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Abstract

Chicago’s 2013 School Actions:
An investigation of post – 2008 racial neoliberal policy.

Sonya Mohini Roy-Singh

Under the threat of a $1 billion budget deficit, the Chicago Public Schools (CPS) declared a “utilization crisis” and in 2013 closed 50 public schools, slated five schools to be turned around and declared the co-location of 23 schools in 11 buildings. This utilization crisis model, marketed by politicians as a cost cutting effort, has been implemented in many large cities across the United States. There are two commonalities across cities closing public schools deemed underutilized. First, these cities have gradually increased charter schools over the last decade. Second, the closing of schools deemed underutilized disproportionately impacted low-income African American students. This thesis argues that such policies are reflective of post-2008 neoliberal reform, both in its characteristics of consolidation and the heightened targeting of the policy’s repercussions. Drawing from critical urban theory, this place-based analysis considers one of two zones of underutilized school actions of Chicago’s 2013 school actions, Englewood/West Englewood, and creates a moving map of the neoliberalization of the school landscape of this zone. First, it considers the historical circumstances that influenced the development of the school landscape of Englewood/West Englewood prior to neoliberal reform through a historical analysis of the interconnection of race, class, capital space and education policy in Chicago. Second, it maps the first wave of neoliberal education reform under Renaissance 2010, the 2013 school actions and the school landscape for Englewood/West Englewood as of June 2015. Finally, it considers how the extra-local competition in the public school marketplace of the Englewood/West Englewood zone has drawn and continues to draw students and thus resources from district run neighborhood schools to privately run charter schools.
Introduction

Racism is deeply interwoven into the fabric of the American public school system and while its pattern and appearance transforms over time, the driving intentions remain constant. Lani Guinier defines racism as “the maintenance of, and acquiescence in, racialized hierarchies governing resource distribution” and argues that racism “has not functioned simply through evil or irrational prejudices; it has been an artifact of geographic, political, and economic interests…and racism is a structural phenomenon that fabricates interdependent yet paradoxical relationships between race, class, and geography” (Guinier, 2004). Guinier’s words provide the context with which to consider the state of Chicago Public School’s Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary, on the city’s West Side, over the course of several points in time.

In 1966, Martin Luther King, Jr. lived in Chicago’s North Lawndale neighborhood on the city’s West side. In his book, Where Do We Go From Here: Chaos or Community, he speaks to the unequal distribution of financial resources across the city’s schools.

One can only assume that the determining factor in the destiny of the children of Lawndale and other ghettos is their color. The evidence of the schools is persuasive. Statistics revealed in 1964 that Chicago spent an average of $366 a year per pupil in predominantly white schools and from $450-$900 a year per pupil for suburban white neighborhoods, but the Negro neighborhoods received only $266 per year per pupil. In this way the system conspires to perpetuate inferior status and to prepare the Negro for those tasks that no one else wants, hence creating a mass of unskilled, cheap labor for society at large. Already in childhood their lives are crushed mentally, emotionally and physically, and then
society develops the myth of inferiority to give credence to its lifelong patterns of exploitation, which can only be defined as our system of slavery in the twentieth century.

(King, 1967, pp.155)

Several blocks away from where Martin Luther King, Jr. lived is Mary McLeod Bethune School in the East Garfield Park neighborhood. The school is named after Mary McLeod Bethune, an African American educator and civil rights leader. In 1991, Jonathan Kozol features Mary McLeod Bethune School in his book *Savage Inequalities*, describing it as a school whose students are among the poorest in the city and a part of a public school system described by its politicians as a “sinkhole”. In 1988, Governor Thompson was quoted to say, “We can’t keep throwing money into a black hole”. Kozol’s description of what the future holds for the students of the kindergarten class reflects an educational system that had experienced little change from King’s words over two decades earlier.

Nine years from now, most of these children will go on to Manley High School, an enormous, ugly building just a block away that has a graduation rate of only 38 percent. Twelve years from now, by junior year of high school, if the neighborhood statistics hold true for these children, 14 of these 23 boys and girls will have dropped out of school. Fourteen years from now, four of these kids, at most, will go to college. Eighteen years from now, one of these four may graduate from college, but three of the 12 boys in this kindergarten will already have spent time in prison.

(Kozol, 1991, pp.45)
In 2009, Chicago Public Schools (CPS) named Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary as one of the lowest performing schools in the district. Of the school’s 346 students, 99 percent are African American and 98.1 percent of the students receive free or reduced lunch (CPS School Segment Report, 2009). Since the passing of the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) in 2001, Bethune Elementary has been on probation for low standardized test scores. Between 2006 and 2008, 35 percent of students met or exceeded ISAT composite standards (Reconstitute, 2009). CPS announces Bethune Elementary will go through turnaround restructuring and will be run by the Academy for Urban School Leadership (AUSL), a private, nonprofit school management organization. Turnaround restructuring begins with the firing of all school staff including union teachers who are replaced by new AUSL staff, none of which are unionized. The Local School Council (LSC), the school-based elected council, made up of parents, school staff and students, who oversee and advise on school funding and principal selection, is notified of the suspension of its authority. As a turnaround school, CPS renames the school Bethune School of Excellence and begins to provide additional funding to AUSL for the school. Specifically, for the first year, AUSL receives $300,000 in addition to $420 per student attending the school. The following year, Mayor Rahm Emanuel highlights the success of the turnaround of Bethune in his opinion column in Crain’s Chicago Business magazine. He describes the turnaround as a success in “our backyard” that needs to be replicated. He applauds the AUSL teachers for their efforts and points to the 8 percent increase in the number of students who met or exceeded ISAT composite standards (Emanuel, 2010). While I am not supportive of standardizing testing as a single measure of academic achievement, if test scores are the priority of the Mayor, how is success defined as 43 percent of students, less than half of the school, meeting or exceeding ISAT test standards? So, after decades of underfunding, Bethune receives additional funding, at a severe
cost. It loses its union teachers, who are more likely to be teachers of color than AUSL teachers, its local school council, and its name for 8 percent more students to have met or exceeded ISAT composite standards. For whom is this education reform initiative beneficial?

In 2012, under the pressure of a $1 billion deficit, CPS announces it is facing a “utilization crisis” of 100,000 empty seats and to cut operating costs, schools deemed underutilized will need to be closed. In the spring of 2013, the Chicago Board of Education votes to close fifty schools, turnaround 5 schools and consolidate 23 schools into 11 buildings to cut the district’s operating costs. Bethune School of Excellence, a school celebrated as a success by Mayor Emanuel just two years earlier, is one of the fifty schools selected to close. In 2013, Bethune had a utilization rate\(^1\) of 48 percent and was rated a Level 3 school, the lowest level rating in the district. Of the 377 students enrolled in 2013, 99 percent of the students were African American and 96 percent of the students were low income (Schoolcuts.org, 2013).

