

The Business Agenda for School Reform: A Parallel Universe

By Denise Gelberg

After fourteen years of elementary school teaching I took a leave from the classroom to pursue my doctorate at Cornell University. It was during my graduate studies that I became interested in what seemed to be a surprising number of business leaders weighing in on the state of education in our country. This seeming curiosity eventually led me to focus my doctoral research and a subsequent book on the role played by business in education reform.¹ What I found in my research was that business leaders' interest in education was not new. In fact, the business community has had significant influence on the public schools since the early 20th century. It was during

Denise Gelberg retired from classroom teaching in June 2006. She is currently a visiting fellow at Cornell University, Ithaca, New York. She sits on the board of directors of the Teacher Education Accreditation Council.

the early 1900s that urban school organizations were restructured and centralized to mimic the business corporation. At that time business leaders found fault with the schools, stating that they were run inefficiently and produced youngsters who were not ready to be workers in our newly industrialized economy.

The contemporary period is no different. Criticism of the public schools has been unrelenting since *A Nation at Risk* was published in 1983. From that pivotal moment to the present the business community has played a crucial role in setting the parameters of the critique of our schools and shaping the reform

The Business Agenda for School Reform

agendas that have been proposed and implemented. As was true throughout the 20th century, the stated impetus for the business community's involvement in the education establishment has been securing America's preeminence in an era of fierce international economic competition.

I come to this study of the influence of business on schools from a unique vantage point. Both a researcher and writer on education, as well an "in the trenches" public school teacher of young children for nearly thirty years, the continued influence of business on school reform fascinates me. I have found the criticisms of student achievement leveled by the business community to reveal tremendous ignorance of the complexity of schools, of the challenges facing children and teachers everyday in classes across the nation, of the nature of the work of teaching and learning. Many of the reform proposals put forth as the "best new thing," often proposed or supported by the business sector and with little or no teacher input, have been either irrelevant or counterproductive to the work that needs to be done with the flesh and blood children in my classroom. It is as though the people creating these proposals are living and working in a parallel universe that never intersects with the realities of my work in education. And yet it is these very criticisms and policy recommendations that dominate the discussion on education reform today. It is my belief that this is a mistake; an expensive and time-consuming diversion from the important work of making our schools better and helping children get the most from what schools have to offer.² What follows is a description of the effects of the business community's significant and well orchestrated efforts to alter education in our country today, and how these efforts influence life in school for teachers and students.

The Acceptance of the Assumption That Schools Ought To Meet Employers' Demands for "Work-Ready" New Hires

It has become an almost unquestioned assumption that public education must be restructured to produce students who are better prepared to begin their working lives in a period of intense global competition. For most school leaders the question is not, "Should we do this?" but rather, "How should we do this?" Of course, one could counter that prior to the 20th century all such training was done by employers through apprenticeship programs and that it is an employer's responsibility to train new employees in the acquisition of the requisite skills for their working lives. One could also argue that there are many competing goals of education, e.g., creating a thoughtful, responsible citizenry that can actively participate in a democracy. However, the goal of workplace or college readiness has taken preeminence, virtually crowding out discussion of competing purposes of education. Art and music education are being neglected in order to focus on math, science, and literacy instruction—mainstays of high-stakes testing, as well as the promised solution to American economic competitiveness.

School chiefs throughout the nation hear the oft-stated complaint about the

poor quality of new hires.³ And they understand that business leaders can be powerful allies. Given this reality, school superintendents often enter into partnerships with the private sector to realize the business community's agenda for school reform. Generally far removed from children and classrooms, central office administrators are often ill-equipped to recognize that bowing to business's demands to get students "work ready" may not be synonymous with providing the best educational experience for their students.

