



## Caution on the Cleveland Plan

### Overview

In early February 2012, two potentially transformational events happened almost simultaneously in Ohio education policy. First, Cleveland Mayor Frank Jackson introduced a new transformation plan for the Cleveland Municipal School District (CMSD). Then Governor John Kasich praised the plan in his State of the State address, hinting not too subtly that what happens in Cleveland will play a key role in the development of his education reform plans, which are expected to include a new education funding formula, which he promised to deliver last year, but has yet to produce.

Given the importance the Cleveland Plan will have in shaping the future of state education policy, as well as the state's past history of taking Cleveland experiments statewide (see: vouchers), it is important to closely examine this new plan. We must determine what can work, what needs tweaking, and what poses a threat to the idea of a democratically accountable system of public common schools, a vision laid out for Ohio by its founders in the Land Ordinance of 1785, which set aside the heart of every community for Public Education.<sup>i</sup>

Innovation Ohio has been studying the plan's outline for several weeks.<sup>ii</sup> IO has found some things to like about the plan, others that need work, and a few detrimental proposals, which, if adopted, could destroy the founders' vision for educating our children. This report will deal with each of these three issues in turn.

### Things to Like

#### I) Innovative School Designs

- a. A Global Language Academy that will focus on Chinese and Arabic language and culture with global travel opportunities and web-based interactivity with kids and students abroad.
- b. An Environmental Science School, which will have kids working closely with scientists at the Cuyahoga Valley National Park and Cleveland Metroparks System to receive hands-on field training in environmental science.
- c. Early Childhood Academies in every neighborhood that use a year-round school cycle from preschool through third-grade, designed to help children catch up to reading levels by fourth grade—a key developmental milestone.<sup>iii</sup>
- d. An Urban Cooperative School that would bring families together in the school, allowing them to work on life skills as well as learning skills.

- e. A Residential Board School that would have kids live in dormitories or other facilities while attending the school for 5-7 days per week. This idea has been considered in Chicago and other urban districts.
- f. Career Technical Academies spread more liberally throughout the district, giving more kids an opportunity for career-specific training and education.
- g. An English Immersion School for students who are English Language Learners, with the goal of quickly overcoming language barriers for these children.

These ideas hold great promise for kids, especially the Early Childhood Academies. Few things in education research are better understood than this: the sooner and better we reach children, the easier and cheaper it is to overcome their obstacles. Pre-schools in every Cleveland neighborhood would give Cleveland a clear opportunity to turn around the district within a generation. The other ideas, none of which are really new, per se, would give children in Cleveland more opportunities to explore more diverse educational options, and a few, like the cooperative and the boarding school ideas, would be directed toward mitigating demographic challenges—the most significant obstacles to good student outcomes.<sup>iv</sup>

## 2) Flattening the Central Office

One of the changes Cleveland is seeking is turning its central office into a kind of portfolio manager, focusing on opening and closing schools, as well as other functions. Schools would be given more autonomy and flexibility, based on accountability, and granted more authority over their operations without having to call the Central Office. Granting great teachers and administrators the authority to run their buildings free from bureaucratic interference is certainly a laudable goal. And as long as the Central Office retains enough authority to be the Local Education Agency (LEA) on federal grants and other matters, granting more localized control is a better management structure, especially in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century learning environment.

## 3) Phasing in Investments in Targeted Areas

- a. **High-quality preschool education.** Pre-schools would be universal for all 4 year olds, with the goal of expanding them to include 3 year olds.
- b. **College and workforce readiness.** The Cleveland plan seeks to increase the number of high school students in pre-graduation programs, as well as to partner with local businesses to better prepare students for careers.

These two investments could be incredibly important, both in the short and long terms. The college and workforce readiness components would help kids approaching high school graduation to better prepare for their lives after high school. The pre-school investment would pay off enormously over the next decade, as we have known for years that investment in pre-school education is among the best and relatively cheap investments one can make for academic improvement.

