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Nine years since its founding, the Program on Education Policy & Governance (PEPG) continues to attend to items central to the nation’s education agenda. Three reform strategies dominate public discourse — adequate funding, accountability, and choice.

Pushing the first of these, teacher unions are funding lawsuits in a majority of the states that are demanding higher, allegedly “adequate,” funding levels, a development of such rising significance that it has become the focus of the October 2005 PEPG research conference.

Meanwhile, the new federal law, No Child Left Behind, is asking schools to make “adequate yearly progress” toward state-determined proficiency standards. When progress falls short, families are given a choice of an alternative public school within the same school district, a quite limited option. Whether such limited choice can motivate school improvement is the subject of a major new PEPG research undertaking.

At the grassroots, broader forms of school choice — charters and vouchers — continue to spread across the countryside, albeit more slowly than proponents desire.

Always a matter of importance to the PEPG research agenda, we continue to explore the promise — and pitfalls — of this, the most far-reaching, of all school reforms.

Through its major publication vehicle, Education next, a journal sponsored jointly by several reform-minded entities, PEPG is reaching a large, growing audience.

We appreciate the support of all those who have made possible the work summarized in the pages that follow.

— Paul E. Peterson
50 Years after *Brown*: What Remains to Be Done?

The Program on Education Policy & Governance hosted a conference, “50 Years after *Brown*: What Remains to Be Done?” on April 23–24, 2004, at Harvard University’s Kennedy School of Government. Prominent lawyers, legal scholars, specialists in public policy, political scientists, and economists gathered together to discuss various issues relating to the achievement gap between races. The then U.S. Secretary of Education, Rod Paige, opened the conference and three other former members of the U.S. cabinet — Secretary of Transportation William Coleman; Secretary of Agriculture Daniel Glickman; and Secretary of the Treasury Lawrence Summers — participated in the presentations and discussions. The presentations related to a wide spectrum of topics ranging from policy measures that could target the achievement gap to the legal challenges to these measures.

There is evidence that while the black-white test score gap shrank considerably in the seventies and eighties, the gap opened up in the nineties. But the conference discussions showed considerable promise that the gap can be closed within a generation. Participants agreed that pre-school education, school desegregation, student accountability, and parental choice can go a long way to close the gap.

In a paper presented at the conference, Derek Neal of the University of Chicago cited a dramatic increase in incarceration among black men, black-white differences in family resources such as income, parental education, and time devoted to children as possible causes of the gap. He suggested that vouchers hold some promise in narrowing the gap since previous research suggests that economically disadvantaged black students in inner-city public schools gain the most from access to private schools.

The role of accountability in raising student achievement in general, and the black-white achievement gap in particular, was also debated. Stanford University researchers Eric Hanushek and Margaret Raymond found that accountability has a positive impact on states that attach “consequences to performance.” They showed that both blacks and Hispanics have lower gains relative to whites on each of the tests, and concluded that accountability by itself cannot close the achievement gap. The papers from the conference are to be published in a volume edited by Paul Peterson entitled *Generational Change: Closing the Test Score Gap*, Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
The black-white test score gap shrunk considerably in the eighties, the gap opened up in the nineties.

Pre-school education, school desegregation, student accountability, and parental choice can go a long way to close the gap.
The PEPG Advisory Committee has continued to meet on a yearly basis since it was formed in 2002 to discuss emerging issues in American education and the most useful ways in which PEPG may contribute to its reform. In October 2003, the committee met in conjunction with the School Boards conference events at Harvard. In November of 2004, the committee convened at the Harvard Club of New York.

Several new members have joined the committee, including: Bob Boruch, faculty member of the Department of Education at the University of Pennsylvania; Phil Handy, chairman of the Florida Board of Education; Deborah McGriff, chief communications officer for Edison Schools; Terry Moe, chair of the Department of Political Science, Stanford University; and Lawrence Patrick III, president and CEO of the Black Alliance for Educational Options.

