This report looks at the accomplishments of Children First America, a national advocacy and support group for school choice. Beginning with a single program in Indianapolis, Indiana, in the early 1990s, private voucher programs (PVPs) had grown until, in the 1999-2000 school year, 108 such programs aided students. PVPs, which served 746 students in 1991-1992, now serve more than 100,000 students. More than 97% of these students are economically disadvantaged, and the vast majority are minorities living in the inner city. The amount of assistance provided to families varies widely, but the average amount increased to $1,150 per year in 1999 from $898 in 1997-1998. Academic studies consistently have shown improved test scores and parental satisfaction with choice schools when compared to control groups of students in public schools. PVP families in Arizona, Florida, and Pennsylvania are now aided by state tax credits, enhancing the ability of PVPs to reach and help students. The largest private voucher program, Horizon (San Antonio, Texas), had a demonstrable impact on the public school district from which it drew students. One appendix lists private voucher contact information, and the other lists Arizona Student Tuition Organizations. (Contains 15 figures and 5 tables.) (SLD)
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

MOMENTUM: From a single program launched in Indianapolis in the early 1990s, 108 Private Voucher Programs (PVPs) aided students during the 1999-2000 school year.

STUDENTS: From 746 students in 1991-1992, PVPs now serve over 100,000 students.

FAMILIES: More than 97 percent of students served by PVPs are economically disadvantaged. The vast majority of students are minorities living in inner cities.

AWARDS: The amount of assistance provided to families varies widely, but the average amount of assistance increased to $1150 per year in 1999 from $898 in 1997-8.

EDUCATION: Academic studies consistently show improved test scores and parental satisfaction with choice schools when compared to control groups of students in public schools.

INNOVATION: PVP families in Arizona, Florida and Pennsylvania are now aided by state tax-credits, enhancing the ability of PVPs to reach and help students.

IMPACT: The largest private voucher program, Horizon, demonstrably impacted the public school district from which it drew students in a very positive fashion.
Introduction

**CHILDREN FIRST AMERICA'S ROLE IN ADVANCING THE SCHOOL CHOICE MOVEMENT**

Many committed organizations and advocacy groups shape and move the efforts to bring school choice to America's educationally disenfranchised parents seeking school choice options for their children. We gratefully acknowledge and recognize the contributions of all groups to the privately-funded voucher movement.

But as we begin this 5th edition of *Just Doing It*, Children First America takes a moment to recap some of its own history and impact. For almost a decade we have been there, among the pioneers of this movement, doing everything possible to win educational freedom for thousands of America's low-income families.

To say that our effort has been fulfilling would fall into the category of understatement. We have shared the privilege of touching and changing the lives of good people with profoundly important needs. And in just doing it we have made a difference. We will not consider our work done until every American family has a choice of schools, and we achieve the worthy goal of no "child left behind" educationally.

"No child left behind", of course, has become the mantra of education reformers, as well as policy and political leaders on both sides of the ideological spectrum. Both presidential candidates invoked the theme during the recent campaign, sending a clear message to America's education establishment: every child can and will learn and opportunities for them to do so should be equal and of the highest quality.

Yet each year, in thousands of America's public schools across our land, a disturbing scene plays out; one that does indeed leave many of our children behind in classrooms where learning is limited; academic quality is poor, and—in some cases—schools are unsafe. Ironically, it is the same education system—that so inadequately serves many of our children that also literally forces them into these conditions without any other options or other choices.

How does this happen? It occurs under the inflexible policies of a public system that assigns children to schools, whether those schools perform academically or not, and whether they are safe or not. The result is one of the great social injustices of our time. Low-income children are forced, by their own education system, into poorly performing or unsafe schools; while their better-off classmates leave for higher quality schools because their families have the means to pay for it.

Children First America helps these children and families. We reach into our pockets and act on principle, driven by our own commitment to an American ideal that says no child shall ever be left behind. If enough of us act, we can surely help thousands more of
deserving children. And with vision, innovation, and perseverance, we might also—in time—change the face of American education.

**THREE KEY OBJECTIVES**

Children First America strives to fulfill its mission by concentrating on three strategic objectives:

1. We encourage, guide, and advise interested individuals and groups across our nation (and beyond) in establishing—with their own charitable dollars—privately-funded school choice programs that offer low-income (often minority) children the funds needed to leave failing or unsafe schools and seek better educational opportunities. When our funding permits, we offer matching grants, as incentives, to potential founders to partner with us in forming these special programs in key cities, regions, and states.

2. We reach out to assist and educate parents who want to be active in working for school choice and for improved academic quality in America’s schools.

3. We provide public policy information, data, statistics and research on school choice issues to government leaders and their staffs at the local, state, and federal levels. These services are provided freely and in a non-partisan spirit.

Accomplishments:

**1. LAUNCHED A NATIONAL SCHOOL REFORM MOVEMENT**

The privately-funded voucher movement, as with all good ideas, began with the vision of a few good people. These thoughtful citizens realized many of America’s schools were not generating academic results as well as they should, and that children who were denied a way out were victims of “unequal” opportunity.

Among them were **CFA Chairman Peter Flanigan**, who in 1986 founded the Student/Sponsor Partnership, a mentoring and scholarship program offering children options to attend parochial schools, and **Pat Rooney** of Indianapolis who, in 1991, formed the first privately-funded voucher program, the Educational CHOICE Charitable Trust.

From these early programs the nucleus of a movement began to take shape. Its purpose was rooted in two fundamental goals:

---

- Help children in under-performing or unsafe schools obtain access to a better educational opportunity.

- Demonstrate to government (the public sector), through private sector initiatives, what can and should be done—as a matter of public policy,
equity, and social justice—for millions of children literally trapped in failing schools.

With the privately supported choice model well established by pioneers such as Rooney and Flanigan, the stage was set for expansion. James R. Leininger, a physician and business leader from San Antonio, saw the opportunity immediately and took action in his state. Exhibiting uncommon vision, Dr. Leininger, along with Children First President and CEO Fritz Steiger, formed the Children's Educational Opportunity (CEO) Foundation in 1992 and within two years they had established six programs in Texas based on Rooney's model.

In time, the CEO program went national. With a vehicle (CEO America Foundation) in place to promote and fund private programs nationally, other generous donors began to come to the table and establish their own programs across the nation (more than 40 by 1996). Thus was born a movement designed to win educational freedom for all Americans—the fundamental, natural, and moral right of every parent to choose their children's schools.

2. EXPANDED CHARITABLY-FUNDED CHOICE MODELS

Today, there are more than 100 privately-funded voucher programs nationwide, most of which grew out of Children First America initiatives. Collectively, they represent almost $500 million invested by caring, reform-minded men and women in the fate and futures of some 100,000 children and their parents who were fortunate enough to secure assistance from one or more programs.

That investment, however, cannot begin to help the expanding numbers of families wanting choice, but unable to obtain it. Currently, 1.2 million children and their families have inquired about aid from privately funded voucher programs hoping to receive assistance. Still more are waiting to enter America's several publicly funded programs in Milwaukee, Cleveland, and Florida. The waiting lists continue to expand.

A decade of public and private choice programs has shown us that where the people see firsthand the value and benefits of choice demand increases and wait lists expand. CFA sponsored programs, and those of other concerned groups, cannot begin to meet this growing demand unless more individuals and groups join with us in forming new private programs.

3. SHIFTED THE DEBATE TO CHILDREN AND FAIRNESS

When Nobel Prize winning economist Milton Friedman first proposed the idea of school choice vouchers more than 40 years ago, the issue seemed destined to languish in the heady world of policy analysts and conservative reformers. In fact, for most of those 40 years that was the case—especially as teacher unions and public school officials banded together to kill the idea and demonize its advocates. But in the early 1990's something extraordinary happened that would clearly transform school choice the policy proposal into school choice the national movement.
Until that time, the choice debate had been framed by abstract—and at times difficult to understand—notions such as market forces, competitive environments, balanced tri-lateral systems, and restructuring. It made for good debate, and certainly the underlying themes had merit. But it hardly struck an emotional chord with the public; and it could not begin to match the dramatic appeal of opponents on the other side of the issue who cast themselves as defenders, at all costs, of public education.