Philanthropy Advances the Business Community's Reform Agenda While Improving Its Image and Standing

Philanthropy is often seen as a win-win scenario by business and school leaders. Given tight budgets, schools are always in need of more funding for essential services. Property taxes, the typical source of funding for public schools, cannot be significantly raised without political fall-out. School leaders face tight budgets at the very same time that they are being called on to deliver more and better educational services. As Paul Vallas, chief executive of the Philadelphia schools, has said,

My approach is Leave No Dollar Behind... There are tremendous needs in this system where 85 percent of the kids are below poverty level. I'm not uncomfortable with corporations giving us money and getting their names on things. As long as it's not inappropriate, I don't see any downside.⁴

Corporations see the upside of giving their names and logos positive exposure as well as burnishing their images as responsible corporate citizens.

Through its generous giving corporations and their foundations not only get their logos and names emblazoned on school facilities. They can also have a say in shaping school policy. In a 2005 meeting organized by the Boston group, Jobs for the Future, corporate foundations from Citigroup, Ford Motor, Johnson and Johnson, as well as the American Enterprise Institute were encouraged to leverage the time and money they give to K-12 education so that high school students will have improved math, science, and reasoning skills. The point of the meeting was to discuss how business philanthropy from a wide range of sources can be better coordinated to meet its ultimate aim of a more highly skilled workforce.⁵

What is curious about these generous efforts on the part of corporations and foundations is they rarely—if ever—make an appearance in the day-to-day lives of students. Buildings, reform proposals, and pre-packaged curricula—yes; rolling up sleeves and making a positive difference in a student's life, well, that is rarely mentioned. I have taught many youngsters who would have benefited greatly from having had a mentor—someone who could have been their advocate and friend; a person who could have shown them some of the opportunities available for hard-working, smart, educated kids in this country. Middle and upper class children get this as a matter of course through their family and friends. Kids from working class and poor families rarely do—and could benefit enormously from having a commit-

The Business Agenda for School Reform

ted mentor who could help with homework and personal problems; someone who could take them to the zoo or on a college tour. Yet it is the rare exception that corporate philanthropy extends to giving their employees released time to help a youngster who could benefit from their care, concern, and knowledge of how systems work in this country—from getting into elective classes in their high school to filling out college applications.

The Importation of Business Management Systems, with an Emphasis on Data Collection and Analysis

In October 2005 the U.S. Chamber of Commerce sponsored a three-day meeting to mark the first public gathering of the Business Education Network. The Network's aim is to build partnerships between business and education as a way of improving American competitiveness. Many ideas were thrashed out from redesigning high schools to improving school leadership. But a unifying goal was the need to improve the collection and dissemination of education data. As Thomas Luce, assistant secretary of the U.S. Department of Education, put it, "You cannot run your businesses without data."⁶

Data collection and analysis is central to the latest management theories used by the business sector over the last three decades. The *total quality management* (TQM) movement, which started in the 1980s in industry, was imported into the schools shortly thereafter.⁷ *Continuous improvement* (CI) is another management theory that found its way to the schools in recent years. *Congruence* is yet another data-driven management system. All of these management theories focus on goal setting, implementation planning, and the collection of data in order to analyze organizational effectiveness and make improvements in the organization's performance.⁸

One of the effects of the importation of TQM into the schools was a push for site-based management in the 1990s. The theory behind site-based management was that people closest to the delivery of educational services to customers, i.e., students, should be empowered to make decisions affecting how those services are delivered. However, in its implementation site-based management has often been an empty exercise because power has not devolved from central office. One stark example of this occurred in my school district. The staff of a neighborhood elementary school—part of the Coalition of Essential Schools—wanted to replace the school district's pages-long checklist for reporting student progress to parents. They preferred writing a narrative and meeting with the parents and the student to confer over the child's progress. The school's site-based council approved the new reporting technique, but the superintendent of schools insisted that they use the district's reporting system. Upon appeal to the New York State Commission of Education, the site-based council lost. Although the Commissioner's regulations mandated site-based councils in each district, the district bureaucracy did not have to relinquish any meaningful power to the local school communities.

