

“SCHOOL VOUCHERS IN WASHINGTON, DC AND BEYOND:
THE RISKS, BENEFITS, AND ALTERNATIVES”

The Century Foundation

National Press Club

Washington, D.C.

September 25, 2003

RICHARD KAHLENBERG: I want to welcome you all here this morning for this discussion on school vouchers. My name is Richard Kahlenberg, I'm a senior fellow at The Century Foundation and I'm going to be moderating today's discussion on "School Vouchers in Washington, DC and Beyond: The Risks, The Benefits, and The Alternatives."

In planing this event, we were a little nervous that the issue of DC vouchers would have been decided by the time the event was held, but we're thankful that the U.S. Senate is still continuing their discussion. It's nice of them. *The Washington Post*, this morning, has a story about a possible compromise, and we hope that Nina Rees, who's here, will enlighten us as to the details of that. I have it on good authority from Tom Daschle and Bill Frist that they also wanted to delay discussion to benefit from this event. (laughter) One can always hope at least.

Seriously, we are very excited about the panel that has agreed to participate in the discussion. It's really a terrific group. But I want to say a short word first about the book that The Century Foundation has published. Each of you should have a copy of *Public School Choice vs. Private School Vouchers*. The Century Foundation has, for about 80 years, been dealing with issues of inequality, but for the past four years or so, we've been focusing, among other things, on inequality in education. And we've commissioned a number of papers and research projects on the question of whether school vouchers will improve education, and more generally what can be done to address inequality.

The research is included in this new volume. The first half of the book concludes, in essence, that vouchers will not improve American education, and indeed, are likely to make things worse. That there is little evidence that they will raise student achievement. That they are not part of a new civil rights movement – and in fact, might increase segregation. That they could undermine national unity, and are not particularly popular among the American public.

Having said that, we've also been intrigued by the new rhetoric from conservatives which says that it is unfair to trap poor kids in bad schools. That represents a change, of sorts, from the days of racial desegregation when the neighborhood school was the ultimate value, and now conservatives are saying the neighborhood school might not be such a good deal for those kids stuck in high poverty schools. And so the second part of the book looks at the question of what progressive policy

could be formulated out of the conservative premise that neighborhood schools are not always the way to go. And so we raise the question of whether public school choice could get many of the benefits of vouchers while avoiding the downside.

I am pleased that a number of contributors to the volume are here today. Richard Just from *The American Prospect* has a piece on vouchers and aid to religious schools. Bernard Wasow from The Century Foundation has a piece on the literature on vouchers and educational achievement. Ruy Teixeira from The Century Foundation has a piece on public opinion, and Thad Hall, also from The Century Foundation, looks at Congress's handling of the voucher issues over the years.

We're releasing this volume in the thick of the ongoing congressional debate over DC vouchers which brings us to today's discussion: How well would vouchers work for students in Washington, DC? Is this really a morality play as it's portrayed by many in the media, between on the one hand, poor kids wanting a better education, on the other hand, the teachers unions concerned only about their own jobs? Or is it more complicated than that? And we hope to get to those issues today.

In particular, how well would public school choice work in a place like the District? In this morning's *USA Today*, the editors proposed that the voucher program should be expanded to include the suburbs of Virginia and Maryland, and the public schools there, and does that make sense?

Now The Century Foundation has staked out a clear position on this issue, but we realize there are many different perspectives on this, and we've invited commentators from a variety of vantage points to discuss those questions. And just to show how fair and balanced we are, we are going to start with Nina Rees. Nina is the Undersecretary of Education for Innovation and Improvement in the U.S. Department of Education. She is such a determined supporter of school choice and vouchers that she has been called "the Thomas Paine of school choice." She was previously with the Heritage Foundation and the Institute for Justice. And we've asked her to describe the President's voucher program for DC, to explain why she thinks it makes sense, and what implications the plan has for the voucher movement nationally.

I was going to introduce the other panelists as well, but Nina is involved in the ongoing negotiations and so we've asked her to speak, then I'm going to ask each of the panelists if they want to ask Nina a question. We'll try to take a couple from the audience and then she needs to leave. And then we'll go to the rest of the program. Thank you.

NINA REES: Thank you, Richard. And I have to really apologize to all of you for not being able to stay for the duration of the panel, even though, I must admit, I feel a little bit outnumbered up here. But I have my colleague, Steve Brockhouse with me

today, so maybe he can field some questions if the discussion gets a little heated afterwards.

School choice, of course, is a big part of the President's No Child Left Behind agenda. As all of you know, the law that we signed into law in 2001 puts in place, or encourages states to put in place, standards and accountability systems that, in effect, help school districts and schools measure student progress on an annual basis so that all of our students are proficient readers, and also proficient in the subject of mathematics within 12 years.

One of the consequences that the law has already put in place, as all of you know, is public school choice. If a child is attending a school that has failed to make the necessary progress toward state standards, after two years, all the children in those schools can transfer to another public school of their choice. And after three years, all of the low-income students in these schools qualify for supplemental services, which are also known as after-school tutoring sessions.

The over-arching theme behind this principle is that these federal dollars ought to be serving the needs of students, and that if children are attending schools that are not doing well academically, we ought to give their parents an option to transfer their kids to other schools while we're trying to fix the schools that they are leaving behind.

So the DC choice plan, and our endorsement of it, very much follows that line of thinking. This plan, as all of you know by now, was designed with the help of city officials, including the Mayor; Kevin Chavous, the head of the education committee on the city council, who early on this year actually held a hearing, a public hearing, inviting parents to testify about this subject; and Peggy Cooper Cafritz who is the president of the school board in the city.

If enacted, it would inject, hopefully, \$40 million into the school system to benefit three different sectors in the city. \$13 million of it would go towards DCPS, another \$13 million will go towards an entity that would help leverage funds to build more charter school facilities in the city. And the last portion of it will go towards a private school choice pilot program. And that's the piece that, of course, has gotten the most attention and the one that I'm going to focus on right now.

This program would give about \$10-\$15 million, depending on whether you look at the House or the Senate bill, and also what the president had put in his budget, for a five-year pilot project to offer scholarships of up to \$7,500 to low-income students in the district, with a priority placed on those students who are attending the schools that have already been labeled as needing improvement. And it's my understanding that there are about 15 of them in the city right now. They would then be able to use these funds to attend a private school of choice within the District of Columbia.

This program will be administered by a grantee or perhaps several grantees in the city. We plan to hold an open competition for interested parties to apply, so conceivably the city itself could apply to administer these funds. And it will be evaluated by a team of researchers that, again, the Department of Education will contract with.

And in my view, I really think the piece that gets the least attention, and the one that I wish would get the most attention, is this research piece, because in effect we would create a gold standard research design by which we could answer a lot of the questions that critics of school choice have asked in the past. Again, those who don't believe this is good public policy are always going to find flaws with this, but as the National Research Council's report of a few years ago indicated, the only way for us to know if school choice is an effective mechanism to raise student achievement is by conducting a multi-year, longitudinal study of choice at the national level, and using a very strong experimental design in order for us to compare the students who are benefiting from these programs to a control group of students who are interested in participating in the program, but were unable to. And that comparison, compared on an annual basis, will really help us answer a lot of these questions.

Now, there are a lot of questions in the flyer about what this panel is supposed to address. I'm just going to go down some of the questions that Richard wanted me to address. The key question is why do this in the District of Columbia? And our answer has been consistently the same over the past few months, which is that we have the local leadership of this city, the mayor, and the head of the education committee on the city council, and the president of the school board, who have endorsed the plan and have asked us to fight for this three-sector strategy.

And on top of that, I should also really add, that if you do surveys of parents in Wards 7 and 8, you see broad public support for such programs. And this is also evidenced by the number of parents who are on wait lists to participate in the Washington Scholarship Fund program, which is a private scholarship fund that sends low-income students to the private school of their choice.

The other question posed today is why not just rely on public school choice and try to see if public school choice works? I did not get to read the rebuttal to this *USA Today* piece, but I did exchange a lot of e-mails with Richard Whitmire, and I'm happy to discuss that in a minute. But the issue with public school choice within the city is that the city already has a lot of public school choice. This is a city that has open enrollments, so you technically have access to any public school in the city, and it has one of the most robust charter school laws in the country.

The problem, though, is again, those charter schools and public schools that are doing well academically are usually over-subscribed, and their waiting lists are very long. So again, to a lot of low-income parents in the poorer districts within the city,

public school choice is not necessarily giving them access to good quality public schools.

The other question that has come up is: why do school choice? Why not come up with a different mechanism to fix the city school system? And again, I don't want to get into this debate too much, but the key thing that we have noticed in looking at the way the District of Columbia's public schools have functioned over the years, is that there's a lot of bureaucracy and not a lot of accountability. And that is really the recipe for disaster. On any given day, if you call the mayor, or the city council, or the superintendent of public schools, or the school board president, they all blame one another for some of the problems that the city is suffering in its schools.

And that's really one of the key reasons why something like choice may be one of the best answers to low-income parents who don't have the time to wait for all these different parties to agree on something that will work in the city, and more importantly, something that will sustain the test of time. A lot of good reforms have been tried and tested in this city, but unfortunately a lot of them have not, again, sustained the test of time. I have a number of good reading experts who have put in place good reading models in a lot of the inner city public schools. After they have left the system, those programs have not remained in those schools.

So bottom line is, when you have entrenched bureaucracies, lack of accountability, and also a system that is not able to keep a lot of good leaders and teachers who are attracted to inner city settings, you're not going to be able to have systemic change stay in a system like this for a long time. So choice is really the only mechanism to a lot of these low-income parents that offers them hope to take their kids out of a poor system and enroll them in a system that's safer, and in a lot of cases, doing better academically than the schools that their kids are currently attending.

