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Introduction

At the end of February 2014, Support Our Public Schools (SOPS), a small group of prominent Dallas area citizens funded by wealthy individuals, revealed their support for a “Home Rule” scheme to take over Dallas ISD.1 Many community members, educators, policymakers and other stakeholders were surprised by the sudden promotion of the Home Rule takeover and questions about the group and the scheme have arisen rapidly. This policy brief seeks to answer some of the most prominent questions related to the Home Rule takeover. By presenting information gathered from a variety of sources including the Texas Education Code, media reports and empirical research, this brief provides information that Dallas stakeholders can use to decide whether the takeover is the most appropriate action to address the longstanding gaps and inequities facing Dallas area schools.2
Who is Support our Public Schools?
Support Our Public Schools (SOPS) is a politically focused 501(c)(4), primarily funded by wealthy individuals, that calls itself a “research and advocacy organization.” SOPS approached the Dallas ISD Board of Trustees on February 28, 2014, to propose an action never before attempted in the state of Texas: creating a “Home Rule District Charter” scheme to take control of Dallas ISD.

SOPS currently consists of five board members: Wilton Hollins (President of SOPS), a human resources director, Jeronimo Valdez (Treasurer of SOPS) and Stephen Jones, each lawyers; Louisa Meyer, a retired account manager; and Gary Griffith, a former city council member. Behind the scenes, SOPS is also actively seeking influential members of the Dallas community to join an advisory group to support the takeover and serve as spokespersons for the board.

Who are the behind-the-scenes players in the Home Rule takeover proposal?
To understand the groundwork arranged for the SOPS takeover, it is important to understand the foundation that may have been laid in the finance of local political campaigns. To begin, Wilton Hollins, the president of SOPS, sits on the board of Educate Dallas, the Dallas Regional Chamber’s Political Action Committee (PAC). Educate Dallas has donated between $3,000 and $32,000 exclusively to DISD Board of Trustees campaigns since 2011. Louisa Meyer, a member of the SOPS board, is a public supporter of the Dallas Kids First PAC. These two local PACs have contributed thousands of dollars to the election and reelection campaigns of eight out of nine DISD Trustees— all of the current board members except Carla Ranger.

Contributors to the two most powerful business-supported PACs in Dallas include the Perot family, Nancy and Ray Hunt, the CEO of AT&T and top contributor, Ken Barth (with multiple contributions exceeding $30,000). Educate Dallas and Dallas Kids First are not the only groups supported by wealthy donors. SOPS is also funded directly by the Action Now Initiative, a political advocacy organization founded by former Enron executive, Houston billionaire John Arnold. There may be other wealthy SOPS donors, but that information is currently unknown to the public.

Who is John Arnold?
Houston-based John Arnold began his career as a trader with Enron. Following the collapse of the company, Arnold founded Centaurus Advisors and continued there until, at the age of thirty-eight, he retired with $3.5 billion to “pursue other interests.” These interests have included monetary contributions to movements in Rhode Island and San Jose aimed at reducing teachers’ retirement. Arnold’s crusade against teacher pensions was further
illustrated when the Laura and John Arnold Foundation awarded $3,500,000 to PBS to finance a show titled “Pension Peril,” only to have the money later returned following suspicions that the grant violated PBS’s perception rule. Notably, regarding the current anti-teacher pension movement funded by billionaires, Centaurus Advisors and other firms in the financial planning sector would likely receive billions of dollars in new fees if public management of pensions was eliminated and teacher retirement (such as the Teacher Retirement System of Texas) was required by politicians to be moved to a 401(k) based system.

When not funding projects aimed at deleting educator pensions, Arnold funds the proliferation of profit-driven education reform in the United States. Millions of dollars have been granted by Arnold’s foundation to organizations such as Teach for America and StudentsFirst, creating controversy in the public space due to their alliances with John Arnold and other profit-driven education reformers. In New Orleans, Arnold’s foundation awarded $25,000,000 to expand the charter schools started in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Incidentally, nine years after Katrina, the “forced choice” of the Recovery School District (RSD) of charters has not yet yielded notable results, as the majority of schools continue to “fail,” with none of the schools rated as “A.” In Houston and San Antonio, Arnold’s foundation has contributed millions to expand the corporate charter school systems. True to form, Arnold is now donating to SOPS, an organization lobbying to take over and charter the entire Dallas ISD district.