## 4) State Law Changes<sup>v</sup>

- a. Enable CMSD to manage its fiscal assets flexibly, including the sale of real estate.

This is a common sense approach to one of CMSD's larger assets.

- b. Allow the district to count enrollment of district sponsored charter schools.

While somewhat technical, this change would have the effect of significantly reducing the impact of state money lost to district-sponsored charters.

- c. Close loopholes in existing law that allow bad charters to close and re-open under different sponsorship and ensure bad schools are closed permanently, including prohibiting transfer to the Ohio Department of Education for continued operation.

This too has become a problem, especially among charter schools that historically have performed poorly. It is also a favorite tactic of White Hat Management.<sup>vi</sup>

- d. Require notice for school closures to be made to parents in June, thereby eliminating a “lame duck” year.

Again, this has been an issue for years in charter schools. The current law allows for a failed charter school to collect state money for a year in which the state says it has performed so poorly it should be closed.

- e. Start-up and expansion of new and high-performing school models.

These models, discussed earlier, include Early Childhood Academies and Environmental Science schools, which are some of the more exciting components of the Cleveland Plan. These schools should be allowed to happen as soon as possible.

## Things That Have Potential, But Need Work

- 1) **Year-round calendar.** The plan seeks to expand the school year and school day throughout the district. The international average school year is 220 days. Ohio has tried this before. In 2009, Gov. Ted Strickland proposed expanding the school year to 200 days, but met stiff resistance from amusement park operators, among others. What needs work in the Cleveland Plan is the implementation.

**Areas for Innovation:** There is no proposed language in the Cleveland plan, so it’s unclear what the District is proposing. What is clear is that not all kids need extra days or hours. Innovation Ohio supports lengthening days and school years, but only where it makes sense and where evidence shows it will positively impact students. It is encouraging to see the district seeking to grant flexibility to schools, teachers and principals around this issue.

- 2) **Talent recruitment and capacity building.** It is encouraging to see Cleveland aggressively pursuing new teacher recruits. However, their focus on Teach for America is problematic for two reasons. First, TFA recruits typically leave the profession within a few years and their results are spotty at best.<sup>vii</sup> Second, what appears to make the biggest difference in student success isn’t a bunch of fresh-faced, inexperienced teachers; it’s eager, experienced and well-educated teachers.<sup>viii</sup>

**Areas for Innovation:** What is absent from the District’s talent recruitment model is a commitment to seek out good, *experienced* teachers who have demonstrated ability to reach challenging kids in other districts or states. While recruiting experience admittedly may cost the district more money, the district wouldn’t have to worry as much about high turnover and could expect more improvement in student performance. When Ohio State University sought to improve

its research credentials, it didn't go looking for recent (and cheap) college graduates. Instead, it poached the best talent and paid a premium for it. Imagine if Cleveland did that.

- 3) **Academic technology enhancement.** Technology is the way of the future in education and most every other aspect of our lives. We are concerned, however, about Cleveland's apparent commitment to blended learning environments, which combines face-to-face and online learning environments, in the absence of further detail. It wasn't long ago that Governor Kasich's former Education Czar Robert Sommers infamously told a legislative committee "in a 'blended learning environment,' class sizes could go to a 50-to-1 ratio."<sup>x</sup> The International Association for Online K-12 Learning recommends that generally "a full-time online teacher ... should carry approximately the same load" as their face-to-face traditional school counterparts.<sup>x</sup> Blended learning environments can serve as excuses to explode class sizes and drastically reduce costs—with no improvement in student outcomes.

**Areas for Innovation:** Ensure that blended learning environments use effective techniques, not simply serve as an excuse to justify large class size and lower staff costs. For example, some online learning has shown to be more effective, but it is more time intensive than face-to-face learning.