How will this plan impact the country? Now, that's a question that comes up a lot, and conservatives and liberals all have their own views of how this is going to impact. Our view is actually a lot more humble than that. We feel that it's important for this to pass and for us to evaluate it. After the evaluation's been done, and I would give this at least three to five years for us to see how the evaluation works, once we have that body of evidence then we can start talking about how this will impact the nation. I think it's premature to talk too much about the impact of this program yet, because we don't have the evidence we need to make any broad conclusions.

But having said that, there are two things about the studies of choice so far that most researchers agree on, which give us confidence that this is good public policy. One is that most of the scholarship programs around the country, private or public, show a very high level of parental satisfaction with the programs. So by and large, those participating in these programs are satisfied with the treatment that they're getting, and with the schools that they have enrolled their children into.

The second thing that has also been shown really through the studies of Jay Greene and John Witte who studied the Milwaukee program and some of the other researchers out there, is that the students who transfer into these schools end up doing better academically, and at the very least, they're not doing any worse than they would have done had they stayed in the public schools that they were attending. So if you mix those two and you compare choice and vouchers to other types of public policies out there, such as food stamps, and low-income housing vouchers, and other types of public services that the government offers to low-income parents and taxpayers, you quickly can conclude that at least this is something that ought to be put on the table as an option for them to have access to while you're trying to fix the overall system, which is ultimately our goal at the federal level.

So anyway, with that I will stop, and again thank you very much, Richard, for inviting me here today. I apologize that I have to leave, but I'd be very interested in the questions the panelists have, and I'm also interested in some of the questions you may have. If you don't get to me, as I said, Steve Brockhouse is sitting right there, and he might be able to answer some of your questions, or maybe even convey them to me later on for me to e-mail them back to you. Thanks.

KAHLENBERG: OK. Why don't I start out with one question, and then we'll turn to the panel. I was intrigued that accountability was at the heart of your criticism of the DC public schools. As I understand it, there's a big debate right now as to whether the accountability provisions and No Child Left Behind should be applied to the private schools that receive vouchers. Do you support that? And if not, why not?

REES: If you just look by and large at the success of private schools around the country, one of the key things you notice about private education is that most of these private schools are successful because they don't have a lot of overhead. So they don't spend a lot of money on bureaucracy. They spend most of their dollars in the classroom, teacher salaries and so forth.

With a lot of these smaller private schools in the inner city, it's very difficult for them to comply with all the rules and regulations that some of our public schools are complying with. And I would also argue with you that, or submit to you that, it's important for us to learn a lot of lessons from some of these private schools and use them in the context of public education, and to some extent charter schools have already done that or started that debate to some extent.

So whereas I think it's important for us to have a strong accountability system, and the discussions we're having with the Senate move us in that direction, I would caution against juxtaposing or putting the entire accountability system that we currently have in place for public schools on private schools because they simply – a lot of them just don't have the capacity to comply. And at the end of the day, I think

the key thing we ought to be concerned about is whether these programs are raising student achievement. OK?

If they're raising student achievement, and if you're using a test, a similar test to compare apples to apples, if they're doing that, if they're accomplishing that goal, then we need to be looking for the reasons why they're accomplishing that goal, and again using those lessons for making the public schools perform better. So as far as accountability is concerned, the key thing we need to be worried about, in my view, is whether the program is effective at raising student achievement. And the things we've put in place so far on the evaluation side definitely address those concerns.

KAHLENBERG: Thank you. I'm sure we'll have a lot more discussion about that. Rosalind Parker has a question.

ROSALIND PARKER: In terms of the testing and evaluation criteria, the research part, you said, is not getting enough attention to be talked about. Could you elaborate on what testing and evaluation criteria are in place in terms of what the specific testing and evaluation criteria are, and kind of what you see the take-aways, what is envisioned after this five years? I'm assuming that means the program will sunset, since it's being called a pilot. And then what are you going to do? I mean what's the next step? So you said to improve the public school system. What would you take away? What would you be evaluating and what is the criteria, and then what is the next step?

REES: Well, we haven't outlined what we're going to evaluate. The statute specifies some of the key questions that we would like to have answered, mainly again, whether this program is raising student achievement, what kind of an effect it's having on the public school system. We will contract with a group of evaluators to do this kind of study.

In terms of the test we would use, again, we haven't decided on that yet. But the best way for this to work is for the evaluators to pull the kids who are – or to take all the kids who have applied for this program and administer a baseline test to all of them, and then follow those who got into the program and those who did not get into the program, and then measure them again using the same test on an annual basis so that we can see how well they're doing in gained scores over the next five years. Again, on an annual basis, we would report this to the public and to Congress.

I'm just so involved in what's going to happen tomorrow that I haven't even thought about what we would do in five years. But the experience of cities like Milwaukee, and Cleveland, and other places have shown that after these programs are in place, they do end up getting more public support. And in the case of Milwaukee, it's been enough public support that has engaged the legislature to expand that program to up to 15,000 students where it's at right now.

So it's going to depend on how well it's being implemented, what the evaluators are telling us, and how popular the program is with the folks in the city in order for us to see if this is something that we should continue or stop funding. So.

KAHLENBERG: OK. Chuck Willie?

CHARLES WILLIE: I noticed that you said that priority would be given to children that are poor. That word "priority" means that people who are not poor can also get these –

REES: No, no, no. Let me just clarify. In order to participate in the program, you have to be at or below 185% of the poverty line. The priority will then go to those low-income kids in the 15 under-performing schools.

PARKER: In the failing schools.

WILLIE: No, I'm not concerned about just in the failing schools, but I'm concerned about the income of people who can use this. Is it limited to poor people?

REES: Yes.

WILLIE: All right. That's number one. Number two is you said that you couldn't do this with choice and public schools, but you never gave a sufficient answer that I feel satisfied with. You did say that the good public schools are already impacted. Well, so far as I know, the good private schools are already impacted. So that means starting up new private schools, which is a way of money-making, which is what happened in Milwaukee. Do you have evidence the private schools are not fully impacted now?

REES: Well, we've done a survey of how much space some of these private schools have, and they have overall about 2,000 slots left, which is the number of kids who would conceivably benefit from this plan, so –

WILLIE: 70,000 students in Washington. You only have 2,000. That will not help Washington public schools.

REES: But again, had we expanded the program to 66,000 or 77,000, however many kids they have in the city, the debate here would have been is it really wise for the federal government to be conducting this experiment on the entire city when we don't have all the evidence we need to see if this is effective. So I think starting a little bit smaller is wise when you're conducting a pilot.

WILLIE: Not if I'm poor and need an education.

REES: Well, again, I think, that's why we're having this debate, and I think it's important for us to continue this debate, because I would, again, submit to you that if there's a lot of public debate and disagreement over something, the best way for us to show the public whether a treatment is useful is by pilot testing it first before we apply it on every single child.

WILLIE: We have some pilots of choice and public schools. I'm going to talk about it later -- unfortunately you won't be here -- in which the achievement of the students increased in public schools that had to attract students, and in which a larger number of students were involved in those public schools. So sift through our data -- my book is right over there, called --

REES: I will grab one on the way out.

WILLIE: *Student Diversity, Choice, and School Improvement*. And if you want a copy, I'll let you have one, too.

REES: Can I just say one thing about that?

WILLIE: Let me finish, though, because I'm not arguing. I'm a little worried, though, because I don't want to see the federal government make a mistake. I have seen public school choice work where schools are challenged to make themselves attractive, number one. Number two, I have seen that this involves a larger number of students than can be involved in the private schools. And I'm wondering why the federal government has passed by this good research that shows that public school choice can work.

REES: Right. As I mentioned earlier, we have open enrollment in the city, and charter schools --

WILLIE: That's not public school choice. Open enrollment always comes up with segregated schools, and I can show you research all over the country. So that's different from choice.

REES: OK. But to address your question, we are firm believers in public school choice, and we are promoting public school choice on a daily basis at the Department because that's part of No Child Left Behind. As I mentioned earlier, if a child's been attending a school that's failed to make adequate yearly progress for two years in a row, every child in that school has to get public school choice.

So we think public school choice is a fine reform and one that ought to be expanded and supported all over the country. We just think, at the same time, that in some places where there aren't enough good quality public schools to meet the demand of the population, that we need to be offering more options while we're trying to fix

the system, while we're trying to expand capacity in these public schools, as we've already started to do with our transformation schools.

Another thing about charter schools in the city is, and if you don't mind I'm just going to throw charter schools in there, I'm a big supporter of charter schools, and I think they're doing a fantastic job at serving the needs of student populations that are not being served well in some public schools. But at the same time these are very new schools, so you're asking parents to take a chance and send their kids to schools that don't have any track record at all of showing success. So when you juxtapose that against a number of center-city Catholic and private schools that are doing a good job of educating kids, with a history of raising student achievement, I think it's – as a public policy matter, I think it's a little bit unjust not to offer access to parents to these schools in the name of us trying to fix the system or trying to come up with mechanisms that benefit all of the kids in the system.

KAHLENBERG: OK. I want to get the audience in here. Let me slip one more in, just that question of the *USA Today* editorial which said expand public school choice to Virginia and Maryland. Where do you stand on that?

REES: Well, I happen to be a firm believer in the fact that schools end up revitalizing neighborhoods. So to that end, I think it's important for us to make a lot of investments in bringing new leaders and teachers into these existing schools in the city so that parents stay in their neighborhoods and send their kids to the neighborhood schools rather than busing them across town or across borderlines to attend another school.

