Schools That Work for Minority Students

CLINT BOLICK

HYSTERIA FOLLOWED the plummeting admission rates of blacks and Hispanics at elite public universities in California and Texas following the curtailment of race and ethnic preferences.[1] The concern was appropriate but overdue and misdirected. Critics claimed that the demise of race-based "affirmative action" meant the end of college opportunities for many blacks and Hispanics.[2]

In reality, the enrollment decline was a long-overdue wake-up call to a dire crisis that seemingly has escaped the attention of many public policy makers and the establishment civil rights groups: the appalling failure of the nation's public school system to deliver quality educational opportunities to a large portion of America's schoolchildren. Though concentrated primarily on economically disadvantaged youngsters in the inner cities, that failure manifests itself in disproportionately poor academic credentials for black and Hispanic students. In a nondiscriminatory college admissions process, that disparity leads to lower admissions rates for blacks and Hispanics; by contrast, in a system where blacks and Hispanics are leapfrogged over more qualified applicants into academic institutions for which they

are not adequately prepared, it leads to disproportionately higher college dropout rates for the two groups.

No substitute exists for high standards and adequate academic preparation at the elementary and secondary school levels, and we are perpetuating a cruel hoax to assert otherwise. Race-based affirmative action in college admissions is a purely cosmetic response that allows underlying educational problems to fester and grow. An immigrant cabdriver recently distilled the policy dilemma: "They don't understand that the problem is not in college. The problem is in kindergarten." Removing the superficial tool of racial preferences from the policy-making arsenal means that policy makers must address at last the core problems that produce racial and ethnic disparities in higher education.

Traditional "civil rights" responses to educational inequality have focused on (1) racial balancing through forced busing or other mechanisms or (2) increased spending. Both approaches have failed utterly to close the gap in educational achievement.[3] Fortunately, promising alternatives are appearing on the horizon, focusing not on social engineering but on parental empowerment. By giving parents—who have the greatest stake in their children's success—greater power over education decisions and resources, it appears we finally can deliver on the sacred promise of equal educational opportunities for all of America's schoolchildren.[4]

Educational Crisis and Systemic Failure

It seems impossible that nearly forty-five years have passed since *Brown v. Board of Education*. During that time, much progress has been made toward erasing the color line from education. As Stephan and Abigail Thernstrom report in *America in Black and White*, high school graduation rates now are nearly the same for blacks and whites. Progress for blacks in this regard has been explosive: in 1980, only 51.2 percent of blacks over age 25 had graduated from high school; but by 1995, 73.8 percent of blacks over 25—and 86.5 percent of blacks between the ages of 25 and 29—were high school graduates; college attendance rates are up,

too, from 21.9 percent of blacks in 1980 to 37.5 percent in 1995.[5] Those gains are important because education correlates closely with income. For instance, black women who have graduated from high school, attended some college, or graduated from college all make more money on average than their white female counterparts.[6]

But from there the news gets bad. Although black high school students steadily were closing the achievement gap with whites in the 1980s, that gap has widened substantially during the past decade. The typical black high school student graduates roughly four academic years behind typical white high school seniors.[7] The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reported in 1995 that only 12 percent of black high school seniors (compared with 40 percent of whites) were proficient in reading.[8] The 1997 NAEP found that while 76 percent of white fourth-graders were proficient in basic mathematics skills, only 41 percent of Hispanic and 32 percent of black students demonstrated basic proficiency.[9]

The crisis is far more pronounced and debilitating among low-income minority children, who are consigned disproportionately to failing large urban school systems. Students often must pass through metal detectors and literally risk their lives on a daily basis for the chance to obtain a woefully substandard education. Two cities where I have litigated present the problem in especially graphic terms. In Cleveland, the numbers 1 in 14 are emblazoned permanently on my memory: children in the Cleveland Public Schools have a 1-in-14 chance of graduating on time from high school at senior-level proficiency—and an equivalent 1-in-14 chance each year of being a victim of crime in the schools. In the Milwaukee Public Schools (MPS), only 48 percent of the students graduate—a dropout rate more than seven times the statewide average—and only 15 percent of children from families on public assistance graduate. In eleven Milwaukee public high schools that enroll more than three-fourths of the city's black students, the median grade-point average is less than 1.5 on a four-point scale.