Two committee members were the recipients of the prestigious Thomas B. Fordham Prize for Excellence in Education. Terry Moe, dubbed “Godfather of the School Choice Movement,” won the 2005 prize for Distinguished Scholarship. John Brandl, the “unorthodox Democrat,” was the co-recipient of the 2005 prize for Valor, given to leaders who had made major contributions to education reform.
PEPG, along with other leading institutions, will establish the federally funded Center on School Choice, Competition and Achievement. Other participating institutions include the Peabody College of Education at Vanderbilt University, the Brookings Institution, the National Bureau of Economic Research, the Northwest Evaluation Association, and the Stanford University School of Education.

The center will receive a $10 million, five-year grant from the Institute of Education Sciences, which is the main research component of the U.S. Department of Education. After a widely publicized nationwide competition, the grant was announced in September 2004.

Under the grant’s terms, PEPG will examine the impacts of school vouchers on public schools, the effects of private schools and charter schools on student achievement, and the effects of school accountability systems on political competition within school districts. A multidisciplinary team from the co-operating institutions, including political scientists, economists, sociologists, psychologists, curriculum experts, psychometricians, statisticians, public finance analysts, and legal scholars, will investigate these issues.
PEPG organized a conference, “Schooling and Human Capital Formation in the Global Economy,” September 3–4, 2004, jointly with the CESifo, a Munich-based research center. The conference brought together renowned scholars from the United States and Europe and, by inspiring spirited discussions and communication between them, succeeded in building bridges across nations and schools of thought. The presentations covered a wide range of topics, including individual and aggregate returns to human capital, equality of educational investments, intergenerational mobility, peer-group effects, tracking of students into different educational programs, equality-focused interventions, school choice, and accountability.

There has not been much evidence as to whether educational opportunities for children coming from different family backgrounds are similar across countries. Ludger Wößmann of the Ifo Institute for Economic Research, Munich, presented new evidence on this issue for children in the Western European countries and the United States. Using comparable student achievement data across countries, he showed that equality of educational opportunity in the United States was remarkably similar to that in Western Europe. However, there are important variations across countries in Western Europe. While France and Flemish Belgium are the most equitable, Britain and Germany are the least. His findings also suggest that equal opportunities for students from different family backgrounds do not require a lowering of average performance.

The effectiveness of different human capital policies targeted to disadvantaged groups was also debated at the conference. In this context, Hessel Oosterbeek presented results on the effects of various policy interventions, such as class size reduction, extra resources for personnel, extra resources for computers, lowering the school attendance age, and increasing the compulsory school leaving age, on student achievement. Focusing on the Netherlands, he concluded that lowering the compulsory school attendance age is the only intervention that produced significant results. He suggested that notable positive effects for the other interventions can be ruled out. The papers from the conference are to be published in a volume edited by Ludger Wößmann and Paul Peterson.
The conference brought together renowned scholars from the United States and Europe and, by inspiring spirited discussions and communication between them, succeeded in building bridges across nations and schools of thought.
The PEPG journal Education next recently celebrated its fourth year of publication. Education next analyzes and influences developments in K–12 education reform and provides a solid platform to present facts, research, sound ideas, responsible arguments, and valuable policy analyses. The journal continues to attract a sizable audience, including thousands of researchers; policymakers in state governments and in the federal government; and educators in public, private, and charter schools. Education next articles have received a considerable amount of press interest. The journal’s stories have been covered in The New York Times, The Wall Street Journal, CNN Money, USA Today, Christian Science Monitor, The Herald-Dispatch, and the Oakland Tribune.

An article by James Peyser and Robert Costrell on the true costs of “No Child Left Behind” has received widespread attention. Their research has been cited by President George W. Bush, by then Secretary of Education Rod Paige, and by major newspapers and periodicals such as The Wall Street Journal, The Boston Globe, Education Week, and the Weekly Standard. Peyser and Costrell’s study showed that NCLB is not an unfunded mandate — there is enough funding to successfully implement NCLB.