The emergence of privately funded voucher programs in the early 1990s changed things considerably. Early pioneers of these programs look back today and confess they probably acted more out of frustration with the system than wanting to change the thrust of the debate. Helping children better their educations, and stepping in to do in the private sector that which the public sector would not do, was what they had in mind. Call it school choice by example (putting one’s money where one’s mouth is!).

But by establishing working school choice models with their own dollars, they did something much more crucial to advancing the cause. They put a human face on the issue. More often than not, that face was the face of educationally disenfranchised minorities trapped in failing schools across the urban and rural landscapes of America.

The plight of real people with desperate needs not only served to bring more emotional appeal into the debate; it awakened lower-income Americans and minority groups (many of them victims of social injustice and veterans of the civil rights movement) to the harsh realities in their children’s schools.

The school choice movement found itself with new allies, those who knew first hand about fighting for justice, rights and freedoms. They would become a powerful voice for choice. And thus the debate took on a new tone that would help it transcend socio-economic, partisan, and ethnic lines.

The private voucher movement shifted the terms of the debate by offering up living breathing examples. It made the issue mainstream. Today, choice is more about children and fairness than ever. It is about doing the right thing. That, more than anything has helped it win support from political and community leaders on the left as well as the right.

4. HELPED WIN THE NATION’S FIRST STATEWIDE PUBLICLY-FUNDED VOUCHER PROGRAM

In 1998, Governor Jeb Bush of Florida bet his political career on providing school choice opportunities to Florida’s children trapped in failing public schools. He won. It was a benchmark legislative victory, and a turning point in America’s historic quest to win school choice for all children and their parents.

The Florida fight was bitter and hotly contested, but when the dust had settled the Florida A+ program was firmly in place. The program provided, by means of a state-funded
voucher, the opportunity for Florida’s children trapped in failing government schools to leave them for better public, private, or religious schools. It has become a model for similar programs in other states and at the federal level, and research has shown that the program has forced improvement in failing government schools.

Children First America saw the potential for victory early in the Florida battle and weighed in with timely assistance. In an informal sense, we became advisors to the Bush team. As such, we provided insight into the choice issue based on our own observations having worked with parents, children, business, and political leadership who had benefited from participation in more than 40 (at that time) privately-funded programs across the nation.

The lessons we had learned from these programs helped spawn Floridians for School Choice, an advocacy group comprising parents, business people, church leaders, and many other Floridians who saw the value of providing children in failing schools a way out. Their united voices helped make the case in Florida and contributed to the first statewide voucher program in the history of the U.S.

We do not consider gains and victories on the school choice front ours alone. They are the spoils of a collective effort comprising many good people and organizations. Some of them are mentioned in this report, which chronicles some of our latest progress as a movement. Where once there were two or three privately-funded voucher programs, now there are more than 100. Their continued impact is extraordinary.
FIGURE 1: PRIVATELY FUNDED VOUCHER PROGRAMS BY STATE-2001

NEW PROGRAMS - 2000

Educate New Mexico 400 Children
Alliance for Choice in Education (Denver) 550 Children
Children First Virginia 162 Children
Children First Columbus 100 Children
Maine Children's Scholarship Fund (Bangor) 28 Children
Northwest Indiana Scholarship Fund (Gary) 100 Children
Parents of Lima Advancing Choice in Education (Ohio) 93 Children
The School Choice Program (Erie, PA) 10 Children
Coalition for Children (Monmouth County PA) 23 Children
Children First of Whatcom County (Washington) 23 Children
### Table 1: Just Doing It 5 Surveyed Private Voucher Programs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Program Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Edgewood Horizon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>CEO San Antonio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Vermont SOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Washington DC Scholarship Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>CSF Alabama</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>AZ School Choice Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Miami Inner City Angels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>CEO Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Children First Tennessee Chattanooga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CEO Lehigh Valley PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF Charlotte</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Bison Fund Buffalo NY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF New Hampshire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>St. Louis School Choice Scholarship Fdn.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Choice Charitable Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CEO Connecticut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>The Basic Fund-San Francisco</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Independent Scholarship Fund Oakland CA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>CSF-Los Angeles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>AZ Scholarship Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>CSF Arkansas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF-Philadelphia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>PACE Foundation-South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF Boston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>STARR-Fort Worth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Carolina Educational Opportunity Fund-Raleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF Seattle-Tacoma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>CSF Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>Memphis Opportunity Scholarship Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>PACE Ohio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Gateway -Missouri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>Education Freedom Fund of Michigan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF Portland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>CSF Tampa Bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>School Choice Kentucky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Children First Central Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Kids First Scholarship Fund - Minneapolis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Carolina Education Fund-Winston Salem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>CSF Kansas City</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Lincoln Park Education Foundation-NJ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The Guardsman Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>CSF Toledo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>CSF of Cincinnati</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>CEO Houston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Milwaukee PAVE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Philanthropy serves as a defining mark of each era. The captains of industry from the Industrial Revolution, for instance, left behind huge endowments for the arts, greatly expanded colleges and universities, and created foundations to pursue the furtherance on almost every human endeavor. By the mid 1990s, commentators had begun to publicly wonder what the philanthropy of our generation would consist of, what unique contribution those living today could add to rich legacy of the past. Some openly challenged today’s philanthropists to be creative with their generosity, to demand results with their gifts, and to do things not done before. Having new buildings at colleges named for you, the thinking went, had been done. The time had come for a new generation of philanthropists to improve upon the past with innovation and creativity.

Ironically, one of the most innovative movements in the history of philanthropy was growing and gaining ground even as these calls for innovation went out. Privately funded school choice programs, started in 1991 in Indianapolis with 746 students were growing rapidly across the nation. The creators of such programs, who included experienced people from all sectors of the modern economy, understood one basic fact: that competition is key to the provision of quality products and services: including education. These leaders understand that the worst schools in America tend to be clustered in low-income urban areas where the parents had no option to buy a house in the suburbs or to pay private school tuition. They understood that it was no coincidence that urban schools performed so poorly- it was the simple economics of government monopolies having a powerless and captive audience. They understood that this more than anything else explains the terrible inequalities in our society- an inequality of opportunity fostered by government policy.

Private voucher program creators understood all of this, and moreover, they took action. Donating their energies and their fortunes, these men and women began a new civil rights struggle aimed at giving parents the right to choose the best school for their children regardless of their income. Giving to universities was a great and worthy hallmark of the old philanthropy. By the 1990s, however, it was clear that our problems today lie more with our elementary and secondary schools than anywhere else. The programs serve economically disadvantaged students almost exclusively, and minority students in disproportionately. From a single city program in 1991, 37 additional programs had been added by 1998, each program attempting to raise as much money as possible to help low-income parents enjoy the same power to choose schools taken for granted by the more fortunate. These programs began to attract public attention, if not that of those commenting upon the state of philanthropy. By 1999, however, the private school choice movement became impossible to ignore.

In recognition of their leadership in innovative philanthropy, Children First America Board Member John Walton received the William E. Simon Prize in Philanthropic Leadership, and Children First America Board Chairman Peter Fhigan received the inaugural William E. Simon Prize in Social Entrepreneurship. The awards were presented at the University Club in New York City in March of 2001. The Philanthropic Leadership
Prize awarded to John Walton is given to prominent philanthropists whose giving has not only achieved positive results, but who have also "helped people to help themselves." The Social Entrepreneurship award goes to outstanding innovators; entrepreneurs or volunteers who have demonstrated the important role one person can have in improving the lives of others, paying special attention to those who have promoted personal responsibility, religious faith, and the value of hard work. Both awards are great honors to John Walton and Peter Flanigan as individuals, and tributes to the as well as the broader private voucher movement.

