

**THE CLEVELAND SCHOLARSHIP AND TUTORING PROGRAM:
SOME BASICS**

This brief note outlines the basics of the Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program (CSTP). The note is intended for those with a general, but non-specialist interest in the Program. For further details, please email Dr Clive Belfield at cb2001@columbia.edu.

DETAILS OF THE CSTP

<i>Date</i>	1995	
<i>Enacted:</i>		
<i>Student Eligibility:</i>	The CSTP only operates in the city of Cleveland, for K–7 students. Lottery selection gives preference to low-income families. (Initial lottery was restricted to low-income families, but widened in 1996).	
<i>Amount:</i>	For families with incomes below 200% of the poverty line – voucher amount is 90% of school tuition, or \$2250 (whichever is lower). For families with incomes at or above 200% of the poverty line – voucher amount is 75% of school tuition, or \$1875 (whichever is lower). Grant of \$500 for public school tutoring for equal number of public school students in district.	
<i>Support Services:</i>	Transportation to schools is provided by the District.	
<i>Student Enrolment:</i>	1996–97	1994
	1997–98	2914
	1998–99	3674
	1999–00	3406
	2000–01	3797
	(The intention was to offer 1500 scholarships per year).	

Voucher students' prior schooling:¹

21% Cleveland Municipal School District

33% Private schools

6% Entering kindergarten, attended voucher pre-school

40% Attending school for the first time

In 1996, approx. 450 (23%) of the voucher participants were enrolled at non-sectarian schools. By 1999, this figure was 25 (<1%).²

¹ Schiller, Z. (2001). Cleveland school vouchers: where the students come from. Working Paper: Policy Matters Ohio. www.policymatters.org.

<i>Voucher Schools:</i>	59 private schools participate. 2 schools (HOPE schools) have mostly voucher students. Voucher can be used at any religious or non-religious private school, or public school in adjacent district. 80% of the schools with voucher students are religious.	
<i>Cleveland Municipal School District:</i>	Average Per-pupil Expenditure: 1995–96 \$6195 1996–97 \$7970 1997–98 \$7097 1998–99 \$7719 1999–00 \$7833 2000–01 \$8814 Student enrolment: 73000 Schools: 122	
<i>Program Cost:</i>	1996–97	\$4.96m
	1997–98	\$8.46m
	1998–99	\$6.90m
	1999–00	\$6.91m
	2000–01	\$7.66m
	(Report by KPMG on CSTP funding) ³	

² Policy Matters Ohio Report. See Stephens, S. Study: Most voucher schools religious. *Plain Dealer Reporter*, January 24, 2002.

³ KPMG LLP. ‘Cleveland Scholarship and Tutoring Program. Management Study Final Report.’ Dayton, OH, (937) 259–9850.

US SUPREME COURT CASE

A legal challenge was brought against the CSTP by the Ohio Federation of Teachers, part of the American Federation of Teachers. Support for this challenge was also given by the Ohio Education Association, part of the National Education Association, and the Ohio ACLU.

In August 1999 US District Court Judge Solomon Oliver ruled that there was probable cause that the CSTP violated the constitutional separation of church and state.

The Judge issued an injunction that allows only students who used the vouchers last year to remain in their private schools. New students were not allowed to participate.

In September 2001 the US Supreme Court announced that it would review the constitutionality of the CSTP, beginning in January 2002. The three petitions for the case are *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris* (Case No. 00-1751), *Hanna Perkins School v. Simmons-Harris* (Case 00-1777), and *Taylor v. Simmons-Harris* (Case No. 00-1779). The Supreme Court accepted all three petitions for review, but will treat them as one case.

At issue is whether the voucher violates the Establishment clause of the US constitution. The issue may be decided based on whether the voucher offers 'neutral aid'. Supporters argue that the voucher is valid for any private schools; it gives the voucher to parents to choose; and the voucher represents 'independent' choice.

EVIDENCE ABOUT THE IMPACT OF THE CSTP

In their data, based on a survey of recipients and non-recipients of the vouchers one year into the program, Greene et al. (1998)⁴ report:

- Parents declared their decisions to apply for scholarships were motivated largely by academic concerns
- Parents of students who had previously attended public schools were much more satisfied with every aspect of their choice than applicants who did not receive scholarships, but attended public schools instead
- Choice schools appeared to have higher retention of students in the program
- Test score results in Mathematics and Reading show moderate gains for students attending the 2 HOPE schools, with 3rd graders in choice schools learning more language skills and science

This evidence is broadly consistent with other research on voucher programs and related choice programs. However, it should not be regarded as sufficient evidence in favor of voucher programs: additional criteria for evaluating education reforms should be included.

A large-scale research evaluation of the CSTP is being undertaken by the Indiana Center for Evaluation, for the Ohio Department of Education. The multi-year evaluation of CSTP includes investigation of the effects on: student learning, parent involvement, teachers, and schools. Data are collected through telephone and face-to-face interviews, focus groups, written surveys, and student testing (a unique achievement test to up to 8,000 students in 136 schools and over 200 classrooms across Cleveland).

EVIDENCE ABOUT US VOUCHER PROGRAMS

For a summary of other evidence about voucher programs, see “Education Vouchers: The Basics” (2001) by CR Belfield and HM Levin at www.ncspe.org.

⁴ Greene, JP, Howell, WG and PE Peterson. 1998. Lessons from the Cleveland Scholarship Program. In Peterson PE and BC Hassel (eds.) *Learning from School Choice*. Brookings Institution: Washington, DC.