Learning Lessons from Chicago

CAROL CAREF & KRISTINE MAYLE

ABSTRACT This article describes how the Chicago schools system has been bedeviled by the social conditions faced by the city’s inhabitants, and now by attempts to use privatization and school closures as the ‘solution’ to those problems. The article describes how teachers in the Chicago Teachers’ Union combined with community members to challenge the neo-liberal restructuring of the city’s schools.

Introduction

This article will focus on the issue of school closures and the related proliferation of charter schools. This issue, as much as any other, has defined the reshaping of public education in Chicago. By closing 168 schools in predominantly African American neighborhoods, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) has destabilized those neighborhoods, laid off thousands of Black teachers, and forced students to travel long distances or attend charter schools. The issue is one that the Chicago Teachers’ Union has invested much energy into opposing – using organizing, research, communications, and political means. At this point the battle is still being fought, but there are small cracks in the ability of CPS to continue this strategy. The union, together with parents, students, and community partners, continues to push on this and other important issues.

National Context

In the USA, 90% of students attend public schools, although in Chicago, the percentage is lower. Education is locally run, although there are changes afoot. National standards are being introduced under the guise of ‘Common Core State Standards’. These common standards have been agreed to by 43 of the 50 states. They move the former education markets, composed of 50 states with different requirements, into one national market, thereby profiting the publishing companies who created the standards.
Funding differs by locality, but Illinois schools are funded mostly by property taxes; this creates great inequities, as wealthier areas have more money for schools. The state provides less than one-third of the education dollars in Illinois, with the rest being generated locally. Federal money accounts for only 12% of education funding, and provides token support for special education and low-income students and for free breakfast and lunch programs. Federal money is distributed inequitably to states winning Race to the Top grants. The idea that education funding is a race, not a right, is one of the many issues facing the US education community.

There are two teachers’ unions nationally: the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), to which the Chicago Teachers’ Union (CTU) belongs, and the National Education Association (NEA). The organizations have different histories and structures; AFT is more common in the cities and NEA more common in suburbs and rural areas. There have been attempts to merge the two unions, but that has not happened on a national scale. The two organizations in New York and California are merged unions. Just about half of all teachers are union members; 24 states have ‘right to work’ laws which make it difficult for unions to organize.

Most AFT and NEA local units have the right to bargain collectively. In Chicago, the collective bargaining has, until recently, followed a traditional structure. Union leaders met in secret with bargaining team members from CPS. Although members knew in general what CTU was demanding at the bargaining table, the details were unknown. In the negotiations leading to the 2012-15 contract, CTU created an open bargaining process. The negotiating team was expanded to include 30 CTU leaders, in addition to the usual officers, attorneys, and staff members. These 30 leaders played an important role, as they explained to the CPS team the importance of each contract item under discussion. During ‘caucus’ breaks in negotiations, the expanded team discussed what response CTU should give to various CPS offers. Communications to the membership kept them abreast of bargaining developments. As 2015 approaches, there is talk of expanding this open process even more widely, to include students, parents, and interested community members, as was done recently in St Paul, Minnesota negotiations.

Throughout the United States, local school boards make decisions about the education of students in the locality. In most cases, these school boards are elected. In Chicago, the school board is appointed by the mayor. Chicago’s unelected school board consistently makes decisions that are in line with the mayor’s financial plans, but at odds with the city’s actual education needs. The expansion of charter schools is one example of this. Charter schools are publicly funded, but privately managed. Even the charters that call themselves non-profit have made money from real estate deals, from huge administrative salaries, or from outlandish payments to the ‘parent’ organization of the charter management company. In this endeavor, they have been successful, but in educating students, they have proven no more successful than publicly funded, publicly run CPS schools.
The Neo-liberal Assault