- 4) **Provide CMSD the same waivers and exemptions provided to charter schools.** A document circulating among education advocates suggests that CMSD is seeking waivers from state law under Title 33 of the Ohio Revised Code, which all laws regarding education, including standards, funding, collective bargaining rights, and accountability. Such an exemption would be a troublesome precedent, giving school districts the right to opt out of accountability, employment and other school-related laws that could adversely impact the work environment and learning environment for kids.

**Areas for Innovation:** Innovation Ohio would support granting CMSD the same waivers from state rules as charter schools currently have. This has long been an issue in the traditional public schools—watching mostly poor-performing charter schools receive waivers from almost 200 different requirements for which the traditional schools must be accountable.

- 5) **Support for high-quality charter schools.** The part of the plan that is quite revolutionary is the district's acceptance of and willingness to work with its high-performing charter schools. This has been a long, hard process for the charters and the Cleveland Municipal School District as both had to overcome many preconceptions and challenges to reach this partnership. While the proposed support goes to far in some areas, the move toward increased and better charter-district cooperation and collaboration is a welcome change from the outright hostilities that has typified that relationship in the past.

## Dangerous Provisions To Be Avoided

- 1) **Cleveland Transformation Alliance.** The plan calls for the establishment of an oversight body that would have several important functions. They would oversee the plan, ensuring fidelity to its concepts by all public schools. They would also assess the quality of all the city's public schools. They would act as the marketers of school choice in Cleveland—a particularly problematic provision. And they would develop charter school provisions in line with well-regarded national standards. Finally, Cleveland is asking the state to allow the Alliance to be the city's sign-off authority for all new charter schools.

**Why This Is Dangerous:** These are all functions that Cleveland’s School Board can and should be performing and, if enacted, would subvert much of the Board’s already limited authority, given Cleveland’s mayoral control of the schools. Why should a school board do this job? Because they are elected. This new Alliance in Cleveland, by contrast, will be appointed, not elected. Therefore, they will exert control over how public dollars are spent without any direct accountability to taxpayers. True, the district is one of the partners, but only one of many. Innovation Ohio believes that keeping control of the public schools in the hands of publicly accountable officials is the best way to ensure accountability for those dollars. Innovation Ohio recognizes that Cleveland has had a problem with school boards in the past, but it is much easier to remove a school board through elections than it is to undo a potentially out-of-control appointed panel.

**Areas for Innovation:** Innovation Ohio commends the Cleveland community for wanting to take control of its schools and for forging the partnerships that have developed in the public and private sectors. However, if the panel goes forward, it should act in an advisory capacity to the publicly accountable officials in control of the school district. This would allow the Alliance to still operate as a watchdog, but avoid the potentially dangerous impact it could have with respect to taxpayer accountability. Public schools should be controlled democratically if Democracy is to be upheld.

- 2) **Weighted Per Pupil Funding Formula Across All Schools.** While the District is light on detail for this plan, it appears to be a formula that distributes funds between schools, often described as “money following the child.”

**Why This Is So Dangerous:** Having money follow the child is a long-held conservative tenant on school funding and it could have a devastating impact on schools, as Ohio’s experience with charter schools has demonstrated. While Ohio’s districts lose 5.5% of their students to charters, the state sends 11% of the districts’ money to charters.<sup>xi</sup> Doubling down on this system could cause tremendous financial hardship for districts like Cleveland.

The “money follows the child” idea is a good sound bite, but in practical terms, it’s a mess. At the most simple level, a child will not cost the same at a Cleveland school as he or she will cost at a charter or in another district. That’s because of human resource, capital and overhead variables that differ widely among buildings, districts and charters. Charters have lower costs structures and expend less on a per pupil basis to educate a child. Yet the schemes currently envisioned pay schools as if there are no differences.