When poor and minority inner-city students have no greater chance of graduating with basic proficiency than of being a victim of crime in the

schools, we know the system is failing. With statistics like these, what is surprising is not that minority schoolchildren are admitted to colleges and universities at rates lower than their proportionate share; what is surprising is that the numbers are not much, much worse.

Apologists for the status quo search frenetically for scapegoats: standardized tests are biased, the students are too poor to educate, their parents don't provide sufficient support, the schools are inadequately funded.[10] Yet students from identical socioeconomic circumstances do much better in private schools. A recent study by University of Chicago economist Derek Neal found that although Catholic schools produce negligible academic gains for suburban and white students, they strongly improve educational outcomes for urban minority children. Holding other factors constant, Neal found that the odds of high school graduation for urban black and Hispanic children increase from 66 percent to at least 88 percent in Catholic schools. In turn, he found that three times as many black students who attend Catholic high schools go on to graduate from college. Not surprisingly, those academic gains translate into substantially higher wages in the labor market. Neal concludes bluntly, "Urban minorities receive significant benefits from Catholic schooling because their public school alternatives are substantially worse than those of whites or other minorities who live in rural or suburban areas."[11]

Why do suburban public schools and urban private schools do a relatively good job in educating children, while urban public school systems as a whole are failures? That question was addressed in a pathbreaking Brookings Institution study by John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe.[12] They found that although student ability and parental background are important factors in student achievement, school organization also plays a central role. The key differences between effective and ineffective schools are autonomy, parental involvement, and a sense of mission. Urban public schools, Chubb and Moe observed, are characterized by massive bureaucracies that make it difficult for teachers to teach, for parents to exert influence, or for reform to take hold. Moreover, because poor students usually have nowhere else to go, large urban school systems are unrespon-

sive to consumer demands and instead try to satisfy special-interest groups and politicians who control the purse strings. Meanwhile, parents have little influence, particularly on an individual basis. Private and suburban public schools, by contrast, tend to have smaller bureaucracies and to be more responsive to parental concerns, in part because parents have the resources to take their children elsewhere. Chubb and Moe found that effective schools boost student achievement by one year for every four. They concluded that greater parental choice and control over resources are necessary for low-income parents to improve their children's education and to effectively prod public schools to improve.

The Catalyst: Parental Choice

Those were the goals State Representative Annette Polly Williams had in mind when she proposed the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program, the nation's first school choice program targeted to inner-city, low-income families. The program initially was modest in scope: only 1 percent of Milwaukee Public School students (roughly 1,000) were eligible to use their share of the state's education contribution as full payment of tuition in nine participating nonsectarian private schools. But the implementation of the program in the fall of 1990 set off an education revolution. For the first time ever, the program transferred control over public education funds from bureaucrats to parents and forced the public schools to compete for low-income youngsters and the resources they commanded.

Predictably, the program prompted litigation by the teachers' union and a blizzard of regulations designed to destroy the program by bureaucratic strangulation. Both counterattacks were beaten back.[13] So in the fall of 1990, nearly one thousand low-income youngsters were able to cross the threshold to a brighter educational future in a dozen or so nonsectarian community private schools.

The assessments by the state's designated researcher, John Witte, produced odd findings over the program's first four years: parental involvement was strong, satisfaction was high, but student achievement failed to

rise. Those results were seemingly contradictory, given that parental involvement and student achievement are closely linked. That conundrum was magnified by Witte's refusal to release data to other researchers.[14]

The confusion dissipated when a team of researchers led by Harvard University political scientist Paul E. Peterson finally obtained the data. For the first time, they compared achievement of students who had gained access to private schools through the random selection process with students who had not. The result: little academic change over the students' first two years in the program, but significant progress in the third and fourth years. Peterson found that over its first four years, the program narrowed the gap between minority and nonminority test scores by between one-third and one-half—an absolutely momentous accomplishment.[15]

Zakiyah Courtney, director of Milwaukee's Parents for School Choice and former principal of Urban Day School, testified:

> I was glad to see . . . a study that reflected what many of us who have been working directly with the families and the children all along knew. And that is that parental satisfaction does make a difference; and that oftentimes you may not see those high achievement scores in the beginning, but if you give those children the opportunity to stay and work in the program, that you do see those differences.[16]

But apart from its benefits for kids for whose parents now can choose better schools, the program unquestionably has also had a positive impact on the public schools, forcing them to pursue long-overdue systemic reforms. At an evidentiary hearing on the program in 1996, both former MPS superintendent Dr. Howard L. Fuller, and his successor, Robert Jasna, agreed that the program had created a prod for long-overdue systemic reforms.[17] Fuller supported the program's expansion in 1995 to increase the number of eligible children to 15,000 and to allow religious schools to participate. Fuller explained:

> I think that what it will bring into play would be, in addition to the existing schools, there will be new schools out there that will come into being that

> will find their niche to begin to teach kids that we are not currently reaching or that we're losing. I think it will begin to give poor parents some capacity to have leverage over this entire discussion. And the reason they will have leverage is because they will begin to have leverage over resources, the same type of control over resources that people with money have. . . . You begin to create a synergism for change that I think is key, if the system is going to be changed, so that we . . . save these kids that we're losing each and every day.[18]

The Milwaukee program's expansion was enjoined before it could go into operation in the fall of 1995 as a result of litigation brought by the teachers' union, the American Civil Liberties Union, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), and others, who asserted that the program violated the prohibition of religious establishment in the state and federal constitutions. (Similar lawsuits are pending against school choice programs in Ohio, Vermont, Arizona, Maine, and Pennsylvania.) In June 1998, the program was upheld by the Wisconsin Supreme Court, setting up possible resolution of the constitutional issue by the U.S. Supreme Court.[19] In the fall of 1998, the expansion of the Milwaukee program finally commenced, with an estimated 6,000 low-income youngsters attending more than eighty private religious and nonsectarian schools.[20]

Meanwhile, a second school choice program championed by Governor George Voinovich and City Councilmember Fannie Lewis was created in 1996, providing $2,500 scholarships to approximately 3,000 economically disadvantaged children, allowing them to attend private secular and religious schools in Cleveland. Again, early results appear promising.[21] Similar promising results are also reported in privately funded scholarship programs serving low-income schoolchildren in dozens of other cities across the country.[22] As Paul Peterson has observed, "The choice movement is spreading in good part because its theoretical underpinnings seem more powerful than ever."[23]

Other forms of parental choice are blossoming. Arizona, which boasts the nation's most wide-ranging charter school system, approved a $500

state income tax credit for contributions to private scholarship funds, which was upheld by the Arizona Supreme Court.[24] In May 1999, a bipartisan majority of the Florida Legislature enacted Governor Jeb Bush's A+ public education reform program, within which parental choice is an important element. The program creates a grading system for all public schools in the state, provides financial rewards for excellent schools, gives extra help to students in failing schools, and allows families whose children are in failing schools to opt out into better public schools or private schools. In essence, the program offers the first money-back guarantee by creating both choice and competition that should improve public education for everyone. It emphasizes that the proper concern of public education is not *where* children are educated but *whether* they are educated. The threat of scholarships also is spurring spirited efforts among public school districts to improve schools that are receiving "F" grades.[25]

Still, a school choice program for the District of Columbia, approved in 1998 by bipartisan majorities in both houses of Congress, was vetoed by President Clinton, in spite of support from a large majority of residents, particularly blacks. Powerful special interest groups have combined to stifle parental choice all around the nation. The question is how long those defenders of the status quo can delay the day of reckoning with America's most urgent crisis—and how many children's lives and educational opportunities will be sacrificed in the process.

Parental Choice and Public Opinion

Public opinion is moving strongly and steadily in favor of parental choice. There are several possible explanations: (1) In spite of massive financial resources and constant excuses from the education establishment, the academic performance of public schools, even in affluent suburbs, is declining, particularly compared with schools in other industrialized nations. (2) The news about parental choice programs such as school vouchers and charter schools is generally promising; reality is debunking the fears raised by choice opponents. (3) Changing demographics

are influencing public opinion: young people with children are used to making choices and are comfortable about selecting from an array of educational options.

Whatever the explanation, the trend is unmistakable. For the first time, the 1998 Phi Delta Kappa–Gallup poll found that a majority of Americans support parental choice. Asked whether they favor allowing parents to send their school-age children to any public, parochial, or private school of their choice with the government paying part or all of the tuition, 51 percent of all respondents support choice, while 45 percent are opposed. Only two years ago, the same idea was opposed by a margin of 54 to 43 percent. Among the groups who most strongly support parental options are non-whites (68 percent), people 18–29 years of age (63 percent), and, notably, public school parents (56 percent).[26]

Support for parental choice is even greater in Wisconsin, which has had eight years of experience with the Milwaukee program. A 1998 poll by Louis Harris & Associates found that Wisconsin residents support parental choice by a margin of 61 to 32 percent.[27] Parental choice draws majority support in all areas of the state and from whites, blacks, men, women, Republicans, Democrats, independents, conservatives, and liberals. The margin in Milwaukee is 65 to 29 percent, and residents back the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program specifically by an even greater 71 to 24 percent. The closer people reside to the program, the more likely they appear to support parental choice.