If you look at the history of Milwaukee, and the reason why Polly Williams endorsed the private choice program from the beginning was because she did not want her child bused across town for desegregation purposes. She wanted her child to be in her neighborhood. Same with Fanny Lewis in Cleveland. She wanted to open her own school in her neighborhood. So I happen to think that if you did the private choice program as we've offered it, you would be able to revitalize the community. And again, we don't have a lot of evidence on private choice yet, although there have been some new schools opening up in Milwaukee.

But in the case of charter schools, we do have some evidence that some of these charter schools that have done well over the years, like Los Angeles's accelerated school in South Central LA, they have brought business back into the city. And a lot of parents from neighborhood districts are now enrolling their kids in these schools in places that up until now no one even wanted to step foot into. And at the same time, if you look at, again, some of these good private schools in the city, like Nannie Helen Burroughs, you notice that they're attracting a lot of students from the suburbs to their schools.

So I think, in terms of urban revitalization, it's important for us to focus on schooling as something – or benefiting our schools in order to keep the neighborhoods together rather than sending our kids outside of the city. Every minute that's spent busing a child outside of the city is a minute that a parent, and a superintendent, and all the individuals involved in the community are spending worrying about that child's safety.

WILLIE: Could I have one more question, though. It's very important. I don't understand why you want to have neighborhood schools for public schools, but yet you're going to send youngsters to private schools with vouchers, and private schools are not neighborhood schools. Not all of them. And yet you're going to let them all be away. That's one question.

But the second one – and I won't ask another at all, Mr. Chair. The second question is will those private schools still be able to admit or refuse a youngster who has a voucher? Because public schools do have to accept all of the children.

REES: Right. OK, again, the answer to your question, the reason why this is a sensible reform, is because there are a lot of center city Catholic schools and private schools in Wards 7 and 8 that are doing a good job of meeting the needs of these communities at a fraction of the cost of sending the kids to public schools. So the idea here is not to bus the kids to far away private schools, but for them to be able to go to these neighborhood private schools that are already in existence. So that's the answer to your first question, and I forget the second question now.

WILLIE: Can those private schools reject children? Do they have an admissions office? And if they do, then I wonder how can you spend public money in a private institution that can reject a child when public schools accept all sorts and conditions of children.

REES: And again, they have to accept everyone who is in the program. That's one of the criteria in the law, so that if a private school wants to participate, they have to accept, and they cannot discriminate against a child based on race, gender, country of origin, and color. In the Senate, religion is also one of the factors added.

KAHLENBERG: OK. Let's turn to questions from the audience. Yes?

AUDIENCE: Can you say just a word about the significance of the per-pupil cost in DC, and what the District is spending, and then what the amount of the voucher is? And then the significance of when the students will leave the public school, and what will happen to that student's per-pupil allotment in that case?

REES: Well, in the case of the city, and I don't like to use these numbers that are being tossed around, but it's my understanding that the baseline per-pupil amount is about \$7,000 to \$7,500. The reason why the numbers we see are that much higher is

because DC happens to have a large student population that is qualifying for the free and reduced lunch program. So if you add some of the grants and federal funds that they get, the number then increases to somewhere between \$10,000 and some people put it at \$15,000.

So the baseline is \$7,000, \$7,500. If you add those I think it comes to about \$11,000, according to the National Center for Education statistics. And also special education costs play a big factor in this, because unfortunately, again, we have a broken system in the city whereby a lot of students in the public system are being transferred to elite private schools and very good public schools at the tune of \$60,000 or more a year in order to get their needs taken care of.

Now the other question was what are the effects on the public – ?

AUDIENCE: Once the students do leave –

REES: Yes. The mayor has pledged to hold the budget for the public schools harmless, so there would not be a decrease in per-pupil funding at the schools, even though they would be supposedly losing 2,000 students. Just one more question, I do have to leave.

KAHLENBERG: Just one more? OK. Bernard?

BERNARD WASOW: Thank you. If vouchers were to do anything like go to scale, there would have to be a vast expansion of private schools. Now Catholic schools are today held up as sort of the model system that does better, but clearly there would have to be lots of other opportunities for new private schools to be established. Are there any set of principles that would prevent fundamentalist Christian schools that are hostile to other religions, that would prevent Hasidic schools that have no interest in non-Jews, that the Nation of Islam schools, Wahabi Islamic schools, from accepting vouchers in the same way that Catholic schools do?

REES: Have you ever been to a Nation of Islam school?

AUDIENCE: You're providing it. You're providing it.

REES: I'm just asking you. Have you ever been to a Muslim school?

AUDIENCE: No.

REES: OK. Because they happen to do an extremely good job of educating their students. The short answer to your question is we don't have a lot of these schools in place right now because there's no public interest in sending students to these schools. But I don't even want to venture and talk about taking the program to scale, because it is just going to be \$15 million for the next five years, benefiting

2,000 students on an annual basis, and there is enough capacity in the private schools to educate those kids with the capacity they currently have.

There are probably going to be some discussions about the topic that you're talking about, but underlying what you're asking is this whole presumption that low-income parents are going to want to send their kids to schools that are run by these individuals, who, most people, the public in general, would not want to send their kids to. And I again would submit to you that most low-income parents want the same things that we all do for our kids, which is a good education. So I'm not as worried about the fact that some of these odd schools are going to pop up simply to benefit from the vouchers, because I have a little bit more faith in the parents who want to send their kids to good schools.

But whatever rules and regulations are in place right here in the District of Columbia on allowing private schools to open are still going to remain in place. And that's why we have an MOU that we're going to sign with the mayor to make sure that he's as engaged as possible in ensuring that the right types of private schools open in the city.

KAHLENBERG: OK. Can we take one more?

REES: Sure.

KAHLENBERG: I understand the gentleman in the back is with the DC school board, and maybe that would be relevant for Nina here.

AUDIENCE: Good morning, everybody. One quick question that the legislation doesn't speak to, and this is a concern that we've been hearing a lot just across – throughout the city, and particularly in Wards 7 and 8. With \$7,500 going towards to support a child in a private school, what about the supplemental services that they would have received at the schools that have been targeted for improvement? Where would that funding come in to help that child to close the gap in terms of achievement at a private school, as well as the children you're talking about also are Title-1 funded oftentimes, which means free and reduced lunch. Where is that gap to help supplement that in terms of the other services? Will all that \$7,500 cover all of that? The legislation does not speak to that.

REES: Right.

AUDIENCE: The second point is as you talk about private schools turned – being economic engines for revitalization of certain neighborhoods, most of the schools that are targeted are only – I forgot. There are only a handful of schools in Ward 7 and 8, and the rest of them are throughout the city. So where the economic redevelopment coming in? In two wards where Ward 8's baseline income is \$12,000 a year, Ward 7 is 18 [thousand], how do you see the education – those

private schools are going to be economic engines for revitalization in that area as well?

REES: These are hard questions, but the answer to your first question is actually fairly simple. This is a choice parents make, so if they decide to opt in to this program, they basically set aside all the other benefits that they would get had they stayed in the public school system, including supplemental service help. And really this is actually an incentive, in our view, for the public school system to serve the students in the system a little bit better, and offer better pre-K, and after school programs, and all sorts of other things in order to keep the students in those system rather than to lose them through a private voucher program.

In terms of the economic revitalization, I'm sorry, I'm not an expert in this area. I was just trying to answer that question. I just happen to think that if you keep neighborhoods together, and you bring good quality people into the business of education, and create a sustainable education system that keeps leaders and teachers in the system for a long time, which is what these Catholic schools have done, you will be able to create a safe haven for learning. And right now we don't have that in a lot of these systems.

And I can speak a little bit about the Catholic school system, which is doing a good job, but they are also not making any money off of this. And when you are not bringing enough resources to your schools, you are not able to expand, and you have a situation here where you have demand for these schools within the neighborhoods, but we don't have funding in order to make sure parents are taking advantage.

And let me also add one more thing to this. In this country, if you are a middle-income or high-income person, you have access to the schools that want to send your kids to. You can move into a neighborhood that has good public schools, or you can send your children to good private schools. The only people who don't have these options right now are low-income parents.

All this law is trying to address is the fact that those parents ought to have access to the same types of schools that middle-income and upper-income parents currently have access to. So I hope that at, the very least, we can agree on this one principle that we should not force low-income parents to send their kids to poor-performing schools simply because of their socioeconomic status. I do have to go. I'm sorry. But as I said, Steve is here, and I'm happy to take questions via e-mail afterwards. Thank you all. (applause)

KAHLENBERG: Thank you. Thank you very much, Nina, for participating. OK. Now we will – let me go ahead and introduce the rest of the panel and begin the discussion of alternatives to school vouchers.

We'll next turn to Rosalind Parker. She is the legislative director and chief counsel with Congresswoman Eleanor Holmes Norton, the DC delegate who is perhaps the leading opponent of vouchers in DC, and raises some question about the argument that this idea of school vouchers is uniformly supported by local leaders.

After that we will turn to Richard Rothstein. He's a visiting lecturer at Teacher's College, Columbia, the former education columnist for the *New York Times*, and the co-author of *All Else Equal: Are Public Schools and Private Schools Different?* a copy of which is over here. We've asked him to describe the findings of his research and what that says about vouchers in DC and nationally.

And finally, Dr. Charles Willie, the Charles W. Elliot professor of education, emeritus at Harvard University, and co-author of *Student Diversity, Choice, and School Improvement*, which we all know is over here, will speak. We've asked him to describe a public school choice alternative that he has devised and promoted in countless communities throughout the country.