**What are the steps to the Home Rule takeover in state code?**

As detailed in several local news sources since March 1, 2014, the process of establishing a Home Rule Charter District begins one of two ways (detailed in Chapter 12, Subchapter B of the Texas Education Code): either 5% of the registered voters (in Dallas ISD, that is roughly 25,000 voters) sign a petition requesting a charter commission, or two-thirds of the board of trustees adopt a resolution ordering the creation of a charter commission. The trustees then appoint a 15-member committee. According to Home Rule law, the committee “must reflect the racial, ethnic, socioeconomic, and geographic diversity of the district;” A majority of the committee must be parents and at least one-fourth must be teachers selected by professional staff representatives.

Following the appointment of the committee, the group has one year to draft a charter to structure a new school district. If the charter is found by the Texas Secretary of State to contain a change in governance, then the charter could be reviewed by the United States Department of Justice or the District Court for the District of Columbia to ensure that the charter does not violate the Voting Rights Act. Next, the Texas Commissioner of Education grants final approval before the charter is presented back to the electorate for a vote. Between the election announcement and the election, the charter must be distributed to all schools in the district.
and election notices must inform voters of how and where to locate a hard copy of the document. Finally, a minimum of 25% of registered voters must participate in the election, for or against. The Home Rule law states,

Whether the (name of school district) shall be governed under the home-rule school district charter, which is proposed by a charter commission appointed by the board of trustees and under which only certain laws and rules apply to the district.

The district can order an unlimited number of elections until the charter passes or the trustees concede the charter’s defeat. All legal procedures regarding the formation of a Home Rule Charter District are contained in Chapter 12, Subchapter B of the Texas Education Code.

Community involvement in the Home Rule takeover is actually minimized. For example, there does not appear to be a challenge process in the law or rules guiding the collection of signatures for the petition. As a result, the petition requirement creates the illusion of community participation because signers are not required to be informed on what exactly the Home Rule takeover would entail. SOPS has cleverly framed the takeover as their paid petitioners wear shirts displaying the phrase “Support Our Public Schools,” while collecting signatures. The petitioners also appear to have been trained to respond with very few details when faced with questions about the petitions. In fact, even Wilton Hollins, the president of SOPS and the Home Rule campaign, has refused to give details when asked.

Furthermore, if the petition does obtain the 5% of voter threshold or if a two-thirds vote succeeds in the Dallas ISD trustee board, then the appointment of the 15-member committee will be thrust into politics. It is worth rementioning that the Dallas Regional Chamber’s PAC has poured money into the campaigns of eight out of nine trustees and could influence those appointed to draft the proposed takeover. Yes, the district’s professional staff representatives choose at least one-fourth of the charter committee, but this group holds little influence as the Board of Trustees appoints the remaining committee members. Thus, despite a process that has the illusion of stakeholder involvement, the Home Rule takeover is primarily without community-based input until the vote in a district-wide election.

Even a district-wide election has potential to minimize the vote of parents of students actually attending the district. Historical voting patterns city wide as well as individuals who do not have children in Dallas ISD could swing the vote toward a Home Rule takeover even though they do not have children in Dallas public schools.

What “rules” will Dallas not be “free” from as a Home Rule Charter District?

The summary of Home Rule released by the Texas Association of School Boards (TASB)—based on the Texas Education Code—highlights the only laws to which a takeover
district(s) must adhere. If Dallas becomes a Home Rule Charter: the district(s) will retain taxing authority; the Dallas takeover district(s) must follow state school finance laws; the district(s) must continue to report Public Education Information Management System (PEIMS) data to the state annually; teachers must obtain the same certifications and receive the same Teacher Retirement System benefits offered to current teachers; students must continue to adhere to compulsory attendance laws and tuition cannot be charged to students by the district; students must also meet the same graduation requirements and pass the same tests currently required by state and federal law; schools must provide health and safety services in compliance with Texas law, and special education and bilingual services must remain in the schools. Regarding minimum class size, the 22-student per classroom elementary maximum must remain in place only if a school fails to meet state accountability standards.

What “rules” will Dallas be “free” from after a Home Rule takeover?

The Texas Association of School Boards (TASB) released a concise summary of the Home Rule Charter takeover procedures and structure. Many of the laws Dallas ISD would be exempted from as a Home Rule takeover district directly impact teachers: the district would no longer need to adhere to the state’s minimum salary schedule ($27,320 for a first year teacher; $37,040 for a teacher with 10 years of experience) or the due process procedures protecting teachers against wrongful termination; state mandated minimums for leaves of absence, planning and preparation time, duty free lunch and professional development will be exempted if Dallas becomes a Home Rule Charter District; the district may be able to alter the curriculum from the TEKS; and schools will no longer have to adhere to counseling programs or code protecting minimum counselor to student ratios. Additionally, no longer applicable would be state laws affording students specific due-process rights in disciplinary proceedings (Education Code Chapter 37) and granting parents access to teaching materials and other information regarding their child’s education (Education Code Chapter 26). Finally, the laws regarding governance will no longer apply to the district, as the trustee appointed charter takeover commission will establish a governance to be approved by the state, federal courts (if they choose to weigh in), and Dallas ISD voters.