Ohio’s “money following the child” scheme has already cost Cleveland dearly. Last year, while Cleveland lost about 20% of its student population to charter schools, the district ended up losing about 26% of its state money to the charter schools.<sup>xii</sup>

**Areas for Innovation:** Weighted per pupil formulas only work if the costs accurately reflect the cost to the district or school. So, for instance, the formula would make different cost approximations in Cleveland Schools than charter schools. So if a child leaves a Cleveland School for a charter, the money necessary to educate the child in the *charter* would be sent to the charter, not the cost of educating the child in the *district*, as is currently done.

In the School Funding Advisory Council (SFAC) in 2010, a group of charter and traditional school advocates agreed to a similar idea: pay for the children where they attend school, not transfer money from the district where they live.<sup>xiii</sup> This was a good first step. In addition, costs should be as

detailed as possible. In the Evidence Based Model from 2009, there were 23 costs used to calculate education funding rather than the three in the Building Blocks model. The SFAC actually converted these into a per-pupil formula in its report to the Ohio General Assembly, and said the per-pupil amount is closer to \$6,800 per pupil, not the \$5,732 under the old Building Blocks formula.<sup>xiv</sup>

- 3) Transferring Local Property Tax Revenue to Charter Schools.** This is the biggie, and could mean the end of the public common school envisioned by the country's (and Ohio's) Founding Fathers. While the Cleveland plan is careful to restrict this provision to district sponsored and partnered schools, it would effectively rub the lamp and release a genie that could not easily, if ever, be put back into the lamp.

**Why It Is So Dangerous:** Depending on how you calculate it, Ohio's property taxes make up about 55% of the funding for public education.<sup>xv</sup> If charter schools are allowed to move in on that money, it would devastate all but a few districts' primary source of revenue. The state currently sends 11 percent of its education funding to charter schools. If charters are allowed to take local property tax revenues too, that could mean another 11% cut in funding for public schools, on top of the state money that has already been cut. This would also start Ohio down the path of directly allowing locally raised property taxes to be sent to schools (both charter and traditional) that are not in the communities in which the taxes are levied – breaking the compact districts have with local taxpayers that their money will go for their community's schools.

**Areas for Innovation:** Charter schools do have a problem in that they are unable to raise local revenue (though they are able to raise private funds, which in some cases are substantial). However, while the Cleveland Plan acknowledges that charter schools don't have a steady, long-term funding stream because they can't count on philanthropic donations forever, the idea of letting charter schools receive local property taxes on top of their already large state payments is untenable. Successful charters do need an additional, dedicated revenue source. However, it should not again come at the expense of local school districts' increasingly shrinking revenue stream.

Rewarding successful charters has already been tried. During the House Bill 1 debate in 2009, the Ohio House inserted a provision that allowed successful charters to receive more state money. However, the Ohio Senate stripped that provision out in favor of ensuring all charters got their money, regardless of their success. It will be interesting to see if the General Assembly will change its mind now.

- 4) Teacher Compensation and Accountability.** The Cleveland Plan essentially would require the state to implement many of the Senate Bill 5 provisions dealing with teachers, like eliminating seniority as a factor in employment, allowing easier dismissals and allowing CMSD to determine things like contract length, terms, tenure and other provisions without bargaining. It would also require a merit pay system for all teachers and require that all future negotiations be done without any carryover from prior contracts.

The plan as currently constituted would force Cleveland's teachers to take the district's last, best offer, which would mean Cleveland's teachers would lose most, if not all their bargaining power – hardly the way to forge partnerships between labor and management in a challenged school district.

**Why This Is So Dangerous:** It directly contravenes the will of the people expressed so emphatically in November 2011. Moreover, it establishes practices that have been demonstrated to have little impact on student outcomes. Merit pay, especially, has been widely dismissed as an



effective tool.<sup>xvi</sup> In fact, the Harvard Business Review wrote recently that merit pay in the private sector is ineffective too.<sup>xvii</sup> Collective bargaining can help make reforms more permanent and effective across the spectrum. Allowing for different conditions in different buildings will all but eliminate collaboration between teachers. It is simply not an effective tool for doing anything but punishing teachers.