We've asked each of the panelists to speak for about 10 minutes, and then we will turn to questions from the audience. Rosalind?

PARKER: Good morning. All right. I'm not going to speak for 10 minutes, because I'm really more interested in the dialogue. I know everyone – I mean this has been one of the most publicized discussions in the last couple months, so I know that a lot of the information is already well known.

I always like to talk about my background briefly. I'm a third-generation Washingtonian, and I'm a product of DC public schools. (applause) There we go. My grandfather, who was vice president of Industrial Bank for many years, and he's still with us, he's 92 years old, was a product of DC public schools. My father, who unfortunately passed away, and whose funeral I had to attend yesterday, so this is a little bit of a challenge, speaking of him right now, but was a product of DC public schools. Had a very established career as a chemist, oversaw a department at FDA. And then you have me and my career. My mother is also a product of public schools, she just happened to not grow up in DC.

The point I say in sharing that sometimes is that we don't talk enough about the successes. What kind of bugs me the most about this dialogue is we always assume what's private is best and what's public is horrible. That's just the undertone that always goes around, and it's not fair. There are good public schools, there are bad public schools. There are good private schools and there are bad private schools. There is not utopia. So from a premise of always assuming that public is bad, private is good, so therefore we have to give people the opportunity to send their kids to private school, I mean, that part of it is always the undertone and it's troubling, so I always like to start there.

But looking at it not from an emotional standpoint, which obviously we can get very emotional about this, being that I am from DC, and DC always being used as a laboratory bothers me also, so I do have to get that off my chest real quickly.

DC is always used to try things out. Why? Because DC can be used to try things out. As everyone knows, we have no voting representation in Congress. We have no senators, interestingly enough. This is being debated in the Senate right now. We have no representation in the Senate. But yet and still, the residents here have to do what we have to do, and we have to live with the consequences of what other people decide, and that also is troubling.

As a quick side note, one of the most interesting things that I got out of my DC history class – because I know a lot of people are not from DC, that's why I spend the time talking from this perspective. Before the Emancipation Proclamation, the slaves in Washington were actually freed here first. It was an experiment. A lot of people don't know that – to see how would we function as citizens in society.

And I won't go into how negative that was in terms of the perception of, well, are they going to loot and steal and be a ruckus. But basically when they see that we could be good citizens in society, they said, you know what, maybe we should try this more broadly.

Unfortunately, I hate to make the analogy between that and this program, but what troubles me by calling this a pilot is, again, a lot of things were called pilots, but they're still with us today. And just looking at this, again, from a policy perspective, what you're dealing with right now is a five-year authorization for the voucher part of this three-sector approach. The other two sectors that are being funded, it's a one-year appropriation.

And I have to go back to that, because a lot of times people who don't know the mechanics are not focused on that. You have a five-year authorization for the voucher pilot, so-called, and a one-year appropriation for the other two sectors. They're not authorized for five years.

So that means – and it's very interesting that – and no slight to Nina, but talking about this in the context of No Child Left Behind, we all know, sitting in this room, what's happening with No Child Left Behind. \$9 billion under-funded across the country. \$9 billion under-funded. \$50 million under-funded right here in DC. How many more things can we have that become in place where it's not clear where the resources are coming from? Again, I'm just looking at this from a pure policy perspective for a minute.

The other problem with this is there is nothing legally that requires Congress to act on this right now. There is no requirement under the law in terms of our home rule charter and other things that govern the laws of DC that requires federal action on

this. If DC wanted to implement, in the same way as Milwaukee, Cleveland, what have you, a voucher program, we could do this locally. We don't need congressional action for this. This is not required. So that's another problem that doesn't get discussed often.

Now, why DC? Well, the common answer is the answer that we've received, which is you have the mayor, you have the head of the school board, you have the head of the education committee on the city council who are supporting this and have become a part of it. Well, what city in today's economy, if you offered \$40 million to any city, would they say, no, that's OK, we don't want it?

The problem is when you link a voucher program to "extra money" for your public school system, if you say no, then the whole \$40 million basically goes out the window. So then you're in a problem because it looks bad.

I mean, all school systems right now need money, and that's the other problem. DC is no more unique than LA, San Francisco, Detroit. Pick any urban area, in any state, and you're going to have similar challenges. And it's the reality of the time. But the other reality is you don't hear – these same people that want to see this pilot here in DC, they're not advocating it for their own backyard, which is also disingenuous.

Thirty-seven states have defeated, at the state legislature level, voucher programs. Have defeated it. Polling data, and I've been reading a lot of it. You can make numbers do what you want to make them to do, and I'm going to defer to our academicians over here for the statistics, because that's not really my area of expertise. But generally speaking, the polling data I'm seeing consistently shows anywhere from 50% to 66% or two-thirds percent of the population right now oppose vouchers. And it all depends on how you ask questions, of course. We know that. It depends on how you ask things, because, obviously, again, if I offered you some money, why would you say no? So it's all in how you phrase the questions and what the impact is going to be.

And the other reality is based on the phone calls, and the e-mails, and letters that we're getting to the Congresswoman's office, there clearly is a lot of the – we would say, the majority of the DC residents are not in favor of this, just based on the feedback we get in the office, based on the parent's groups that we're working with, based on the fact or equally important that the majority of local elected officials, based on the referendums that have been passed by the school board and city council, based on letters that they are writing right now to Congress, clearly show that this is not where the majority position is of the city. And, of course, based on where my boss is, of course.

So the reality is that, from a policy perspective, it has a lot of flaws. And unfortunately the devil is always in the details. A lot of the details of how this

program is going to be implemented has never been answered. And it's troubling because even with the testing and evaluation criteria, the reason I wanted to ask that question is, because as everyone knows that looks at the legislation, it's not clear what the testing and evaluation criteria is really going to be, if that's really the point of doing this.

The other problem is – I mean, I get asked a lot of questions daily. If I'm a single parent and I have nine kids, are all nine of my children going to be eligible for this program? Because again there's a lottery process that still has yet to be defined. I mean, there's a lot of details here that are just not really matching up with the details.

And a lot of the added expenses, if you look at the \$7,500 allocation, we all know what the cost to go to private school in this area is. Where are we going to go to school? And then all these added – the transportation costs, the uniform fees, the book fees. I mean, there's a lot of details that no one can seem to really – well, we haven't thought about that yet, we're just worried about the vote today or tomorrow or whatever. It's very, very troubling.

But again, from a policy perspective, we have no federally funded voucher program yet, and when and if this passes, this will be the first time you have a federally funded voucher program. So that really does open up the floodgate to privatization of the public school system, which does not make sense. And closing out my initial thoughts, in DC especially it doesn't make sense, because we do have the largest number of charter schools per capita in the country. And yes, there are waiting lists, so let's deal with that problem.

We do have 15 transformation schools, and there would be a lot more if we had the resources to have more transformation schools that really get to the crux of the issue, which is not so much what's going on in the classroom. It's what's going on in these communities and what's going on in the house. How can I learn if I'm in an environment where I can't eat before I go to class? Of course I'm not going to be as good. Or if I have to deal with a lot of other issues in my immediate home environment.

So with the transformation schools, where you have these wraparound services that provide the extra tutoring services for the kids, for the parents, a lot of the adult education components, and other things that have documented scholastic achievement. SAT-9 scores are up substantially for the first time in all 15 transformation schools. That's phenomenal.

We have success stories. And as I know my colleagues are going to speak to, as many of you know in this room, the data on scholastic achievement for students in vouchers programs is mixed at best, minimal arguably, and really null and void if you really can put it side by side. They always speak to parental satisfaction. Well, what

parent wouldn't be happy to have a different option? I mean, that's the easy one, again.

Of course we would all like to have choices beyond maybe what our immediate environment is, but in DC – I mean, it's really weird that they're focusing in DC because, in closing, I know that, yes, OK, the neighborhood I grew up in is a “better neighborhood” in the city, but we have one of the most flexible out-of-boundary systems here. I can speak to that because I know who I went to school with. They came from all parts of the city, so you're not trapped into your neighborhood, if you want to use that as an argument. Well, you're trapped in your neighborhood school. You're not trapped. Not in DC. Now I can't speak to other areas, but in DC we have a very flexible system. So again, it doesn't make sense from that standpoint.

The testing and evaluation criteria really do not make sense. The factor that we have all these budget cuts going on right now, and to use money for something that just has all these questions to it just doesn't make sense from a basic policy perspective. And that's where I'll leave it for the moment.
(applause)

RICHARD ROTHSTEIN: Thank you. As Nina Rees said, the most that can be said about the various analyses of vouchers, as they've been experimented with around the country, is that they don't make things any worse. It's incredible actually what the research has found. There's been a lot of debate between econometricians who have tried to analyze data from several voucher experiment.

Here at the Press Club a few weeks ago, Alan Krueger and Paul Peterson went at each other over Peterson's studies, which have been the most consistent and long-term studies of voucher experiments. Even if you accept everything that Peterson claims, even if you dismiss Krueger's methodological criticisms of Peterson's work, the most that he can find is a tiny difference for some students in some places and in some times, and not others.

What Peterson finds is even granting everything that he says and dismissing all the criticisms of his work, what he finds is that voucher experiments produce small gains for African American students in some grades in some cities some of the time. They don't produce gains for Hispanic students. They don't produce gains for white students. They don't produce gains for African American students in other grades and in other cities and in other times.

