

47 “(H)e transformed the state’s system of normal schools, which were really charity schools for the
48 poor, into the modern system of free public schools organized on principles that promoted the
49 natural curiosity and goodness found in every child.”¹

50
51 Since that time public schools have become simultaneously the most revered and most berated
52 institution in society. They have been asked to bridge gaps between Protestant and Catholic, new
53 immigrants and mainstream America, blacks and whites, rich and poor. And teachers have
54 become the most controversial profession in America.² As writer Dana Goldstein says, they have
55 been “attacked and admired in equal proportion.”

56
57 In 1966 James S. Coleman headed a study of *Equality of Educational Opportunity* which found
58 that “...the social composition of the student body is more highly related to achievement,
59 independent of the student’s own social background, than is any school factor.”³ Commissioned
60 by the U.S. Department of Education, the report concluded “student background and
61 socioeconomic status are more important in determining educational opportunity than school
62 funding. Differences in the quality of schools and teachers have a small positive impact on
63 student outcomes. Coleman determined that various achievement tests “do not measure
64 intelligence, nor attitudes, nor qualities of character. Furthermore they are not, nor are they
65 intended to be ‘culture free.’ Quite the reverse: they are culture bound. What they measure are
66 the skills which are among the most important in our society for getting a good job and moving
67 to a better one, and for full participation in an increasingly technical world.”⁴

68
69 Education historian Dean Paton claims that until about 1980 public school teachers were iconic
70 as they were portrayed in a kind of Norman Rockwell patina. They made democracy possible. In
71 1980 Nobel Prize-winning economist Milton Friedman, in his “Free to Choose” public television
72 series, devoted one program to school vouchers: public money, he said, should follow K-12
73 students wherever they went, even to private/parochial schools. While education author Jonathan
74 Kozol called vouchers the “single worst, most dangerous idea to have entered education
75 discourse in my adult life,” they were advanced by President Ronald Reagan.

76
77 In 1983 the Reagan-appointed National Commission on Excellence in Education issued *A Nation*
78 *at Risk*, which gave a very negative critique of American public education which “threatens our
79 very future as a Nation and as a people.” In a much less publicized response, the Sandia National
80 Laboratory was commissioned to find out why. It discovered that while overall *average* scores
81 on tests had gone *down*, they had actually gone *up* in *every demographic group*. Why? Because
82 there were many more disadvantaged students taking the test, pulling the average score down.
83 This report was never officially released.

84
85 In 2001 President George W. Bush succeeded in getting his “No Child Left Behind” (NCLB)
86 education package enshrined in law. Supporters described it as launching a new era of
87 accountability. NCLB tied federal funding to standardized tests and increasingly involved
88 corporations in developing and selling textbooks and tests. In 2009 President Barak Obama
89 promoted his “Race to the Top” program, putting public schools in competition for federal
90 money. Charter schools became one response to this educational effort. Philanthropist Bill Gates’
91 Foundation developed “Common Core” standards which were adopted by many state governors

92 and became the criteria for “Race to the Top,” with more testing and the development of more
93 charter schools.

94
95 How are U.S. schools faring in 2015? The states and federal government spend about \$500
96 billion annually on primary and secondary schools, about \$79 billion from the federal
97 government. While much public rhetoric finds them failing, the National Center for Educational
98 Statistics (NCES) of the U.S. Department of Education ranked the U.S. high, relative to other
99 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries in reading, math
100 and science (especially in reading, and in all areas better in 4th grade than in 8th grade.)⁵
101 Remarkably, “...schools with less than 25% free-lunch eligibility scored higher than the average
102 in ALL OTHER COUNTRIES.”⁶

103
104 How can that be explained? The Southern Education Foundation concluded that the “(m)ajority
105 of U.S. public school students are in poverty.” Fifty-one percent of K-12 students were eligible
106 for free and reduced-price lunches in the 2012-13 school year – that eligibility being a rough
107 proxy for poverty.⁷

108
109 Furthermore, the U.S. ranks near bottom of the developed world in the percentage of 4-year-olds
110 in early childhood education. Head Start has been hit with its worst cutbacks. Funding for K-12
111 education declined in 2011 for first time since the Census Bureau began keeping records. The
112 Center on Budget and Policy Priorities found that “(s)tates’ new budgets are providing less per-
113 pupil funding for kindergarten through 12th grade than they did six years ago – often far less.”
114 New York came out minus 5.1% (percentage change in student funding per student adjusted for
115 inflation FY 08-FY14.)⁸ One reason cited was that state taxes from wealthy people and
116 corporations have been deferred to the tune of \$44 billion. Warren Buffett’s Berkshire
117 Hathaway, Boeing, Caterpillar and Verizon are only a few of the non-payers of state taxes.