In 1995, the Illinois state legislature instituted mayoral control over Chicago’s public schools. Signaling the corporate community’s intrusion into education, CPS would now have a ‘CEO’ with business experience instead of a Superintendent with education experience. A few years later, the Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago issued recommendations that became the foundation of CPS’s Renaissance 2010 policy. Subsequently, education policies took on the character of business practices. Practices like competition, investment in ‘winners’ versus disinvestment in ‘losers’ and outcomes-based planning all replaced proven educational practices of collaboration, more attention to those in greater need, rich curricula, and emphasis on hard-to-measure qualities such as creativity, critical thinking, and love of learning. It is hard to believe that the corporate community’s interest in education is unrelated to the profit motive. The US education market is a $800 billion business! While the details of how corporations make profits from this industry are still unfolding, the details of the harm to students from business-based policies are apparent.

The closing of schools in order to turn the education of Chicago’s students over to charter management organizations is a failed policy. While charters began as a vision for teacher-led, unionized schools that would lead to innovations to be shared across all schools, charter operators have pursued a different agenda. As a result, charter schools perform no better, and in many instances worse, than comparable neighborhood schools. The slash-and-burn approach to schooling that lies at the heart of the ‘charter bargain’ must be abandoned and replaced with policies based on proven supports for schools in need. By continuing to accelerate school closures, ‘turnarounds’ (all adults in the school must reapply for their jobs and most do not get rehired) and charter school proliferation, CPS ignores the evidence that their policy is a failure. The Districts’ actions are destructive, particularly in low-income, African-American communities.

School actions, which include closur es, turnarounds, consolidations, and phase-outs, and charter proliferation are concentrated in the African American South and West Sides of the city. These areas have the lowest median family incomes and frequently include demolished public housing sites. More than 95% of turnaround schools are located in census tracts with the lowest median family income range. There are few school actions or schools run by charter management operators in areas of the city where the wealthiest Chicagoans live. The policies of CPS only further the destabilization of neighborhoods already disrupted by housing and employment crises, poverty, and racial segregation.

Although some exceptions do exist, in general, the 20-year-old policy of moving children from school to school has failed dramatically. On average, educational outcomes for CPS students have not improved, despite claims to the contrary. Instead, the policy of closing, turning around, consolidating or
phasing out neighborhood schools and turning the education of Chicago’s students over to charter management companies has:

- increased racial segregation in schools in general;
- depleted stable African American neighborhood schools in particular;
- increased student mobility, particularly in areas with high concentrations of school actions;
- promoted disrespect and poor treatment of teachers by blaming them instead of CPS policy for under-performing schools;
- expanded unnecessary testing while decreasing opportunities for deep, conceptual learning;
- increased punitive student discipline.

The ‘underutilization crisis’ of 2013 was manufactured largely to justify the replacement of neighborhood schools by privatized charters. In spite of CTU and community-led protests against more closings, CPS closed 50 schools in May 2013. CPS claimed that it needed to ‘right-size’ the number of schools to match the number of students, but that position is not supported by the facts. Actually, CPS has opened more than 100 new schools and acquired or constructed space to educate close to 50,000 additional students in the last 10 years. Many of the new schools were placed in areas where existing schools had been closed. As part of the Gates Compact, CPS has pledged to open at least 60 new schools run by charter management organizations. If the problem is ‘underutilization’ or ‘under enrollment’, why spend hundreds of millions to create new schools?