The history of Mary McLeod Bethune Elementary tells the story of an urban, public, neighborhood school in a low-income, predominantly African American community that after decades of racist disinvestment is targeted and creatively destroyed through two waves of neoliberal education reform. Neoliberal education reform is influenced by neoliberal ideology, the belief that open, competitive and unregulated markets are the optimal mechanism for advancing both economic growth and human well-being. In this case, the first wave of reform directed additional capital to the school, through AUSL a private operator, while simultaneously destroying the school’s interpersonal connections, inside the building, between the students and the staff and outside the building, between the school and the community. The second wave of

\(^1\) A school’s utilization rate represents the number of students actually enrolled vs. the school’s ideal enrollment. A school’s ideal enrollment is defined by CPS as the number of allotted homerooms multiplied by 30.
reform directed capital to facilitate the permanent closing of the school. While both waves of reform directed capital to the school, the school rating never improved and what is left standing in the community is an empty, boarded up building until the fall of 2014, when Joseph Kellman Corporate Community Elementary, run by a private organization, was relocated to the building.

The historically unprecedented 2013 school actions of schools deemed underutilized is a shift from previous neoliberal education reform in Chicago. Prior to 2013, under the Renaissance 2010 initiative announced in 2004, CPS closed or completely re-staffed 100 schools due to low test score performance while simultaneously opening charter schools. As of 2015, 142 of Chicago Public School District’s 664 schools are charter or contract schools. The shift in the focus of neoliberal education reform, from closing low performing schools while simultaneously opening charter schools, to closing underutilized schools while simultaneously opening charter schools, is reflective of a larger shift in neoliberalization after the global financial crisis of 2008. Post-2008 neoliberal reform is heightened and more extreme in its targeting of race and space. It is driven by the contradictions and repercussions of previous neoliberal reform and exacerbated by the repercussions of the financial crisis. The urban spaces targeted by post-2008 education reform in Chicago are concentrated zones. The 2013 school closings were primarily on the South and West side of the city as in previous years, but the mapping of these school actions determined there were two “zones of underutilized school actions”, each made up of two adjacent city neighborhoods. On the West Side, the underutilized school closing zone is in East Garfield Park/West Garfield Park. On the South Side, the underutilized school closing zone is in Englewood/West Englewood. The number of school actions in these zones is higher than any other two neighborhood zone in the city.
The schools impacted by the 2013 school actions served a larger share of vulnerable students than did other schools in the district. A research report released by the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research found that students affected by the 2013 school closings were more likely to receive special education services, be old for their grade, and be in families that have changed residences in the year prior to the school closings. Moreover, while 39 percent of the district’s students are African American and 86 percent of the students received free or reduced-price lunch, 88 percent of the students impacted were African American and 95 percent of the students impacted received free or reduced-priced lunch. Finally, the majority of the schools closed are in neighborhoods hit hardest by the foreclosure crisis and have high levels of crime (de la Torre, Gordon, Moore, and Cowhy, 2015).

School actions to address an underutilization of school space is not a story unique to Chicago. As the repercussions of the global financial crisis of 2008 spread into state and city budgets, cash strapped school districts across the country in major cities, particularly in America’s Rust Belt, found themselves in a “utilization crisis” where schools had too few students to fill too many empty desks. Since 2012, cities across the country including Newark (Sawchuk, 2014), Philadelphia (Hurdle, 2013), Pittsburgh, Kansas City, Mo., Milwaukee, Washington (Dowdall, 2011), and Detroit (Landon, 2012) looked to reduce operating costs by closings schools deemed underutilized. The message from each school district was the same: threatened by significant budget deficits, closing underutilized schools is a required cost cutting measure to more efficiently use the district’s scarce financial resources.

The budget deficits that districts are attempting to reduce are massive, and so too are the number of schools closed to reduce costs. In Philadelphia, 30 schools were closed between 2012 and 2013 as an attempt to cut the district’s $1.35 billion deficit (Jack and Sludden, 2013).
Closing underutilized schools is often publicized as a strategic effort to resolve a district’s budget crisis. However that is not the end result. Projected savings are typically overestimated and the cost cuts are rarely significant in comparison to the budget deficit (Lytton, 2011).

There are other commonalities across cities closing underutilized schools. First, in the years leading up to the school closings, cities have gradually increased the number of charter schools in their school district (Dowdall, 2011, Hurdle, 2013, Landon, 2012, Sawchuk, 2014).

Second, once districts closed underutilized schools, another national trend was revealed: the closure of underutilized schools in urban districts disproportionately impacts low-income, African American students (Lee, 2013b) and the majority of schools closed are located in the most economically challenged areas of the city. For example, in Philadelphia, while 58 percent of the district population is African American, 80 percent of the students impacted by the closing of underutilized schools are African American. 93 percent of the students impacted by the closings are low-income. (Lee, 2013a).

For urban school districts across the country, under the pressure of huge budget deficits, declaring a “utilization crisis” as a justification to close public schools is not a random coincidence. Nor are the commonalities in the repercussions of such school actions, which reflect the shift in post-2008 neoliberalization in cities as state and local administrations carry the burden of the risk and responsibilities of the global economic meltdown. Neoliberalization represents a historically specific, unevenly developed, hybrid, patterned tendency of market-disciplinary regulatory restructuring (Peck, Theodore and Brenner, 2012). While neoliberalization has been reshaping urban landscapes for close to four decades, post-2008 neoliberalization assumes place-specific forms within cities marked with an intensification and deepening of neoliberal rationalities and discipline processes (Brenner, Peck and Theodore,
These processes and their repercussions have evolved and continue to evolve through the collision and intertwining of failure and crisis, regulatory experimentation and policy transfers across spaces and scales. Moreover, post-neoliberalization is more acute in the targeting of cities’ most marginalized communities, reinforcing for those previously unconvinced, how social injustice is perpetuated by the vicious discriminatory bias of the market (Peck, Theodore and Brenner, 2013).

This study seeks to investigate why Chicago’s 2013 underutilized school actions initiative had a concentration of school actions in two geographic spaces, or Zones of Underutilized School Actions. More specifically, it will analyze neoliberalization at the local and extra-local level, specific to education reform in one of the two zones. I argue that the CPS 2013 school action initiative has the characteristics and repercussions of post-2008 neoliberalization. The failures and contradictions of previous policy pre-2008 in this extra-local space are drivers for the space to be a target for the 2013 school closing initiative. Moreover, the hybrid formations and interconnectedness of neoliberalization processes in the space have crystalized the neoliberalization of the space into a more deeply rooted, exacerbated transformation of the landscape.

This place-based investigation focuses on one of these zones, Englewood/West Englewood, and draws from critical urban theory to identify a moving map of neoliberalization, specific to education reform, of the Englewood/West Englewood zone. Neoliberalization of public education has multiple components. However, this work focuses specifically on the introduction of a marketplace for Chicago Public schools and its repercussions through two waves of neoliberal education reform. This analysis will begin by considering the historical circumstances that influenced the development of the school landscape of Englewood/West.
Englewood prior to neoliberal reform through a historical analysis of the interconnection of race, class, capital and space in Chicago. Second, it will conduct a data analysis to identify the neighborhoods most impacted by the 2013 school actions, thus the zones of underutilized school actions. Third, it will use Geographic Information Science (GIS) maps to illustrate the school landscape of Englewood/West Englewood. The first map will illustrate the school landscape of Englewood/West Englewood during the 1950s and 1960s when Chicago Public schools built 266 new schools over the course of a decade to continue to keep schools segregated. The second map will illustrate the first wave of neoliberal education reform prior to the 2008 financial crisis. The third map will illustrate post-2008 reform, the 2013 school actions. The fourth map will illustrate the school landscape of Englewood/West Englewood as of June 2015. The intent of this mapping is to illustrate both the historical development of the school landscape prior to neoliberal education reform and the destruction of the school landscape through two waves of neoliberal education reform. Finally, enrollment data from 2006 through 2013, for schools in the Englewood/West Englewood zone will be analyzed to determine enrollment trends across district run neighborhood schools, privately run neighborhood schools, district run selective enrollment schools, district run magnet schools and privately run charter and contract schools.