It's really incredible that – I mean, I would have expected students with the vouchers to have done better, regardless of any other policy criticisms you might have of a voucher proposal. In Milwaukee, the most that you can say is, even granting all of the proponents, the most reliable study is one by Cecelia Rouse in which she found that students did slightly better in math and not better in reading.

The bottom line is that the voucher experiments that have been done so far have shown virtually no difference in the performance of students in private schools and public schools. And that is, I think, surprising, I think, even to me who is skeptical of vouchers for other reasons.

Now why is that? As Richard Kahlenberg mentioned before, we did a study, which is in this book, *All Else Equal*, in which we said let's look at actual public and private schools and see if they're different, see what it is that might make them different. And so we picked a – this was not a quantitative study, it wasn't statistically representative because we actually wanted to do case studies. And so we picked 18 elementary public and private schools in California, matched them by community, as Nina Rees says we should do, and then went in and looked and tried to see what the differences were.

And what we found was that, to be brief, that if you went into a school in Watts, for example, in Los Angeles, the public and private schools looked very, very similar. If you went into schools in Palo Alto, the public and private schools look very similar. The big differences in schools in California were not between whether they were public and private but whether they were in low-income or high-income communities.

I'll give you just a few examples of this. Parent involvement. The theories of private school choice, of vouchers, theorists of private school choice and vouchers argue that one of the reasons that private schools do better, as Nina Rees says, are successful – as I noted before actually there's no evidence that they do better - but one of the reasons that they're said to be successful is they have more parent involvement.

Well, when you go into low-income Catholic schools in, for example, Watts in Los Angeles, they do have more parent involvement because parents are required to be involved in order to enroll their children. They're required to agree to be involved in the school.

And how are they involved? Well, they're involved in selling candy and in selling chits for the local supermarket, which gives a kickback to the school, and so forth. The big frustration of the nuns and the lay teachers in the schools that we visited, low-income Catholic schools, was they couldn't get parents involved in the academic program. Exactly the same complaints that we found when we visited similar schools, public schools, in the same community.

We went into an upper-income suburb and visited private and public schools, and we found a surfeit of parent involvement in both the public and private schools. The schools were concerned with how to limit parent involvement. The teachers in both the public and private schools complained that they couldn't get parents off their backs. That one teacher told us that every day she got a letter from a parent with a

new curricular suggestion about how the teacher ought to be teaching math. There was no problem with parental involvement in the public school. In fact in one public school we visited, high-income public school, there was high teacher turnover attributed to the fact that the teachers got fed up with all the harassment from parents. So parental involvement is not a function of public versus private control of the school. It's a function of social class.

Now in fact, I think, that the reason that we don't find these big differences between public and private schools, either in the research, the quantitative research, such as Paul Peterson or Cecelia Rouse do, or in the case study kind of research that we've done, is that, as we've known since the Coleman Report, the biggest single determinant of the variation of student achievement is social class. It's not the quality of the school.

And there is, of course, differences in school quality, as mentioned before, between public and private schools. There's no doubt about that. But there's also enormous difference in the quality of the upbringing the children have and the preparation that they come to school, and their ability to learn. Children spend most of their time, as everybody knows, out of school. And they learn a lot out of school, or don't learn a lot out of school. Much of their achievement is a result, a function of the kind of upbringing they have and the social environment from which they come.

Now let me try to make that a little bit concrete, because we often say that people dismiss it because they don't understand why it should be that social class makes a difference in how children learn. Well, to take a very basic example. If you have two children, one from a professional family, one from a low-income family, the kind that would be eligible for vouchers, the child, the infant, the toddler in the professional family is likely to have been lap-read to from before the time they can talk or walk. These days, they probably sit on their parents' laps as they work on the computer and play with the mouse, or absorb the idea of computers, before they can even understand what they're doing.

A child from a –

END OF SIDE

ROTHSTEIN: – at home, they don't have their first toys, those touch-and-feel books, they don't have letters all over the refrigerator that they can move around and make words with, and so forth and so forth. Doesn't that make a difference in the ability of children to achieve to high levels in an academic program with the best of schools? With the best of schools there would be an enormous difference in the achievement of children from those two kinds of homes at the end of school. And that in fact is what the research finds.

Now it's not just a question of the problem of the intellectual environment with which children are raised and the facility they have with language, although that's a big part of it as well. My favorite study is one that was done by two Kansas researchers about 10 years ago in which they actually went into the homes of both professional, and working class, and welfare families who had children up to the age of three years old, toddlers. And they counted the words that those children heard in their background noise. These children weren't talking, they were just in environments where words were spoken.

They found that the professional families used an average of 2,150 words an hour. Just in the background, that children heard. The working class families' children heard an average of 1,350 words an hour. And the welfare family children heard an average of 600 words an hour. And yet we think, that when these children come to school, that if only teachers have high expectations or private schools focus more on curriculum, these children will achieve the same levels of academic proficiency.

Let me give you a few concrete examples that are not about the intellectual environment. There are very practical differences in the way in which children are brought up in this country.

A couple of years ago – my favorite example is a very trivial one, and that's why it's so favorite of mine because it is so trivial. A couple of years ago the Surgeon General published a report in which he found that one-third of all low-income children in this country had untreated dental cavities. One-third. Now I'm not an expert in oral hygiene, so I don't know what an untreated dental cavity means. But let's just assume for the sake of this discussion – maybe I'm wrong - but let's assume that in half the time that a child has an untreated dental cavity, he has a toothache sometime.

To me that means that any time you have a low-income school, whether it's public or private, anytime you have a low-income school and you give a test, a sixth of the kids are going to have a toothache. To me that means they're not going to do as well, no matter how high the standards, no matter how much academic press the school has, no matter how much parental involvement you have. Any time you teach a lesson, one-sixth of the kids are going to have a toothache.

I asked Richard before we started if it's OK if I make a criticism of the book that we're promoting today, and he said it was OK if I did so, so I will. My objection to this book is the way it throws around the term failing schools, as though the problem of our urban minority schools is that the schools are failing. In fact – and we don't pay attention to this research, but it's out there, and in fact the Century Foundation published it in its last book called *A Notion at Risk*. What we know from the research is that schools for low-income, disadvantaged children do as well if not better in terms of value added than schools for middle-class children.

Now I'm not saying there aren't bad schools, but we don't know how to identify them and we certainly can't identify them by their test scores, for the reasons I've indicated so far. What the research shows, the careful research shows, is that there's test score gap between black and white children. About half of it exists when children enter kindergarten. The other half that is created from the time children enter kindergarten until the time they leave 12th grade is created in the summertime. There's children in those cases where tests are given to children at the beginning of the year and at the end of the year, so you can separate the effects of school-year learning and summer learning.

Low-income children, black children, learn more in school than white children do, and then they fall behind in the summer when they don't have the kinds of enriching experiences that middle-class children have. The gap is created, as I say, half before school, and the other half is created out of school during the years the children are in school. No choice program, whether it's public or private, is going to solve that problem.

How do we solve the problem? Well, I'm certainly not opposed to choice, but if we want to solve the problem of low achievement for disadvantaged and minority children, we have to take our attention away from this myth of failing schools and begin to turn our attention to trying to narrow the socioeconomic gaps between children that are primarily driving this achievement gap.

To give some trivial examples, based on the one I talked about before, if I were a school superintendent or a school administrator, and I had \$150 extra per pupil to spend in a school of low-income children, and I wanted to get a big test score bump, I'd put a dental clinic in the school. I wouldn't do a lot of professional development and reduce class size. If we really wanted to improve student achievement, let's put a dental – you'd get a bigger test score bump from that, I am convinced, than you would from all of the school improvement, the curricula reform that we can imagine.

And of course, there's a lot bigger public policies that we should be concerned with as well. One of the biggest problems, for example, in most of our urban areas with student achievement of low-income children, is student mobility. Anybody who's read the data about schools knows that there are some schools, many schools, inner-city schools in the big cities of this country, where mobility rates are over 100%. That means that for every seat in the school, two children or more occupy that seat at some time during the year.

Now you can standardize your curricula as much as you want. If your seats are turning over at that rate, you're not going to get very high achievement. There's still going to have to be review. You're still going to disrupt the learning of other children in the class. You're still going to have to get the teacher to know the child

and that child's particular and individual needs. That kind of student mobility does far more to depress student achievement in inner-city areas than any differences you can attribute to public or private control of schools.

And what do we do about student mobility? Well, one of the things we do is we can stabilize housing arrangements for children in our urban areas. As you know, in urban areas around the country, housing prices, rents, have gone up far more rapidly than incomes of working parents. And I'm not talking about people on welfare now. I'm talking about – OK. I will wrap up. I'm talking about children of working families.

Now what's the federal government doing about that? Well, we're cutting back on the Section 8 housing voucher program. Right? If I wanted to get a big test score bump in the inner city in cities around this country, I'd be far better off putting my money into increasing the Section 8 housing voucher program rather than cutting it back, than I would on trying to figure out a way of getting people a way of taking advantage of a non-existent private school benefit.

So to sum up, the primary driver of the test score gap is not failing schools. It's not public versus private schools. It's the socioeconomic differences that children come to school with and stay in school with. And unless this society begins to address those socioeconomic differences, our school reform, of any kind, I think, I bound to fail. (applause)

KAHLENBERG: Thank you, Richard. Let me just make one clarification about the Century Foundation's research while this is in people's mind. We did publish a study which found that the summer setback was significant. That is, that low-income students don't continue to learn as much during the summer, whereas middle-class children do. I think it would be inaccurate to say that the body of our research suggests that therefore schools don't matter, and I don't know that you're going that far, Richard, either.