While the policy of school closing and opening has not moved education in Chicago forward in any significant way, the benefits to charter school operators, private testing companies, real estate interests, and wealthy bankers are growing. The Chicago Board of Education’s facilities decisions have a long and controversial political history, but the most recent iteration can be traced to 1995, when the Illinois state legislature granted complete control of the schools to the Mayor of Chicago. The city was once ‘hailed as a pioneer for putting local school decision-making into the hands of elected school councils’,[2], yet the practical operational effect of mayoral control was a concentration of power in the mayor’s office and CPS central office. This shift made education policy less democratic and increasingly directed by the business community and politicians, with reduced input by actual educators. Since mayoral control began in 1995, the District saw both positive and negative increases, positive being graduation and negative being racial achievement gaps and percentage of students leaving the system. Huge resource disparities proliferated – selective enrollment schools were established, turnarounds and charters received state of the art facilities, equipment and supplies, while neighborhood schools serving low-income students of color deteriorated. These disparities, supposedly established to give ‘choice’ to parents, reflect a two-tiered system akin to what is commonly understood to be apartheid.
Disparities grew under Arne Duncan, who was hired to lead CPS in 2001. During Duncan’s tenure, the number of facilities decisions and school actions skyrocketed. In 2004, CPS launched the Renaissance 2010 initiative (Ren10), with the intention of improving schools by closing at least 60 low-performing neighborhood schools and opening 100 new schools in their place – mostly a mix of charter, contract, and performance schools, but also several magnet, selective enrollment, and new neighborhood schools. Ren10 was based on recommendations from the Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago [3] and the federal guidelines of No Child Left Behind, which allowed Districts to close or turn around schools that failed to make adequate yearly progress (AYP) on state exams.

Throughout the Ren10 process, CPS had no master facilities plan. Without any coherent strategy, CPS phased out, consolidated, and turned around 17 schools in early 2012, in addition to the dozens of schools acted against in the previous 10 years. Facilities decisions were so ad hoc and haphazard that pressure from parents, teachers, and community groups for a moratorium on school actions gained traction in the Illinois state capitol in 2009 and 2010. A bill that would have put the brakes on this policy was watered down during the legislative process (CPS lobbied heavily in opposition to the bill), and the resulting legislation did not call for a moratorium. Instead, the state created the Chicago Educational Facilities Task Force (CEFTF) to oversee CPS’s facilities decisions. Under the law, CPS is required to create a 10-year master facilities plan, but the District missed the January 2013 deadline and the plan that was finally released in September 2013 was severely deficient.

It is unsurprising that the ‘reform’ plan of the corporate community, represented by the Commercial Club, focused on gutting neighborhood schools and punishing teachers for the sake of private profits. Chicago’s corporate leadership has been attempting to control public schools and weaken public sector unions for more than 100 years.[4] Furthermore, since mayoral control began in 1995 and gentrification has spread across the city in earnest, Chicago’s political and corporate elite have used school reform as a strategy to attract and retain middle-class families in the city, while controlling and closing schools in low-income communities of color.[5]

In all, tens of thousands of students have been directly impacted by CPS school actions since 2001.[6] Some 88% of students affected are African American. Schools that are over 99% students of color (‘Apartheid schools’ [7]) have been the primary target of CPS school actions – representing over 80% of all affected schools. Black communities have been hit the hardest – three out of every four affected schools were economically poor and intensely segregated African American schools.[8]

These students face a wide range of challenges outside of school, including high levels of violence and trauma, but are still expected to serve as test subjects for unproven school reform schemes. Schools serving wealthier and whiter students would never be expected to fire the entire school staff; yet, this disruptive tactic has been used repeatedly on the predominantly Black South
and West Sides of Chicago. Moreover, school actions like closures and turnarounds disproportionately target experienced African American teachers. In 2011, African Americans – 26% of all teachers – represented 65% of teachers in schools earmarked for closure and 40% of tenured teachers laid off.[9] The number of African American teachers is likely to decline even more, as Black teachers make up only 20% of the District’s teachers with five or fewer years of experience.[10] The proliferation of charter schools also contributes to the decline of Black educators and the racial imbalance between the teachers and the students in CPS – only 22% of teachers identified as Black among CPS charter schools in 2011, compared to the roughly 60% of Black students in charters.