It is important to note that while this study places particular focus on how neoliberal policy has restructured the school landscape in Englewood/West Englewood, this is just one component of destruction through the neoliberalization of public education. There are other critical components that are evolving simultaneously that should be remembered while considering this work. For example, the destruction of inter-personal connections as a result of school restructuring and the commodification of relationships in the school setting impact the lives, wellbeing and education experience of children. Consider how the closing of a school
could impact the daily life of a student. Closing a school typically results in the destruction of school specific relationships that contribute to the inter-personal support for a student. Students lose the benefit and support of pre-established relationships with teachers, school staff and fellow students. Some of the 2013 school actions resulted in the separation of siblings, now forced to attend different schools determined by each student’s age and grade level. Most students were assigned to a school significantly farther from their home than their original school, requiring them to walk longer distances to and from school, oftentimes in neighborhoods with high levels of crime. All of these examples speak to the way in which the repercussions of the destruction by neoliberal education reform burdens the student physically, intellectually and emotionally. With this initiative, the city silently but boldly states that the emotional well-being and physical safety of African American children who live in the most economically challenged neighborhoods in the city, are disposable. While this initiative was presented as a cost savings effort, it barely makes a dent in the budget deficit, yet it creates stress and strain on students and families in the community.

Finally, consider the following parade of events leading up to the Board of Education’s decision to close 50 schools, turnaround2 5 schools and consolidate 23 schools into 11 buildings on May 22, 2013. The intent of this section is not only to provide specifics around the school action initiative but more importantly to create a space to represent the voices of people who live in the Englewood/West Englewood community. While their words challenge the proposed school closings, they also speak to the dynamics created by the intensity of neoliberalization processes in their community, above and beyond education reform. While this thesis focuses on

---

2 A school turnaround refers to the reform approach where students remain in the school and the entire school staff is dismissed. CPS allocates additional funding for five years to the school and allows an outside operator to take over the school and hire an entirely new staff.
neoliberal education reform and how it transforms the school landscape of a community, it is important to remember the people who have lost their school, an anchor of a community, and the decades of history lived in this public space.

March 20, 2013

The threat of a $1 billion dollar budget deficit coupled with the claim of “too many seats [and] too few students to fill those seats…” (“Interim Report,” 2013) is touted by both Chicago Public Schools (CPS) and the Mayor’s office as justification for the CPS 2013 school action proposal to close 54 schools and turnaround 6 schools. If approved, 11 percent of Chicago’s district run schools will shut their doors permanently in June, as part of the largest school closing action in American history (Lutton, 2013a). CPS estimates a cost savings benefit of $560 million to be gained over the next decade as a result of an estimated $43 million annually saved in operating expenses as well as the avoidance of capital spending on repairs and maintenance on the buildings of the underutilized schools proposed to close (CPS Fact Check, 2013). The majority of the schools impacted by this cost cutting initiative proposal are located on the South and West sides of the city and these changes will disproportionally impact African American students. A WBEZ analysis found that 87 percent of the schools proposed to close are majority African American schools (Keefe and Vevea, 2013).

March 21, 2013

Karen Lewis, President of the Chicago Teacher’s Union, publicly comments on the School Board’s proposal, “[t]his policy is racist. It’s classist and we have to continue to say that [to] our mayor…” (Ford and Parker, 2013).
The CPS Office of Communications issues a press release in response to the accusations of targeting African American communities with school closings. CPS acknowledges that African American communities are disproportionately impacted by the proposed school closings and then reiterates that the schools proposed to be closed have been selected due to their low utilization rate. According to CPS, these schools’ low utilization rates are influenced by the decline in the number of African Americans living in Chicago over the last decade.

According to U.S. Census data, there are 181,000 fewer African Americans in Chicago today than last decade. This has had a significant impact on the utilization rates of schools in these communities – in fact, 65 percent of underutilization in elementary schools is due to population decline. Due to declining revenues and an additional $600 million pension payment, CPS is facing a $1 billion deficit next fiscal year. While it has cut more than half a billion dollars in non-classroom spending over the last two years, it can’t cut its way out of this deficit.

(CPS Fact Check, 2013)

While the mayor’s office and CPS hold firm that the lack of financial resources leaves the district with no other options but to close these schools, it does not change the fact that the majority of the schools scheduled to close are in African American communities. Both the Mayor and CPS CEO Barbara Byrd-Bennett insist that addressing this underutilization crisis is a way to provide good schools for all of Chicago’s children. “For too long children in certain
parts of Chicago have been cheated out of the resources they need to succeed in the classroom because they are in underutilized, under resourced schools,” says Byrd-Bennett (Lutton, 2013a).

April 17, 2013

A public hearing is held at the Chicago Board of Education building downtown regarding the proposed school action for the closure of John Altgeld Elementary School (Altgeld) in West Englewood, the naming of Daniel S. Wentworth Elementary (Wentworth) in Englewood as the dedicated welcoming school, and the relocation of Wentworth to the Altgeld facility. The pairing of two schools, where one school closes and the second school, along with its staff and its name, is relocated to the first school’s facility, is common in the 2013 school action proposal. The staff of the closed school is dismissed. A hearing officer oversees the hearing and listens to the presentation by several CPS representatives of the proposed school action, followed by statements from the public about the proposal. It is important to clarify that the purpose of the hearing is not to determine whether or not this school action should be approved but instead, whether or not the CEO’s proposal for this school action fulfills the requirements of the CEO’s guidelines for school actions and the Illinois School code.

The hearing begins with the CPS representatives’ statements. The following statement describes the CEO’s school action guidelines for 2012/2013 and is read at every public hearing for every proposed school action.

According to the Chief Executive Officer’s guidelines for the 2012/2013 school year, the CEO may propose to close a school if it is underutilized based on CPS space utilization standards and student enrollment numbers recorded on the 20th attendance day of the 2012/2013 school year. The CEO may only propose a closure if the impacted students have the option to enroll in a higher performing
school and the resulting space utilization after the closure will not exceed the facility’s enrollment efficiency range as defined by the CPS space utilization stands.

(Transcript of Testimony, 2013)

The CPS presentation outlines the process for calculating each school’s utilization numbers to determine that both Wentworth and Altgeld are underutilized (see Appendix A for a detailed description of the utilization calculation and how it is applied to Altgeld and Wentworth). Both Altgeld and Wentworth received a Level 3\(^3\) rating in 2011/2012; therefore the average of four achievement measurements is utilized to determine which of the two schools is the higher performing school and thus declared the welcoming school (see Appendix B for a detailed description of the achievement measures and how these measures were utilized to determine the higher performing school). The presentation concludes by reiterating that the CEO’s proposal fits the requirements by the CEO and the State of Illinois and thus justifies the school action. The hearing officer then asks for statements from the public clarifying that each person will only be given two minutes to speak. The following clips are from some of the statements made at the hearing.