FAR GREATER DEMAND FOR CHOICE THAN SUPPLY OF VOUCHERS

In the fall of 1997, Ted Forstmann and Children First America board member John Walton teamed to offer 1,000 partial scholarships to low-income families in Washington D.C., but were amazed to receive 8,000 applications for those scholarships. This amazing display of demand for choice by low-income parents inspired the philanthropists to create a nation-wide program. Offering matching funds to both pre-existing and brand new PVPs across the country, Forstmann and Walton created the Children's Scholarship Fund (CSF) and raised money from 40,000 partial scholarships. CSF received a broad based support from Republicans, Democrats, liberals and conservatives. Early supporters of CSF included big city mayors such as Richard Daley, Richard Riordan and Rudolph Guiliani, former Clinton White House Chief of Staff Erskine Bowles, House Speaker Newt Gingrich and Washington D.C. delegate Elenor Holmes Norton. CSF raised $70,000,000 in matching funds for that 38 partnership programs, for a total commitment of $140,000,000.

Families from all 50 states and from 22,000 communities representing 90 percent of all counties in the country contacted CSF hoping to apply for the partial scholarships. While scholarships were offered nationally, in many urban school districts a quarter to more than a third of the eligible children applied: 33 percent in Washington; 26 percent in Atlanta; nearly 20 percent in Los Angeles. Nationwide, 1,250,000 people made applied for 40,000 vouchers, a ratio of over 30 applicants to every voucher. Joseph A. Califano Jr., Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare under President Lyndon Johnson, wrote the following about the extraordinary CSF experience:

These parents sent a powerful message. They want out of schools that cannot protect their children's safety, let alone teach them. This tidal wave of applications from parents desperate to give their children an opportunity to receive a quality education must serve as a wake-up call. The ideal of equality of opportunity in this country is predicated on a system of education that puts all children at the same starting line. Today the realities of public education have become dangerously alienated from this ideal. By quarantining poor, mostly minority children in schools affluent families would never tolerate, we do not preserve the institution of public education; we dishonor its guiding ideal.

More than anything else, the private voucher movement has demonstrated beyond a shadow of a doubt that the debate over choice is far more than an abstract policy.
argument carried out by contending groups of policy-wonks. The 1,250,000 people who sought help from PVPs in 1999 are real people who want the opportunity to exercise choice in the education of their children. Private philanthropists will continue to do all they can, but low-income families in this country will continue to be poorly served until they are given choice in how their education dollars are spent.

A RISING TIDE: TRENDS IN THE PRIVATE CHOICE MOVEMENT

The strength of the choice movement is demonstrated both by the increasing number of programs and the increasing number of families making applications. Figures 2 and 3 below show trends in the data regarding the number of programs and the number of applications received by our surveyed programs.

Figure 2 shows the information regarding the demographics of participating families. Not all programs track demographic information, but the profile is nevertheless unmistakable: PVPs serve a population that is almost entirely economically disadvantaged and is disproportionately minority. These are the people with the fewest education options, and the ones most in need of help.

Children First America surveyed a sample of private voucher programs around the country. The PVPs in our survey sample demonstrated vigorous growth in the numbers of applications received in 1999, an increase of 157% when compared the 1997, as illustrated in Figure 3 below.
Sampled programs had total funding of $33,407,773 in 1999, with an average total funding of approximately 726,000 per program, although programs budgets ranged widely, from as low as $33,000 to as high as $3,750,000.

Programs in our sample serve 32,238 students, with an average program size of 716, with an average scholarship size of $1150. This represents an increase of 28% from the 1997 average of $898. The ratio of applicants to winners for our programs was approximately 5 to 1. Despite the fact that these programs typically spend little to no money on promotion, that only low-income families are eligible for scholarships, and that participating families are still called upon to make great financial sacrifices to afford private schools, demand far exceeds supply for PVP vouchers.
Figure 5: Average Voucher Value in Sampled PVPs

In short, privately financed voucher programs have continued to expand the number of students aided, while increasing the average aid provided to students.
TAX CREDIT SUPPORTED PRIVATE VOUCHER PROGRAMS - THE ARIZONA MODEL

Arizona House Bill 2074, the School Tuition Organization Tax Credit\(^1\), was signed into law on April 7, 1997. The law provides for a dollar-for-dollar personal income tax credit for contributions of up to $200 per household for donations to public schools for extracurricular activities and up to $500 for donations to school tuition organizations providing scholarships to students to attend private schools. Proposition 301, a ballot referendum adopted by Arizona voters in November 2000, increased the tuition tax credit amount to $650 per household. The new law goes into effect May 2001.

On January 26, 1999 the Arizona Supreme Court upheld the tuition tax credit law in a 3-2 ruling. The decision cited the Wisconsin Supreme Court's ruling on the Milwaukee choice program (Jackson v. Benson) and the United States Supreme Court's ruling in Mueller v. Allen (1983), which upheld tax deductions for school expenses. In Mueller v. Allen, the court ruled that the tax deductions have a secular purpose, do not have a primary effect of advancing religion, and do not create excessive church-state entanglement thus satisfying the test presented in Lemon v. Kurtzman (1971).

Since the successful defense of the Tax Credit program, a large number of private voucher funding organizations, known as Student Tuition Organizations, have arisen to help fund private school tuition. STO organizations have directed aid almost exclusively to low-income students, and the number of scholarships has increased each year.

Figure 6: Total Arizona STO Scholarship Vouchers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>11,328</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Arizona Session Laws 1997, Chapter 48, section 2, codified as ARS 43-1089.
Imitation is the most sincere form of flattery, so school choice advocates in Arizona should feel proud. At the time of this writing in June of 2001, both Florida and Pennsylvania had enacted Arizona-inspired tax credits, while similar bills passed both the Colorado and the South Carolina Houses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Clearinghouse</th>
<th>Donations</th>
<th>Amount Donated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Adventist Scholarships Inc.</td>
<td>371</td>
<td>$163,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Christian School Tuition Organization</td>
<td>6,173</td>
<td>2,816,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Episcopal Schools Foundation</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>320,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Independent Schools Scholarship fund</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>329,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Native Scholastic and Enrichment</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>12,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Private Education Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>95,120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>362,930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona School Choice Trust</td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>590,189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brophy Community Foundation</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>617,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Tuition Organization of the Diocese of Phoenix</td>
<td>11,060</td>
<td>4,672,380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catholic Tuition Organization of the Diocese of Tucson</td>
<td>3,198</td>
<td>1,198,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chedar Scholarship Organization Inc.</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>257,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian Scholarship Fund of Arizona</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educare Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>88,373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence Englehardt/Pappas Foundation</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>22,893</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation for Montessori Scholarships</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>6,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HELP</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>252,951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute for Better Education</td>
<td>603</td>
<td>260,593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish Community Day School Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>818</td>
<td>371,332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lutheran Education Foundation</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>355,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maranatha Christian Co-Op Tuition Fund</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montessori School Tuition Organization</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>43,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Arizona Christian School Scholarship Foundation</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>125,897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patagonia Scholarship Fund</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>14,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott Christian School Scholarship Foundation</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>137,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools with Heart Foundation</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>74,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Tuition Association of Yuma</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>91,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Arizona Foundation for Education</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>162,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tesserac T Tuition Organization</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>133,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VVBC Christian Education Fund</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter T. Beamis Scholarship Foundation</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4,221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 31,875 $13,606,661

Source: Arizona Department of Revenue. Cited in Olsen, D. and M. Brouillete, Reclaiming Our Schools: Increasing Parental Control of Education through the Universal Education Credit, Cato Institute, 2000.
Similar bills were considered in a number of states. The level of difference an Arizona type tax credit can make to a private voucher program is demonstrated by the fundraising experience of the Arizona School Choice Trust, presented in Figure 7 above. The Arizona School Choice Trust is a Private Voucher Program predating the tax credit program. The effect of the tax credit on the fundraising success after the settlement of the lawsuit was immediate and dramatic.