A careful “check the facts” article by Michael Podgursky of the University of Missouri on the annual reports of teachers’ salaries released by the NEA and AFT was widely cited by the press. In this article Podgursky found that teachers work 30% fewer days than people from many other professions and they typically have a shorter workday. After adjusting for the shorter work year and workday, he found that only engineers, architects and surveyors in private practice, and attorneys earn more than teachers on an hourly basis.
An article by William Damon on the role of schools in character education of children has been picked up by Fox News, the Arkansas Democrat Gazette, the North Carolina News and Observer, and the Scripps Howard News Service. In this article, Damon argues that the choices and actions of schools leave indelible marks on the students and shape their characters. Therefore public schools should strive to do their best in guiding students and in helping them to distinguish right from wrong.

The Education next website currently receives 12 million hits a year.


Circulation, Subscriptions, and Distribution

Education next is available by subscription and at bookstores all across the United States. Both subscriptions and bookstore sales of Education next have been growing steadily. The number of stores receiving the journal has increased to around 600 and bookstore sales have now increased by over 200%. The journal is carried by the Gale Group and by H. W. Wilson, the electronic database used by libraries and booksellers, in addition to a few other library buying services. An increasing number of individuals uses and downloads articles from the journal’s website (http://www.educationnext.org/). The site’s current usage rate is 12 million hits a year, with close to one million visits annually. These numbers rose by over 50% in 2004.
Unfunded Mandate?

“The Wall Street Journal

Sue First, Teach Later

BY MARTIN R. WEST and PAUL E. PETERSON

April 28, 2005; Page A18

The National Education Association, its affiliates in 10 states, and a ragbag of school districts have just filed a federal lawsuit alleging that No Child Left Behind (NCLB) is an unfunded mandate. If the NEA’s complaints sound familiar, it’s because Americans have heard them before — 40 years ago, when Southern segregationists did their best to evade the desegregation requirements of Lyndon Johnson’s original law offering federal aid for education.

Then, recalcitrant school districts complained about an unfunded mandate. Then, they objected that the dollars did not cover the full cost of desegregating their schools. Now, resistance comes from those who claim as much as then, the resistance is woefully misguided.

There are two things wrong with the NEA’s claim that NCLB is an unfunded mandate. The law is neither a mandate, nor unfunded. The nonpartisan General Accounting Office dismissed the mandate claim last October. The law only provides funds to those states that wish to reject the dollars — and the rules that accompany them. Any state that wants to reject the dollars is free to do so. That no state has yet taken this route provides an on-the-ground basis for rejecting the complaint out of hand.

As for funding, the law provides for three decades. In inflation-adjusted dollars, spending per pupil in 1970 hovered around $5,000. Today, it is over twice that. With all the extra money, classes are smaller, more popular tutoring options have so far been covered in full by Federal dollars. Yet according to the most recent results from the National Assessment of Educational Progress, 17-year-olds score no better today than they did in 1970. In other words, the doubling of real expenditures has borne little educational fruit. That is the scandal No Child Left Behind is attempting to address.

The law has its deficiencies. Implementation of key features is left to school districts, many of which must use to gauge schools’ performance. But those problems can be fixed with a modicum of the goodwill that historically has been the hallmark of our intergovernmental system. Instead of joining efforts to improve a law designed to help the most disadvantaged Americans, the NEA seeks to short-circuit the civic process.

Yet educating the neediest of our children remains the civil rights issue of our time. The Southern segregationists who resisted integration found themselves on the wrong side of the history books. Fortunately, many of them have figured this out, as well. Mr. West is a research associate of the Program on Education Policy and Governance, of which Mr. Lee Shattuck Professor of Law, Director.

URL for this article:
http://online.wsj.com/article/SB943419249,00.html

943419249,00

10

Program on Education Policy & Governance
Public school expenditures have seen a steep increase between 1970 and 2000; however, there is little evidence of achievement gains of students during this period. In fact, high school graduation rates have been falling since 1990. As remedies, several reform proposals have been proposed and debated. A reform strategy that has been slowly but steadily gaining ground is the adequacy movement. Adequacy claims have been filed in 29 states since 1989. Based upon evidence from student test scores generated by state and federal accountability systems, plaintiffs in such cases argue that schools are failing to provide “thorough and efficient” education required by state constitutions. Consequently, they ask the courts to mandate substantial increases in state educational spending. Plaintiffs have already won in 24 such cases. With cases pending in several states and the federal No Child Left Behind law focusing attention on disparities in student achievement, the adequacy lawsuits are sure to get more and more prominence.