MS. PLAIR: I have a granddaughter that attend Altgeld….Did you give the school the help, the resources? No. You want to give them laptop – I read the papers, a science lab. You want to make it a STEM, that’s fine; but why didn’t you do this while they was here? Why did you wait to offer these students this – Okay why did you wait for a school to close to give them the resources that they

\(^3\) Schools are given an annual achievement level rating based on specific criteria defined by the district. There are three levels of achievement. Level 1 is the highest and Level 3 is the lowest.
need. That shouldn’t have never happened. I see a computer lab up in the main building that’s not being used.

(Transcript of Testimony, 2013)

MS. ARNOLD: I’m a grandparent of two at Altgeld…It’s my heart. They have good teachers. You ask my granddaughter about her teachers, she said they’re her hero…. Please do not close them down. I went there. I graduated from Altgeld. For you all to come in and change the name that’s known, get rid of the good teachers that are qualified to teach our babies, don’t do this to us. Please don’t do this to us. I got tears in my eye. Don’t do this to us. These is our babies. These is our teachers, and I’m proud of each and every last one of them…. They are mighty warriors at Altgeld. Please do not take our teachers. Do not destroy our children. They have a life and let them live their life….Please do not take our teachers. I’m begging you all because the streets going to take our children if you all do this. The streets will have our children. We don’t want more killings. We don’t want no more dying. We don’t need this. We are parents standing up fighting for what’s ours. We tired of fighting with killing. So please do not take our school. Do not take our teachers. We are begging you all do not.

(Transcript of Testimony, 2013)

MS. MCLAURIN: One of my concerns with Wentworth going over to Altgeld is the transportation. It’s a big concern of mines. I have a nine-year-old in third grade, and it is not safe. We are in Englewood and people standing on the corners is just not good enough for me. We have seniors. We have foster parents. We
have single parents that have to work, and the distance within our community, Wentworth is workable; but because of you all doing what you do in the decision-making, I don’t think you really considered the fact that we have small children that walk to school, and it takes me five minutes to go to Altgeld and I’m in a car. So that just doesn’t sit well, and I need something – I need you all to come and let the LSC president, which is myself, do something because it’s already a lot of static. It’s already a lot of – we are trying to go with the flow and being supportive to both schools, but the safety in Englewood – We have enough children dying all by itself. We have enough kids getting raped and stabbed all by itself. We have enough kids being shot. So I think this would add more fuel to the fire, and I really need you all to consider the decisions that you’re making. So if it’s that you need to get a bus service or however you can do it to make my day, my evening better because you all already doing what you’re doing in terms of the change, I would appreciate it if you consider that because that is a very big concern with the children, parents, single parents and grandparents at Wentworth.

(Transcript of Testimony, 2013)

April 29th, 2013

The Independent Hearing Officer’s Report is released with the findings and recommendations of the Hearing Officer confirming that CPS has met the required CPS Space Utilization Standards and the Guidelines for School Actions 2012-2013. He then goes on to note the following:

The public speakers and Alderman Thomas strenuously dispute the findings put forth in the CEO’s presentation. They have stated that the CEO does not take
into account the classrooms that are used for a specific purpose such as labs, computer, library and special ed classes in which the State limits the number of students. They feel that Altgeld is not underutilized. Further they state that Altgeld is the higher performing school based on the statistics set for in their binder illustrating that Altgeld has been the high performing school over the period of 2007-2012. … If the Board approves this proposal, I recommend that the Board address the true concerns over safety of the children crossing various gang territories. Further, as stated in the Guidelines for School Actions 2012-2013 School Year under additional information to consider, the Board should take into consideration the public outpouring voiced by parents, students, teachers and Alderman.

(Independent Hearing Officer’s Report, 2013)

April 17, 2013 – May 2, 2013

One by one, teachers, students, parents, grandparents and community leaders attend public hearings for all the proposed school actions to utilize their allotted two minutes allocated to speak out about the closings of their neighborhood schools, historical institutions and anchors of their communities.

May 22, 2013

The Chicago Board of Education votes to close 50 public schools, turnaround five schools and co-locate 23 schools in 11 buildings. These school actions, in the form of closings, turnarounds and co-locations, affected an estimate of 40,000 students in 120 schools, the majority of which are on the South and West sides of Chicago (Vevea, 2013b). While African
American students account for 43 percent of 403,000 total enrollments in the district, 88 percent of the students whose school will be closing are African American (Maxwell, 2013). Additionally, 93 percent of the students affected by school closures received free or reduced lunch compared to 86 percent of the district enrollment. Finally, the schools closed due to underutilization were predominantly located in neighborhoods hit hardest by the foreclosure crisis. A WBEZ analysis compared a list of schools closed in 2013 to foreclosure data from January 1, 2012 to February 1, 2013. The analysis concluded that there was almost a 1:1 ratio of areas with schools closed due to underutilization and areas of the most distressed real estate in the city (Ramos, 2013).

Following the school board decision, media outlets presented a vast range of public opinion. Many people were outraged that a small group of individuals, appointed by the mayor, as opposed to being elected by the people, could make a decision that impacted so many lives, justified by the need to cut costs. Others were barely moved by the decision because in these “uncertain economic times following the financial crisis, every penny must be used efficiently”. But, the elephant in the room for much of the commentary was the reluctance to talk about race. Specifically, those who are convinced we live in a color-blind society insisted that the fact that low-income African American students were disproportionately impacted by the closing of underutilized schools, not just in Chicago, but across the country, is a bizarre coincidence. This reluctance is not only an issue in public discourse, it is also a dynamic with some academics who have fallen victim to the illusionary language of neoliberalism or have been wooed by the enticing grandness of globalization. Specific to education reform, there are those in the academy who continue to argue that improving standardized test scores is the key to quality education, where quality education is equated to job readiness. This study seeks to contribute to the larger
body of work that challenges neoliberal education reform, not only for the way in which it guides reform efforts to generate profits rather than improve education, but also for its violent silencing of democracy in the public sphere. The overarching intent of this study is to provide a visual understanding of how the neoliberalization of the school landscape, one of many neoliberalization process initiated and perpetuated through neoliberal education reform, is interconnected to history and the contradictions of previous neoliberal education, continuously transforming through the interlocal competition for access to capital through the body and lived experience of children. All the while, this process coupled with other neoliberalization processes becomes a larger political economic force that dismantles the community through the breaking of interpersonal connections and the destroying of physical public space of the neighborhood. This perpetual process of destruction has only increased in severity since the global financial crisis of 2008.
Literature Review

The academic research on neoliberal education reform covers a range of topics from the impact on the infrastructure of school systems such as the privatization of public schools, to the neoliberalization of learning such as high stakes testing, and the interconnection of neoliberal education reform to urban development, specifically gentrification. However, the majority of research on neoliberal education reform has focused on the implementation and repercussions of policies tailored to the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 prior to 2008. The financial crisis of 2008 is an economic event that represents another historical inflection point in the mutating process of neoliberalization toward a deeper, crystalizing of intertwined processes and the cumulative impacts of prior waves of neoliberalization (Peck, Theodore and Brenner, 2012). Moreover, the heightened intensity of this post-2008 neoliberalization magnifies its consequences, specifically with regard to race and capital investment in economically challenged urban communities. This thesis investigates how post-2008 neoliberalism has shifted the focus of neoliberal education reform and recreated a more heightened targeting specific to race and zones of economically challenged urban space in Chicago. This literature review begins with a discussion of the literature on neoliberalism and neoliberal education reform followed by a discussion on the literature specific to post-2008 neoliberalism.

