venture philanthropies market strategies fail urban kids. *Phi Delta Kappan* v 93 n 8 pp 12-16

Skerett, A., and Hargreaves, A. (2008) Student diversity and secondary school change in a context of increasingly standardized reform. *American Educational Research Journal*. V 45 n 4 pp 913-945.

Stiglitz, J. (2012). *The price of inequality: How today's divided society endangers our future* New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Strike, K. A. (2006). *Ethical leadership in schools: Creating community in an environment of accountability*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Strike, K. A., Haller, E. J., and Soltis, J. F. (2005) The Ethics of School Administration (3rd ed.). New York: Teachers College Press.

Ungerleide, C. (2006). Neo-liberal media, and education in Canada. *Canadian Journal of Education*. Vol 29, number 1. 70-90.

Vanourek, G. (2005). *State of the charter movement 2005*: Trends, issues, & indicators.Washington, DC: Charter School Leadership Council.

West, A. (2014) Academies in England and independent schools (fristående skolor) in Sweden: Policy, privatisation, access and segregation. *Research Papers in Education*, Vol. 29, No. 3, 330–350

Wibord, S. (2013). Neo-liberalism and universal state education: The cases of denmark, norway and sweden 1980–2011. *Comparative Education* Vol. 49, No. 4, 407–423

Wilson, Stephen. (2005). *Realizing the Promise of Brand-Name Schools* in Brookings Paper on Education Policy, (ed. Diane Ravitch), Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 89-126.

Windle, J., Stratton, G. (2013) Equity for sale: Ethical consumption in a school-choice regime. *Discourse: Studies in the Cultural Politics of Education*. Vol. 34, No. 2, 202 213.

Yudof, M., Kirp, D., and Levin, B. (1992) *Educational Policy and the Law* (3rd ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

THE UNIVERSITY OF
WAIKATO
Te Whare Wānanga o Waikato