

Bulkley Chapter -- Identification of Themes

Change central office, performance accountability, school closure, school differentiation,

3.1A	In recent years	Shift from centralized bureaucracy that directly manages a relatively uniform set of schools
3.1B		Toward model central office oversees a portfolio of schools offering diverse
3.1C		Portfolio = traditional, private, charter, service providers
4.1A	In Chicago, Arne Duncan	Chicago 100 new schools = charter, contract, empowered
4.1B		New Orleans: two distinct governing authorities
4.1C		New York from greater centralization to shifting selection of supports to schools
4.1D		Diverse provider model: for-profit, nonprofit
4.2A	The idea of a PMM	Accountable for performance, contingent
4.2B		Continuous improvement: expansion/imitation, closure/replacement, constant search for ideas
4.3A	In theory	a strong performance-based accountability system: schools evaluated, closed/altered
4.3B		Central changes from directly managing to closing/opening based on performance
5.1A	The policy roots	Distinct lines of reform brought together
5.1B		Market mechanisms for competition
5.1C		Common standards and performance accountability
5.1D		Focus on individual school as site of differentiation: offer families variety of paths
5.2A	These three distinct strategies for	Market-based reform
5.2B		Standards-based reform
5.2C		Differentiation of schools
5.2D		Different theories of actions with distinct political coalitions
5.2E		Revamping the overall system & making district strategic manager of change
5.2F		Markets, competition, choice as alternatives to government as institutional mechanism
5.2G		PMM puts local government and public capacity and intervention on center stage
5.3A	This book seeks	Too early to declare PMM failure or success
5.3B		Coherent synthesis or messy melange

Bulkley cont 2.

6.1A	The idea of a portfolio management model offers broad contours: 3 core ideas	creation of new schools: family choice interest/needs & away from neighborhood zone
6.1B		Clear and rigorous academic accountability
6.1C		closure of schools
6.2A	What pulls these 3 distinct elements	Strategic management of central office in opening/ closing schools
6.2B		Directly develop/ actively recruit providers for schools in areas of need = manage supply side
6.2C		Manage set of high quality/ diverse needs
7.1A	The idea of a PMM is still developing	Common threads including expansion of school choice
7.1B		External providers to manage school
7.1C		Increase attention to alternative ways of providing high quality human capital
7.1D		Focus on differentiating central office support
7.2A	Often (but not always) connected	Portfolio schools are a strategy for creating an entire system of excellent high schools that uses managed universal choice as a central lever in a district change process
8.1A	However, while these and	Identifying schools to close
8.1B		Primary consumer is the district, not the family
8.1C		PMM draw on market logic
8.2A	A second common thread	Outside providers
8.3A	A third common thread	Human capital and experimentation
9.1A	Finally, central office staff	Provides differentiated support
9.2A	The following section	Three strategies: market based, standard based and differentiation
10.1A	The shift to mayoral control	Response to a loss of legitimacy; mayoral control appeals to business groups
10.2A	The broader context of federal	PMM's push NCLB
11.1A	While all these reforms	Market based solutions, contracting out and student choice
11.2A	Policy Roots of PMMS	Progressive Era reformers
11.3A	Over the past twenty-five years	Two competing schools of thought are: first seeks to utilize the tools of markets as an alternative to bureaucracy
11.4A	The second and more dominant	The second and more dominant school of thought involves ideas of systems and standards-based reforms
12.1A	The idea of one best system	Common school as a melting pot

		instrument
12.1B		Differentiates schools based on themes, structure
12.2A	The rhetoric surrounding PMM	Contracting out and privatization
12.2B		Markets can address both efficiency and quality by shifting incentives for change
12.2C		Different forms of student choice; open enrollment, vouchers
12.2D		Demand for schools to improve
13.1A	In the case of	School choice, consumer in the educational market-place is the student and family
13.1B		Other types of reforms focus on district or central government
14.1A	In recent years, there has been	Private organizations – contracting for the management of entire public schools
14.1B		Justifications for contracting-quality and efficiency
14.2A	While, for several decades	1990's many contract providers
14.3A	One school-focused reform	Charter schools autonomous schools of choice
14.3B		Have to demonstrate successfully education children
15.1A	Although advocates of charter	Pushing for higher-quality charter school
15.1B		Do not appear to outperform district schools
15.1C		Choice in and of itself, doesn't ensure quality
15.2A	One common strategy	Charter management organization (CMO) KIPP, Aspire, etc
15.3A	Another strategy is to	Charter "quality control"
16.1A	Beginning with the 1983 Report	A Nation at Risk – focused on raising standards and expanding accountability
16.1B		Standards based reform
16.1C		Federal policy/legislation
16.1D		NCLB
16.2A	While noting that there	Core elements of SBR: clear academic expectations for ALL, alignment of curriculum assessment materials, assessment to monitor performance, decentralization to schools for curriculum and instruction, support and technical assistance and accountability provisions that reward or sanction schools
17.1A	In addition, some early advocates	High-stakes testing influences teacher and administrator behavior and can reduce the importance of the standards themselves

Chapter 2 – Portfolio Management Models and the Political Economy of Contracting Regimes