Neoliberal Ideology and Neoliberalization

Neoliberal ideology is the belief that open, competitive and unregulated markets are the optimal mechanism for advancing both economic growth and human well-being. Neoliberalism, associated with the Chicago School and economists such as Milton Friedman, was introduced in the late 1970s as a strategic response to a lengthy global recession. It has since become the
central principal of economic thought and management in the world. Neoliberalism values market exchange as “an ethic in itself, capable of acting as guide to all human action” and emphasizes the significance of contractual relations in the marketplace (Harvey, 2005).

Maximizing the reach and frequency of market transactions drives economic activity. But to do this, capital must flow freely without constraint of regulation on both a local and state level as well as across national borders on a global level. Neoliberalism emphasizes the gathering and storing of data for the use of quantitative analysis to inform investment and an individual’s participation in the market.

Neoliberalism is the vehicle through which the U.S. economy transitioned from a manufacturing economy to a service economy. Harvey describes neoliberalism as the “financialization of everything, deepening the hold of finance over all areas of the economy” through privatization, the commodification of the public spaces and institutions (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberal theory holds that deregulation reduces the cost of bureaucratic red tape, creating cost reductions for services while improving the quality of services through market competition. The net result, according to neoliberal theory, is that deregulation reduces costs of services, improves service quality through market competition and saves money for everyone across the board. The intent of the neoliberal project is to disembed capital from the constraints of regulation. This ideology, particularly in North America, has been used to dismantle Keynesian welfare policies such as public housing, public education, public health and other public services.

Neoliberal theory supports the management of common resources through privatization by suggesting that the individual freedom of private property rights serves to maximize the common good when integrated through open market exchange. Neoliberalism assumes that individual freedoms are guaranteed by the freedom of the market. The creation and utilization of
markets for public services is falsely presented as a commitment to individual freedom for all. For example, neoliberal education reform suggests that introducing the option to choose a school “maximizes” access for students to quality education providing them with the “freedom” to choose the “best” school. Moreover, this school competition in the marketplace will weed out the “bad” schools and contribute to an overall improvement in the district’s schools. Thus, to improve public education, it is essential to introduce a marketplace where individuals can choose a school. If a market does not exist for a public service, it is the role of the state to create the market. The rolling back of state regulations and the introduction of private funding into public services has severe consequences. First, it allows for the introduction of private financing, coupled with public financing, to manage and fund public services. This is presented as a positive option because it increases the amount of financial investment made in public services. However, with the incorporation of private financing comes the expectation of a return on investment. After all, why would a capitalist investor invest in a project that does not produce a return on his/her investment? This expectation of return on investment places weight on the measuring and monitoring of investment outcomes, thus transitioning the role of the state in relation to its citizens, from a democratic relationship to a relationship based on economics and accountability. Neoliberalism does not introduce the freedom that is best for the common good but instead, as described by David Harvey, “the freedom to exploit one’s fellows, or the freedom to make inordinate gains without commensurable service to the community” (Harvey, 2005).

David Harvey challenges neoliberal ideology on several fronts. First, he points out that the theory assumes that markets can be fair and free, while in reality there is bias in the market (Harvey, 2011). Second, he insists that unregulated individual private property rights fail to fulfill common interest and instead, at the expense of the common good, serve to benefit only the
private property owners. Moreover, this perpetual accumulation of capital threatens to destroy the two basic property resources required for production: the laborer and the land (Harvey, 2011). Privatization is a decline of the public sphere and thus, the decline in the accessibility to public resources. The social safety net created under Keynesian policy to protect against the bias of the private market is significantly reduced by the pressure of the market to generate profit for private investments. Moreover, neoliberalization exacerbates income inequality and increases poverty. The reduction of regulation barriers to capital flow expands market competition, reducing the price of goods. This forces a reduction in the price of labor and labor benefits such as health care and pensions. The reduction in wages exposes an ever growing group of the population to impoverishment. Harvey concludes, “[t]he social safety net is reduced to a bare minimum in favor of a system that emphasizes personal responsibility” (Harvey, 2005).

Personal failure to benefit from choices in the market is generally attributed to personal failings, because there is a false assumption that the choices in the market are quality choices and that quality is accessible to all market participants. David Harvey’s critique of neoliberal ideology provides fundamental insight for a critique of neoliberal policy reform. However, he fails to incorporate race into his discussions. In fact there is significant scholarship around neoliberal ideology and the way in which it is actualized through policies, discourse, and social relations but only a portion of this scholarship incorporates race into the discussion of neoliberalism.

Racial Neoliberalism

The lack of the incorporation of race in neoliberal critique perpetuates a pivotal misconception of the separate existence of neoliberalization and racism, and thus, the misconception that neoliberalization can exist without racial implications. The lack of incorporation of race and racism into the discussion of neoliberalism is evident in the works of
Marxist scholars such as David Harvey who argue that land is a commodity and valued as a financial asset. “Land and the improvements thereon are, in the contemporary capitalist economy, commodities” (Harvey, 1973). Under this argument, urban renewal, or the spatial organization of the city, is driven by the conflict between labor and capital. Thus, path specific, uneven development in the city, or gentrification, is driven strictly by the seeking of profit. Stephen Haymes argues that this Marxist perspective “has strongly contributed to the reinforcement of the perception of place as simply the location of objects and events in space” in his book *Race, Culture and the City*. Counter to Harvey’s perspective, space also has cultural meaning: “place and identity are bonded together, and culture is the glue that bonds them” (Haymes, 1995). He refers to this as “space as place” as opposed to “space as location” when space is “rendered universal, homogeneous, objective and abstract …stripped of its meaning and reduced to location” (Haymes, 1995). The gentrification of an African American community in the city “silences and marginalizes the historical and cultural, but everyday meanings that blacks give to their particular place in the built environment” (Haymes, 1995). Thus, gentrification is not just about the redevelopment of space. It is the uprooting and displacing of low-income, communities of color and the erasing of the historical and cultural context of the space in order to create a new image of the city, for the purposes of initiating economic activity and attracting consumption. Neoliberal discourse creates an illusion to mask and/or justify these actions. Thus, to identify the racial neoliberalization of a space, one must consider the history of the space.

David Theo Goldberg speaks to the way in which race is politically mobilized through neoliberal ideology in his book, *The Threat of Race. Reflections on Racial Neoliberalism*. His analysis incorporates five regional mappings of spatio-historical conditions and expressions of
race and racism with an emphasis on the historical connections to contemporary configurations. Goldberg outlines for the United States, one of the five regions of focus, how racism was articulated through segregation over the course of the 20th century up through the 1960s, at which time the majority of African Americans lived in large cities in geographic isolation. As a result, by the end of the Civil Rights Movement, when the country had committed itself to desegregation, it effectively planted the seed for “desegregating mobilization”. Goldberg defines the model of racial americanization as the process of “undoing the laws, rules, and norms of expectations the Civil Rights Movement was able to effect, attacking them as unconstitutional” by embracing race neutrality. This undoing or devaluing of the achievements of the Civil Rights movement deepens the hold of racial preference schemes historically produced “as if they were the nature of things” (Goldberg, 2010). The public sphere, specifically the state, is used as a structure or a set of boundaries to create choice markets, which results in the privatization of racial exclusion. Goldberg describes this transition as, “[w]here the prevailing social commitments of the liberal democratic state had to do with social wellbeing revealed in the registers of education, work, health care and housing, the neoliberal state is concerned above all with issues of crime and corruption, controlling immigration and tax-cut-stimulated consumption, social control and securitization” (Goldberg, 2010). While this thesis focuses on the shift in neoliberal education policy post-2008, it uses a similar mapping approach to Goldberg’s in that it considers the spatio-historical articulations of race and racism in Chicago, and the way in which history is connected to the articulations of racism in neoliberal education policy.