Clearly there are differences between low-income schools and middle-class schools, as Richard says. Levels of parental involvement, quality of the teachers, the influence of the peers, all of which Coleman also talked about. And so, I don't want people to leave here thinking that the Century Foundation stands for the proposition that we've got the school situation fixed, if only we could fix the home environment. I think we're supporting Richard's research on home environment and think that that's very important, but that schools are important as well. Dr. Willie?

WILLIE: I'm pleased to be on this panel to say a few words different from the words that you've heard, because I think it's very important. I begin this discussion by listing a few assumptions about education in general, and vouchers in particular. With

reference to education, education is an institutional system concerned with creating and disseminating knowledge for the welfare of all.

The second assumption is that knowledge development and knowledge dissemination, these functions of education are improved when they take place in a diversified learning environment. In this respect, I somewhat differ with the other speaker.

I think that the school environment can be a significant place for enhancing learning. As a matter of fact, Coleman's study pointed out – and this is why we read things differently when it has race in it. Coleman's study pointed out that white children seemed to be influenced more by their home environment when they go to school, their achievement in school, but he found that minority children seemed to be influenced more by the school.

And yet, even Coleman in his own study left that second finding out. He came down heavy on the fact that what people bring to school, in many respects, is what they get out of school, although his data found that for minority children, school has a more important influence on them than their families. I don't know why we forgot that. Maybe it was because Coleman was white. I don't know. But some of my best friends are white, so I'm not talking against whites. But I am saying you ought to look at the full range of findings. And that's what Coleman found, and nobody's paid any attention to it.

My third assumption is that education is a private good as well as a public good, thus education has a twofold goal of individual enhancement and community advancement. That's why I disagree with the proposal that's been advanced and floated here in Washington. They want to do well for particular children, but they are not doing anything for the school system. As a matter of fact, that's what's wrong with the legislation Leave No Child Behind.

Actually they're leaving a system behind. And you can't educate children without school systems. I've never seen a child who was educated alone. Even Rousseau didn't do so well years ago with Emile. Gee, I still remember that. Must have had a pretty good education somewhere, although I am a southern boy. So leave no child behind. That sounds good. But you also have to say leave no system behind. And this proposal does nothing for the system.

And my final assumption is that education is concerned with developing multiple intelligences, such as communicating and calculating skills, the search for self-understanding, empathy toward others, and ways of achieving love and justice in society. Now that's what schools are supposed to do. You will begin to realize why I have put my money on diversified schools rather than on the individual alone.

Now I want to make one other assumption about education, and that is that excellence is good and beautiful, it's fine and beautiful, but equity is also important. And one of our problems we've had in education in the United States is we're focused on individuals, but we have forgotten about equity for the institution. And you cannot have effective education focusing on individuals without focusing on the group. And equity is a property of the group. Excellence is the property of the individual. Excellence and equity complement each other. One without the other is incomplete.

Now let me make a few assumptions about vouchers. Vouchers may enhance students who receive them, but do nothing for the school system left behind. The other assumption I make about vouchers is that the Robin Hood story in reverse is a function of the voucher system. They take from the poor and give to the rich. They've never read about Robin Hood. That's what they're doing. They're completely reversing that noble story.

And my third assumption is this: unless public school systems provide transportation by the students who receive vouchers – because I don't buy her stuff, let's keep them in – what is that – 7 and 8 Wards. Sounds like segregation to me. I'm 75 years old and I know segregation when I hear it. Why should anybody be retained in a certain ward if one doesn't want to stay in that ward, unless somebody wants to contain them.

And I don't like what I heard here about 7 and 8 Wards. These are Catholic schools in the 7th and 8th Ward. Well, what about those other little schools like the school up there by the cathedral and so on? Why can't those kids go to that school? I don't understand it. I don't understand it. I tried to make sense out of it in my own mind, but it doesn't make sense to me. I don't like segregation. And the Supreme Court in *Brown* said segregation has no place in education. That simple. And yet here is a program that's designed to perpetuate segregation, keeping all those people in the 7th and 8th Wards. Must be something good there. I don't know what it is.

But there's no reason why white people shouldn't be brought into those wards so they can have all that goodness that's in the 7th and 8th Wards. But they're not doing that in it, so something's wrong here. I smell something. I'm not going to go beyond that.

I want to also say that if transportation is not provided for those who receive vouchers, this program then begins to discriminate against poor kids, because they cannot get to the good schools that the vouchers would let them enroll in. And that's not fair.

And finally, if private schools receive public money by way of vouchers, then any public school that admits voucher-bearing students should forfeit the privilege of

rejecting such students if they do not meet the admissions requirements. And I was told that they would have to take everyone with vouchers, but they never told how they would guarantee that schools were not rejecting these kids for some other reasons.

I also know in Milwaukee some of the private schools that took children sent them back to the public schools saying they couldn't educate them. That happened, because I was a consultant in Milwaukee, and they wouldn't accept my plan, and put in those private schools, and then they sent some kids back to public schools because they said we can't educate them, while still taking the money for those that they liked. And that's what's going to happen here in Washington, if that's what happens.

Finally, my assumption is there are not enough private schools. And you heard what was said in here. This was almost a signal. Start gearing up to have your private school, that has no experience behind it, but is private. There are not enough private schools with space available to accommodate 70,000 students. Now I put 70,000 students there because that's about what you have here in District of Columbia. And the fact is you are being unfair to the students who cannot be accommodated in private schools, if that's supposed to be the best school.

It's almost like magnet schools. Magnet schools were better schools in some respects. But they never accommodated more than one-fifth, one-fourth, or one-third of all students. And the question I ask is a simple one. That's unfair to the two-thirds of people who can't be accommodated. And we never deal with fairness in education, but we should.

So those are my basic assumptions about education and vouchers, and now let me tell what Richard asked me to tell is an alternative. An alternative is to make all of the schools in the school district good schools. And you can do that using a market approach. Letting schools be able to attract students. And I tell you we have done this. We have a program called Controlled Choice that was in Boston for about 10 years before they finally started listening to Washington and dumped it. It is in Cambridge. It is in St. Lucie County in Florida. It is in Lee county in Florida. And let me tell you what happened.

What we did is decided the neighborhood schools no longer had any relevance in terms of what people learned. I've been a researcher for years and years in education and in social science. And I've found no document that tells me that the convenience of going to school has anything to do with what you learn in school. In fact, I did a study in Boston based upon our controlled choice plan, which went into effect in 1989, and found that only 20% of the students and their parents chose a school because of its location. Four-fifths of the parents and student chose

a school because it was one they thought was more in sync with their child's need. And that will happen under a choice plan if you can choose your school.

What we did in Boston, what we've done in Lee County, Florida, and what we tried to do in Seattle, and in San Jose, and also in Illinois, was to set up a new way of choosing schools. First we knew that neighborhoods were segregated, and we know that segregated education is very bad for minorities and poor people. Interestingly, this is an important finding, segregation seems not to be harmful in terms of achievement for affluent white people. So since the affluent white people are not harmed by a segregated school, the policy makers decide, well, maybe poor black people won't be harmed by a segregated school. It's the opposite.

So we decided, since diversity seems to be so good, and I'm a great believer in diversity. I wore my Noah's tie today because Noah believed in diversity. What we did then is said, neighborhood schools don't make sense. Now you can go to a neighborhood school if you want to, but they don't make sense in terms of the education. So we took all of the small neighborhoods – in Boston, we did three large zones, which each zone had about 20 elementary schools in them. And those were large zones. They were diversified. Large zones, where you accommodate about 20 schools.

Then what we did is said, any student who lives in any one of these zones can go to any of those 20 schools. Then you visited schools, and by February, you had to turn in your card. This was for the entering grade. We didn't have to do it for every grade because if you did it at the entering grade, eventually that would filter through the school system.

After you visited those schools, you could make your preference, you could rank order your preference, and then the computer could assign you. And what we did, in order – because open enrollments will never give you diversified schools, that's why I oppose what's going on in Washington right now. What we did then is said, we had to have some enrollment fairness guidelines. At that time we had racial fairness guidelines, but you can add gender fairness guidelines, you can have socioeconomic fairness guidelines.

And the guidelines were not quotas as such. They were goals. And the goals were how many people of the different racial groups would be in the school if they were assigned randomly. So you take the proportion of whites in the city, you take the proportion of blacks, you take the proportion of Hispanics, and those are your enrollment fairness guidelines.

But we do something different. After people choose their school, if people in one race group don't want it and others do, they can have that school. But all people are guaranteed getting in the first round. So we have enrollment fairness guidelines. That means everybody has to go to a diversified school. Every school

is diversified, but some are diversified because people move in town in August and all the other schools are filled. But the schools that filled up first were those that had the best educational programs.

What we're doing then is asking schools now to make themselves attractive so people will want to come to you. We found – this was just for elementary schools only. I want to tell you this little story because I don't have time to go for the whole system. We found that three out of every ten elementary schools were so popular that all racial groups wanted to go to it. We call these over-chosen schools. And because we had our racial fairness guidelines, these were the most diverse schools in the city and these were the schools that had persons who had the highest achievement, because the schools had a lot of things going on that were enhancing education.

And I looked at the discussions about the New York data that's been analyzed and reanalyzed and reanalyzed. Paul Peterson said, those youngsters who go to those private schools, the proportion who increase their educational score is about 8%. Well, I found that in – and that was just black students. I found that these schools that were over-chosen, I found that 6% of both black and Hispanics had higher achievement scores over the youngsters in other schools. These were schools that made themselves attractive. I found that about 8% of whites who were in these over-chosen schools had achievement scores that were higher than the other schools. And then I found about 10% of Asians in these over-chosen schools had a higher proportion with higher achievement than in the other schools.