118 119 **New York State Public School Funding: History and Context**

120
121 The New York State Constitution requires that every student in the state be given a “sound, basic
122 education.” In 2006 the Campaign for Fiscal Equity (CFE) won a court case which determined
123 that New York State was not providing the constitutionally mandated education for New York
124 City students. The Alliance for Quality Education was founded to argue that the principle of the
125 CFE case should be extended to the rest of the state.

126
127 In 2007 Governor Spitzer and the state legislature promised added funding, but ultimately
128 reneged on that promise. The State had promised to phase in \$5.5 billion of new school aid over
129 4 years, mostly directed at poor districts, but froze it in 2009 during the so-called “Great
130 Recession. Attorney General Eric T. Schneiderman said the State promised more generous
131 funding than State Court of Appeals deemed necessary.

132
133 In 2015 there are two lawsuits against the State on the same basis. The New Yorkers for
134 Students’ Educational Rights claims the State is still \$5.6 billion short of its commitment under
135 the 2006 decision. The other suit is brought by several small cities who claim they are still short
136 from \$2500 to \$6300 per student. These schools have a 72% student poverty rate.

137

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

140
141 New York State's **Foundation Aid Formula** is a method of distributing funds to high needs
142 districts based on over 50 state aid formulas – books, computer software, etc. The funding stream
143 is based on a very complex **Combined Wealth Ratio**, a measure of both property taxes and
144 income in each district, though some districts have low income and high property taxes and some
145 the other way around.

146
147 The **Gap Elimination Adjustment** is the deduction from state school aid to help the State fill its
148 revenue shortfall. In 2010 Governor David Paterson cut aid to schools to close the State's \$10
149 billion budget gap. There have been efforts since to eliminate the GEA.

150
151 New York State spent \$22 billion on K-12 public education in Fiscal Year 2014, \$1.1 billion
152 more than the year before, an increase of 5.4%. In 2015, with a possible increase of \$3.3 billion
153 which various advocacy groups want, the total expended from federal, state and local sources
154 would be \$62.9 billion. A \$2 billion Smart Schools Bond Act passed by voters in the 2014
155 election will provide computers, Internet upgrades, security improvements and classrooms for
156 pre-K students.

157
158 The New York State Board of Regents (the policy-making body in the State) wants a \$2 billion
159 increase to support Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs, improve services for
160 English language learners, and assist recent immigrants in getting an education. Additionally
161 they request \$251 million to expand the upstate Statewide Universal Full-Day Pre-Kindergarten
162 program. The New York Association of School Business Officials says a \$384 million grant
163 could help districts respond to a surge in unaccompanied minors – undocumented immigrants.

164
165 The New York State Educational Conference Board (NYSECB), a coalition of groups including
166 teachers, superintendents and other advocates, wants a \$1.5 billion increase to reduce GEA and
167 provide Foundation Aid increases. NYSECB calls for additional investments in professional
168 development to address Common Core implementation and expansion of Universal pre-K. The
169 \$2.2 billion increase to \$62.9 billion (up 3.7%) would maintain programs at their current level.⁹
170 NYSECB notes that districts have shed more than 30,000 staff members since 2009 in response
171 to reduced spending.

172
173 In making this request NYSECB states these principles: (1) adequacy: enough financial effort to
174 maintain present levels of program; (2) equity: fairness in distribution especially to high needs
175 districts; (3) stability: informing districts in a reasonable time frame with consistency over the
176 years to enable responsible planning; (4) flexibility to meet ever-changing needs like influx of
177 immigrants and loss of tax base; and (5) simplicity: a formula that is easily explained to all
178 stakeholders.