The massive school closures that have been part of CPS’s broader strategy dating back to the 1990s have drastic consequences: they tear apart school communities; they disrupt deep and strong relationships between students, parents, and teachers; and they dismantle organizations that are often the only center of stability and safety for students. Overall, students have not benefited from schools closures or turnarounds. Despite the illusion of ‘choice’, students affected by school actions have most often landed in schools that struggle as much as their previous school.[11] In a consolidation or closure, those students are sent to a receiving school that may be several miles from their original neighborhood school. The transferred students have to navigate transportation challenges and cross gang territories that put them at risk of violence. Additionally, studies have shown that student achievement in the receiving schools is negatively affected by the school closures.[12]

Charter and turnaround schools do not serve all neighborhood students. If the original school endured a closure and restarted as a charter, students in the new school usually have a different composition than the previous mix of students – fewer special education students, fewer students from the neighborhood and fewer low-income students.[13] Charter schools require an application process for lottery admissions, which has the effect of weeding out students who have difficult family situations or are more alienated from school. The school action policies of CPS have a disproportionately negative impact on the students who most need policies that actually improve the quality of their education.

While school closures and disruptions have required vast resources at both the District and school level, simple yet effective interventions to help students have had their funding removed and have been ignored for decades. The Chicago Tribune’s 2012 series on truancy at the elementary level in CPS sheds light on the tragic and complex life struggles that impede the ability of so many children living in poverty to get to school.[14] As with other challenges associated with the effects of poverty and segregation in Chicago, truancy is especially prevalent in South and West Side communities. As many as 20% of Black elementary school students missed more than four weeks of school in 2011 due to truancy, gaps in enrollment, and absences.
The reasons for truancy have their roots in poverty and the difficult familial circumstances of the students, but schools can still help children when they have the resources to individually and personally monitor the students who consistently fail to appear in school. The Tribune series indicates that for some suburban school districts coping with rising poverty, the use of truant officers and social workers to reach out to students and their families is of crucial importance in making sure children don’t end up out of school and forgotten.[15] Truant officers are long gone from CPS – the last one was fired in 1992. Like other essential support staff, even when CPS had them, there were never enough truant officers to go around, with most working in at least three schools.[16] The data from that period indicate that truancies went up in the years following the loss of truant officers.

Instead of providing schools with resources and funding so that they can properly offer wraparound supports, the District has attacked and shut down schools they label ‘failing’. Schools that have been closed, turned around and phased out all had histories of high chronic truancy in the years leading up to the disruptive school actions. High schools that faced school actions from 2008 to 2011 had chronic truancy rates averaging over 50% in the years prior to closure. Elementary schools that faced school actions over those years had nearly one in five students chronically truant. The District’s contradictory response to such evident need for targeted support shows how misguided the policies of austerity and school closures are.

The Union Response

In June 2010, a group of teachers formed the Caucus of Rank-and-File Educators (CORE) and won leadership of the 30,000-member CTU. Members voted for CORE because the caucus had focused on organizing against the neo-liberal assault, while their predecessors ignored it. CORE fought against the closing or ‘turn around’ of 25 schools that had been placed on the 2009 ‘Hit List’. They attended and organized at every hearing, held protests downtown and in neighborhoods, wrote letters to the editors of local newspapers, and united with community and parent groups to fight the school actions. They organized 500 people to attend a meeting during a January blizzard to plan the fight. In the end, nine schools were removed from the list – not enough, but more than previously, when CPS had carte blanche to close and turn around at will.

In 2010, the list of 15 schools slated for action ended up being eight, after more protests organized by CORE and their community partners in the Grass Roots Education Movement (GEM). Most of the eight schools were turned around. This process leads to the dismissal of every adult in the building (including lunchroom workers, custodians, and other support workers, as well as teachers and principals). Workers may ‘reapply’ for their jobs, but are seldom rehired. Turnaround is mainly a ploy to turn over schools to private operators,
such as Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL), although unlike
charters, the schools are still unionized and subject to CPS policies.