What is perhaps most remarkable, and disturbing, is the chasm between mainstream minority individuals and establishment civil rights organizations on issues over parental choice. Black Americans consider education the top national priority.[28] That concern is well placed. A 1997 survey by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies found that while 37.5 percent of white parents considered their schools "fair" or "poor," 64 percent of blacks and 61 percent of Hispanics gave their schools the same low grades. Not surprisingly, the poll found that while support for school choice was evenly split among whites, it was strong among both blacks (56 to 37.5 percent in favor) and Hispanics (65 to 29 percent in favor). Support

for school choice was most intense among those in the age bracket most likely to have school-age children: 86.5 percent of blacks between ages 26–35 back school choice, with only 10 percent opposed.[29]

Similarly, a *Washington Post* poll found that a large majority of District of Columbia residents backed the low-income scholarship program passed by Congress but vetoed by President Clinton and opposed by liberal black politicians such as Delegate Eleanor Holmes Norton.[30] The residents supported the scholarship program by a margin of 56 to 36 percent. While whites and blacks with incomes over $50,000 split fairly evenly over the issue, lower-income blacks favored the legislation by a margin of 65 to 28 percent. "I would jump at the chance to send my son to private school," said Janice Johnson, who lives in one of the poorer sections of the city. Meanwhile, 1,001 low-income children from among more than 7,500 applicants received support from the Washington Scholarship Fund, which is financed by businessmen Theodore J. Forstmann and John Walton.[31]

In light of strong minority support for school choice, there is little wonder that establishment civil rights groups such as the NAACP are struggling for relevancy. The Milwaukee NAACP chapter joined the lawsuit against the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program in spite of overwhelming support for the program among black city residents. The national NAACP last year announced an unholy alliance against parental choice with People for the American Way. Parental Choice is "exploitative of the black community," contends Mary Jean Collins, PAW's national field director. "The philosophy of the right is always, 'Give my kid what he wants and to hell with the rest.' For that attitude to get into the black community would be shameful."[32]

Dissenters such as the Urban League of Greater Miami and former Atlanta mayor and U.N. ambassador Andrew Young reject such patronizing attitudes and support school choice as an essential component of civil rights. Former representative Floyd Flake, whose church in Queens, New York, operates a private school, says: "When a white person kills a black person, we all go out in the street to protest. But our children are being educationally killed every day in public schools and nobody says a thing."[33]

It is time for politicians to recognize the will of the people, to reject the entreaties of special-interest groups, and to make parental choice a reality.

The Broader Context of Education Reform

Never has the climate for reform been so vibrant—nor the need for reform so urgent. In addition to parental choice encompassing private schools, promising reforms include (1) charter schools, which are autonomous public schools often operated by private or nonprofit entities;[34] (2) contracting out public schools to private management firms such as the Edison Project;[35] and (3) tax deductions and credits that allow people to deduct their children's education costs or to contribute to privately funded scholarship funds.[36]

Meanwhile, private philanthropy is working to meet demand from low-income parents to secure better education for their children through programs like the Children's Scholarship Fund and CEO America. In April 1999, 1.25 million children applied for 40,000 CSF scholarships. Andrew Young likened the outpouring to Rosa Parks's refusal to give up her bus seat and to Martin Luther King Jr.'s letter from a Birmingham jail. Declared Young:

> If families were allowed to seek a quality education wherever it may be found, who would benefit? Simple: Those who aren't getting a quality education and those who can deliver it. Certainly, some will oppose competition—just as AT&T once fought the breakup of its monopoly. Others will reflexively resist the redistribution of power to poor families. Still others will wave their worn-out ideologies to defend a system of educational apartheid while demonizing anyone who promotes a parent's right to choose. . . .
>
> I predict that we will one day look back on the 1.25 million who applied for educational emancipation—for the chance to seek the light and oxygen of a nourishing education—not as victims, but as unwitting heroes with whom a great awakening was begun.[37]

Parental choice is a central facet of systemic education reform that

places equal resources behind each child and allows the funds to follow children to whatever schools—public, private, or religious—their parents choose.[38] Child-centered education funding transforms the focus of public education from public schools as ends in themselves to publicly funded education in whatever schools parents deem best. If parents choose public schools, the funds stay in those schools under the control of the schools themselves, rather than filtering down through an education bureaucracy. Only through a system of choice, competition, and accountability where parents are sovereign will public schools in the inner cities begin to improve.