Analysts predict that the Arizona program will continue to expand in coming years, both in terms of funds invested and the number of voucher granting programs. As additional states pass tax credit legislation, additional private tuition support organizations can be expected to flourish, and existing programs should be able to raise additional funds and help more children choose the best school for their situation.
SCHOOL CHOICE EVALUATION RESEARCH: A CONSENSUS OF POSITIVE RESULTS

Social science only rarely provides definitive answers to important questions. The consistency of results across multiple evaluations of school choice programs across the country, however, proves to be an exception to this rule. Every major statistical analysis performed note positive developments associated with school choice. Positive features include: higher standardized test scores for choice students, choice program parents who express higher satisfaction with their child’s school, and a reduction in the level of racial segregation in our schools. Better yet, many of these evaluations have employed a study method (Control Group Design) which is of the highest possible quality, the same methodology medical researchers use to test the effectiveness of treatments and drugs. Furthermore, the weight of the evidence from non-control group studies reinforces the point that school choice programs have major benefits for both students and school systems.

Researchers produced evidence demonstrating that children perform better when attending a school chosen decades ago. Researchers, however, could not until recently definitively answer the following question: do choice students perform better because they receive a superior education, or is it simply the case that these students only seem to do better because of pre-existing advantages? Students attending private schools, for instance, might have parents who are more involved in the education of their children, and thus their children were on course to do better than average whether they went to private school or not. This “selection bias” problem proves very difficult to overcome in the absence of a Control Group study. Unlike the vast majority of education research, voucher programs now have several Control Group studies to draw upon.

This Control Group design has been employed in the publicly funded program in Milwaukee and also privately funded programs in New York City, Dayton, Washington D.C. and Charlotte North Carolina. Four of the five programs with Control Group evaluations have been privately financed CEO/CSF programs, demonstrating the vital importance of the private choice movement. In each of these studies, applications for vouchers exceeded the supply. In each case, vouchers were awarded by random lottery in order to give each student an equal chance at receiving a voucher. The lottery method was initially used in Milwaukee simply to distribute vouchers in a fair way, but luckily, the lottery creates a perfect opportunity for research. The random lottery effectively divides children into a control group (those children who applied for the voucher but did not win) and an experimental group (those children who applied for a voucher and received it). These two groups are essentially identical except that one group of children received a voucher and entered the choice program while the other group remained in the government run school system. Both group of parents, for example, demonstrate a high

2 The publicly funded Milwaukee Parental Choice Program was in fact sustained through privately funded efforts while enduring a challenge in the court, which ultimately upheld the constitutionality of the program.

3 Families with multiple children have typically been awarded multiple vouchers in the event that one child wins in order to allow siblings to attend school together.
level of motivation by applying for a voucher, showing a willingness to transfer their child in the hope of a better education. We can therefore confidently attribute differences in the performance of these two groups of students to participation in choice programs. Although researchers have found many benefits associated with school choice programs, the primary benefits identified are higher parental satisfaction with their child's school and higher academic achievement as measured by standardized test scores.

**Does choice lead to greater parental satisfaction?**

Customer satisfaction represents the most basic measuring stick: satisfied parents indicate effective schools. Researchers have surveyed both choice parents and those of control group parents in order to measure the effectiveness of choice programs. Choice parents consistently display greater satisfaction with the schools of their children, as detailed in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3: The Effect of School Choice on Parental Satisfaction in Control Group Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York - Peterson, Myers and Howell 1998</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;The percentage of parents ‘very satisfied’ with a private school was significantly higher for all of the following: location of the school, school safety, teaching, parental involvement, class size, school facility, student respect for teachers, teacher communication, extent to which child can observe religious traditions, parental support for the school, discipline, clarity of goals, staff teamwork, teaching, academic quality, the sports program and what is taught in school.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington D.C. - Wolf, Howell, Peterson 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Forty-six percent of the private school parents gave their school and ‘A’ as compared to just 15 percent of the public-school parents.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dayton, Ohio - Howell and Peterson 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Private-school parents are more enthusiastic about their schools than either public-school parents generally or those public-school parents who applied for a school voucher. When asked to give their school a grade from A to F, 47 percent of the private school students gave their school an ‘A’, as compared to 25 percent of the cross-section of public-school parents and 8 percent of the public-school parents who had applied for a voucher but did not receive one.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charlotte, Greene 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Parents were asked to assign their child’s school a letter grade, A through F. Nearly twice as many choice parents gave their child’s school an A (53%), compared to the public school parents (26%). Choice parents were also nearly twice as likely to report being “very satisfied” with virtually all aspects of their children’s school: location, safety, teaching quality, course content, class size, facilities, student respect for teachers, information on student progress, religious observance, parental support for school, discipline, clarity of school goals, teamwork among staff, teaching moral values, academic quality, and teacher respect for students.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greene (2000a) "A Survey of Voucher Results: Where We Are and What We Know" and Greene (2000b) "The Effect of School Choice: An Evaluation of the Charlotte Children’s Scholarship Fund Program."

Obviously, choice parents express far greater satisfaction with their children’s schools when compared with parents unable to exercise choice. Figure 8 below presents a combination of the overall satisfaction questions from the four control group studies.
discussed above. Given the chance to choose the school that they think best serves the needs of their children, parents display far greater satisfaction in every measurement of satisfaction. The results should hardly surprise us: after all, how happy would you be with your car, computer, haircut or anything else if you were not allowed to choose it? Choice programs have given the power to choose to low income parents who previously had little opportunity to shop around for the best education available.

**Figure 8: Percentage of Parents Highly Satisfied With Their School (Control Group Studies)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Choice School</th>
<th>Public School</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>60%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHOICE PROGRAMS AND STUDENT ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE**

Improved education represents the "holy-grail" for which all educational reformers profess to quest. Attempted government-school reforms have ranged from the silly (e.g. open classrooms) to the deeply controversial and possibly counterproductive- such as "New Math" and "Whole Language Reading". As the "reforms" piled up, government-school spending raced ahead. Figure 9 below presents United States Department of Education data tracking inflation adjusted spending per-pupil from 1919-1996.

**Figure 9: Real Public Spending Per Pupil (Constant 1996 Dollars)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>533</td>
<td>1007</td>
<td>1202</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>2547</td>
<td>4017</td>
<td>5098</td>
<td>6983</td>
<td>7371</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Unfortunately, despite decades of greatly increased spending, we have precious little to show for it in terms of academic performance. *National real spending per pupil increased from $3,500 to $7,000 per student between 1967 and 1994 while during the same period, average SAT scores dropped 50 points.* Tragically for American schoolchildren, the “crusade” of the government-school establishment to increase student learning has resembled the bumbling knights of Monty Python, and the grail is nowhere to be found. The recently completed Third International Math and Science Study found that the longer American children stay in school, the further they fall behind students in Asia and Europe. American high-school seniors ranked near the bottom (19th out of 21 countries studied), ahead of only Cyprus and South Africa, in these international rankings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4: Test Score Evaluations of Choice Programs (Control Group Studies)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milwaukee- Greene, Peterson, Du 1999</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 National Curve Equivalent (NCE) point benefit in reading and 11 NCE point benefit in math after 4 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Milwaukee- Rouse, 1998</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5 to 2.3 NCE point gain in math per year in the choice program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dayton- Howell and Peterson, 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American students gained 7 National Percentile Rank (NPR) points in math after one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New York-Peterson, Myers, Howell 1998</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice students in grades 2 through 5 benefited by about 2 NPR points in math and reading. Students in grades 4 and 5 gained 4 points in reading and 6 points in math after one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Washington D.C.- Wolf, Howell and Peterson 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American students in grades 2 through 5 gained 7 NPR points in reading, but students in grades 6 through 8 lost 8 NPR points in math after one year.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Charlotte- Greene 2000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving a scholarship to attend private school improves scores on standardized math tests by between 5.9 and 6.2 NPR points, and between 5.4 and 7.7 NPR points on standardized reading depending on the type of analysis performed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Greene (2000a) "A Survey of Voucher Results: Where We Are and What We Know" and Greene (2000b) "The Effect of School Choice: An Evaluation of the Charlotte Children’s Scholarship Fund Program."