In addition to leading the fight against school closures and turnarounds,
CORE built its internal strength. It held a study group on Naomi Klein’s *The
Shock Doctrine*. Its members met often, recruited new members, and raised
money. It hammered out its principles, and agreed to the following:

- **Member-Driven Union** – The focus of the caucus is to respond to and
  represent the voice of the members.
- **Transparency & Accountability** – All actions, elections and finances shall be
  open to all members for inspection and as such are open to public debate and
discussion within the membership.
- **Education for All** – CORE fights for equitable high-quality education for all
  students and seeks to establish and maintain partnerships among parents,
  students, community, and labor organizations for this purpose.
- **Defense of Publicly Funded Public Education** – Whereas public education is
  under attack from a well-funded group of business interests, politicians,
  privatizers, and enemies of publicly funded public education, CORE seeks to
  defend publicly funded public education as the last bastion of democratic
  expression and hope for students in all public schools across Chicago.
- **Strong Contract** – A strong agreement between the Chicago Teachers’ Union
  and the Board of Education shall ensure that working conditions and
  compensation provide for optimal teaching and learning.

The principles and actions proved to be in line with what CTU members
wanted to see in their leaders, and those elected from CORE have continued to
lead the union with those principles in mind.

The change in direction led to a noticeable improvement in teacher
morale. The new CTU leadership made several changes to the focus of the
union. They allocated the resources needed to create a CTU organizing
department, and a research department, neither of which had previously existed.
They strengthened the communications department, and members began to
regularly see quotations from CTU leaders in the newspaper as well as radio and
television interviews. The legislative department was reinvigorated as well. The
new leaders aligned the salaries of union staff with teachers’ pay. In addition,
they created a summer program that trained activist teachers to organize their
peers and formed contract committees in every school. They increased training
for the elected union leaders in each school, known as delegates.

In September 2012, the CTU published ‘The Schools Chicago’s Students
Deserve’. The report made the case for immediate district-wide enforcement of
practical and proven solutions to improve the academic performance of
Chicago’s students. It presented the argument that the education children
receive should not depend on zip code, family income, or racial background,
although statistics show that all too often those are the deciding factors. It was
the answer to the neo-liberal narrative about the ‘reforms’ necessary to fix
education. This paper became the cornerstone of CTU’s advocacy.
‘The Schools Chicago’s Students Deserve’ also took on the funding issue. It attacked schemes such as Tax Increment Financing (TIFs), which diverted money from schools and other public projects into the pockets of bankers and developers. It called for fair school funding, progressive taxation, and an end to corporate subsidies and loopholes. The paper itemized the educational improvements that could be tied to these funding increases.

CTU turned every attack into an organizing opportunity. In 2010, the billionaire-backed Stand for Children (also known as ‘Stand on Children’) donated hundreds of thousands of dollars to Illinois politicians for their election campaigns. Those politicians then held ‘education hearings’ to push Stand’s agenda. CTU organized hundreds of members to attend the hearings, published research to dispute Stand’s claims, and lobbied legislators against the ‘reform’ agenda. The result was legislation that was far less harmful than it would have been without CTU’s efforts.

In 2011, CPS started demanding ‘waiver votes’ (a contract clause allowed members to waive a section of the contract for their school, with a majority vote), to allow for a longer school day. CTU had meetings in virtually every school scheduled to take a waiver vote, which resulted in a ‘no’ vote in all but a handful of schools. The effort led to the election of delegates in dozens of schools without them, energized members used to having no recourse against CPS demands, and created a basis for further organizing efforts.

The Stand on Children law passed in 2011 included several provisions designed to make it harder for CTU to strike. The union was able to turn every one of those provisions around and use it to its advantage. The law required a yes vote of 75% of the membership (not just the voters) in order to strike. The CTU held delegate training sessions, mock votes, and practice votes in the schools, so that when the actual vote came, the organizational apparatus was in shape to guarantee that every member voted. The draconian measures implemented by CPS, including the denial of a negotiated 4% pay rise, together with the confidence the CTU leadership had instilled in members, meant that most members were ready to vote ‘yes’ to a strike. When the actual vote came, 90% of members and 98% of those voting said ‘yes’ to authorization of a strike.