179
180 The Educational Law Center of the Rutgers Graduate School of Education has published a
181 *National Report Card: Is School Funding Fair?*, which evaluates state funding with four criteria.
182 In their January 2014 edition they rank New York as follows:
183

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

185

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

188

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

191

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

193

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

203

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

214

215 In January of 2015 State Comptroller Thomas DiNapoli’s Fiscal Stress Monitoring Program
216 reported that 90 school districts out of 672 (13%) were at least “susceptible” to fiscal stress,” 10
217 were found to have “significant” stress. This does not include the so-called “Big Five” districts:
218 New York City, Buffalo, Rochester, Syracuse and Yonkers.¹³ Why? Declining property values,
219 high rates of poverty and low school budget support, reductions in state aid (down 4% from
220 2002-2013), a decrease in federal funding from 7% to 5%, decreased rainy day funds and a 2%
221 tax cap on local property taxes which help fund the schools.¹⁴

222

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

226

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

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

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

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

238
239 Criticisms of those proposals were quick to come: the universal Pre-K program still does not
240 cover all eligible students; no restoration of the GEA (currently at negative \$1.037 billion; no
241 increase in Foundation Aid (\$4.88 billion is still due to underfunded districts); no increase in
242 Reimbursable or Expense driven aids like BOCES, Transportation Aid, etc. (due for an increase
243 of \$368 million); objection to the trade-off between the DREAM Act and educational tax credits;
244 and increasing pressure on teacher evaluation and tenure. There was continued criticism over the
245 2% property tax cap which precludes high-needs school districts from raising increased local
246 public school funding. Exceeding that cap requires a 60% voter approval. The Governor said the
247 “runs” (estimates of funds schools could count on for the next fiscal year) would not be available
248 until his reforms were passed with the budget. School officials responded that this did not give
249 them adequate time to prepare budgets for the May school budget vote.

250
251 The Governor has engaged in strong rhetoric about the schools and their teachers, calling public
252 education in New York State an “industry” and a “monopoly” which must be disassembled.
253 Critique of the Governor’s grasp of educational policy contains the following:

254
255 **There seems to be no recognition that New York State schools which are in non-poverty areas*
256 *are among the best in the nation. To take the average achievement means balancing high-*
257 *achieving schools with low-achieving schools in poverty areas. This appears to reflect mediocre*
258 *results to the whole system. High needs schools in poverty areas require greater overall funding*
259 *than high-spending districts to create the semblance of an even start for New York students. As*
260 *one teacher put it “The job of teacher has expanded to ‘counselor, therapist, doctor, parent,*
261 *attorney.”¹⁵*

262
263 As columnist Mark Hare puts it: “...socioeconomic integration of our schools is essential, though
264 not sufficient to reverse the catastrophic outcomes in the city schools....School is not just a place
265 where information gets poured into your head; it is a community where children and parents
266 learn from each other and learn to appreciate each other....demography is destiny.”¹⁶

267
268 **The Civil Rights Project at UCLA charged that New York has the most racially and*
269 *economically segregated schools in the nation and concluded that the State had given up on the*
270 *problem: “The children who most depend on the public schools for any chance in life are*
271 *concentrated in schools struggling with all the dimensions of family and neighborhood poverty*
272 *and isolation.”¹⁷*

273

274 **Policy Recommendation:** *Interfaith Impact joins other groups as listed above in advocating*
275 *increased spending for public education, including restoration of the Foundation Aid formula,*
276 *eliminating the Gap Elimination Adjustment, and funding of the DREAM Act – approximately*
277 *\$2.2 billion.*

278
279 **Charter Schools** are funded by taxpayers but administered by private entities. They have been
280 promoted as an alternative to traditional public schools. These schools operate with fewer
281 regulations and have the flexibility to implement longer school days. Criticisms are manifold.
282 Since they receive contributions from private individuals and corporations, the same contributors
283 may also be campaign funders for state officials. As noted above, there are currently 460 charter
284 schools in New York State. It should be noted that 97% of New York’s K-12 students are in the
285 public school system.