As a classroom teacher the current emphasis on data-driven management is

intriguing. On the one hand, every teacher worth her salt will assess her students frequently—in a variety of ways—analyze the results, and have that analysis inform her decision making about how to proceed with instruction. However, the way in which “data driven management” is often implemented in schools is for school boards, district managers, and school staffs to look at the scores from the previous year’s high stakes tests looking for problematic cells in the data. Because these tests usually do not compare a single child’s progress from year to year—but rather focus on performance of an entire class—the annual test scores tell little about how effective instruction has been for any given child being tested. And the same teaching team can get vastly different results from year to year depending on the characteristics of the group being tested. The results of these different cohorts’ test scores are reported in the newspaper with virtually no analysis or explanation. When scores drop the public can only assume that the previously successful school has lapsed into both sloth and ineptitude.

Data analysis and the goal of continuous improvement have important roles to play in education; long before TQM, both characterized every good teacher and principal’s practice. However, the manner in which aggregated data is analyzed in today’s high stakes environment rarely leads to continuous improvement in terms of designing thoughtful instructional strategies that work for students. As Dennis Shirley and Andy Hargreaves put it, No Child Left Behind’s mandate allows,

teachers little time to respond to the figures in front of them. They find themselves instead scrambling to apply instant solutions to all students in the problematic cells—extra test-prep, a new prescribed program. . . . There are few considered, professional judgments here, just simplistic solutions driven by scores and the political pressures behind them.⁹

Mandatory High-Stakes Testing across the Nation, Serving the Dual Purpose of (1) Imposing “One Size Fits All” Standards for Children and (2) Opening Rich, New Markets to Business

It has become apparent that minorities as a proportion of the American populace is growing. This has implications for our workforce. Charles Kolb of the Committee for Economic Development puts it this way:

As our need for educated workers grows, the American workforce is going to come increasingly from the ethnic groups that have been least well served at all levels of American education. By 2020, some 30% of our working-age population will be African American or Hispanic, nearly doubling the percentage in 1980. And for these students the (education) pipeline isn’t leaking; it is gushing.¹⁰

For a very long time, schools have had limited success in educating children from poor and minority families.¹¹ Due to demographic changes in our country, this is no longer seen as something the economy can tolerate. The frequently-stated belief by the business community is that the poor performance of kids from poor families

The Business Agenda for School Reform

is caused by a lack of effort or rigor on the part of public schools. They are said to have a “monopoly” and, therefore, do not see the need to work hard to teach all students. The argument goes that by setting the bar high with tough curricular standards, and punishing schools that do not meet that bar, public school personnel will work harder, make the kids work harder, leading to higher student achievement. These assumptions underpin the No Child Left Behind legislation—that ostensibly aims to close the achievement gap between minority and majority children. It is these same assumptions that have taken control over much of the daily lives of our teachers and students as “test-prep” rules the day.

NCLB has been a bonanza for vendors to the \$732 billion education market.¹² Standardized tests have been formulated and sold. Test preparation materials have been marketed. Commercially developed educational programs that promise to increase test scores if used by an entire school district in the prescribed manner have been purchased by school districts all across the country. Integrating technology into systems of assessment and data management and analysis has been yet another market that the private sector has cultivated. Finally, “supplemental education services,” i.e., tutoring, \$620 million of which was funded in 2006 by NCLB, is the fastest growing segment of the pre-collegiate market.¹³

While NCLB has been a financial bonanza for vendors, it has been less of a bonanza for teachers and students. NCLB laudably aims at erasing the achievement gap between poor and rich, black and white kids. Yet, it ignores the hurdles so many of our youngsters have to jump over everyday in their lives—and that significantly contribute to the achievement gap it aims to close. The children who do not do well on these high-stakes tests often come from families that are suffering under the weight of a host of stressors and social pathologies: low wage or under-employment, drug addiction and alcohol abuse, involvement with the criminal justice system, and the myriad hardships associated with poverty. *Whether deliberate or inadvertent, the fact that so little attention is paid by our business community and policy makers to this reality dooms the efficacy of their reform agenda.* Instead of blaming schools for not preparing kids for standardized tests today and the world of work tomorrow, they should, as Linda Darling-Hammond has suggested, come into an elementary school classroom and try the daunting task of embarking on this adventure we call “education.”¹⁴ Let them work with children who have medical conditions but do not have any medication for their treatment. Or, let them attempt a lesson with a child whose single mom works nights and who is falling asleep in class because she was never put to bed the night before. They ought to try to teach a child who repeatedly misses school because the family car frequently breaks down and there is no money for the repairs. After they do they may agree with former New York Times commentator, Michael Winierip:

... what angers public educators is that under the (NCLB) law, schools get all the blame if students fail, when they see many other variables at play, including the

crippling effects of poverty on families. Studies show that the economic status of a child's family has a major impact on a child's performance on standardized tests. On the SAT, for example, for every \$10,000 increase in family income, a child's SAT scores rise about 10 points.¹⁵

While poverty cannot be an excuse for poor instruction, neither can its effects on educational achievement be ignored. The United States' rate of childhood poverty, which in our country is strongly correlated to minority status, stands at 21%. This figure is far higher than that of any other developed nation. A teenager's socio-economic status affects his or her school achievement in every industrialized country. But the nations with which we compete have childhood poverty rates in the single digits.¹⁶ Of all the industrialized nations, only the United States fails to provide a safety net for children, regardless of how successful their parents are in the labor market or in life.

As David Berliner put it, ". . . why, when we have so much credible research making connections between poverty and school success, do we keep looking for other answers?"¹⁷ That is the question every business leader who chooses to weigh in with recommendations for school reform should be mandated to answer.

The Private, For-Profit Takeover of Publicly-Funded Schools

Until the 1990s the business community attempted to shape the education reform agenda while keeping its distance from the day-to-day operations of the schools. However, in the last fifteen years many corporations have been formed to takeover the actual management of existing public schools or to manage publicly funded charter schools. This is a new facet of the nexus between the private sector and the schools.¹⁸

Beginning with Education Alternatives, Inc. and followed quickly by Christopher Whittle's Edison Project (now Edison Schools, Inc.) in the early 1990s, private management companies have marketed themselves as the way to improve student outcomes.¹⁹ Even charter schools that were initiated by grass roots community organizers are often managed by for-profit school management firms such as Sabis Educational Systems, Inc., and Mosaica Education. In 2006 there were fifty-one education management organizations (EMOs) operating in twenty-eight states and Washington, D.C., enrolling nearly 240,000 students.²⁰

In the late 1990s I became interested in forming a charter school in my small city, a college town in central New York State. I was joined by a number of interested parents and some of my most talented colleagues in developing a proposal for a charter school. We hoped the school would address the needs of the whole child, reaching the mind through academics, the heart through the fine and performing arts, and the body through athletics. These three areas would be equally balanced in an effort to have an avenue for children of varied interests and strengths to excel.

The Business Agenda for School Reform

We hoped to attract children who did not find the local school district a good fit for their needs. We were awarded a five thousand dollar grant from what we initially believed to be a New York State charter school agency, but, in fact, was a privately-funded organization supporting charter school development. Immediately after we were informed of our grant we were contacted by two private, for-profit management companies. They sent glossy literature suggesting that we hire them to do the business end of the school proposal so we could concentrate on instructional issues.

My colleagues and I had no interest in getting involved with either of these firms. We had a fervent belief in our proposal and felt certain that we could deal with the management aspects of our small school in the event that we should win a charter from New York State. However, what deflated all our hopes was our review of successful and unsuccessful charter proposals. Self-managed, grass-roots, community-supported proposals with creative curricular design were denied a charter by the state authorities. The winners were most often charter school proposals that offered scripted, pre-packaged curricula—sometimes just downloaded from the web—and were to be run by one of the for-profit management companies that we had rejected. Realizing that our efforts would likely have a chance like the proverbial snowball in hell, we declined our grant award and abandoned our idea for a charter school.