Against this backdrop of repeated failure, the evaluations of school choice shine out like a beacon. *Every major evaluation of school choice effectiveness making use of the Control Group design has found significant academic gains for students participating in choice.* This includes test score evaluations in Milwaukee, Washington D.C., Dayton Ohio, and Charlotte conducted by scholars from Harvard, Princeton, Stanford, Georgetown, and the University of Texas. Several programs could not make use of the Control Group design because they did not use a lottery to distribute vouchers, but evaluations using alternate methodologies have found gains in these programs as well.
HELP TO THOSE WHO NEED IT MOST

These gains are all the more impressive when placed into proper context: the students making these gains are from low-income families who have already demonstrated as a group academic achievement far below the national average. Table 5 below presents statistics on the choice programs with control group studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic of Choice Students and Families</th>
<th>Family Income</th>
<th>Single Mother Family</th>
<th>Prior Test Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milwaukee</td>
<td>$10,860</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>31 NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$10,540</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td>27 NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.C.</td>
<td>$17,774</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>33 NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dayton</td>
<td>$17,681</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>26 NPR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>$23,449</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>Not Available</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The scholarship winners from each of these groups are from low-income families, growing up in single parent families much more often than not, and with very low pre-existing test scores. These programs, in short, are attempting to help the most difficult to educate students- the same sort of students that public schools have demonstrably failed to educate for decades. Figure 10 below, taken from the review of the Milwaukee choice program by Cecilia Rouse, shows the academic progress on standardized math exams for three groups of students- choice students, students who applied for but did not receive a voucher, and a sample of Milwaukee Public School Students.

A close examination of the trend lines in Figure 10 reveal that the choice students show choice students gaining on their math scores, while both of the other groups of low-income students suffer a steady decline in their math scores. *Rather than an aberration, these declines tragically represent the normal progress of students in urban school districts.* Tragically, it is common for children in urban school districts to fall behind national norms, falling further and further behind grade level. Not coincidentally, the dropout rates tend to be highest in urban school districts, as generations of students in government schools become academically frustrated, fall behind, and ultimately dropout of school.

---

4 NPR (national percentile rank) of the student choice group estimates the percentile rank the group average on standardized tests. The average score of the Dayton choice group, 26 NPR, indicates that 74 percent of students score higher than the Milwaukee choice group average.

This trend in urban schools has profound implications for racial inequality in the United States. Professor Lawrence Stedman from the State University of New York described the severe extent of educational inequality in the United States at a 1997 Brookings Institution conference:

"The most tragic evidence...is the lingering performance gaps among different racial and ethnic groups...Twelfth grade black students are performing at the level of middle school white students. These students are about to graduate, yet they lag four or more years behind in every area including math, science, writing, history, and geography. Latino seniors do somewhat better than 8th grade white students in math and writing but, in other areas, are also four years behind white 12th graders...Schools and society remain divided into two different worlds, one black, one white, separate and unequal."

The research is clear: academic progress displayed by choice students will greatly benefit students and society as a whole, and can help prevent the sort of gross inequalities described by Professor Stedman. The CEO/CSF programs working to help as many low-income families escape this vicious cycle as possible. Fortunately, research has confirmed the overwhelming promise of choice based reforms while aiding these children.

---

CHILDREN "LEFT BEHIND" IN GOVERNMENT SCHOOLS

Opponents of choice express concern about children “left behind” in government schools, and conjure dark visions of the poorest of the poor stuck in schools that no longer have enough money to educate them properly. Defenders of the education status-quo claim that choice programs will “drain public schools of badly needed funds” leading to the “destruction of public education.” Supporters of school choice believe that competition for students will also create powerful incentives for all schools to improve.

Figure 11: Student Participation in CEO Horizon 1998-2000

If the fears of opponents have any basis in reality, we should find evidence of such terrible outcomes in the Edgewood Independent School District (EISD) in San Antonio. The CEO Horizon Program has provided the option of a school voucher to almost the entire population of the Edgewood district starting in 1998, providing an empirical test of both positive and negative theories of the effect of choice on public schools.

The Horizon program is the only school choice program devoted to an entire school district. The program has no academic qualifying criteria, and is open to all permanent residents of EISD currently attending a public school (unless entering kindergarten). No lottery system was employed since all eligible students who apply have been provided with a voucher. Figure 11 above presents the participation in the Horizon program.

Enrollment in EISD declined from 14,142 students during the 1997-8 school year to 12,500 students in the 2000-2001 school year. Several factors impacted EISD enrollment during this period other than the Horizon program, including the relocation of a public housing project out of the district (costing the district 500 students), students otherwise moving into and out of the district, dropout rates, etc. After the announcement of the Horizon program, Edgewood became one of the few districts in Texas to accept

---

transfers under a public school choice law. Figure 12 below gives an impression of the size of the dropout problem in Edgewood. These data, taken during the period immediately before the advent of the Horizon program, tracks the size of the Class of 1997 from their freshman to their senior years. The senior class has declined by 54% from the freshman figure.  

In short, EISD enrollment fluctuations have many sources besides the Horizon program.

![Figure 12: Dropout Problem in EISD, 1993-1997, Source: TEA AEIS Reports](image)

RENAISSANCE OR DESTRUCTION IN EDGEWOOD?

How has EISD fared since the Horizon program began? Some claim that the program has harmed the district. For instance, the Dallas Morning News ran the following quote from Edgewood Superintendent Noe Sauceda "We estimate the CEO program has cost the district $5 million over the past few years...with that kind of decrease, we can't attract and retain quality staff." It must be noted, however, that while Edgewood receives fewer funds, it also has fewer students to educate as a result of the Horizon program, and loses none of the local funding despite enrollment fluctuations. Average teacher pay was $4994 per year higher in 1999-2000 than in 1997-8, and the average number of teachers per pupil fell from 14.8 to 13.6 during this same period.

---

8 We cannot be certain that dropouts account for all of this decline since students moving into and out of the district, transferring to other schools, etc. would certainly impact the figures. The decline in enrollment during the same period between 2nd and 5th grade, however, was only 8.5%. Students dropping out of high school certainly accounts for the majority of the more than six-fold increase in the enrollment decline rates between these two groups of students.

Total expenditures by the district have increased since the advent of the Horizon program. Rather than decreasing, the Edgewood district has continued to spend more money than in the previous year since the advent of the Horizon program, despite a substantially lower enrollment. Figure 14 shows that total Edgewood spending increased after the advent of Horizon, and as seen in Figure 15 below, spending per pupil increased substantially.

Total district expenditure in 1997-98 was $85,695,522 (with 14,142 students) but was $88,505,665 in the 1999-2000-school year, with 12,982 students enrolled.\(^\text{10}\) Best of all, the Texas Education Agency awarded EISD with a “Recognized” status in the 2000 accountability rankings for the first time, due to improvements in passing rates on the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) tests.