286
287 There have been many studies comparing charter public schools with non-charter public schools.
288 While some have made much of periodic differences, the consensus seems to be that there is
289 little difference in achieving a quality education for children. There is some criticism of charter
290 schools for a student selection process that constitutes the so-called “creaming” process,
291 selecting the best students while leaving poorer students and those with disabilities to the non-
292 charter public school. There is a natural “creaming” effect in the tendency for parents of better
293 students to seek out alternatives to normal public schools, while students from poorer families do
294 not have strong parental advocates.¹⁸ In New York City charter schools show lower rates of
295 attrition but serve fewer students with special needs. Some 12.75 of kindergarteners in traditional
296 public schools have some kind of disability requiring special services, compared with 8.9% at
297 charter schools. For example, 9.5% of students at the Harlem Success Academy 2 charter schools
298 are in temporary housing; the figure is 26.7% at the district school that shares the same
299 building.¹⁹

300
301 One critic wrote, “The charter school movement was born out of a desire to creatively address
302 the many obstacles teachers faced.” Since they are part of the school district, it was hoped that
303 anything learned that was valuable could quickly be translated into the public school system.
304 “The charter school movement began as a grassroots attempt to improve public education. It’s
305 quickly becoming a backdoor for corporate profit.”

306
307 A champion of this reformist movement is Michelle Rhee, former head of the Washington, DC,
308 public schools and founder of StudentsFirst. She claims that the cause of poor educational results
309 is not poverty, but bad teachers and bad schools. She claims poverty is used as an excuse for
310 poor schools.

311
312 StudentsFirstNY promotes charter schools, stricter teacher evaluations and changes to teacher
313 tenure. Its stated purpose is “to make sure every student in America has access to great schools
314 and great teachers. We are driven by the belief that every child – regardless of background – can
315 succeed if put in the right school environment.” The group ran \$500,000 in ads to support
316 Governor Cuomo’s 2014 campaign. Families for Excellent Schools is another private group with
317 a similar agenda. There are other indications that some charter schools are an avenue for private
318 sector economic growth. *Forbes* magazine stated: “The charter school movement (is) quickly
319 becoming a backdoor for corporate profit.” In Michigan 80% of charter schools are for profit.²⁰

320 The *Wall Street Journal* wrote: “As states race to implement the Common Core academic
321 standards, companies are fighting for a slice of the accompanying testing market, expected to be
322 worth billions of dollars in coming years.”²¹

323

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

330

331 **Educational tax credits (Vouchers)**

332

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

338

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

342

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

347

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

352

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

358

359 **Teacher Evaluation and the Common Core**

360

361 In his 2015 State of the State report, Governor Cuomo stirred up a hornet’s nest when making
362 recommendations on teacher evaluation and tenure. He dismissed the current evaluation in which
363 41.9% were rated highly effective, 53.7% effective, 3.7% developing and only 0.7% ineffective
364 according to the State Education Department. These figures came from the Approved Teacher
365 Practice Rubric (APPR) in evaluating teachers, based on 60% observation and 40% standardized

366 tests. The Governor, noting the “failure” rate of students on the first round of Common Core
367 testing and the “success” rate of teachers has recommended changing that ratio to 50%
368 observation and 50% tests. Is this fair to teachers? And is it educationally defensible?
369

370 The emphasis on tests stems from the Common Core – initiated by the Bill and Melinda Gates
371 Foundation, elaborated in the “No Child Left Behind” of President George W. Bush and “Race
372 to the Top” promoted by President Barack Obama and adopted by many state governors. The
373 Common Core had a rough rollout with many administrators, teachers and students objecting to
374 the very concept of standardized tests as well as inadequate time to prepare for them. It has been
375 noted that relatively few parents seek out the evaluation score for the teachers.²²
376

377 Governor Cuomo refused to sign legislation which would have held teachers and students
378 “harmless” in the first round of scores although he had initially endorsed it. Many felt that with
379 the abrupt roll out, such scores would be meaningless. The Governor disagreed and cited the
380 failure rate.
381