Discussion

Business has taken center stage in the school reform debate. Its proposals have been accepted and are coloring the school experience of teachers and students nationwide. However, the business agenda is based on a faulty assumption, i.e., schools can and should operate like businesses, and as such, ought to function in accordance with rational business management principles. With correct systems in place, the output, i.e., children, will leave the K-12 system ready for work or college. Standardized tests provide “quality control” for the system.

Hence the parallel universe from which the business reform agenda springs. That is not the universe I lived and worked in for nearly thirty years. My world was filled with idiosyncratic human beings—both young and old—who did not fit neatly into the “rational” system proposed by business. The affective elements of my students’ lives had to be addressed just as much, and sometimes more than, the cognitive. My goal was not to create members of a more highly skilled workforce but rather to engage in teaching and learning with each and every child to the best of our joint abilities. My belief was (and is) that if that goal was reached, the workforce needs of the country would be taken care of as a matter of course.

Surely, there is room to improve our nation’s schools and our instructional practices. Schools serving poor rural and urban communities, in particular, need our attention. There are many disciplines that should inform our school reform efforts. Brain research comes to mind. For example, we know that second language acquisition is done most easily during the first 13 years of life. While many other

countries begin second language instruction at age 6, most school systems in this country begin this instruction around age 13, i.e., at precisely the wrong time.²¹ It would be logical, therefore, to alter and adapt typical education practice to match the science of children's brain development. Yet I am astounded at how little the burgeoning knowledge of human brain development informs the discussion of how we should go about educating our youngsters. Instead, our policy makers have opted to pay far more attention to the workforce needs of employers and, accordingly, created rigid, one size fits all academic "standards" requirements for children as young as nine years old to meet, irrespective of their individual strengths, or the exigencies of human development.

Among the critical factors the business community has chosen to ignore in its reform agenda is the central role of the teacher in a student's performance. Value-added research confirms both my intuition and experience: Of all the things that happen in school, the interactions between the children and their teachers are the most powerful contributor to children's academic success. In studies done and replicated by different investigators in different settings it has been found that the proportion of the variance in student achievement that is due to teacher quality is many times greater than that from any other school variable. Better teachers help students to learn more.²²

After a *Nation at Risk*, there was recognition of this central truth and an attempt to improve the attractiveness of teaching as a profession. In the 1980s The Holmes Group and the report, *A Nation Prepared*, advocated the professionalization of teaching as a means of improving educational outcomes for students. The late Ernest Boyer, who headed the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching said,

To talk about recruiting better students into teaching without examining the circumstances that discourage teachers is simply a diversion. . . . In the end, the quality of American education can be no greater than the dignity we assign to teaching.²³

Boyer's strong belief in the critical need to improve teaching as a profession—including giving teachers the autonomy and authority to design curricula—is something given little currency or weight by the business community's reform agenda.

In my own career, despite my expertise developed over many years, advanced degrees, and successful student outcomes, I was never treated as a professional by the school district's top managers. Whether it be in terms of compensation, consultation on school or grade assignment, determination of what programs to use—I was treated as any worker in a factory would be treated, i.e., as a subordinate who first and foremost was to follow orders. Despite the call for professionalizing teaching after a *Nation at Risk*, little progress has been made in the effort to make teaching a more attractive career option for our brightest college students. If anything, high-stakes testing has made teaching a less attractive option for people who are creative and intelligent.

The Business Agenda for School Reform

All of this has serious implications for teacher preparation in our colleges and universities. First, how do we draw the best students in our colleges and our universities into the profession? Just as important is the question of readying those who do choose teaching for the reality they will face in their classrooms. So many of their students they will teach live difficult lives that will affect how well they can operate in a school setting. As Linda Darling-Hammond has said, we need to bring people into teaching “armed” for the complexity of their work in the classroom.²⁴ These new teachers must know that they will have a greater effect on their students than any program, any school facility, or any standardized test. They are critical to their students’ learning. And many of their students will come to them carrying terrible personal burdens that will interfere with their ability to do well in school. Today’s teacher preparation students need to know this reality as surely as they need to know their subject matter, theories of pedagogy, or how to integrate technology into the curriculum.