If we can do only one thing in public policy to improve prospects for minority individuals and economically disadvantaged people, there is nothing more tangible or important than making good on the promise of equal educational opportunities. As I have acknowledged before, if I were given the option, straight up or down, of abolishing racial preferences or adopting parental choice on a nationwide basis, in a heartbeat I would opt for the latter, for it would reduce the pressure for divisive race-based solutions. Unfortunately, no one is offering that choice: the same reactionary leaders who support racial preferences are blocking the schoolhouse doors for the very people whose interests they falsely claim to represent.

That won't last long. Nothing that Jesse Jackson, Kweisi Mfume, Bill Clinton, Al Gore, or others like them can say to inner-city parents will convince them not to pursue educational opportunities their children desperately need. Milwaukee parent Pilar Gonzalez makes that plain: "I will find a way to have my children attend private school even if it means less food on the table. A quality education for my children is that important."[39]

That is the primary civil rights goal of the millennium: making it possible at last for Pilar Gonzalez and millions of others like her to secure the best possible education for their children.

Notes

The author expresses appreciation to Daron Roberts, a University of Texas student who interned at the Institute for Justice in the summer of 1998, for research assistance.

1. The end of racial preferences in California was attributable first to a decision to curb preferential admissions policies by the Regents of the University of California, which subsequently was extended by the California Civil Rights Initiative (Proposition 209) to all public postsecondary schools. In Texas, the cessation of preferences was due to the decision striking down preferential admissions at the University of Texas School of Law in *Hopwood v. Texas*, 78 F.3d 932 (5th Cir.), *cert. denied*, 116 S.Ct. 2850 (1986).

2. In any event, that prediction has now definitively been discredited. See, e.g., James Traub, "The Class of Prop. 209," *New York Times Magazine*, May 2, 1999, p. 44.

3. For an examination of the effects of forced busing, see David J. Armor, *Forced Justice: School Desegregation and the Law* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1995). For a discussion of the lack of correlation between increased educational performance, particularly in the context of the lavish Kansas City desegregation decree, see Blake Hurst, "Runaway Judge," *American Enterprise*, May–June 1995, pp. 53–56.

4. In *Brown v. Board of Education*, 347 U.S. 483, 493 (1954), the U.S. Supreme Court declared that education, "where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms."

5. Stephan Thernstrom and Abigail Thernstrom, *America in Black and White: One Nation, Indivisible* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1997), pp. 190–91, 192.

6. Ibid., p. 445.

7. Ibid., p. 355.

8. See Dennis Kelly, "Kids' Scores for Reading 'In Trouble,'" *USA Today*, April 28–30, 1995, p. 1A.

9. See "U.S. Students Make Progress in Math," *Dallas Morning News*, February 28, 1997, p. 6A.

10. In fact, like many other large urban school districts, the Milwaukee and Cleveland districts spend more per pupil than the statewide averages.

11. Derek Neal, "The Effects of Catholic Secondary Schooling on Educational Achievement," *Journal of Labor Economics* 15: 100. Neal's findings echo similar studies from the 1980s. See James Coleman, Thomas Hoffer, and Sally Kilgore, *High School Achievement: Public, Catholic, and Private Schools Compared* (New York: Basic Books, 1982); and Andrew Greeley, *Catholic High Schools and Minority Students* (London: Transaction, 1982). Recent evidence indicates that Hispanic students, too, fare better in Catholic schools. See Anne-Marie O'Connor, "Many Latinos Fare Better in Catholic Schools," *Los Angeles Times*, August 3, 1998.

12. John E. Chubb and Terry M. Moe, *Politics, Markets, and America's Schools* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1990).

13. See *Davis v. Grover*, 480 N.W.2d 460 (Wisc. 1992).

14. Witte subsequently has concluded that the results of limited school choice are favorable. See John F. Witte, *The Market Approach to Education: An Analysis of America's First Voucher Program* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 2000).

15. Jay P. Green, Paul E. Peterson, and Jingtao Du, *The Effectiveness of School Choice in Milwaukee: A Secondary Analysis of Data from the Program's Evaluation* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University John F. Kennedy School of Government, 1996).