382 Criticisms from educators were: (1) the tests are a snapshot in time of a student’s score on a
383 particular exam. They are designed to measure student achievement, but do not reflect student
384 progress. For example, which is more important – that a student goes from an 85 to 86 or from
385 49 to 60? The former score is higher, but the latter shows more progress. How does one evaluate
386 that? (2) the tests are designed to measure student achievement; they were not designed to
387 evaluate teachers; (3) the heavy emphasis on frequent testing is not educationally sound.
388 Teachers will tend to “teach to the test” at the expense of learning skills.
389

390 The Governor also proposed an extension from 3 to 5 years for a teacher to be eligible for tenure.
391 Teachers object, in part fearing that such a process, in combination with emphasis on testing,
392 means that higher-paid veteran teachers may be fired to save money by hiring new and lower-
393 paid teachers. State law requires laying off teachers by seniority rather than ability.
394

395 The Horace Mann League and the National Superintendents Roundtable have warned of the so-
396 called “iceberg effect.” Their thesis is that the public looks at the tip of the iceberg – in this case
397 test scores – instead of all that lies below.²³ Even the test scores are good at points. However,
398 single-minded focus on test scores has led policymakers to overlook other important trends that
399 affect U.S. public education, including high levels of economic inequality and social stress.
400 Child poverty here is much more prevalent than in any other comparison nation except China.
401

402 The data- and test-driven philosophy of education is well summarized in *The Horn Book*.
403 “Perhaps this (philosophy)... is not surprising when the emphasis through school is very apt to
404 be on preparation for tests which prepare for more tests, which if one is lucky, pave the road to
405 college. In rebellion one high school student asked, ‘Once in college will we then be able to learn
406 for the sake of learning, or must we continue to prepare for tests to prepare us for more tests to
407 prepare us for more tests. When does this testing end and real learning begin?’”²⁴
408

409 **Policy Recommendation:** *Interfaith Impact calls for the depoliticizing of public education so*
410 *that professional educators have the prime role in policy-making. The Common Core should be*

411 *thoroughly reviewed as to its educational benefits. Testing must not become the prime means of*
412 *evaluating educational effort by students or by teachers.*

413

414

Conclusion

415

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

421

422

Resources

423

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

426

427 New York State Educational Conference Board
428 www.nyscoss.org/img/news/advocacy_6fxfk01x6m.pdf

429

430 Alliance for Quality Education

431

432 Opportunity Action (demanding equity and excellence in public

433

434 Public Policy Educational Fund of New York

435

436 Statewide School Finance Consortium. www.statewideonline.org/wordpress/

437

438 www.schoolfundingfairness.org/National_Report_Card_2014.pdf

439

440 United Teachers:

441

442 200 law – 39% tax credit for giving to charter schools and more advantages

443

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

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

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

³ *Equality of Educational Opportunity*, 1966.

⁴ *Ibid.*

⁵ *The Condition of Education 2014*. May 2014.

⁶ Paul Buchheit, *Alternet*, January 11, 2015.

⁷ Lyndsey Layton. Southern Education Foundation.

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

⁹ *Turning the Corner*: NYS Educational Conference Board

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

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

¹² Teacherken. “What You Absolutely Must Understand About How Poverty Impacts Education.” *Daily Kos*, January 23, 2015.

¹³ Jon Campbell. “DiNapoli: 90 school districts facing fiscal stress.” *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*,” January 30, 2015 (Albany Bureau Gannett Newspapers).

¹⁴ “School districts facing fiscal stress.” *Legislative Gazette*, January 21, 2014.

¹⁵ Teacherken. “What You Must Absolutely Understand About How Poverty Impacts Education.” *The Daily Kos*, January 23, 2015.

¹⁶ Mark Hare. *City Newspaper*, Rochester, NY, January 7, 2015.

¹⁷ UCLA report.

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

¹⁹ Karen Matthews. “Study: NYC charter schools have lower attrition rates.” Associated Press, February 2, 2015. Citing a study by the Independent Budget Office.

²⁰ *Forbes*, September 28, 2011.

²¹ “Fight Is on for Common Core Contracts.” *Wall Street Journal*, January 4, 2015.

²² Carolyn Thompson. Associated Press. “Few parents seek evaluation scores.” *Rochester Democrat and Chronicle*, January 19, 2015.

²³ *School Performance in Context: The Iceberg Effect*.

²⁴ *The Horn Book*, June 1961.

Just for Fun?????

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