To begin to grapple with the severe pervasiveness of neoliberal political and economic power, it is important to consider the way in which neoliberalism manages and reinforces the
racial structure of society by encouraging and perpetuating the interaction between concepts of race and property. In her work *Whiteness as Property*, Cheryl Harris’ description of the historical relationship between race and property provides context.

The origins of property rights in the United States are rooted in racial domination. Even in the early years of the country, it was not the concept of race alone that operated to oppress blacks and Indians; rather, it was the interaction between conceptions of race and property which played a critical role in establishing and maintaining racial and economic subordination.

(Harris, 1995, pp.277)

As Harris points out, there are historical connotations to the way concepts of race and concepts of property began to intertwine as African American people as slaves were considered property whereas White people were oppressors who occupied the land. Through this dynamic historically, Whiteness became a validation of the right to own property. Historically these social identity constructions were further emphasized through the institution of government in the form of laws that forbade slaves from owning property or obtaining an education, further reinforcing these polarized concepts of white and black, owner and property, freedom and containment. A derivative of this dynamic is evident in the way whiteness as property/whiteness as validation to own property in gentrified neighborhoods in the global city requires the counter impact on African American communities through uprooting and displacement from place and the erasing of the historical and culture meaning to public community space. Moreover, the history of a space, or a neighborhood, and the way in which regulatory failures and political struggles shaped the neighborhood landscape prior to neoliberalism must be considered in the
discussion of interlocal competition in the city. The landscape was created through history and it is this landscape that is destroyed through neoliberalization processes and restructured through the processes that follow, all the while exacerbating the neoliberal management and containment. The fundamental embeddedness of race and racism in the neoliberal project have modified and will continue to modify society’s understanding of race and the way in which race is experienced. History is forgotten and replaced with market logics as exemplified in Chicago’s public debate around school closings deadlocked in disagreement as to whether or not school closings were racist. To see past the illusion of neoliberal language and identify the political mobilization of race through neoliberal policy, I will first discuss in more detail the concept of neoliberalization in the context of the city.

Neoliberalization – A Definition and Its Components

The neoliberal project is an ongoing geopolitical and geoeconomical transformation of urban restructuring. Neoliberal policies do not always function in line with neoliberal theory and it is important to focus on the tension and conflict between theory and the actual existence of neoliberalism, also referred to as neoliberalization (Brenner and Theodore, 2002; Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalization is a process that results in creative destruction of “not only prior institutional frameworks and powers, but also of divisions of labor, social relations, welfare provisions, technological mixes, ways of life and thought, reproductive activities, attachments to the land and habits of the heart” (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberalization is not a policy template or a historical period of capitalism but instead, is an open-ended, contradictory, and multi-scalar process of market-disciplinary regulatory restructuring. It takes the form of a process or a set of “intertwined processes, acting on and through state and institutional forms; its character and consequences evolve over time, while varying geographically along with contextual and
institutional conditions, as well as the evolution of crisis tendencies, both of accumulation and of regulation” (Peck, Theodore, and Brenner, 2012).

Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2010) define neoliberalization as a historically specific, unevenly developed, hybrid, patterned tendency of market-disciplinary regulatory restructuring. Each component of this definition is more extensively defined below:

- **Historically specific**: Neoliberalization represents patterns or processes of political and economic restructuring post-1970s that respond to historically specific regulatory failures and political struggles, and exist across unevenly configured institutional landscapes.

- **Unevenly developed**: The process of neoliberalization is articulated unevenly across places, territories and scales. There are two dynamics that contributed to this uneven development. First, the continuous collisions between “the contextually specific, constantly evolving neoliberalization projects and inherited politico-institutional arrangements, whether at global, national or local scales”. Second, through this collision, “neoliberalization processes rework inherited forms of regulatory and spatial organizations, to produce new forms of geo-institutional differentiation”. The uneven development of neoliberalization is not a temporary condition and continues to change over time.

- **Hybrid**: Neoliberalization does not exist in a pure form. It is only articulated “in incomplete, hybrid modalities, which may crystallize in certain regulatory formations but are nevertheless continually and eclectically reworked in context-specific ways”.

• *Patterned:* Neoliberalization processes generate patterned, cumulative effects. The trajectory of neoliberalization processes is best understood as a “wave-like process of relational articulation, in which each successive round of neoliberalization project transforms the institutional and ideological preconditions in which subsequent rounds of regulatory restructuring unfold”.

• *Tendency:* Neoliberalization should not be considered one singular process that encompasses all aspects of restructuring but instead one of several, although the most dominant, in post-1970s capitalism.

• *Market-disciplinary regulatory restricting:* Neoliberalization represents a specific form of regulatory reorganization that involves “the recalibration of institutionalized modes of governance, and state-economy relations, to impose, extend, or consolidate marketized, commodified forms of social life”.

To understand the transformative and adaptive capacity of neoliberalism, Peck and Tickell (2002) suggest using a process-based analysis of neoliberalization. This analysis would take into account the “historical and geographical (re)constitution of the processes of neoliberalization and of the variable ways in which different “local neoliberalisms” are embedded within wider networks and structures of neoliberalism” (Peck and Tickell, 2002). The emphasis of the analysis should be on the change or shift in the focus of neoliberalization processes and the repercussions. For example, Peck and Tickell point to a focus shift in neoliberalism from the 1980s to the 1990s. Its focus in the 1980s, referred to as “roll-back neoliberalism”, was deregulation and the dismantling of Keynesian policies and “anti-competitive” institutions such as labor union and social welfare programs. Over time, there was a gradual, but directed shift in focus from the destruction and dismantling of Keynesian policies
to the construction and consolidation of neoliberal regulatory structures, also known as “roll-out neoliberalism”.

This tipping point reflects both the contradictions and limitations of earlier neoliberal reforms coupled with a proactive, more aggressive form of neoliberalism that exists not only in institutions and places but also in the spaces in between. The shift from the 1980s to the 1990s introduced the neoliberalization of interlocal relations which constructed and implemented the “rules” of interlocal competition within the city. This tipping point marked a transition for the role of the city into one that competes on a global level with other cities while functioning as the disciplinarian of neoliberalized spatial relations within the arena of the city. Over time, coupled with other neoliberalization processes, this interlocal competition mutated and intertwined itself, through the policy that followed, into every component of the political and economic life of the city. The logic and pressure of the market, implemented through social policy, began to socialize individual subjects and discipline those who would not comply. Finally, this shift in focus and its repercussions initiate a new bundle of neoliberalization processes that have a more intensified impact in the uneven restructuring of spatial development of the local, the city, which sets the stage for determining future neoliberalization processes. To understand the way in which the political and economic power of neoliberalization influences the local, there must be a more specific conversation around the character and the power of the neoliberal global city.