However, scholarly attention to adequacy lawsuits has been very limited. Whatever little evidence there is suggests that although school finance reforms in various states have succeeded in dramatically reducing spending disparities between districts, the impact on achievement disparities has been substantially less. This calls for a critical assessment of the role of the adequacy movement in garnering improvement in student achievement and, more specifically, in reducing disparities and inadequacies in American education.

The conference will address issues relating to the adequacy movement that the existing literature largely overlooks: the origins of the education clauses in state constitutions, the assumptions about the impact of increased spending implicit in adequacy claims, the appropriate role of state courts in matters of education policy, and, most importantly, the impact of an increase in state aid resulting from adequacy lawsuits on student outcomes.

To address these very important issues, PEPG has solicited essays from political scientists, legal analysts, economists, historians, education researchers, and other scholars. The papers will use a variety of research designs, including careful case studies, thorough historical analyses, and rigorous quantitative research. Moreover, in this conference, PEPG plans to bring together participants in several recent adequacy lawsuits with wide-ranging views on the topic of adequacy reform.
Besieged:
School Boards and the Future of Education Politics
William Howell, ed. (Brookings, 2005)

The point of the book is very well brought out in the following excerpts from School Boards Besieged by William Howell, Education Week, March 9, 2005:

After 32 years of teaching in the same public schools that she attended as a child, this winter my mother-in-law decided to run for the local school board. . . . In last month’s election, Linda upset a two-term incumbent by winning over 90 percent of the votes cast. Some challenges, of course, will come from sitting board members who disagree with Linda’s views on these matters. But the real hazards lie elsewhere — specifically, with politicians in every level and branch of government who, over the past half-century, have worked to displace the visions and prerogatives of school board members everywhere.

In 1920, public elementary and secondary schools relied on local governments for 83 percent of their funds, state governments for 17 percent, and the federal government for less than 1 percent. By 2000, local revenues constituted just 43 percent of total expenditures, while the state and federal governments kicked in for 50 percent and 7 percent respectively. Accompanying these funds are increasing numbers of regulations affecting what schools teach, how their contracts are written, who is hired, and when they can be fired.

The courts, especially since Brown v. Board of Education, have had a profound impact on public education. After leading the fight to desegregate public schools in the 1950s and 1960s, courts now mandate all sorts of education policies. They set rules on which student organizations can assemble on public school grounds, what kinds of religious references valedictorians can make at graduation, what allowances and accommodations must be made for students with disabilities. State courts have had a definite impact on school finance, setting fixed standards on the levels and types of permissible funding inequalities between and within districts. And now, courts are adjudicating cases over whether local school boards can place stickers claiming that “evolution is a theory, not a fact” in science textbooks.

Whereas 19th-century school board members governed virtually all aspects of public education, today boards must

Research Papers

The Impact of Charter Schools on Student Achievement

Using data from a large charter school system, the Chicago charter schools, this study investigates how students’ achievements are affected by their attending charter schools. Identifying a good control group for charter school students is very difficult and most studies are plagued by the problem that the charter school students differ from the comparison group in observable or unobservable ways. This study overcomes this problem by using the fact that the charter schools were required to select students by lottery when the number of students exceeded the number of available places. Relying on random assignment of students and comparing “lottered-in” and “lottered-out” students, the authors find that in comparison to the lottered-out students, “students who apply to and attend charter schools starting in the elementary grades [and have spent an average of two years at the school] score about six national percentile rank points higher in both math and reading.”

Learning to Lead?
What Gets Taught in Principal Preparation Programs
by Frederick M. Hess and Andrew P. Kelly (American Enterprise Institute).