**Areas for Innovation:** This solution is the easiest, Innovation Ohio recommends adopting the Model Teacher Evaluation System that has been worked on for more than two years in the Ohio Educator Standards Board. It has all the requirements Cleveland wants – evaluations based in good measure on student outcomes, as well as peer review, 360-degree evaluation and a non-tenure/seniority based dismissal system. The difference is teachers helped develop this model and have signed off on it. Why Cleveland would seek to re-fight the Senate Bill 5 battle and ask legislators to fall on their swords for these ideas defies logic—especially when all Cleveland would have to do is adopt the emerging Ohio Educator Standards Board Evaluation System.

The solution to re-starting negotiations at the beginning is also simple. Start fresh during the next negotiating cycle. The district doesn't need to have the state step in; they can do this anyway. It simply needs to be willing to have teachers go on strike and be tough. Having the state step in and force both sides to start fresh every cycle when one of the primary benefits of collective bargaining is you don't have to re-invent the wheel each round, makes little sense and would mark the beginning of the end of collective bargaining in Ohio – a principle Ohioans emphatically rejected in November.

## A Path Forward

The Cleveland Plan has much to like—and a good bit to be very concerned about, especially for those who believe in the Founding Fathers' vision for our system of Public Common Schools as laid out in the Land Ordinance of 1785. None other than Alexis de Tocqueville made mention of this commitment to public education by saying in his great 19<sup>th</sup> Century work *Democracy in America* that “the originality of American civilization was most clearly apparent in the provisions made for public education.”<sup>xviii</sup> However, once again this idea is threatened by money.

Throughout the Cleveland Plan outline, references are made to Cleveland's desperate financial situation. And while the writers of the plan hint at some state accountability, they ask nothing specific for new state revenues; only the right to ask for a levy from local property taxpayers with the ability to give some of that money to Charter Schools, whose governing boards operate outside the sunshine that public School Boards have to employ. In 2000, Ohio sent Cleveland \$304,222,710. This year, the district ended up getting \$283,381,810. That is nearly 30% less than a simple inflationary increase. It is true that enrollment in Cleveland has dropped precipitously since 2000, but a 30% effective cut cannot be explained by the drop in enrollment.<sup>xix</sup>

What's happened in Cleveland is reflective of the state as a whole. Since the DeRolph school funding case was dropped in 2002, state funding has dropped 15% relative to inflation while money to charters has more than doubled. To simply ignore, or downplay, the role Ohio's state government has played in putting Cleveland into this financial predicament is a notable and glaring omission from the Cleveland Plan outline. Would Cleveland be seeking draconian personnel measures, laying off hundreds of employees, closing buildings and seeking higher and higher property taxes if the state hadn't cut its funding by nearly 30% relative to inflation over the last decade?

The Cleveland Plan is very light on what it asks of the state—beyond giving the district more authority to tax local property owners and greater flexibility to dictate terms to employees. But the alleged “need” for both of these measures can be traced directly to huge state cuts, especially from the last budget, which cut about \$50 million over the biennium.

It was equally disappointing to see that the authors of the Plan have perpetuated the mantra that the public schools are troubled.

“Public trust and confidence in the schools over decades have almost evaporated, evidenced most dramatically by the district’s steep drop in enrollment,” the report said.

It is no accident that the evaporation of public trust has coincided with the state’s divestment in public education.

The state’s funding system was declared unconstitutional four different times because it relied too much on local property taxes and didn’t accurately calculate the costs. Ohio is now the only state in America without a school funding formula.

To say the state does not bear a significant responsibility for what’s happened in Cleveland is akin to saying the Earth is flat.

