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State Control of Local Schools

- **Old Wave**
  - Started as mostly financial
  - Increasingly became “comprehensive” - include academics
  - Endpoint - return to local district control
  - In Detroit: Emergency Manager

- **New Wave**
  - Post 2005: New Orleans effect
  - Academically driven
  - In Detroit: Education Achievement Authority
Did Old Wave State Takeovers Work?

- Most were comprehensive: Financial and academic takeovers
  - Almost 70% of large district takeovers involved both

- Financial recovery sometimes achieved
  - Local control sometimes restored - NJ vs. CA

- Academic performance –
  - Results not promising
New Wave: Recovery School District

- Hurricane Katrina, 2005
- Low performing schools placed in RSD

**Portfolio Management Model**
- “RSD is best understood as a bridge between a government monopoly and a liberalized educational system.” - Neerav Kingsland
- **School autonomy** - charter schools
- **Recruitment** - Teach For America, school leadership
- **Accountability** - low performers close/restructure

Finances?
Governance?
Financing Portfolio Models

- $100 to $150 million in philanthropy for NOLA transformation + federal funds

- What about Detroit?
  - Local and national funders have been involved
  - Broad, Gates, Kellogg, Kresge, McGregor, Skillman
Philanthropy in Detroit

Millions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Education Nonprofits</th>
<th>Teacher/Principal Programs</th>
<th>EAA</th>
<th>Charter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Cleveland Plan- 2012
- Charter partnership with school district
- Charters get some local tax dollars; share data
- Currently 17 partner schools with CMSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number of charter authorizers</th>
<th>Charter Market Share, 2014-15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Los Angeles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detroit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Governing Detroit

- Declining student population
- 4-way division of students and resources
- All driven by state policy
  - DPS- Emergency Manager
  - EAA
  - Charters (12 authorizers)
    - no cap
  - School of choice
Looking Ahead

- DPS finances are not the whole story

- School governance in Detroit is unusually fragmented

- State policy touches on every aspect-
  - School quality and accountability
  - Competition for funding