The new era of accountability and No Child Left Behind has created a new and critical role for principals that demands strong and effective leadership. In this study, Hess and Kelly investigate whether principals are adequately prepared for this job. Investigating 210 syllabi collected from a national cross-section of 31 principal preparation programs, they find the courses to be “severely lacking.” They conclude that the graduates of these programs are not adequately trained to take on the new challenge of accountability.

(The highlights of this article are available in “The Accidental Principal” by Frederick M. Hess, Education next, Summer 2005.)
Economics of “Acting White”  
by David Austen-Smith (Northwestern) and Roland Fryer (Harvard),  
This paper formalizes the tendency of “acting white” and its consequences on black achievement and labor-market outcomes. The authors argue that there is a tradeoff: “behaviors that promote labor-market success are behaviors that induce peer rejection.” Consequently, chances of peer rejection often drive individuals to choose lower education, which in turn, engenders lower labor-market outcomes.

Rotten Apples:  
An Investigation of the Prevalence of Teacher Cheating  
by Brian A. Jacob (Harvard) and Steven D. Levitt (Chicago),  
Using data from the Chicago Public Schools, the authors find evidence of teacher or administrator cheating on standardized tests in at least 4–5% of elementary schools annually. They argue that frequency of cheating responds strongly to even small changes in incentives. As a result, reforms that garner strong incentives, such as the No Child Left Behind Act, may induce larger amounts of teacher cheating unless care is taken to ensure that it does not occur.

Common Sense School Reform  
by Frederick Hess  
(Palgrave Macmillan, 2004).

Choice and Competition in American Education  

Generational Change: Closing the Test Score Gap  

Should we applaud these trends?… Aren’t the excesses of localism (cronyism, corruption, provincialism, and waste) ample justification for legislative and judicial intervention? To be sure, not all aspects of local education politics are cause for celebration…. But in the push to advance the now-fashionable goals of standardization and accountability, we would do well to reflect upon the appropriate role of the governing institution that, at least historically, has assumed primary responsibility for the educational lives of children.

For if not the local school board, then which political institution will hear, and heed, their voices?
Christopher Berry  was a postdoctoral fellow at the PEPG during 2002–04. Currently, he is an assistant professor in the Harris School of Public Policy at the University of Chicago and a research affiliate at PEPG. Berry received his Ph.D. from the Department of Political Science at the University of Chicago. He was awarded the William Anderson award in 2004 for the best doctoral dissertation in the field of federalism, intergovernmental relations, state and local politics. In recent research on school size, he has shown that students from small schools earn more later in life.

David Campbell was a PEPG research fellow during 1999–2001. Currently, he is an assistant professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame, a research affiliate at PEPG, and a fellow of Notre Dame’s Institute for Educational Initiatives. He received his Ph.D. in government from Harvard University in 2002 and received the 2004 E. E. Schattschneider award for best doctoral dissertation in the field of American politics. His forthcoming book is entitled Why We Vote: How Schools and Communities Shape Our Civic Life (Princeton University Press). In recent research, he has investigated the factors that lead families to participate in a school voucher program.

Rajashri Chakrabarti is the current postdoctoral fellow at PEPG. She received her Ph.D. in economics from Cornell University and was a recipient of the Sage Fellowship during her graduate studies at Cornell. Her current research focuses on school choice and accountability. In recent work, she argues that differences in voucher designs can lead to very different responses from public schools. She has investigated the effects of the Florida and Milwaukee voucher programs on public school performance. In other research, she argues that voucher design matters as far as student sorting is concerned and shows that the Milwaukee program has been able to eliminate sorting by income.

Martin West, Bradley fellow at PEPG, is the co-editor of No Child Left Behind? The Politics and Practice of School Accountability (Brookings, 2004) and has published articles on topics including school vouchers, tuition tax credits, charter school research, and the effects of class size and school size on student achievement. He is also a research fellow in governance studies at the Brookings Institution and the research editor of Education next. West holds an M.Phil. in Economic and Social History from Oxford University. He is currently a Ph.D. candidate in government and social policy at Harvard University.

