

A P P E N D I X 5

**Editorial Pages Have Their Say
on School Vouchers**

Editorial Pages Have Their Say on School Vouchers

“The next state superintendent of public instruction must strive to put some controls on the [voucher] program. Right now, for example, regulations would not stop a convicted murderer or rapist from opening a choice school. Oversight of the money is too lax, and the program lacks measures of academic success.” *“Choices on Choice Schools,” Milwaukee Journal Sentinel on the Milwaukee voucher program, Jan. 22, 2001.*

“It should come as no surprise that there are problems with vouchers for disabled students, given the state’s rush to create the program and its lack of accountability. A Legislature and state bureaucracy that have repeatedly preached public education ‘accountability’ have created a private voucher program for disabled students that simply hands out tax money for the asking.” *“An Educational Fraud,” St. Petersburg Times on Florida’s voucher program, Oct. 11, 2001.*

“But that, apparently, is how Florida’s new educational marketplace is supposed to work. Invite students to leave their public schools, point them to places that in some cases have been created for the sole purpose of attracting tax dollars, and then let the families deal with the consequences. Maybe the market will catch up with these schools some day, in the same way the markets ultimately caught up with Enron. In this case though, Florida’s pension fund won’t be the only thing to suffer. So will its public schools and some disillusioned poor and disabled schoolchildren.” *“A Voucher Marketplace,” St. Petersburg Times on Florida’s voucher program, April 14, 2002.*

“Accountability, ironically, has been missing from the voucher debate. Florida’s voucher system ... gives taxpayers, whose money is being spent, no opportunity to measure the effectiveness of that expenditure. Milwaukee’s decade-old voucher program doesn’t even require private schools to test their voucher students.” *“Pass on Vouchers,” Orlando Sentinel, Jan. 4, 2001.*

“As State Auditor Jim Petro pointed out yesterday, the operation is so poorly managed that unscrupulous leaders of one school easily siphoned away tens of thousands of dollars. And as the *Plain Dealer* revealed last year, the program is so badly monitored that several schools operated in unsafe buildings with unqualified teachers. As the legislature learned two years ago, the program is so poorly directed that it overspent its budget by more than \$1 million. With a record like this, the program’s constitutional mettle becomes less important.” *“Confusion Reigns,” Cleveland Plain Dealer on Cleveland’s voucher program, Jan. 7, 2000.*

“It also is worth remembering that public schools educate 90 percent of our children, and are a cornerstone of democracy. Everyone—white and black, Christian and Jew, believer and

nonbeliever, rich and poor—gets a desk, a pencil and a chance. Where public schools are failing to realize their promise, the answer is fixing the schools, not diverting their resources.” *“Mend the Broken Promise,”* St. Louis Post-Dispatch, *Feb. 21, 2002.*

“Even if the voucher program were not unconstitutional, however, we would object to it because it drains human and financial resources from public education without solving the real problems facing American education. The vouchers do not encourage better public schools, and they do not sow the seeds for a rich counter-system of private schools. Providing quality education for all America’s children will take a steady, concerted effort, combined with experimentation and a great deal of money. Vouchers are not a solution. They are a distraction.” *“A Matter of Church and State,”* New York Times, *Feb. 20, 2002.*

“Voucher programs do not enhance educational equality. Private and parochial schools are already advantaged over public schools because they need not take all comers. They can refuse children with special needs, learning disabilities, behavioral problems, language difficulties, or who come from abusive homes. Meanwhile, private schools are free of the accountability increasingly—and properly—applied to public schools.” *“No on Vouchers,”* The Boston Globe, *Feb. 20, 2002.*

“Furthermore, the disastrous deregulation of natural gas here in Georgia and of electricity elsewhere, and the collapse of Enron and other companies, should have taught some humility to those who argue that private enterprise and competition are the answer to every problem. In theory, that may be true. But in practice, capitalism produces two or three failures for every stirring success. Tossing students to its cruel efficiencies would be a mistake.” *“Vouchers’ Results are Mixed at Best,”* Atlanta Journal and Constitution, *Feb. 24, 2002.*

“Significantly, the concept of providing government funds or tax credits for private school education has been tested on ballots 10 times in recent years. And 10 times voters have turned the idea down.” *“School Vouchers Have Not Proved Selves,”* Omaha World-Herald, *Nov. 16, 2000.*

“When one gets the same answer to essentially the same test question that many times, even the dullest of students should know the answer. Americans believe in working within the public schools, not in vouchers.” *“Thumbs Down: School Vouchers Take Yet Another Beating,”* Houston Chronicle *on voucher referenda defeats,* *Nov. 12, 2000.*

“Unproven vouchers ... are a societal dead end.” *“Recess on Vouchers,”* Raleigh News and Observer, *June 17, 2001.*

“Regardless of how the U.S. Supreme Court rules in Cleveland’s case, America has every reason to doubt vouchers’ supposed benefits and to beware their many potential costs.” *“Why Vouchers?”* Louisville Courier-Journal, *Oct. 7, 2001.*