The Neoliberal Global City

Over the course of the past several decades, neoliberalism has influenced and continues to influence the restructuring and the transformation of cities, both physically and politically, through an ever-growing interconnectedness between capital flow in the global economy and the city.
“[C]ities (including their suburban peripheries) have become increasingly important geographic targets and institutional laboratories for a variety of neoliberal experiments…[t]he overarching goal of such experiments is to mobilize city space as an arena both for market-oriented economic growth and for elite consumption practices. The manifestations of destructively creative neoliberalization are evident across the urban landscape.

(Peck, Brenner and Theodore, 2008)

Chicago, like many large cities that were once manufacturing capitals, has spent the past several decades transforming into a neoliberal, global city through neoliberal urbanism. This multi-faceted process of local institutional restructuring, executed in gradual stages over time, deployed in place-based forms, through neoliberal policy experiments, is part of a continuous, uneven restructuring of the city. Logan and Molotch’s (1987) concept of “the city as a growth machine” involves the continuous redevelopment of the city into a destination for investment and consumption. The city, as a growth machine, functions as an apparatus for economic activity, fueled and perpetuated by the unregulated national and transnational flow of capital (Brenner, N. and Theodore, N., 2002, Hackworth, J., 2007). This glocalization recreates the political, social and economic relationships between the global and the local, positioning cities to engage in competition for capital on multiple geographic scales while simultaneously becoming crucial geographic spaces of neoliberalization.

On a global scale, cities compete against each other for access to capital in the form of investment and consumption from international business and tourism. This competition drives the political and economic focus of the business of the city to its continuous redevelopment in order to maintain its position in the global economy. Gentrification, the uprooting and
displacement of low-income communities of color to open urban land for real estate
development targeting middle to upper income home buyers, is a pivotal component of the urban
renewal project. The intent is not only to increase the city’s future revenue in the form of
property taxes but also to create a city that will attract consumption via international business
investment and tourist consumption. This neoliberal urbanism is facilitated through the use of
public funding incentives to draw private real estate development and neoliberal policy seeking
to privatize components of the public sector.

Urban renewal is presented by the city as an initiative to make improvements for the
economic benefit “of the entire city”. However, the global city is actually a site of stark conflicts
and contradictions. David Harvey argues that this spatial reordering of the city is understood in
the spatial logic of capital. “The inner contradictions of capitalism are expressed through the
restless formation and re-formation of geographical landscapes” (Harvey, 2005). Neoliberal
illusionary language masks the actual repercussions of this urban restructuring. The political
and economic focus to attract capital accumulation for financial elites displaces low income
communities of color from their neighborhoods while simultaneously reproducing and
perpetuating racialized socio-economic inequality. Neoliberal urbanism, the reorganization of
urban space through gentrification and privatization of the public sector, is not a linear process
but instead is a fragmented, uneven path that reinforces patterns of power and privilege while
accumulating capital through urban development that reinforces and perpetuates place-based and
racial inequalities.

Erik Swyngedouw’s definition of what he refers to as “glocalisation” is helpful here to
understand the dual dynamic of this interconnectedness between the global and the city, as well
as how this relationship drives the reorganization of urban space and reinforcement of
inequality. He uses the term *glocalisation* to refer to the twin processes whereby, “firstly institutional/regulatory arrangements shift from the national scale both upwards to supra-national or global scales and downwards to the scale of the *individual body* or to local, urban or regional configurations and, secondly economic activities and inter-firm networks are becoming simultaneously more localized/regionalised and transnational” (Swyngedouw, 2004). He argues that the scales of both economic flows and networks are rescaled through the process of “glocalisation”. The network ordering of the economy is simultaneously localized and transnationalized. This global interconnectedness to the local has initiated an ongoing socio-spatial struggle in which a key arena is the configuration of spatial scale, or the arenas around which social-spatial power choreographies are enacted and preformed (Swyngedouw, 2004). In other words, local economic investment or disinvestment in a space, or a neighborhood in the city, is influenced through this multi-spatial economic network, by changes and fluctuations in the global economy. Additionally, these fluctuations also influence the deconstruction and reconstruction of spatial scales of the city, and reshuffle social and political power relationships through interlocal competition in the arena of the city.

*The City as the Arena for Interlocal Competition*

The shift in neoliberalism from the 1980s to the 1990s, as previously discussed, introduced the “rules” of interlocal competition and neoliberal governance into the arena of the city. Overtime, through glocalization, these rules or the neoliberalization of social and spatial relations, are heightened through neoliberalization processes that follow and expand continuously into increasingly local spaces and arenas. Peck and Tickell (2002) point to the continuous acceleration of interlocal competition and the extra local resource allocation to illustrate the deepening neoliberalazation of spatial and scalar, creating a more dramatic and
intensified geographic, uneven, path-dependent development. They identify the ways in which the fundamentals of neoliberalism act as continuous accelerants to this interurban competition and extra local resource allocation. First, neoliberalism promotes a “growth-first” approach to urban development while reframing social welfare systems and public services as a hindrance of economic growth. Second, neoliberalism strictly adheres to the tunnel vision of market logics to create, implement and measure policy outcomes. This creates a lock hold effect on the public sector while constantly seeking new ways to initiate economic development. Third, neoliberalism is stubborn in its approach to urban policy, never straying away from the use of “capital subsidies, place promotion, supply-side intervention, central-city makeovers, and local boosterism” (Peck and Tickell, 2002). Fourth, and for this work perhaps the most important, neoliberal regimes are merciless and unforgiving to the inability to compete for funding streams because capital seeks to connect with economic opportunity and not social need. This rejection and exclusion from funding streams is further exacerbated by national and transnational pressures and has created urban spaces socially and economically isolated from the city, with high concentrations of poverty, joblessness, crime and social breakdown (Peck and Tickell, 2002). In large Rust Belt American cities, such as Chicago, these spaces are predominantly low income, African American communities. This isolation is a cycle in and of itself perpetuating the denial of capital, justifying the disinvestment by neoliberal market logics, and reproducing false notions of personal responsibility as the sole determinant of the political and economic dynamics of one’s community. Peck and Tickell (2002) suggest that the pressures to engage in continuous redevelopment have recently driven some cities to reconsider economic investment in such spaces. However, as I will argue in more detail shortly, when cities make investments in such spaces, if they use neoliberal financial products such as TIF funds, to support the creation or
further building of the neoliberal landscape, these types of investments do not create economic support or stability for the community and potentially can put the community at risk economically in the future.

Post-2008 Neoliberalization

The global financial crisis of 2008 represents the most recent shift in the moving map of neoliberalization marked with an intensification and crystallization of neoliberalization, further entrenching neoliberal rationalities and disciplines in urban spaces (Peck, Theodore, and Brenner, 2013). These processes and their repercussions continue to evolve through the collision and intertwining of failure and crisis, regulatory experimentation and policy transfers across spaces and scales. Capitalizing on crisis conditions and the contradictions of previous neoliberal policy has become a driver of post-2008 neoliberalism with heightened targeting of marginalized communities (Peck, Theodore and Brenner, 2012). Such urban spaces are examples of what Peck and Tickell describe as urban space that through interlocal competition over time becomes a space of heightened poverty, joblessness, crime and social breakdown, socially and economically isolated from the city.