16. Transcript of Evidentiary Hearing, *Jackson v. Benson*, No. 95-CV-1982 (Dane County, Wisc., Circuit Court, Aug. 15, 1996), p. 77.

17. Ibid., pp. 48, 165.

18. Ibid., p. 51.

19. *Jackson v. Benson*, 578 N.W.2d 602 (Wisc. 1998).

20. See Jon Jeter, "As Test of Vouchers, Milwaukee Parochial School Exceeds Expectations," *Washington Post*, August 31, 1998.

21. See Jay P. Greene, William G. Howell, and Paul E. Peterson, "Lessons from the Cleveland Scholarship Program," in Paul E. Peterson and Bryan J. Hassel, eds., *Learning from School Choice* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1998), p. 357.

22. See, e.g., R. Kenneth Godwin, Frank R. Kemerer, and Valerie J. Martinez, "Comparing Public Choice and Private Voucher Programs in San Antonio," in ibid., p. 275; and David J. Weinschrott and Sally B. Kilgore, "Evidence from the Indianapolis Voucher Program," in ibid., p. 307.

23. Paul E. Peterson, "School Choice: A Report Card," in ibid., p. 8.

24. *Kotterman v. Killian*, 972 P.2d 606 (Ariz. 1999).

25. Carol Innerst, *Competing to Win: How Florida's A+ Plan Has Triggered Public School Reform* (2000). (This report was copublished by five groups.)

26. *The 30th Annual Phi Delta Kappa–Gallup Poll of the Public's Attitudes Toward the Public Schools* (1998). The poll surveyed attitudes about a wide range of parental choice alternatives. The pollsters found that one proposal championed primarily by Republicans—tax credits for private school tuition—actually is supported by a higher percentage of Democrats (by 61 to 37 percent in favor) than by Republicans (57 to 42 percent in favor).

27. Louis S. Harris & Associates, Inc., "Wisconsin Residents Strongly Favor Voucher System and Choice," news release, August 17, 1998.

28. A survey conducted November 5–7, 1996, by the Polling Company found that a large plurality of blacks (42 percent) considered education the top national priority, compared with 25 percent of whites. Fighting crime and drugs was the second top priority for blacks (21 percent).

29. See David A. Bositis, *1997 National Opinion Poll: Children's Issues* (Washington, D.C.: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies, 1997).

30. See Sari Horwitz, "Poll Finds Backing for D.C. School Vouchers," *Washington Post*, May 23, 1998, p. F1.

31. Debbi Wilgoren, "1,001 D.C. Students Win Scholarships," ibid., April 30, 1998, p. B1.

32. Quoted in Samuel G. Freedman, "The Education Divide," *Salon Magazine*, September 30, 1997.

33. Quoted in ibid.

34. Several dozen states permit charter schools, although some jurisdictions (such as Arizona, Michigan, and the District of Columbia) provide for far greater autonomy than others. See, e.g., Clint Bolick, *Transformation: The Promise and Politics of Empowerment* (Oakland, Calif.: Institute for Contemporary Studies, 1998), pp. 53–60; Bruno Manno, Chester E. Finn Jr., and Louann A. Bierlein, "Charter Schools as Seen by Students, Teachers, and Parents," in Peterson and Hassel, eds., p. 275; and Bryan J. Hassel, "Charter Schools: Politics and Practice in Four States," in Peterson and Hassel, p. 249.

35. See, e.g., John E. Chubb, "The Performance of Privately Managed Schools: An Early Look at the Edison Project," in Peterson and Hassel, eds., p. 213.

36. In addition to the Arizona state income tax credit for contributions to private scholarship funds, Minnesota provides tax deductions for school tuition, and both houses of the Illinois legislature passed a tax credit for tuition in 1999.

37. Andrew Young, "Let Parents Choose Their Kids' Schools," *Los Angeles Times*, April 29, 1999, p. 9.

38. The concept of child-centered education funding is championed most prominently by Arizona Superintendent of Public Instruction Lisa Graham Keegan. See, e.g., Clint Bolick, "Charter Reformer: Arizona's Superintendent of Schools Points the Way to an Education Revolution," *National Review*, April 6, 1998, pp. 42–44.

39. Quoted in Bolick, *Transformation*, p. 34. Ms. Gonzalez is one of the parents defending the constitutionality of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program, and I am proud to represent her.