So I said, gee whiz, if I can get this big a bounce in public schools, why take people out and send them to private schools? And finally the point I came to is that if the school system was worth its worth, they would have ways of asking schools to make themselves attractive and reward them for it, and then that means that all of the schools would be attractive and you didn't have to send anybody outside of the schools, and you could take advantage of all of the 162 schools you have and challenge all of them to become attractive.

And the way you can do it, is you can say look at school number 8, see all of the people they attracted? Why don't you do a school just like that? You can point out a school that's already working. And that has worked in Boston. It has worked in Cambridge. It has worked in Lee County. I'll say one thing and then I'll quit, Richard.

In Lee county, when we put in this kind of plan with three big zones, and every school in a zone belongs to every youngster, the state rated the schools in Lee county, and 15% of those schools in Lee county were rated as A. Two years after we started controlled choice, 30% of the schools were rated as A. They began to make themselves attractive. 15% of the schools in Lee County, Florida were rated as D, and after the controlled choice was in where each school competed with

others for students, there were no more. It was zero D schools in Lee County, Florida.

So public schools can be positioned to compete for students, and public schools can be made good year after year by replicating what public schools do that are good. You can't ask a public school to become good by acting like it's a private school when it's a public school. But in my plan the public schools can emulate other public schools, and that enhances the number that are very good, and you will enhance all of the students. And that means you're looking out for the system as well as the individual. Thank you. (applause)

KAHLENBERG: Thanks very much. Those were three excellent presentations. You all have been patient with your questions. And I don't know. Steve, do you want to come up and be the punching bag, since Nina's not here? I'll ask you to represent the Department of Education. Steve spends most of his time, as I understand, on magnet schools and public schools, but I'll ask you to step in. Yes, Sally.

SALLY SACHAR: Hi. (inaudible) your comments about capacity. I'm Sally Sachar. I'm actually the incoming CEO of the Washington Scholarship Fund, and will be there in a couple weeks. But I wanted to –

KAHLENBERG: I'm sorry, I don't think it's switched on.

SACKER Yes, it is. Can you hear me now? OK. I had a question about the observations you were making and the concerns you raised about capacity in terms of private schools as it relates to the scholarship or the voucher program. In terms of the program you just talked about in Boston and the other cities, what did you do with the over-chosen schools, as you talked about it? How did you deal with the capacity problems there?

WILLIE: We dealt with it in a fair way, and that's what I like about it. Incidentally, the book is called *Student Diversity, Choice, and School Improvement*. A copy of it's over there. We let all people choose the schools that they would like to go to, and then if there were more people wanting a school than there were seats available, then we had a lottery. And that's the way we chose the first choice.

What happened is we found that when you give a challenge to all of the schools to make themselves better, there's more than just one school that's good. And so people who didn't get their first choice got their second choice schools. As a matter of fact, 85% of the people got either first or second choice school. We let people in their second choice school try again for their first choice the next year, but the truth is only 3% did it, because their second choice school they found was just as good as the first choice, and that means that you have a series of good schools. But we used a lottery when more people wanted it than there were seats available.

KAHLENBERG: Yes, right here. And I've been asked to say if you all can speak into the mike. I know, Dr. Willie, everyone can hear you given your projection, but –

WILLIE: This doesn't seem to be on, though.

KAHLENBERG: I think they are working. Yeah, they're working. Yes.

AUDIENCE: I have two really short questions. Firstly, for Dr. Willie, can you just explain the basic difference between open enrollment and then controlled choice?

WILLIE: Yes.

AUDIENCE: And secondly, for either Miss Parker, if she knows, or the representative for Miss Rees, does anyone know yet how the 2,000 children for the pilot program are going to be selected? Are there any criteria that are thrown around yet?

STEVEN BROCKHOUSE: I have – first of all, let me say I'm not an expert on this yet, but I don't think that we know exactly how those things will work out because the legislation itself has not been passed. There has been a version of the bill that's passed the House of Representatives. As Nina said this morning, the debate and the discussion in the Senate is still ongoing. My guess is that there will be differences between the two bills, and those will have to be resolved, and there are some differences in the details on that. So at this point I don't think we do know exactly how that will work.

PARKER: Well, again, that goes back to my point of the details. But in terms of what's in the legislation, the 185% poverty baseline is the criteria, and then there is a whole list of priorities which deals with the kids in the “failing schools,” and there's a whole slew of other priorities that make up how certain preferences are going to be given. But the bottom line, and I think going to your point, is there's probably going to be way more than 2,000 people that are going to want to do this, and then there's going to have to be some kind of lottery process that still has to be worked out basically. What the legislation is setting up is basically whoever the administrating entity is that sets up the program is really going to have discretion on how the details get worked out.

WILLIE: The difference between open enrollment and controlled choice is any student can go to any school that one wishes to go to if there's space. That means, you may end up with a lot of segregated schools. In controlled choice, we have enrollment fairness guidelines, as I said they can be socioeconomic, that is free lunch versus non-free lunch. They can be race, whites versus brown and blacks. And when you have controlled choice then you guarantee diversity in all of your schools.

And the reason for it, again, is what I mentioned earlier. I found that minority children and poor children do better in diversified schools, while I found that affluent children and white children do better in homogeneous schools. And so you're never going to raise the scores of minorities as long as you have them in segregated schools. In fact, I found in Tampa, Florida, 17 D schools one year, and all of those schools were racially or socioeconomically isolated. That is, 80% or more of the people were one race, and 80% or more of the people were poor.

So the homogeneous schools are bad for poor kids and minority kids, heterogeneous schools are good for them. Homogeneous schools seem to be good for white kids and affluent kids. Diversified schools don't harm them. So you might as well go with what will help those who need help, especially since you know that diversified schools won't harm whites.

KAHLENBERG: One other point I think worth mentioning, under the controlled choice plan, everyone is required to choose. Under open enrollment, the most motivated families tend to opt out. And under Dr. Willie's plan, everyone must choose, so you don't get this big divide between those who choose and those who choose not to choose. And I think that's one of the concerns people have with the voucher program as well, is that the most motivated families are likely to participate, but those left behind may be worse off. Yes?

AUDIENCE: Is this on? I'd like to address a question to Steve and to Miss Parker. I was interested, again Richard pointed out, that Nina brought up accountability and really fingered that as one of the very important pieces, and her critique of the DC public schools included a lack of accountability. However, she specifically seemed to imply that private schools should not be held accountable to the standards that the Department of Education and President Bush have required of every public school in the country.

And certainly, for instance, the Catholic schools have a system. They have a bureaucratic structure. They're perfectly capable of implementing many of the No Child Left Behind requirements as well as many public school systems that are similar size. We're not giving public school systems a pass because they're small, because they only have four schools, because they're in a rural area, or something like this. We're saying every public school in the country must meet these accountability requirements. And yet, Miss Rees seemed to imply that private schools should get a pass on that.

And I know, Steve, it's not your area, but I'd like you to address that, why the Department of Education and President Bush, I assume, is opposing having the accountability requirements that every public school has to meet, why those should not apply to schools that get federal dollars, and that we should instead rely on parental satisfaction numbers as being a reason why we should continue to give these schools federal dollars.

BROCKHOUSE: I can't address sort of the underlying why on that question. The point I would want to make with respect to the proposed DC voucher program is that there are provisions in it, as this pilot proceeds, for very rigorous evaluation of what the program was going to accomplish in terms of raising student achievement for the participants.

PARKER: In a nutshell that's one of the main problems. Private schools and public schools are very different and held to different standards, and that is, from our perspective, one of the policy problems when you start looking at doing that, and part of the reason I'm sure that they're not pressing the point.

The other key issue with this, and the reason that it goes back to your question about how are the 2,000 kids going to be selected. To call this parental choice is really a misnomer too, because a lot of people are not going to get their choice, because there is going to be, I'm sure, a lot more people than those 2,000 slots are going to be able to accommodate.

The other problem becomes that private schools have to choose to participate in this program. So if you put too much baggage on it, and too many additional criteria – private schools are private for a reason, and so when you start looking at things like teacher certification requirements, and obviously, building codes and things all schools have to satisfy that to a point.

But in terms of the testing criteria, and then that says that many people that know that have been following this debate, whether you're going to offer the same exact tests that are required under No Child Left Behind versus a comparable test. Who's going to pay for this?

Again, the devil is in the details, and it isn't fundamentally right from a policy perspective that if you're going to essentially be giving these public funds, funds that would otherwise go into the public school system to a private school, that they don't have to adjust how they daily operate to accommodate that.

And that's not clear yet. I know that there's some discussions that are going on right now to maybe strengthen some of the accountability provisions, but it yet remains to be seen. And obviously, it's probably – I mean I'm willing to bet it's not going to be as strict as what the public schools have to do, which is yet another problem.

KAHLENBERG: There seems to be some resistance. In this morning's paper, Jeanne Allen, who is a voucher advocate, says she's opposed to the accountability provisions being applied to the private schools: "The very freedom that private schools have is what makes them more successful than their counterparts here in the District." So that is the argument that's being made. Interestingly, I think

these groups often are very much in favor of accountability for the public schools, so that's a dilemma that has to be addressed. Yes, back here.

AUDIENCE: I had a question for the first presenter after Roz was showing a correlation between word exposure for children at early ages. Building upon that point, when you consider – how important is adult literacy in terms of a parent supporting a child in the household? When you look here in Washington, for example, in the FY '03 appropriations bill, there are 117,000 illiterate adults here in the city, people who are not functioning at full capacity literacy-wise. How important is that in terms of supporting a child in a household once they do come home? That's the first question.