Thus, everything not specifically stipulated in the law is fair game, including the splitting of Dallas ISD into several smaller districts, as well as turning the district over to mayoral control, a voucher system, or the control of a private, for-profit corporation.

Is the Home Rule takeover really necessary?

Recently, Mike Morath, a Dallas ISD trustee, spoke with The Dallas Morning News regarding Home Rule. Morath focused on an extended school year, moving the trustee election, avoiding
state law on teacher salary and making changes to the curriculum. Morath has advocated for longer school days and extended school year since 2012. Only recently has he begun to attach his argument for longer days and year to the Home Rule takeover. However, if the Trustees want to extend past the minimum school-year length of 180 days, or past the minimum day length of 7 hours, they can do that without becoming a Home Rule Charter District (a 187 day cap does not exist). In fact, Dallas ISD previously implemented extended days and an extended year that was found not to have an impact on student achievement in prior research.

Morath called for moving the trustee election. Before January 1, 2013, the board of trustees had the opportunity to change the election date to November. So why raise this issue now in relation to Home Rule? If this was a concern of theirs at the time, then eight of the current trustees could have expressed this concern because they were already in office before the deadline.

Morath also called for flexibility with teacher pay in Dallas. The state already allows for increased pay and incentive pay above the minimum salaries. So the only reason that Dallas ISD would need exemption from the teacher salary schedules would be to pay educators less than the minimum ($27,320 for a first year teacher), or to cut the salaries of experienced teachers. Neither idea is likely to attract droves of high-quality teachers to Dallas ISD. The opposite actually is true in peer-reviewed research examining other urban districts— a salary increase can improve a school district’s attractiveness within their local teacher labor market and increase both the size and quality of the teacher applicant pool.

Finally, in the Dallas Morning News Morath argued, “the home-rule process would allow us to broaden our curriculum to help educate the whole child, focusing on traits like perseverance, gratitude, self-control and optimism, which research tells us is critically tied to a child’s success as an adult.” However, the Home Rule takeover is not necessary for Morath and the Trustees to expand Dallas ISD’s curriculum beyond the Texas Essential Knowledge and Skills (TEKS), as the district already has the latitude to supplement the curriculum. In fact, Texas state law includes the phrase, “Each district shall ensure that all children in the district participate actively in a balanced curriculum designed to meet individual needs.” Nevertheless, a Home Rule Charter District is still required to execute No Child Left Behind’s multitude of high-stakes tests and graduates must still meet minimum the graduation requirements.

With the exception of the Home Rule governance provisions (i.e. where anyone, or any for-profit company, can take over the control of the district), Dallas ISD can already implement the majority of the actions proposed in the media by Trustee Mike Morath and SOPS.
Is a charter district takeover more democracy and local control or less?

On the surface, SOPS board members, Mike Morath and Mayor Mike Rawlings paint the Home Rule Charter District process as democratic and as bringing control back to the voters and taxpayers. First, a petition must be signed by almost 25,000 voters, then an elected school board appoints community members to a charter drafting commission, and finally, the charter becomes approved and placed before the electorate again in the form of a referendum, where at least 25% turnout is required.47

Earlier, it was suggested that this process might only be an illusion of democracy. After all, according to documents from the Texas Ethics Commission, Educate Dallas is in the campaign coffers for eight of the nine trustees.48 While Mike Morath and Support our Public Schools lamented low-voter participation in school trustee elections,49 it empowered the PACs—which spent thousands in campaign donations—to win Dallas ISD trustee elections. Would the Trustees appoint the 15 committee members to benefit voters or their financers? In a March 13, 2014, meeting with Latino leaders, Mike Rawlings may have signaled his intentions for working with the community on the Home Rule takeover when he walked out of a meeting after his statistics50 were challenged by a Dallas community member.51

If voters go to the polls in November and the Home Rule takeover passes, then how will community input influence the district moving forward? Recent reports suggest Mayor Rawlings hopes to head the Dallas school system under the new charter and appoint five trustee members while four continue to be elected.52 However, it is guesswork what SOPS really has in mind for Dallas because they have been purposefully vague on their intentions. However, what is clear is that the democratically elected school board could be rendered obsolete or moot (similar to Chicago) if the mayor takes control and/or for-profit private companies are selected to take over Dallas schools.