\(^{10}\) The district’s fund balance has declined from $25,860,587 in 1997-98 to $7,307,310 in 1999-2000. This is a drawing down far greater than the loss that the Edgewood Superintendent claimed in the Dallas Morning News as being associated with the Horizon program.
In short, Edgewood has improved their standardized test scores, have fewer pupils per teacher, and have higher teacher salaries than before the Horizon program created
competition for students. Predictions of doom seem completely fanciful when the data are examined closely. Further adjustments and challenges surely lie ahead for the district, but as of now, the district seems to be in the early stages of a renaissance, rather than sliding down the slippery slope to destruction.
APPENDIX A: PRIVATE VOUCHER PROGRAM CONTACT INFORMATION

ALABAMA
Children's Scholarship Fund
Alabama
Birmingham & Fairfield
Lesley Searcy, Executive Director
Tonya Jones, Program Administrator
P.O. Box 590073
Birmingham, AL 35259
205-877-3385 Fax 205-877-3387
E-mail: lesleysearcy@aol.com

ARIZONA
MESA
Arizona Scholarship Fund
ChamBria Henderson, Executive Director
P.O. Box 2576
Mesa, AZ 85214-2576
480-497-4564 Fax: 480-497-4737
e-mail: AZScholarships@iuno.com
Web-site: www.AZscholarships.org

PHOENIX
Arizona School Choice Trust (statewide)
Jack McVaugh, President
Eileen Klein, Executive Director
John David Smillie, Program Administrator
3737 E. Broadway Road
Phoenix, AZ 85040-2966
602-454-1360 Fax 602-454-1362
E-mail: info@ascl.org
Website: www.ascl.org

ARKANSAS
Children's Scholarship Fund – Arkansas (statewide)
Lawrence Gunnells, Executive Director
Libby Davis, Program Administrator
P.O. Box 3060
Little Rock, AR 72203
501-907-0044 Fax 501-907-0047
e-mail: libbydavis@alltel.net

CALIFORNIA
LOS ANGELES
Children’s Scholarship Fund LA
Julia MacInnes, Director
1650 Ximeno Ave. #245
Long Beach, CA 90804
562-861-9250
FAX 562-861-9240
e-mail: jmachnnes@thegrid.net
Web-site: scholarshipfund.org

OAKLAND
CEO Oakland
Nancy Berg, Program Director
P.O. Box 21456
Oakland, CA 94614
510-453-7971 Fax 510-339-6770

OAKLAND
Independent Scholarship Fund
Michelle Moore, ISF Director
100 Swan Way
Oakland, CA 94621-1428
510-632-1966 Fax 510-568-6040
e-mail: scholarships@independent.org
Web site: www.independent.org

SAN FRANCISCO
The BASIC Fund
LaVois Hooks, Executive Director
268 Bush Street, #2717
San Francisco, CA 94104
415-986-7221 Fax: 415-986-5358

SAN FRANCISCO
The Guardsmen Scholarship Fund
Mark Harris, Executive Director
P.O. Box 20330
San Francisco, CA 94129-0330
415-561-2700 FAX 415-561-2966

COLORADO
COLORADO SPRINGS
Parents Challenge
Evelyn Taylor, Program Administrator
2 N. Cascade Ave., Suite 1280
Colorado Springs, CO 80903
719-633-4500 Fax: 719-633-6258

DENVER
ACE
Kathy Porter Program Administrator
511 16th Street, Suite 300
Denver, CO 80209
303-573-1603 Fax 303-573-7340
www.GotToSchool.org
E-mail: info@gottoschool.com

DENVER
Educational Options for Children
Sheryl Glaser, Program Manager
PMB 226
11757 West Ken Caryl Ave, # F
Littleton, CO 80127-3719
720-981-2557 Fax: 303-948-5923

CONNECTICUT
CEO Connecticut
Bridgeport, Hartford New Haven
Bill Heinrichs, Executive Director
97 Crescent Street
Hartford, CT 06106
860-297-4254 Fax 860-987-6218
e-mail: wheinrichs@juno.com

FLORIDA
MIAMI
Miami Inner City Angels
Michael Carriere, President
Anne DeLa Pena, Executive Director
7001 SW 97th Ave.
Miami, FL 33173
305-275-1412 Fax 305-275-1454
E-mail: mica@amedex.com

MIAMI
Florida Child (Statewide)
Tina Dupree, Director
Steve Green, Assistant Director
1000 Brickell Ave., Suite 900
Miami, FL 33131
305-702-5579 Fax 305-702-5580
E-mail: info@floridachild.org
Web www.floridachild.org

ORLANDO
Children First Central Florida
Sally Simmons, Executive Director
1101 N. Lake Destiny Rd., Suite 225
Maitland, FL 32751
407-629-8787 Fax 407-629-1319

TAMPA
Children Scholarship Fund Tampa Bay
Michele L. Cutler, Executive Director
1101 N. Ashley Dr., Suite 500
Tampa, FL 33602
813-222-8001 Fax 813-222-8001
e-mail: ceocenfla@aol.com
GEORGIA

ATLANTA
Georgia Community Foundation, Inc.
James P. Kelly, III, Executive Director
P.O. Box 2054
Alpharetta, GA 30023
770-521-0523 Fax 770-901-5815
e-mail: jkelligvii@atol.com

ATLANTA
CSF Atlanta
Faith Sweeney, Executive Director
3110 Canal St.
New Orleans, LA 70119
504-821-5060 Fax 504-821-5271

SAVANNAH
Savannah Foundation
Maggie Keenan, Administrator
426 Bull St.
Savannah, GA 31401
912-238-3266 Fax 912-231-8062

ILLINOIS

CHICAGO
Children's Scholarship Fund
Chicago
Gael Byrnes, Executive Director
55 West Superior, Suite 3N
Chicago, IL 60610
312-960-2025 Fax 312-377-1837
E-mail gbymes@scholarshipfund.org

CHICAGO
The FOCUS Fund
Patrick Keleher, President
Joan Ferdinand, Operations V.P.
Georgetown Square, 522 4th St.
Wilmette, IL 60091-2523
e-mail: TEACH522@aol.com

INDIANA

FT. WAYNE
Guardian Angel Society
William Dotterweich
2010 Prestwick Lane
R. Wayne, IN 46814
219-625-3122

GARY
Northwest Indiana Children's Scholarship Fund
Kim Pryzybyszki, Executive Director
9202 Broadway
Merrillville, IN 46410
219-769-9922 Fax 219-738-9034
E-mail: kprzyzby@dgcary.org

INDIANAPOLIS
Educational CHOICE Charitable Trust
Tim Ehrgott, Executive Director
Lori Rikard, Program Administrator
7440 Woodland Drive
Indianapolis, IN 46278-1719
317-293-7800 Fax 317-293-0603
e-mail: tpehrgott@goldennug.com

IOWA

DES MOINES
Christian Scholarship Foundation
Sherry Vanderploeg, Program Administrator
P.O. Box 522
Altoona, IA 50009
515-264-0111 fax 515-264-0222

KENTUCKY

LOUISVILLE
School CHOICE Scholarships, Inc.
Diane Cowne, Executive Director
P.O. Box 221546
Louisville, KY 40252-1546
502-254-7274 Fax 502-245-4792
e-mail diane@pattco.net

LOUISIANA

BATON ROUGE
CSF Baton Rouge
Baton Rouge Boys and Girls Club
461 Westmoreland Drive
Baton Rouge, LA 70806
225-387-6840 Fax 225-387-6840

NEW ORLEANS
CSF New Orleans
Faith Sweeney, Executive Director
3110 Canal St.
New Orleans, LA 70119
504-821-5060 Fax 504-821-5271

MAINE

BANGOR
Maine Children's Scholarship Fund
Rene Davis, Program Director
P.O. Box 913
Bangor, ME 04402
207-946-2684 Fax 207-947-2119
e-mail: rene@adadvisors.com
Web-site: mecs.org

MARYLAND

BALTIMORE
CSF Baltimore
Suzanna Duvall
2604 Sisson St., 3rd Floor
Baltimore, MD 21211
410-243-2510 Fax 410-243-8149
web: www.balmer.com/CSFBaltimore

MASSACHUSETTS

BOSTON
Coalition for Parental Choice in Education
Emily Jones, P.O. Box 846
Boston, MA 02103-0846
617-951-6883 Fax: 617-951-1295
E-mail: maschoolchoice@yahoo.com
www.massparentschoice.org

BOSTON
CSF Midwest/ Northeast
Gael Byrnes, Executive Director
55 West Superior, Suite 3N
Chicago, IL 60610
312-960-2025 Fax 312-377-1837
E-mail gbymes@scholarshipfund.org