Patrick Wolf entered Harvard’s government Ph.D. program in 1988, completed his dissertation on bureaucratic effectiveness under Paul Peterson’s direction, and in 1998 joined the faculty of Georgetown University’s Public Policy Institute as an associate professor, where he is now a tenured member of the faculty. He co-authored a half-dozen journal articles and book chapters on school choice in New York City, Dayton, Ohio, and Washington, D.C. In the spring of 2004, Wolf led a team of D.C.-based researchers into the competition for the federal contract to study the D.C. Opportunity Scholarship Program, and his team was selected as the official evaluator of this important new school-choice initiative.

Thomas T. Hoopes Prize Winners
Awarded to undergraduates, along with their academic supervisors, to recognize outstanding scholarly work.

Matthew Mark Chingos, B.A. ’05,
“The Effects of Florida’s A-Plus Accountability and School Choice Program on Student Achievement”
Supervised by professors Caroline M. Hoxby and Paul E. Peterson

Brad Michael Smith, B.A. ’05,
“The Results of Political Compromises in Education: The Effects on Student Achievement of Charter Schools in Milwaukee”
Supervised by Martin R. West
PEPG’s Postdoctoral Fellowship Program

PEPG offers a one-year resident fellowship at the postdoctoral level from July to June of each year. Fellows work at Harvard University and are expected to engage in independent projects that are related to the program’s focus. Additionally, fellows are expected to collaborate with PEPG’s ongoing research and programs.

For additional information, please go to http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/pepg/postdoc.htm
The School Choice Debate

The Wall Street Journal, August 18, 2004
“Dog Eats AFT Homework” by William Howell, Paul Peterson and Martin West

[A] recently released study of charter schools issued by the American Federation of Teachers, … after receiving top billing in the right-hand corner of the front page of yesterday’s New York Times, was picked up by news media across the country. The AFT’s conclusion: “Charter schools are underperforming.”

Big deal. These results could easily indicate nothing other than the simple fact that charter schools are typically asked to serve problematic students in low-performing districts with many poor, minority children.

Indeed, the AFT’s most telling comparisons — the ones within ethnic groups — cut against the case it is trying to make. This comparison is vital, precisely because prior research has found ethnic differences to be large. Yet when the authors look just at African-American or Hispanic children, they find no statistically significant difference between public school students and those in charter schools.

But do any of these findings — within ethnic groups or otherwise — say anything meaningful about the quality of charter schools? Not a bit. For starters, one must do much more than look separately at students grouped by free lunch status, ethnicity or school location, in order to take into account family influences on a child’s learning capacity. All of these factors — and many other considerations — must be combined into a sophisticated analysis in order to begin to gauge how well students perform.

The AFT study only looks at student performance at a single moment in time. One needs to track student progress within a school over multiple years in order to ascertain how much the child is learning. Moreover, nothing in these data accounts for the length of time that a charter school has been in place — a factor known to have an impact on a school’s performance.

The New York Sun, April 11, 2005
“Power of the Voucher” by Paul Peterson and Martin West

School vouchers are making a comeback. Under legislation championed by Governor Bush, the number of Florida students using vouchers, either because they are disabled or were attending struggling public schools, has crossed the 10,000 mark. Meanwhile, Mr. Bush has raised the ante further by asking the Florida Legislature to provide vouchers for all low-performing students.

To its credit, [No Child Left Behind] neatly combines accountability and parental choice. Either public schools must perform well, or parents must be given the choice of another, non-failing public school within the district. Is public school choice under NCLB enough to promote school improvement?

It is now possible to examine this question systematically in Florida, side by side with a similar study of the voucher component of that state’s own accountability scheme. Vouchers remain available to Floridians in all those schools that received an “F” grade under the state accountability system twice in any four-year period. The voucher threat was expected to give them an incentive to improve in the school year 2002-2003. Did it?

Information from every elementary school student in Florida for the years 2002-04 allows us, for the first time, to answer these questions. As it turns out, the stigma of receiving a “D” by itself, motivated schools to work harder the next year. They outperformed by a significant margin the “C” schools that just missed getting the worse grade. Still, the “F” schools, faced with the threat of vouchers, did even better, raising scores by an amount roughly equivalent to three to four months of student learning above the performance of students in the “C” schools. They did so despite the fact that these “F” schools had highly disadvantaged, predominantly minority populations.