The second question is, as it relates to accountability for the private schools. There's a thing that we have at DCPS called pacing charts, which are our system-wide curriculum. If a child who's enrolled in the 2,000 kids who are going to a private school or are going to have to take the SAT-9 once a year, don't you think there should be some link between our curriculum and the private schools' curriculum to make sure that the children are progressing at the same rate in which their counterparts in the public school side is? That's another devil in the details, as Roz says, that's not even being discussed.

ROTHSTEIN: Well, certainly you're right that parental literacy has a very big impact on what children learn. But I think that – and while it's very, very important to have adult education programs in places like DC, which improve the level of adult literacy, that is not going to be sufficient to address the kind of problem that I was talking about. It would make some difference, but it won't make a big difference.

The only real solution to that problem, if we really want to close the gap between children from less literate and more literate homes, the only solution is a high quality early childhood program that's available to children from homes that are less literate. And by early childhood I don't mean pre-K. That's four years old. That's already too late. By a high quality early childhood program, I don't mean one that's staffed by high school graduates and they're essentially custodial programs.

If we really want to equalize the exposure of children to language, to intellectual processes, to inquiry, we have to have high quality early childhood programs staffed by professionals who use the same kind of language the professional parents use in middle-class homes. That's an enormously expensive proposition. But if we're not willing to put money into that, I think it's foolish to expect the test score gap to close.

WILLIE: I'm doing a little research right now on black colleges and what they have done for individuals. One reason I'm doing it is because I know that many of the individuals who have graduated from those colleges came from families with

limited income. And one of the important facts I see in the black colleges is that the teachers there have been mentors to their students.

And I have another book called *A New Look at Black Families*, where I look at people like Matthew Holden, University of Virginia, people like John Hope Franklin, people like Clark and so on, who were great individuals. And the most important thing that I have found is that they came from such different kinds of families. So family background is important, I'm not denying that, but the schools can also have an effect beyond what the family does, and I think it's time for us to tell schools is you can't opt out simply because of what the family did. The school has an effect independent of the family.

KAHLENBERG: OK. Any questions over here? Yes.

AUDIENCE: Thank you. I had a question about – it might be in the details, but how the 2,000 students are chosen, and then Miss Rees had mentioned that, to me abstractly, that all the students would be allowed to go to the private school, yet there's also going to be a lottery. And I know these private schools, they don't have to – like special education is not one of the criteria that private schools can deny students. So after you have those 2,000 students, can some of those be denied or are those 2,000 students guaranteed for some private school? Because it seems to me you have the 2,000 students, and then they can be denied by the private schools having the ultimate authority. So that's more a question for you, Miss Parker, if you know, if there's a way out for those 2,000 who are chosen. It seems to me that the private schools still have the power.

PARKER: Well, again, unfortunately, I mean, we hate to keep going back to the devil's in the details, but these are the kinds of things, and I've been getting these questions, and I've been trying to get answers myself. You probably have seen a range of statistics. I've seen between 1,300 and 2,000. I've even seen, I think, as low as 1,200 and 2,000. I mean, the language is up to 2,000, when you actually – and it's not in the bill, by the way. The number 2,000 is not in the legislation. It's just when you calculate whether you have \$10 million or \$15 million or \$13 million, you've got a lot of numbers being thrown around here, and you have a voucher that could be up to \$7,500, so you have to take the \$7,500 and then do the math. And so that's why you're getting a range.

But again, the way out that's in the legislation is if there's an over-subscription for the resources that are available, then it's going to go to a lottery. And then a lottery is just like a lottery is, so there are going to be people that are going to be left out, even arguably within that set number, because the number's not set. Yes.

AUDIENCE: Rosalind, I guess you'd have to say a lottery is as a lottery does, right? Professionally I do marketing and business consulting, and have done a lot of volunteer work in schools over the years, and I would certainly say that the one

thread that I have seen is the fact that everybody wants progress and nobody wants change. And the one thing I would ask just rhetorically is, why not just do it instead of fighting it, and let the cards fall where they're going to fall. We have a lot of people – we certainly have people sitting at that table and the people out here are here because of their interest in seeing education go forward. I think that there's too much energy being wasted in trying to find reasons to not do things instead of reasons to do them.

And then I have a question for Professor Willie. In your activities in Florida, regarding having the schools make themselves more attractive, are there any specifics that you could share with us for a moment as to essentially, in more rubber meets the road fashion, what did they do to make themselves more attractive?

WILLIE: To your first answer, though, it's very serious when you say why don't you try it. You're trying it on somebody else's kids. For example, I pointed out that white students do well in homogeneous schools, but black students do not. And you're going to strip the black students of their homogeneity. And I'm not speaking of just race, you're speaking of different learning styles, different capacities and so on. So these schools left behind in the 7th and 8th Wards are going to be homogeneous, and I can give you chapter and verse of homogeneous schools with black, and other minority, and poor kids where they do poorly. So I don't want to experiment on something that my data already shows me is harmful, and we're stripping those schools of their heterogeneity, which is important for them doing well.

Now, what do the schools do to make themselves better? All kinds of things. Some have developed after school programs, which are very helpful. See, you thought I might say something in just the curriculum only, but they do all of those kinds of things.

AUDIENCE: That's one of the big platforms that Schwarzenegger is running on in California to be governor, because he championed that very thing.

WILLIE: That, and then we have schools such as two-way bilingual schools where both English and Spanish are spoken, and taught, and they teach in both English and Spanish. And those youngsters come out of there being fluent in English and in Spanish. It's the most exciting school I've ever seen. Another one of the schools became an inclusion school with special education and regular education, but it was designed to be an inclusion school. It also had a parent's center built into the school, and it had visitations on all parents who were new to the school as they started.

There are a lot of different kinds of things like that that make schools attractive. And then, most of these schools that are very attractive are schools that have some really strong rules and regulations about what is acceptable and what is no. And

I've found those schools tend to be very, very effective because they provide some – not only standards, but they provide some limits on what will be tolerated.

AUDIENCE: Having grown up in that environment myself, I know exactly what you're saying.

WILLIE: That's right, yes.

PARKER: All I'll say to that point is that, again, let me make something clear. Myself and the Congresswoman have no problem – as a matter of fact, in terms of the Washington Scholarship Fund, the Congresswoman has done fundraisers for that organization and will continue to do so. It's just kind of also ironic that they're funds right now, the timing of this, when private scholarship funds are drying up, the economy is bad. We know that.

The bottom line is there is no extra money. We're dealing with one pot of limited public resources. You have to be very careful with what are you doing with public resources. And bad policy is bad policy. It has nothing to do per se with let's just try this, because unfortunately, there is no federally funded voucher program yet, but once this happens, this is already being touted as just the beginning. Then we're going to start to see these kinds of things popping up other places, and you have to be very careful with what precedent are you setting at a time where we all know that public funds are very limited, and you are setting a bad precedent.

You are setting a bad precedent, you are diverting public resources into a private system, and that's just bad – because you're getting into privatization issues, and it's a bad precedent, simply stated.

KAHLENBERG: We have time for –

BROCKHOUSE: It is a pilot.

KAHLENBERG: Oh, go ahead.

BROCKHOUSE: I mean, let's not lose sight of the fact that as this is set up, it is a pilot. It is – and a pilot is what it is. It's an experiment. The thing that I think is very, very important about it is that there are provisions for very rigorous attention – evaluation attached to it by an administration that is very, very strong on very serious evaluation, whether we're talking about this or any other educational program.

PARKER: Well, unfortunately the evaluation criteria – not to go tit for tat, but I mean, I am not a research expert, but I've talked to enough people who are. There is not a rigorous evaluation criteria, and that's one of the problems. Even to say that really does a disservice to the language that's in the legislation. And even Nina before

she left said, well, we really haven't dealt – because I asked her that question specifically, and I'm not going to rehash what she said. But the whole testing evaluation criteria really has not been etched out. It really hasn't.

BROCKHOUSE: No. And a lot of the detail will be yet to be worked out, but –

PARKER: So to say it's rigorous, that's a stretch. Let's be honest, that's a stretch. You can't have rigorous criteria because the criteria really isn't there. It's a framework.

KAHLENBERG: It's "faith-based." The last question is over here.

AUDIENCE: I've got a question, but first just a quick response to the "just do it" attitude part. For people who were back in '96 when the charter law was here in DC, that was very much the attitude. We rolled out the experiment, and I wish people would look at that, because the result of that is a lot of kids went to a lot of really bad schools. There's some great charter schools in town, but that was an example where we experimented without really looking at the nuts and bolts of how it's going to work, with a lot of chaos as a result.

And my question is Miss Rees mentioned a survey that had been done to establish that there was this capacity for 2,000 students. Did that survey, or has any other survey, looked at whether these schools are any good? Because our experience with the charters was we drew a lot of students from private schools that were, if I can use that term, failing. There are a lot of private schools that do not have a good reputation. And for all the rhetoric about competition, is this going to be a subsidy for schools that are failing in the competition that exists now? So the question is has anyone looked at the private schools that exist and have capacity?

BROCKHOUSE: If you give me contact information in terms of the survey that she mentioned, we'll follow up with you. I just don't have that information.

PARKER: Not to my knowledge. Not to my knowledge.

KAHLENBERG: OK, well, thank you all for coming. I want to thank our panel who did a terrific job. (applause) And thanks to Christy Hicks and Laurie Ahlrich for all their hard work.

END OF TAPE