Have a politically appointed school board and mayoral control been a successful approach?

Perhaps the most prominent and comparable example to Dallas of a mayoral takeover of a large, urban school district is Chicago. Led by Mayor Rahm Israel Emanuel, the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) recently underwent “reform” that disproportionately affected communities of color.53

Since 2002, an average of 10 schools per year were closed. In total, 99 of the 100 closed or phased-out schools were located in high-minority areas. At the same time, Chicago destroyed public housing that served large numbers of African Americans and Latino/as. Where schools have closed, there was a 40% spike in violence in the communities.54 Thus, when Emanuel and the mayoral-appointed CPS Board of Education decided to close 50 more schools, primarily in
African American communities—the largest mass school closure in Chicago’s history—it is easy to understand why parents of color and the Chicago Teachers Union presented vigorous opposition.

Similar to Dallas, the Chicago school closures were framed as resulting from a “budget shortfall,” and the “under-utilization” of schools. Yet, new CPS funded charters are opening at a rapid pace. The number of charter schools in Chicago increased55, with some paying as little as $156 for taxpayer funded school buildings that were emptied by school closures/phase outs.

Have the school closures in Chicago improved student achievement? Have the displaced African American and Latino/a students attended better schools? The short answer is: No. For an analysis of the impact of mayoral control and school closures in Chicago, please read the research brief57 authored by CReATE, a volunteer group of Chicago-area education researchers.

**Have charters outperformed traditional public schools across Texas?**

The public perception of the charter approach is that freeing schools of certain rules will automatically increase student success. However, it turns out that student success does not automatically improve. A 2009 study by Stanford’s CREDO showed that across the nation 85% of charters did not perform better than traditional neighborhood public schools in their vicinity.58 Furthermore, CREDO’s 2013 study found that, on average, charter schools in Texas cost kids 22 days of learning in reading and 29 days in math.59 Charters in Texas, writ large, have a negative impact on student learning.

A study of Texas data published on *Cloaking Inequity* showed that the vast majority of schools producing college-ready Latino/a60 and African American61 students in Texas are public magnet schools and traditional public high schools. Furthermore, a statistical analysis of statewide Texas data showed that charter schools are not more likely to have college ready students than traditional public schools.62

On this, most agree—the achievement gap is real and it must be fixed. However, the charter approach is not the magic elixir for a complex problem.

**How does the Texas and Dallas investment in education compared to peers?**

Important to question is why the Dallas community perpetually encounters financial pressures that impact teacher salaries, school closures, class size and other issues discussed above? It is widely known that, over the past few decades, the state of Texas has been sued by its citizens numerous times due to the legislature inadequately funding schools while telling the public that
the schools are inadequate.63 How do the Texas and Dallas investments in education compare to peers?

Dallas ISD is the 15th largest public school system in the nation. The most recent U.S. Census data show that Dallas ISD per pupil spending of $9,561 ranks 32nd in the nation in spending per pupil when compared to the 100 largest public schools systems in the U.S..64 Census data also show that Texas’ per pupil expenditures of $8,671 place the Lone Star State at 43rd in the nation.

Considering the state of school finance in Texas, it is readily apparent why Dallas is feeling fiscal pressure in several areas – because relative to the nation, the district is only modestly competitive in terms of large districts’ spending per pupil. Furthermore, the entire state of Texas is perpetually in the bottom fifth of states in terms of per pupil investments in the public education of children across the Lone Star State.

If not Home Rule, what reforms should DISD and SOPS commit to?

Universal Full-day Pre-K. There are very few gold standard reforms in the research literature. However, Pre-K is one of the educational policies with demonstrative empirical evidence65 supporting its implementation, full-day showing more impact than half-day.66 For Latino/as and African Americans, Pre-K is shown to be especially promising for closing the achievement gap. The National Education Policy Center (NEPC) recently released a brief summarizing the academic and fiscal benefits of universal preschool.67 San Antonio should be commended, as their community is leading the state of Texas by investing in the Pre-K 4 SA initiative.