Meanwhile, we found no impact at all of the threat of public-school choice under NCLB as it was implemented in Florida the next school year. No harm done, but no good either. As Congress thinks about how to enhance NCLB, the voucher option should be put back on the table.

(The paper is available at http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/pepg/)
Staff Research

“Participation in a National Means Tested Voucher Program,” David Campbell, Martin West, and Paul Peterson

“Latest Results from the New York City Voucher Experiment,” Paul Peterson and William Howell

“Efficiency, Bias and Classification Schemes: Estimating Private-School Impacts on Test Scores in the New York City Voucher Experiment,” Paul Peterson and William Howell

“Impact of Voucher Design on Public School Performance: Evidence from Florida and Milwaukee Voucher Programs,” Rajashri Chakrabarti


“Do Vouchers Lead to Sorting under Random Private School Selection? Evidence from Milwaukee,” Rajashri Chakrabarti

Papers from the Conference: School Board Politics

(October 15–17, 2003)

“The Local School District in American Law,” Richard Briffault and Joseph P. Chamberlain

“Desegregation and School Board Politics: The Limits of Court-Imposed Policy Change,” Luis Fraga, Nick Rodriguez, and Bari Anhalt Erlichson

“Whither Localism? No Child Left Behind and the Local Politics of Federal Education Reform,” Douglas Reed

“Teacher Unions and School Board Elections,” Terry Moe

“School House Politics: Expenditures, Interests, and Competition in School Board Elections,” Frederick Hess and David Leal


“Contextual Influences on Participation in Local and School Governance,” David Campbell


“Minority Representation and Local School Boards,” Melissa J. Marschall

“When Mayors Lead Urban Schools: Toward Developing a Framework to Assess the Effects of Mayoral Takeover of Urban Districts,” Kenneth Wong and Francis Shen

“School District Consolidation and Student Outcomes: Does Size Matter?” Christopher Berry


Education Policy Colloquia Series

(Spring and Fall 2004, Spring 2005)

“Common Sense School Reform,” Frederick Hess

“Do Charter Schools Promote Student Citizenship?” Jack Buckley

“School District Consolidation and Student Outcomes: Does Size Matter?” Christopher Berry

“No Child Left Behind?” Paul Peterson

“Impact of Vouchers on Public Schools: Evidence from Milwaukee,” Rajashri Chakrabarti

“Charter Schools in Chicago: Evidence from a Randomized Trial,” Caroline Hoxby

“The Economics of Acting White,” Roland Fryer

“Educational Adequacy in Massachusetts: Hancock v. Driscoll,” Robert Costrell

“The Efficacy of Choice Threats within School Accountability Systems: Results from Legislatively Induced Experiments,” Paul Peterson and Martin West

Papers from the Conference: 50 Years after Brown: What Remains to Be Done?

(April 22–24, 2004)

“Leaving No Black Children Behind,” Chester E. Finn Jr.


“Preschool Programs and the Achievement Gap: The Little Train That Could,” Ron Haskins

“Black Achievement 50 Years after Brown,” David Armor

“Is Increased Diversity the Answer to the Achievement Gap: Race-Conscious K–12 Student Assignment Plans in the Aftermath of Grutter,” John Munich

“Resources and Racial Skill Gaps,” Derek Neal

“Educational Adequacy Lawsuits: The Rest of the Story,” Al Lindseth

“School Accountability and the Black-White Test Score Gap,” Margaret Raymond and Eric Hanushek

“Education Accountability: Motivation or Discrimination? A Survey of Legal Theories Used to Challenge and Defend State Accountability Systems,” Jane Wilensky

“School Choice by Mortgage or Design: Implications for the Black-White Test-Score Gap,” Patrick Wolf

“Delaying the Dream: Legal Obstacles to School Choice,” Clint Bolick

(Papers from the conference on Schooling and Human Capital Formation are available at http://www.ksg.harvard.edu/pepg/)
What’s next in Education?
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