The Cleveland Plan should insist on several things from the state:

- 1) **Equal state funding with their Charter partners.** Currently, charters receive full state funding while districts have the amount they can raise locally subtracted from that amount. However, if the state is going to allow charters to collect local revenue too, which IO thinks is a dangerous public policy precedent and would recommend Cleveland not adopt, the charters should get a reduced state amount, like districts, or districts should receive the full amount, like charters.
- 2) **Bring Charter Schools into the Sunshine.** If charters are going to be more substantive partners with CMSD, essentially eliminating the differences between them, the least charters should do is open up their operations to public scrutiny. That means having the same open public board meetings, open records and open financials as traditional school districts, and that sunshine should extend to any operators of these schools. If there is to be no difference in Cleveland between charter and traditional schools, then there should be no difference in how taxpayers keep track of their money and how these schools operate. That includes making charters subject to the same level of public disclosure requirements as traditional schools. In addition, charters that receive local revenue should have *no trade secret exceptions* to public records law.
- 3) **Replace all state cuts from HB 153.** It is difficult to see how losing about \$50 million over two years won’t seriously impede the district’s ability to innovate, especially when it would involve raising 10 mills locally to replace those cuts, which is more than \$300 per \$100,000 home. Just to plug Cleveland’s projected budget deficit would cost more than 12 mills (or about \$400/\$100,000 home), and that doesn’t include any additional investments by the district as envisioned in this plan. Without additional state support, it is difficult to see how these innovations can be realized. Under the Evidence Based Model, Cleveland was set to see an additional \$158 million in state money over 10 years, which is about a 30-mill reduction in property tax need, cutting taxes by about \$900/\$100,000 home in Cleveland. So it’s not impossible to have the state make long-term commitments to Cleveland and the rest of Ohio’s schools.



- 4) **Establish a Charter School Fund for successful Charters that does not take money from districts.** Taking more money from school districts by raiding local property tax revenues, as the Plan currently calls for, is extremely problematic. Forcing the state to find a new revenue source for charters that won't adversely impact local districts is essential to developing better relationships between districts and charters. If lawmakers believe so strongly in charter schools' efficacy, they should at least be willing to set up a fund for the really good ones. Fewer than two dozen would rate in the top half of all school districts on the Performance Index Score. So this would not be a huge investment.
- 5) **Develop a School Funding Formula that accurately measures the cost of education, encourages creativity and significantly reduces the need for property taxes to pay for schools.** This has been the state's Constitutional Duty since 1853, yet it is currently failing to perform this duty. It's up to Cleveland and others to force the state to live up to its obligation. Until it does, it remains very difficult to envision a true reform package surviving.

The Cleveland Plan outline frequently mentions how unstable charter school funding is because they have to rely on philanthropic donations. But how can they ignore how unstable State funding has been over the last decade? Ironically, their most draconian provisions are directly related to state funding cuts. If the cuts hadn't been so deep, it is doubtful that the most objectionable portions of the Cleveland Plan would be considered. So until state funding stability returns, it is difficult to see how Cleveland's plan can be effectively implemented.

Finally, IO is disappointed as well in the lack of engagement the drafters of the Cleveland Plan had with the district's teachers.<sup>xx</sup> The district's teachers partnered with CMSD agreed to sign on to Race to the Top, which, among other things, included the development of a teacher evaluation system. Cleveland teachers have also made large contract concessions in the face of financial challenges.<sup>xxi</sup>

What research has shown time and again is that collaboration rather than dictation will help teaching improve most.<sup>xxii</sup> The Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development, reported that Ontario, Canada, was able to cement many of its reforms *because* of collective bargaining with its teachers.