Class Size Reduction. At the beginning of the school year, each school district in Texas is required to review its class size enrollment to determine whether its class sizes for grades K-4 meet the 22:1 limit in Texas Education Code §25.112.68 Since 2012, Dallas ISD has requested 387 exceptions from the Texas class size law due to “financial hardship.”69 Is class size reduction a priority for Dallas ISD? It is an easy task to find a single study or a small set of studies that find no relationship between class size and student success.70 However, the predominance of the peer-reviewed research literature is clear on this point—class size matters. NEPC recently released a 2014 research brief that analyzed the breadth of peer-reviewed literature on the impact of class size.71 The comprehensive study of current research on class size shows that it is “an important determinant of a variety of student outcomes, ranging from test scores to broader life outcomes. Smaller classes are particularly effective at raising achievement levels of low-income and minority children. Policymakers should carefully weigh the efficacy of class-size policy against other potential uses of funds. While lower class size has a demonstrable cost, it may prove the more cost-effective policy overall.”72 Furthermore, research on urban Latino/a schools in Dallas and several other urban Texas districts show that reducing the teacher-student ratio has a statistically significant impact for increasing test scores.73
Guarantee a Qualified Teacher for Each and Every Child. The district should follow the lead of wealthy U.S. communities, elite private schools and successful countries worldwide—such as Finland—and guarantee an experienced and certified teacher for every student in the district. The recent Each and Every Child Report released by the U.S. Department of Education has three proposals to improve teacher quality. The report called for a talent strategy initiative that targets potential teachers into the profession and then retains them in the classroom as career educators. The report also called for ensuring the rigor of clinical preparation programs and including a one-year teacher residency combining practice with pedagogy. Lastly, the report stated that, “salaries have to be competitive with those of other career fields so that prospective candidates can consider teaching as a viable career option.”

Integration of Schools by Class. The most recent peer-reviewed research demonstrates that racial isolation has an adverse impact on student achievement. The U.S. Supreme Court limited race-based school assignment in the Parent Involved case, but SES-based schools assignment has shown promise for integrating schools. Continuing racial segregation plagues South Dallas and other areas. The district therefore, should consider plans to limit racial isolation and segregation. A way forward demonstrated in practice and research is using geographic integration plans based on economic status from census tracts to integrate schools.
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1 Some members of the community see this effort as a continuation of corporate, trickle-down school reform efforts. See http://www.fcedallas.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/10/Digging-Into-Data-and-Evidence.pdf
2 To see a flowchart of SOPS financial influence and relationships to corporate reformers visit: https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/21886773/Cloaking%20Inequity/SOPS%20flowchart%20.pdf
3 http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2013/05/13/what-is-a-501c4-anyway/
4 http://www.disdblog.com/docs/sops-f020114.pdf
5 http://www.disdblog.com/docs/sops-020114.pdf
7 Some members of the community have level the critique that some of the leaders and funders of SOPS are not actually stakeholders living in the Dallas ISD footprint.
8 http://educatedallas.org
11 http://www.dallaskidsfirst.org/about.html
12 The first version of this brief incorrectly stated that Luisa Meyer was on the board of Dallas Kids First.
13 D. Williams, Personal Communication, March 24, 2014. Barth is also the employer of Miguel Solis, DISD Trustee, and is a primary funder of Solis’ political campaigns.
14 http://frontburner.dmagazine.com/2014/03/10/mike-morath-statement-on-support-our-public-schools-home-rule-effort/
15 http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2012/05/03/john-arnold-enron-retires_n_1475574.html
Due to the US Supreme Court decision Shelby County v. Holder (2013), this step may no longer be necessary. While, the Supreme Court only ruled on sections 4 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act, in section 3, the proof of burden is on the plaintiff. In other words, there has to be convincing evidence that protected classes are disenfranchised as a result of the Home Rule charter.

One issue that might give the public pause in regard to the appointment of educators to a council is that in recent years the Inside Track advisory group was transitioned from being democratically elected to being solely appointed by Superintendent Mike Miles. Due to the US Supreme Court decision Shelby County v. Holder (2013), this step may no longer be necessary. While, the Supreme Court only ruled on sections 4 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act, in section 3, the proof of burden is on the plaintiff. In other words, there has to be convincing evidence that protected classes are disenfranchised as a result of the Home Rule charter.

During the US Supreme Court decision Shelby County v. Holder (2013), this step may no longer be necessary. While, the Supreme Court only ruled on sections 4 and 5 of the Voting Rights Act, in section 3, the proof of burden is on the plaintiff. In other words, there has to be convincing evidence that protected classes are disenfranchised as a result of the Home Rule charter.
M. Dryden. Personal Communication, March 24, 2014. There is likely no turning back from a Home Rule district because of the difficult and expensive hurdles of 5% signatures and 25% voter turnout.
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