Recommendations

The business community’s effort to shape our nation’s school reform agenda has had little positive effect on the quality of education offered our youngsters because it fails to acknowledge that students are complicated human beings, with differing needs, wants, and talents. It fails, too, because it does not recognize that students will not only have a working life someday, but a life that encompasses much more than going to work. To foster genuine, successful school reform, business leaders will have to confront this reality. Only then will the use of their powerful arsenal of tools, e.g., philanthropy and political clout, have a reasonable chance of making a positive difference in education in this country. Business leaders view themselves as “realists.” Here is a realistic three-pronged reform strategy they ought to embrace:

(1) School organization and curricula needs be based on what scientific research has taught us about how children learn; not only healthy, advantaged children, but children who suffer from learning differences, personal loss, and the social pathologies related to living in poverty. If the goal is to teach every child, which I believe is a moral as well as a practical imperative, we should make certain that both pre-service and veteran teachers are educated in the most up to date knowledge of how children learn. In addition, because we know that emotional issues interfere with learning, teachers must be equipped to teach strategies of resiliency to the vast numbers of children who are living difficult lives.²⁵ If business is looking for a place for its philanthropy, funding research on best educational practice for teaching a diversity of students would be a good starting point.

(2) Making teaching a more attractive career option for the best and the brightest among our college students is the second key element to improving student outcomes. Once again, business should use its philanthropy to help recruit

bright young people into teaching by providing full tuition grants for highly talented college students who promise to teach for a minimum of five years. Philanthropy can be extended to offer tuition reimbursement for veteran teachers who want to take university courses in order to stay at the top of their game in the classroom. This philanthropy—while not controlling what is taught and not as flashy as a new building—would make a real difference in educational opportunities available to American youngsters. It is hard to think of a more important contribution than bringing and keeping the best possible teachers into our children’s classrooms.

(3) Finally, school reform cannot be completed in a vacuum. Our neediest students often attend poor schools in the poorest neighborhoods. The business community should take this point to heart. As political economist Jean Anyon put it, “Attempting to fix inner-city schools without fixing the city . . . is like trying to clean the air on one side of a screen door.”²⁶ A 2006 National Center for Educational Statistics study found that private schools perform no better than public schools when students’ scores are adjusted for socioeconomic status, race, and parental educational level.²⁷ Enter the third facet of any viable school reform strategy: dealing with the problems associated with childhood poverty. Poverty is the enemy that educators face in whatever school they teach. I await the time when the leaders of our most successful corporations make the improvement of children’s lives—as well as their academic achievement—the cornerstone of their efforts to improve America’s standing in the world.

Notes

¹ Gelberg, Denise. (1997). *The “Business” of Reforming American Schools*. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press. The business community’s influence on school reform throughout the twentieth century is the focus of the book.

² Additionally, the “economic imperative” argument for school reform has been criticized by some economists as being of little relevance to America’s broad economic problems, such as the widening income gap and globalization. Paul Krugman argues that improved education of the masses will not correct broad income disparity. Between 2000 and 2004 real income for college graduates actually dropped. Between 1972 and 2001 the wages and salary income of the top .01 percentile went up 497%. Lawrence Mishel of the Economic Policy Institute points out that emerging economic powerhouses such as India and China present big problems for the American economy regardless of how well educated our children become. Economic Trends Fuel Push to Retool Schooling. (2006). *Education Week*, 25(28), 1, 20, 22-24.

³ Michigan Businesses Surveyed. (2006). *Education Week* 25(39), 25. In this survey only 52% of employers said they were satisfied with the quality of employees coming out of Michigan high schools. This survey shows greater satisfaction than other surveys, where employer satisfaction with new high school graduates’ skills is as low as 20%. It is interesting to note that many complaints focus on work habits, e.g., punctuality, neat appearance, effort, and attitude.

⁴ In Public Schools, the Name Game as a Donor Lure. (2006, January 26). *New York Times*.

⁵ Business Leaders Call for More Cooperation in K-12 Giving Efforts. (2005). *Education Week*, 25(5).