The law also required that an impartial ‘fact finder’ look at disputed issues. The fact finder looked at the CPS numbers and the CTU numbers and agreed that the CTU numbers were right. He recommended:

1. A 12.6% pay increase to account for his finding that teachers would be working a 19.6% longer day and year.
2. An additional 2.25% cost-of-living increase.
3. Step and lane increases. The district wanted to scrap these pay increases based on seniority and education in favor of a merit pay program, which the union opposed.

It was obvious that this favorable decision did not happen in a vacuum, but was the result of the hard work of the organizing, research, and communications department. The large turnout of CTU members to vote, rally, and march in the
streets, the evidence compiled by research, and the publicity generated by communications all played a role in this decision.

A May 23, 2012 rally had galvanized members and the public alike. The spirited gathering of 4000 (all that could fit in the hall) joined another 2000 CTU members and supporters for a march around downtown Chicago that took over the streets and foreshadowed the daily downtown rallies that would later occur during the strike.

By September 2012, the city had still refused to offer CTU members an acceptable contract. The House of Delegates voted unanimously to go on strike. It was the first teacher strike in Chicago in 25 years. A Truthout review of Micah Uetricht’s book *Strike for America: Chicago teachers against austerity* sums up the strike as follows:

‘The entire city felt transformed’, Uetricht writes. ‘Teachers were engaged in highly visible, militant, mass action, and there was a widespread sense throughout the city of the legitimacy and necessity of such action – for educators and for other workers ... The union held mass rallies nearly every day with tens of thousands of teachers and their supporters ... Teachers began organizing actions themselves, independent of the CTU leadership. No union staffers planned the small marches on the mayor’s house during the strike; teachers planned these themselves.’

This had an enormous impact on union activists because the ability to do what they felt was necessary – without having to jump through bureaucratic approval hoops – gave the members a sense of CTU ownership. Eight days later, when a tentative contract settlement was reached, they voted to extend the strike by two days to give themselves a chance to thoroughly digest the document rather than allow Lewis and the negotiating team to tell them what it said. ‘For the first time,’ Uetricht writes, ‘teachers were studying every word of their contract, the principal document governing their work lives.’ On October 3, 79 percent of the membership voted in favor of the accord.

And the lessons? *Strike for America* concludes that ‘Rather than trying to meet free-market education reformers in the middle on their proposals to privatize schools or increase teacher evaluations based on standardized testing – as national teachers unions have done – the CTU was uncompromising in its rejection of the demands of Mayor Rahm Emmanuel and corporate reform groups. Rather than allowing such groups to paint the union as a roadblock to educational progress, the CTU put forth its own positive proposals to reform schools, grounded in an unapologetic vision of progressive education that would be funded by taxing the rich.’[17]
Notes

[1] Census tracts are small areas within counties that are used by the US Census Bureau to track and analyze socio-economic and population data over time and across areas. Since they are small (between 1500 and 8000 residents), they are thought to be relatively homogeneous in terms of the characteristic information the census collects about the people that live there. For more information about census tracts, visit the US Census Bureau website: www.census.gov


[3] Civic Committee of the Commercial Club of Chicago (2003) Left Behind: a report of the Education Committee. Note: the Civic Committee members are Chicago’s corporate elite, the chairmen and CEOs of the top corporations operating in Chicago. For a list of its members and initiatives, visit http://civiccommittee.org


[6] School actions include closures, turnarounds, consolidations, and phase-outs.

[7] Apt term referring to schools with 99% or more non-white students, coined by Gary Orfield, Co-Director of the Civil Rights Project of UCLA.

[8] Referring to schools that were at least 90% Black and at least 75% free or reduced price lunch.
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