27.1A	Everything seems new and fresh	New reform ideas seem compelling and full of promise.
27.1B		Each new idea is seen as sui generis little learning accumulates
28.1A	The portfolio management model	New approach increases flexibility, competition, choice, efficiency, and student performance
28.1B		Key features include: contract arrangements in exchange for accountability.
28.2A	It is too soon	PMM contracting regime
28.3A	Contracting regimes incorporate	Place government in the role of consumer
29.1A	Government entities differ	Stronger bargaining position,
29.2A	Acknowledging the core	Understanding differences between contracting and consumer markets
29.3A	The portfolio model	Greater reliance on market is the best route for speedy and effective school reform
30.1A	Claims by some advocates	PMM will not take the decisions about schools out of politics
30.1B		Decisions shifted different political dynamics
30.1C		Social interests do not get overlooked or obscured
30.2A	Market theories and reform	Milton Friedman – elements of market perspectives
B		Free interactions between suppliers and consumers – most effective way
C		Competition provided efficiencies, innovations, responsiveness
D		Government monopolies more insidious than private monopolies
31.1A	Part of the political appeal	Metaphor – firms compete for shoppers
B		Parental choice as an alternative to neighborhood schools

Ch. 3 Neoliberal School Reform in Chicago?
Renaissance 2010, Portfolios of Schools, and Diverse Providers
David Menefee-Libey

55.1a	Renaissance 2010	New initiative they proclaim as a way to replace worst performing schools
55.1b		Offered new choices and instructional programs
56.1a	Ren10 policies	Test-based accountability
56.1b		Creation of charter schools
56.1c		Establish contract schools
56.1d		Human capital initiatives
56.3a	Political challenges	Confirms importance of the civic committee of Chicago
56.3b		Solidified Mayor Daly's control over CPS
57.1a	Diverse Portfolio	A blending of public and private provision for students and differentiation of entrepreneurial schools
57.1b		New governance or a neo-liberal policy approach
58.1a	Waves of School Reform	CPS does not perform at an acceptable level
58.1b		School's System leaders proved incapable of reforming
58.2a	CPS	3 rd largest school system in U.S. (STATS)
59.1a	Table 3.1	Chicago Public Schools by Type
59.2a	Wave One	Chicago School Reform Act of 1988
59.2b		Public frustration with poor school quality
60.1a	Creation of elected LSC	Empowered to choose school's principal and create a school improvement plan
60.1b		Enable parents, teachers and principals to develop an autonomous school educational program best suited to the needs of local children
60.2a	CPS Central Office	Developed an elaborate system of oversight for LCS's and schools
61.1a	CCSR created	Consortium of Chicago School Research – developed substantial policy and evaluation; created by colleges and universities
61.2a	Daley's relations with the LSCs	Daley began working to preempt a development of an LSC power base that might challenge his control
61.2b	First Wave	Brought substantial school-focused innovation and development
62.1a	Wave Two: Mayoral Control	Gave Daley the power to appoint the district superintendent and a smaller school reform board
62.1b		Reduced CTU influence in the district
62.1c		Freed CPS to contract out almost any type of service
62.2a	Daley's New Authority	Brought a bottom-line business orientation to the district's management
62.2b		Ultimately contracted out services for entire schools
62.3a	Superintendent Vallas and boundaries	Limits were placed on LSC's autonomy making it conditional on the performance of schools
63.1a	Accountability	Remain central to Vallas's vision for system improvement
63.2a	Daley and Vallas Vision	Reinvention of schools themselves
63.2b		Create more effective instruction
63.3a	Charter Schools	Allowed the creation of 45 charter schools state-wide, including 1 in Chicago
63.3b	Daley's view on charter schools	Saw charter schools as a tool for injecting innovation

Chapter 4 – Strong Vision, Learning by Doing, or the Politics of Muddling Through?

91.1A	Michael Bloomberg took office	Emphasized school reform
91.2A	In the final four decades	Four decades of turmoil. Corruption. Previous Mayor said should blow up Board of Education
92.1A	Picking up where Giuliani	Centralized mayoral control. Prerequisite to breaking pattern.
92.2A	In June 2002, the state	Empowered Bloomberg to appoint Chancellor. Chancellor appoint community superintendent
92.2 B		Goal: reduce the power of city school board
92.3A	A month later, after	Klein appointed chancellor. David vs. Goliath attitude.
92.3B		Skill and tenacity important
92.3C		Solicited advice from school reformers
92.4A	With 1,200 schools, 80,000	Overbureaucratization, overfragmentation, patronage politic and stark inequities.
92.4B		Civic capacity was in place. Support from foundations. Wall Street and individuals as well as business community.
93.1A	Despite this mandate	Inherited preexisting collective bargaining agreements
93.1B		Union very powerful
93.2A	Mobilizing these resources	Reform grounded in management theories, corporate value and metaphors, PMM. Eliminated bureaucracy.
93.2B		Autonomous schools and principal – greater control over budgets and staffing. More direct responsibility for performance.
93.3A	In contrast to a more	Schools self-affiliate into networks. Central information management system. Robust charter school sector. Separate portfolio of public schools.
94		First wave of reform 2002-2004 Klein conducted top-down study
95		Little input from community groups Decisions made behind closed doors Replaced city's 32 independent school districts with 10 regions Regional superintendent reports to Klein
96		Uniform curriculum in reading and math implemented citywide NYC Leadership Academy