“Central to success in this area in Ontario was the signing of a four-year collective bargaining agreement with the four major teachers’ unions. In reaching the accord, the ministry was able to negotiate items that were consistent with both its educational strategy and the unions’ interests, thus providing a basis for pushing forward the education agenda while creating a sustained period of labour peace that allowed for continued focus on educational improvement.”<sup>xxiii</sup>

Meanwhile, in Denver, teachers and administrators agreed to a performance-based evaluation system that included measures to help teachers improve. Preliminary results are quite encouraging.<sup>xxiv</sup>

What is *not* encouraging are the results from merit pay systems that don't involve any real teacher improvement strategies, instead relying simply on monetary compensation to drive change. Those systems, which closely resemble Ohio's Senate Bill 5 and what CMSD is proposing in the Cleveland Plan, have shown zero positive impact on student achievement.<sup>xxv</sup>

No less a School Reformer than Bill Gates recently wrote in the *New York Times* the following:

“A good personnel system encourages employees and managers to work together to set clear, achievable goals. Annual reviews are a diagnostic tool to help employees reflect on their performance, get honest feedback and create a plan for improvement. Many other businesses and public sector employers embrace this approach, and that's where the focus should be in education: school leaders and teachers working together to get better.

Fortunately, there are a few places where teachers and school leaders are collaborating on the hard work of building robust personnel systems. My wife, Melinda, and I recently visited one of those communities, in Tampa, Fla. Teachers in Hillsborough County Public Schools receive in-depth feedback from their principal and from a peer evaluator, both of whom have been trained to analyze classroom teaching.

We were blown away by how much energy people were putting into the new system — and by the results they were already seeing in the classroom. Teachers told us that they appreciated getting feedback from a peer who understood the challenges of their job and from their principal, who had a vision of success for the entire school. Principals said the new system was encouraging them to spend more time in classrooms, which was making the culture in Tampa’s schools more collaborative. For their part, the students we spoke to said they’d seen a difference, too, and liked the fact that peer observers asked for their input as part of the evaluation process.”<sup>xxvi</sup>