MICHIGAN

BATTLE CREEK
The Educational Choice Project
Kimberly Holley, Administrator
34 W. Jackson, One River Walk Center
Battle Creek, MI 49017-3505
616-962-2181 Fax 616-962-2182
RALEIGH-DURHAM, WINSTON-SALEM, FAYETTEVILLE, GREENSBORO
Carolina Educational Opportunity Fund
Vernon Robinson, Executive Director
P.O. Box 272
Winston-Salem, NC 27102
336-768-3567 Fax 336-765-7655
 e-mail: vrobinson@ceto.net

OHIO
CINCINNATI
Children’s Scholarship Fund Cincinnati
Lisa Claytor, Administrator
33 West Walnut
Oxford, OH 45056
513-891-3279 Fax 513-221-9192

COLUMBUS
Children First Columbus
Thomas Needles, Founder
Alan Endicott
66 East Lynn St.
Columbus, OH 43215
614-470-2442 Fax 614-221-9192

DAYTON
Parents Advancing Choice in Education
T. J. Wallace, Executive Director
Mary Lynn Naughton, Program Adm.
6430 Sand Lake Rd.
Dayton, OH 45414
937-264-4800 Fax 937-264-4805
 e-mail: twallace@erinet.com

LIMA
Parents of Lima Advancing Choice in Education (PLACE)
Susie Crabtree, Program Administrator
Lima Community Foundation
P.O. Box 1086
Lima, OH 45802-1086
419-221-5928 Fax: 419/221-2930

OREGON
PORTLAND
CSF Portland
Julie Riggs, Executive Director
813 SW Alder, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97224
503-242-0900 Ext. 15 Fax 503-242-3822

PENNESYLVANIA
ALTOONA/ JOHNSTOWN
Misciagna Challenge Scholarship Program
Joel Peppetti, Program Coordinator
726 Ben Franklin Hwy.
Ebensburg, PA 15931
814-833-3200 Fax: 814-833-4844

ERIE
School Choice Scholarship Program
Bea Blenner, Program Director
2171 West 36th Street
Erie, PA 16508-1925
814-833-3200 Fax: 814-833-4844

LEHIGH VALLEY
CEO America, Lehigh Valley
Sharon Recchio, Executive Director
33 South Seventh Street, Suite 250
Allentown, PA 18101
610-776-6740 FAX 610-776-8741
 e-mail: sgr.ceo@juno.com

PHILADELPHIA
CSF Philadelphia
Cathy McLaughlin, Executive Director
Matt White, Administrator
P.O. Box 1193 (zip 19105)
718 Arch St., Suite 100 South Philadelphia, PA 19106
215-925-4321 Fax 215-925-4342

SOUTH CAROLINA
COLUMBIA
PACE Foundation
1325 Pendleton Street
Columbia, SC 29201
803-254-1201 Fax 803-779-4953

TENNESSEE
CHATTANOOGA
CSF Chattanooga
Priscilla Caine, President
Gail Triton, Dir.
Operation/Scholarship Program
102 Walnut Street
Chattanooga, TN 37403
423-756-0410 Ext. 113 Fax 423-756-8250
 e-mail: priscilla@resercesfoundation.org
 web-site: www.childrenfirsttn.org

KNOXVILLE
CEO Knoxville
Mike McClamroch, President
507 S. Gay Street, Suite 500
Knoxville, TN 37902
865-546-0550

MEMPHIS
Memphis Opportunity Scholarship Trust
Trent Williamson, Executive Director
850 Ridge Lake Blvd., Suite 220
Memphis, TN 38120
901-767-7005 Fax 901-818-5260
 e-mail: trentwilliamson@rfsotel.com

TEXAS
AUSTIN
CEO Austin
Jane Kilgore, Administrator
111 Congress, Suite 3000
Austin, TX 78701
512-472-0153 Fax 512-310-1688
 e-mail: Austinaceo@aol.com
 web-site: ceoaustin.org

DALLAS
Children’s Education Fund
Patricia Boyer, Executive Director
Fran Sauls, Administrator
P.O. Box 225748
Dallas, TX 75214
972-298-1811 Fax 972-298-6369
 e-mail: Today@TodayFoundation.org
 web: www.TodayFoundation.org
FORT WORTH
CSF Fort Worth
Patty Myers, Executive Director
Janet Carter, Program Director
316 Bailey Ave., Suite 110
Fort Worth, TX 76107
817-332-8550 Fax 817-332-8825
e-mail: Starssponsorship@mailcity.com

HOUSTON
Houston CEO Foundation
Herb Butrum, Executive Director
Laura Schlameus, Program Director
952 Echo Lane, Suite 350
Houston, TX 77024
713-722-8555 Fax 713-722-7442
web: www.hem.org/ceo

MIDLAND
CEO Midland
Andrea Catania, Chairman
300 Moss
Midland, TX 79705
915-697-5666 Fax 915-683-1988

SAN ANTONIO
CEO San Antonio/CEO Horizon
Robert Aguirre, Managing Director
Teresa Treat, Program Director
8122 Datapoint Dr., Suite 804
San Antonio, TX 78229
210-614-0037 Fax 210-614-5730
e-mail: TFTreat@aol.com

TYLER
Children's Education Fund
c/o Fourth Partner Fund Suite 205
601 Shelly Drive
Tyler, TX 75701-1903-509-1771
FAX 903-509-1909

UTAH
SALT LAKE CITY
Children First Utah (statewide)
David Salisbury, Executive Director
11778 South Election Rd, Suite 240
Draper, UT 84020
801-209-8406 Fax: 801-569-8700
e-mail: info@childrenfirstutah.org
web: http://childrenfirstutah.org

VERMONT
Vermont S.O.S Fund (statewide)
Ruth Stokes, Executive Director
P.O. Box 232
Williston, VT 05495
802-879-7460 FAX: 802-879-2550

VIRGINIA
RICHMOND
Children First Virginia
Judy Baucom, Program Director
9020 Stony Point Parkway, Suite 185
Richmond, VA 23235
(804)-327-9504 Fax: 804-327-9505

WASHINGTON
SEATTLE - TACOMA
CSF Seattle-Tacoma
Bob Hurtbut, Administrator
1401 E. Jefferson, Suite 300
Seattle, WA 98122
206-329-7305 Fax 206-329-7415

WASHINGTO, DC
Washington Scholarship Fund
Danny LaBry, Executive Director
Ethel Morgan, Program Administrator
1133 15th St., NW, Suite 550
Washington, DC 20005
202-293-5560 Fax 202-293-7893
e-mail: dlabry@wsf-dc.org
web: www.wsf-dc.org

Student/Sponsor Partnership Programs

DETOIR, MI
Student Mentor Partners
Tim Hudson, Director
19360 Harper Ave.
Harper Woods, MI 48225
313-664-6742

NEWARK, NJ
Student Partner Alliance
Ms. Dorothy J. Knauer, Administrator
25 James Street
Newark, NJ 07102
973-297-0207
NEW YORK CITY, NY
Student Sponsor Partnership Program
Jane Martinez, Executive Director
420 Lexington Ave, 9th Floor
New York, NY 10019
212-986-9575 Fax: 212-986-9570

PROVIDENCE, RI
Rhode Islanders Sponsoring Education (RISE)
Kristin Moran, Director
80 8th Street
Providence, RI 02906
401-421-2010

FORT WORTH, TX
STAR Sponsorship Program, Inc.
Patty Myers, Executive Director
Janet Carter, Program Administrator
316 Bailey Ave., Suite 110
Fort Worth, TX 76107
817-332-8550 Fax 817-332-8825
APPENDIX B: ARIZONA STUDENT TUITION ORGANIZATIONS

Arizona Adventist Scholarships, Inc.
P.O. Box 12340
Scottsdale, AZ 85267-2340
Contact: Rachel Terwillegar
Ph. (480) 991-6777
Fax (480) 991-4833
FID# 86-0131620