The Business Agenda for School Reform

⁶ Network Aims to Bolster Business Support for Schools. (2005). *Education Week*, (07), 6. At this meeting the Chamber of Commerce unveiled the website for the Business Education Network: www.businesseducationnetwork.net. The Network has information on more than 300 partnerships, as well as toolkits for collaboration between business and education.

⁷ Gelberg, *op. cit.* 126-132.

⁸ Ingram, Debra, Seashore Louis, Karen, and Schroeder, Roger. (2004). Accountability Policies and Teacher Decision Making: Barriers to the Use of Data to Improve Practice. *Teachers College Record*, ¹⁰⁶(6), 1258-1287.

⁹ Shirley, Dennis and Hargreaves, Andy. (2006). Data Driven to Distraction. *Education Week*, ²⁶(6), 32-33.

¹⁰ Kolb, Charles. (2006). The Cracks in Our Education Pipeline. *Education Week*, ²⁵(42), 56, 45.

¹¹ Lubienski, Sarah Theule, and Luckiensi, Christopher. (2006). What NAEP Can Tell Us About School Achievement. *Education Week*, ²⁵(26), 28, 30. This recent study showed that a child's demographic background is a much stronger predictor of achievement than the type of school, i.e., public, private, or charter, they attend. Children from poorer families tend to have lower levels of academic achievement.

¹² Shaker, Paul, and Hellman, Elizabeth. (2004, July). The New Common Sense of Education: Advocacy Research v. Academic Authority. *Teachers College Record*. The authors argue that partisan politicians allied with corporate interests malign the schools and make the rich education market vulnerable to development by corporations.

¹³ CEOs, Schools Chiefs Trade Notes of K-12 Business Trends. (2005). *Education Week*, ²⁵(11), 14.

¹⁴ Educator Condemns Lack of Respect for Teacher Preparation. (2006). *Education Week*, ²⁵(25), 8. Ms. Darling-Hammond suggests a new version of the television show, *Survivor*: Put 6 business men or women into an elementary school that includes high needs students, students with ADHD, students who do not speak English. Expect them to multi-task by documenting student progress, maintaining discipline, etc. Golfing for recreation will be out of the question because the teacher will not be able to afford it. "The winner will be allowed to return to his or her job."

¹⁵ Winerip, Michael. Teachers and a Law That Distrusts Them. (2006, July 12). *New York Times*.

¹⁶ Gelberg, *op.cit.*, 111-113, 219; Report Roundup: International Comparison. (2006). *Education Week*, ²⁵(33), 19. The National Center for Education Statistics found that non-school factors affect American students' achievement in ways similar to the effects on students in other developed nations, e.g., occupational status of parents, highest level of education attained by parents, family structure.

¹⁷ Berliner, David. (2005). Our Impoverished View of Educational Reform. *Teachers College Record*, ¹⁰⁸(6), 949-995.

¹⁸ The private, for-profit school management model is not limited to the K-12 arena. Randy Best is a Dallas investor and owner of Voyager Expanded Learning, a company that sells supplemental reading and math programs to school districts. Best bought Barat College, previously owned by DePaul University. He then founded the American College of Education, a for-profit school, to "revolutionize how teacher are trained in the United States . . ." His college has partnered with the Chicago public schools to offer a Masters degree programs to its teachers. See: Entrepreneur Offers Alternative Teacher Training at New College in Chicago. (2006, July

14). *Chronicle of Higher Education*, web edition.

¹⁹ Gelberg, *op.cit.*, 136, 182, 193.

²⁰ Molnar, Alex, et.al. (2006). *Profiles of For-Profit Education Management Organizations, 2005-2006: 7th Annual Report*. Arizona State University: Education Policy Studies Laboratory; Study Finds Research on Management Groups Lacking. (2006). *Education Week*, 25(34), 15, 18. This study showed that despite the proliferation of EMOs, there is scant evidence that they are successful in raising student test scores.