- i. Under the Land Ordinance of 1785, Section 16 was reserved for public schools. Section 16 was literally at the center of each township laid out by the Ordinance
- ii. There is currently only a PDF outline of the plan available here: <http://www.cmsdnet.net/~media/Files/About/CEO/ClevelandPlanForTransformingSchools202212.ashx>. While the plan will need state legislative action, there has yet to be any legislation developed for components of the plan.
- iii. M. Daane, P. Donahue and W. Grigg, *The Nation's Report Card: Reading Highlights 2003* Washington, DC: National Center for Education Statistics. Poor kids are three grade levels behind on reading by fourth grade, which is when kids start reading to learn rather than simply learning to read.
- iv. Grissmer, D., Kirby, S., Berends, M. and Williamson, S. (1994). *Student Achievement and the Changing American Family*. RAND Monograph Report.
- v. Again, there is no legislation yet, so this report will use the Plan's wording verbatim in its analysis
- vi. Eagle Heights Academy was closed for academic failure in 2010 and re-opened as Southside Academy.
- vii. Innovation Ohio blogged about this issue here: <http://innovationohio.org/blog/tfa#more-2163>, which was based on an Associated Press story that found, among other things, that "Its teachers perform about as well as other novice instructors, who tend to be less successful than their more experienced colleagues. Even when they do slightly better, there's a serious offset: The majority are out of the teaching profession within five years. 'I think ultimately the jury is out,' said Tony Wagner, a professor at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and an instructor to the first class of TFA corps members."
- viii. From the same Associated Press article on TFA: "A Harvard study of students in Texas found that a teacher's level of education, experience, and scores on licensing exams have a greater influence on student performance than any other factor. North Carolina research on teacher training programs, including Teach for America, showed that elementary students taught math by a first-year teacher lose the equivalent of 21 days of schooling compared with students who had teachers with four years of experience."
- ix. Jim Siegel, *Schools can Adjust to Cuts, Kasich Education Official Tells Lawmakers*, Columbus Dispatch, March 24, 2011.
- x. From iNACOL discussion of class size at <http://www.onlineprogramhowto.org/policies/curriculum-instruction/class-size/>
- xi. According to the Final #1 PASS Payment
- xii. According to the Final #1 PASS Payment  
Additionally, If it was a true "money follows the child" system, payments to Charters should have been far less since Charters taking Cleveland kids pay their teachers less than half of what teachers are paid in Cleveland Schools<sup>1</sup>, among other lower costs. The per pupil amount is based on the old "building blocks" calculation performed under the state's previous foundation formula. The building blocks formula used several components in determining the per pupil amount, including a base cost for classroom teachers, personnel support (arts teachers primarily) and non-personnel support.<sup>1</sup> Those separate components were calculated as \$2,931 in FY 09 for teachers (at an average teacher salary with benefits of \$58,621 and a flat student-teacher ratio of 20:1), \$1,962 in FY 09 for personnel support, and non-personnel costs of \$839 per pupil. All components added together made the per pupil amount \$5,732 in FY 09 (the last year it was in place for all schools). If Charter Schools that take Cleveland students pay their teachers about \$31,000 a year on average, why do they get paid as if they paid teachers \$58,621?
- xiii. The full SFAC recommendations on Charter Schools can be seen here: <http://education.ohio.gov/GD/DocumentManagement/DocumentDownload.aspx?DocumentID=95172>
- xiv. The full report is located here: <http://education.ohio.gov/GD/DocumentManagement/DocumentDownload.aspx?DocumentID=95171>
- xv. According to the Ohio Department of Taxation's latest annual report, Ohioans pay about \$8.5 billion a year in property taxes for school districts. If one looks only at how much the state pays through its "formula", the percentage of state-local is 58%. However, if one includes federal money as well as additional state support, such as filling in the homestead exemption money, the percentage is closer to 53%. IO went with 55% to be closer to the percentage with just state "formula" spending, local property taxes and federal funds.
- xvi. The first major, longitudinal study of merit pay found it had no impact on outcomes. It's located here: <http://blogs.ajc.com/get-schooled-blog/2010/09/21/another-blow-for-merit-pay-long-awaited-tennessee-study-finds-no-impact-on-student-achievement/>
- xvii. <http://hbr.org/2012/01/tackling-business-problems/ar/1#.TvtyhA4E5ps.twitter>
- xviii. De Tocqueville, A. 1835. *Democracy in America*. Literary Classics of the United States Inc., New York, New York. (2004 ed.) Page 46.
- xix. All calculations use final or latest payment figures from the discussed years. Inflationary increases are measured using the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics Inflation Calculator at: [http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation\\_calculator.htm](http://www.bls.gov/data/inflation_calculator.htm). While it's true that CMSD's funded enrollment (different from head count enrollment) has dropped by about 18% between 2000 and 2011 (about 72,000 to 59,000), the cut is still greater than enrollment drop alone can explain. And in fact it almost perfectly mirrors the losses to Charter Schools, which took in 14,287 students last year.
- xx. [http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2012/02/cleveland\\_teachers\\_should\\_be\\_o.html](http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2012/02/cleveland_teachers_should_be_o.html)
- xxi. [http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2011/12/applause\\_for\\_new\\_cleveland\\_tea.html](http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2011/12/applause_for_new_cleveland_tea.html)
- xxii. OECD (2011), *Lessons from PISA for the United States*, Strong Performers and Successful Reformers in Education, OECD Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1787/9789264096660-en>
- xxiii. Ibid at 238.
- xxiv. [http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2011/12/applause\\_for\\_new\\_cleveland\\_tea.html](http://www.cleveland.com/opinion/index.ssf/2011/12/applause_for_new_cleveland_tea.html)
- xxv. <http://blogs.ajc.com/get-schooled-blog/2010/09/21/another-blow-for-merit-pay-long-awaited-tennessee-study-finds-no-impact-on-student-achievement/>
- xxvi. Gates, B. *For Teachers, Shame is Not the Solution*. New York Times. Feb. 23, 2012. Page A27. Available on the Internet at: <http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/23/opinion/for-teachers-shame-is-no-solution.html>