Arizona Christian School Tuition Organization, Inc.
East Valley Christian School Tuition Organization, Inc.
P. O. Box 25949
Tempe, AZ 85285
Steve Yarborough - Executive Director
One W. Elliott Rd.
Suite 109
Tempe, AZ 85284
Ph. (480) 820-0403
Fax (480) 820-2027
Web http://www.acsto.com/
FID #86-0931047

Arizona Episcopal Schools Foundation
P.O. Box 17135
Suit 5-171
Phoenix, AZ 85011
Dawn Craft - Director
Ph. (602) 265-3686
Fax (602) 274-5032
FID #86-0133389

Arizona Independent Schools Scholarship Foundation (formerly St. Gregory/Green Fields Scholarship Foundation)
3231 N. Craycroft Rd.
Tucson, AZ 85712
Carol Zimmerman - Secretary
Ph. (520) 327-6395

Arizona Native Scholaristic Enrichment and Resources (ANSER)
7617 E. Verde Ln.
Scottsdale, AZ 85251
Contact: Vernon Massayesva
Ph. (480) 421-2377
Fax (480) 675-0870
Web http://w3.arizona.edu/~anser/anser.htm
FID #86-0928681

Arizona Private Education Scholarship Fund, Inc.
14550 N. Frank Lloyd Wright Blvd.
Suite 100
Scottsdale, AZ 85260
Contact: Mark Moerkerke
Ph. (480) 699-8911
Fax (480) 699-8913
Web http://www.apesf.org

Arizona Scholarship Fund
P. O. Box 2576
Mesa, AZ 85214-2576
Contact: ChamBria Henderson
Ph (480) 497-4564
Fax (480) 497-4737
e-mail ChamBria@azscholarships.org
Web http://www.azscholarships.org

Arizona Scholarships & Grants Organization (ASGO)- see Giving Kids The Credit
P.O. Box 37491
Phoenix, AZ 85069-7491
Doug Tannous, Chairman
Ph. (602) 944-2254
Fax (602) 861-6220
e-mail chairman@givingkidsthecredit.org
Web http://www.givingkidsthecredit.org

Arizona School Choice Trust
3737 E. Broadway Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85040-2966
Illene Klien, Executive Director
Ph. (602) 956-1360
Fax (602) 956-1362
e-mail info@asct.org
Web http://www.asct.org
FID# 86-0904575

Brophy Community Foundation
4701 N. Central Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85012-1787
Dawn Kennedy - Executive Director
Ph. (602) 264-5291 ext.500
Fax (602) 266-3642
e-mail dkennedy@brophyprep.org
Web http://www.brophyfoundation.org/
Catholic Tuition Organization of the Diocese of Phoenix
400 E. Monroe St.
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2336
Contact: Jennifer Kraus - Program Coordinator
Ph. (602) 744-6345
Fax (602) 258-3425
e-mail ctodp@diocesephoenix.org
Web http://www.ctodp.org

Catholic Tuition Support Organization of the Diocese of Tucson
P.O. Box 31
Tucson, AZ 85702
Contact: Gracie or Rosario
Ph. (520) 792-3410
Fax (520) 792-1179
FID #86-0958969

Chabad Tuition Organization
C/o Evelyn R. Budd
Budd Accounting & Tax Services, Inc.
1530 W. Indian School Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85015
Ph. (602) 241-0444
Fax (602) 241-0524
FID #86-0949590

Chedar Scholarship Organization, Inc.
C/o Ms. Joyce Geyser
"Coppersmith, Gordon, Schermer, Owen & Nelson"
2633 E. Indian School Rd.
Suite 300
Phoenix, AZ 85018
Contact: Odette or Shaya Schimel
Ph. (602) 234-5161
FID #86-0953552

Christ Lutheran School Foundation
3901 E. Indian School Rd.
Phoenix, AZ 85018
Contact: Gregory E. Harman
Ph. (602) 957-7010

Christian Scholarship Fund
P.O. Box 31101
Tucson, AZ 85751-1101

Educare
P.O. Box 1709
Scottsdale, AZ 85252
Contact: John J. Jakubczyk
Ph. (602) 980-2680
FID #86-0967764

Florence Englehardt / Pappas Scholarship Foundation
617 N. 2nd Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85003
Arthur P. Parker - Executive Director
Ph. (602) 957-1234
Fax (602) 234-2975

Foundation for Montessori Scholarships
9201 N. 7th Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85021
Contact: Richard C. Mayo
Ph. (602) 870-0004
Fax (602) 678-5320
FID #86-0973909

High Education for Lutherans Program (HELP) Foundation, Inc.
P.O. Box 48354
Phoenix, AZ 85075-8354
Contact: Vernon Caulk
4913 West Eva Street
Glendale, AZ 85302-3520

Institute for Better Education
8230 E. Broadway Rd.
Suite W-8
Tucson, AZ 85710
Contact: Ruth Helm - Treasurer
Ph. (520) 546-0099

Jewish Community Day School Scholarship Fund
32 W. Coolidge
Suite 200
Phoenix, AZ 85013
Contact: Fred Zeidman
Ph. (602) 274-1800 ext. 120
Fax (602) 266-7875

Patagonia Scholarship Fund, Inc.
P.O. Box 172
Patagonia, AZ 85624
Lutheran Education Foundation, Inc.
2001 W. Camelback Rd.
Suite 285
Phoenix, AZ 85015
Rev. Norman Walter - Chairperson
Ph. (602) 864-9197
Fax (602) 864-9209
e-mail nahrwold@ionet.net
Web http://www.azneighbors.com/739/
MemberList.wsi

Maranath Christian Co-Op Tuition Fund
7101 N. 55th Dr.
Glendale, AZ 85301
Contact: Galen Norman
Ph. (623) 937-7866
Fax (623) 934-3971
FID# 86-0647093

Montessori School Tuition Organization
745 S. Extension
Mesa, AZ 85210
Robert S. Nichols - Treasurer
Ph. (480) 962-1432

Northern Arizona Christian School Scholarship Fund
P.O. Box 30762
Flagstaff, AZ 86003-0762
Contact: Dr. Lawrence C. Mohrweis
Ph. (520) 523-9580 / (520) 526-5918
Fax (520) 779-0493
FID # 86-0455630

The Orme Primavera Schools Foundation
HC 63, Box 3040
Mayer, AZ 86333
Contact: Critt Butler
Ph. (520) 632-7601 ext.2232
Fax (520) 632-7605
e-mail cbutler@orme.k12.az.us

V.V.B.C. Christian Education Fund
4222 E. Lincoln Dr.
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253-3949
Contact: Pat Lawrence
Ph. (602) 765-2226
Fax (602) 765-2227
FID #86-0973378

Prescott Christian School Scholarship Foundation
P.O. Box 10502
Prescott, AZ 86304
Bill Warren - President
Bob Ancha - Vice President
Ph. (520) 771-2018
Fax (520) 778-7084
FID # 86-0947958

School Tuition Association of Yuma, Inc.
P.O. Box 515
Yuma, AZ 85364
Contact: Lloyd H. Sunderman
Ph. (520) 782-5786
Fax (520) 783-8251

Schools With Heart Foundation
4027 E. Lincoln Dr.
Paradise Valley, AZ 85253
Contact: Pamela Edberg-Pike
Ph. (602) 274-0071
FID #86-0967975

Southern Arizona Foundation for Education
6601 E. Paseo San Ciro
Tucson, AZ 85710
Contact: Warren Matthias
Ph. (520) 296-1537
FID# 86-0939957

TesseracT Tuition Organization
Debra Taylor Johnson, CPA
Rick Kidder, Scholarship Committee
3820 E. Ray Rd. #2
Phoenix, AZ 85044
Ph. (480) 706-2500
Fax (480) 704-0966
FID# 86-0940349
Walter T. Beamis Scholarship Foundation
PMB 268
5025 N. Central Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85012-1520
Contact: Rick Erickson
Ph. (602) 264-2725
FID# 86-0942329
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