²¹ English Now *the Foreign Language of Schools Abroad*. *Education Week*, 25(31), 1, 22-23. For example, in 1998 the Palestinian National Authority moved English coursework from 5th to 1st grade, joining Egypt, Japan, Jordan, Kuwait, Luxembourg, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, and Syria—all of which begin English instruction in 1st grade. China begins English instruction in grade 3. Iran, Morocco, and Yemen begin English instruction at age 13 or older.

²² Hershberg, Theodore, and Lea-Kruger, Barbara. (2006). Aligning the System: The Case for Linking Teacher Pay to Student Learning. *Education Week*, 25(29), 52, 40; Teachers With High Licensing Scores Found More Effective. (2006). *Education Week*, 25(32), 14. In this study by Dan Goldhaber of the University of Washington new teachers who scored higher on licensing tests had students who scored higher from year to year in state tests.

²³ Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. (1988). Teacher Involvement in Decision-Making: A State by State Profile. Summary published in *GERR*, (29), 1319-20.

²⁴ Educator Condemns Lack of Respect for Teacher Preparation. (2006). *Education Week*, 25(25), 8.

²⁵ For example, Cornell University's School of Human Ecology has developed ACT for Youth Upstate Center of Excellence. The Center has a training program, "Fostering Resiliency." The goal is to help "equip each child with a 'self-knowledge' of their strengths that protect from and overwhelm the 'deficits.'"

²⁶ Anyon, Jean. (1997). *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.

²⁷ Public Schools on Par With, Outperform Private Schools in Some Areas, Federal Study Says. (2006). *Education Week*, 25(43), 7; Public Schools Perform Near Private Ones in Study. (2006, July 15). *New York Times*. This meticulously crafted study, "Comparing Private Schools and Public Schools Using Hierarchical Linear Modeling," found that both public and private schools are less successful with children who come from poor and minority families. This study's conclusions are similar to those of the study cited in note 11.

References

- Anyon, Jean. (1997). *Ghetto Schooling: A Political Economy of Urban Educational Reform*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Berliner, David. (2006). Our Impoverished View of Educational Reform. *Teachers College Record*, 108(6), 949-995.
- Callahan, Raymond. (1962). *Education and the Cult of Efficiency: A Study of the Social Forces that Have Shaped the Administration of the Public Schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Duffy, F.M. (1997). Knowledge Work Supervision: Turning School Systems into High Performing Learning Organizations. *International Journal of Educational Management*, (1), 26-31.
- Gelberg, Denise. (1997). *The "Business" of Reforming American Schools*. Albany, NY: State

The Business Agenda for School Reform

- University of New York Press.
- Hawley, W.D., & Rollie, D.I. (2002). *The Keys to Effective Schools: Educational Reform as Continuous Improvement*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin.
- Ingram, Debra, Seashore Louis, Karen, & Schroeder, Roger. (2004). Accountability Policies and Teacher Decision Making: Barriers to the Use of Data to Improve Practice. *Teachers College Record*, 106(6), 1258-1287.
- Kolb, Charles. (2006). The Cracks in Our Education Pipeline. *Education Week*, 25(42), 56, 45.
- Lubienski, Sarah Theule, & Lubienski, Christopher. (2006). What NAEP Can Tell Us About School Achievement. *Education Week*, 25(26), 28, 30.
- Molnar, Alex. (2001). Calculating the Benefits and Costs of For-Profit Education. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 9(15).
- Molnar, Alex. (2005). *School Commercialism: From Democratic Ideal to Market Commodity*. New York: Routledge.
- Shaker, Paul, & Hellman, Elizabeth. (2004, July). The New Common Sense of Education: Advocacy Research versus Academic Authority. *Teachers College Record*, 106.
- Sorkin, Andrew. (2006, March 6). Education Management Said to Be Sold for \$3.4 Billion. *New York Times*.
- Steffens, Heidi, & Cookson, Peter, Jr. (2002). Limitations of the Market Model. *Education Week*, 21(43).
- Winerip, Michael. (2006, July 12). Teachers And a Law That Distrusts Them. *New York Times*.