With this shift comes another reiteration of glocalization to an extra-local level. Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2012) describe post-2008 neoliberalism as a time of “extra-local ‘rules of the game’ that continues to be structured according to selectively competitive principles”. Additionally, spaces of regulatory change, such as neighborhoods, zones or cities are increasingly interconnected with a transnational governance system and are linked to “fast-moving policy” where one model of restructuring is copied in other geographic locations. Finally, they emphasize that previous policy failure serves as an accelerating proliferation and reinvention across sites and scales (Peck, Theodore and Brenner, 2012)
repercussions of this most recent restructuring of neoliberalization processes have acutely targeted cities’ most marginalized communities simultaneously unveiling a starkly blunt statement as to how social injustice is perpetuated by the vicious bias of the free-market.

Peck, Theodore and Brenner suggest several analytical dimensions to use to investigate post-2008 neoliberalism, two of which apply to this study. First is to utilize a place-based investigation as to how policies and regulations are evolving in a specific space and the space’s interconnectedness to the multi-scalar, multi-sited nature of neoliberal urbanism. Moreover, a specific emphasis on interlocal and extra-local competition is more relevant given the heightened and more targeted characteristic of post-2008 neoliberalism. Second, they suggest an analysis of interconnected neoliberal projects and the increasing trend of urban policy to be replicated across spaces. Peck, Theodore and Brenner’s description speaks to the more specifically targeted location of the school actions for 2013 and the findings on the characteristics of the students in the district most impacted by these school actions.
Methodology and Research Procedures

Conceptual/Theoretical Framework

This qualitative study seeks to understand why Chicago’s 2013 underutilized school actions initiative had a concentration of school actions in two geographic spaces, or Zones of Underutilized School Actions. Each zone is comprised of two Chicago neighborhoods. This analysis examines one of the two zones, Englewood/West Englewood. I argue that the CPS 2013 initiative has the characteristics and the repercussions of post-2008 neoliberalization, characteristics of which were described in the literature review. This analysis draws from critical urban theory to analyze the neoliberalization of the Englewood/West Englewood underutilization school action zone. Neil Brenner describes critical urban theory as both “the critique of ideology (including social-scientific ideologies) and the critique of power, inequality, injustice and exploitation, at once within and among cities” (Brenner, 2010). Brenner highlights four key broad elements to critical urban theory (Brenner, 2010 and Brenner, Marcuse and Mayer, 2012).

1. Abstract, theoretical arguments regarding the nature of urban processes under capitalism are required.

2. Knowledge of urban questions, including critical perspectives, are historically specific and mediated through power relations.

3. The rejection of instrumentalist, technocratic and market-driven forms of urban analysis that promote the maintenance and reproduction of extant urban formations.


4. An emphasis on the seeking of possible alternatives, radically emancipatory forms of urbanism that are latent, yet systemically suppressed, within contemporary cities.

Brenner argues that while these four core elements are relevant in the 21st century, their “meanings and modalities” need to be reconceptualized to align with the current state of urbanization. Today the focus of urbanization is not just expansion but the “sociospatial transformation of diverse, less densely agglomerated settlement spaces that are, through constantly thickened inter-urban and inter-metropolitan infrastructural networks, being more tightly interlinked to the major urban centers” (Brenner, 2010). Essentially, urbanization is more than just the expansion of the city; it is the uneven development and reorganization of space through the interconnectedness of multiple sites, across all spatial scales, around the global landscape. Drawing from the work of Peck, Theodore and Brenner, this analysis utilizes their definition of neoliberalization: a historically specific, unevenly developed, hybrid, patterned tendency of market-disciplinary regulatory restructuring.

Methodologies

This qualitative study uses a mixed methods study approach that incorporates two themes of focus for analysis recommended for post-crisis neoliberal urbanism by Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2013). Specifically, it incorporates a place-based investigation of an extra local field of policy experimentation and failure. Additionally, it considers the interconnectedness of neoliberal projects and the interconnection of policies in motion across multiple sites. The study utilizes three methods of data analysis to create a moving map of neoliberalization of the school landscape in the Englewood/West Englewood zone. First it conducts a historical inquiry with
regard to race, capital and education reform in Chicago from the 1900s to the 1970s to understand the historical politics that led to the architectural development of the school landscape over the course of history prior to the implementation of neoliberal reform, with a particular emphasis of years leading up through the Civil Rights Movement, drawing from Goldberg’s model of racial americanization. Additionally, it highlights the way in which this historical analysis speaks to the development of the school landscape specifically in Englewood/West Englewood. Second, it uses maps to provide a spatio-visualization of the school landscape of Englewood/West Englewood at specific points of time. The intent of the maps as a collection is to illustrate the creation of the school landscape through the building of schools over the course of the 20th century, followed by the destruction of the school landscape through neoliberal reform up through 2013. Finally, the third method of analysis provides a basic data analysis of the change in student enrollment data from 2006-2013 in all of the schools in Englewood/West Englewood. The intent of this is to provide quantitative context to the extra-local competition in the school marketplace of the Englewood/West Englewood zone.

This study uses qualitative GIS (geographic information science) to provide a visualization of the school landscape and the school actions implemented through neoliberal education reform initiatives in Chicago. Historically, GIS has been associated with quantitative analyses and typically incorporates the use of GIS software. Over the past decade, there has been a growing use and acceptance of GIS in qualitative analysis. Megan Cope and Sarah Elwood (2009) write that qualitative GIS is incorporated in qualitative mixed methods research to provide spatio-visualization to the analysis often because the visual of the map is the most telling non-quantitative component of GIS. While there are many applications for using qualitative GIS for visual purposes, this research specifically uses mapping as a vehicle to
illustrate the location and type of school actions through neoliberal education reform in Englewood and West Englewood and the change in the school landscape over the course of the shifts in neoliberal reform.

*Methods of Data Collection:*

This research began with an investigation of Chicago history to understand the relationship between race, space, capital and education reform throughout the course of the city’s history. This was followed by a series of data collection efforts that were exploratory in nature with the intent to gain a general understanding of the process and impact of school actions since the inception of Ren2010. First, I used a list of the 2013 school actions from an NPR report (Lutton and Vevea, 2013) that listed the school, the school action and the neighborhood of the school. A school action is defined as a school closing, the designation of a school as a receiving school, the designation of a school as a turnaround and the designation of a co-location which means that more than one school will exist within one school building. Through this list I determined the underutilized school action zones: Englewood/West Englewood and East Garfield Park/West Garfield Park. I selected Englewood/West Englewood as a focus. It is important to note that this list was based on city defined neighborhoods which use boundary lines that can be slightly different than those of the Chicago Public School Englewood Geographic Area, which includes schools outside of the city defined Englewood and West Englewood boundaries. Second, I built a spreadsheet listing all of the schools in Englewood and West Englewood and the school actions if applicable for each school since 2002 based on the information collected by a second list from NPR of all the school actions for Chicago Public Schools prior to 2013 (Vevea, B., Lutton, L. and Karp, S., 2013). I also gathered all the data available for each school from the CPS website by downloading each school’s Master
The data used in this study obtained from this document included: school type, performance rating, year built, and cost to update the maintenance of the building and historical student enrollment, current student enrollment, student population demographics, school ratings and school utilization rates. I also downloaded from the NPR website and listened to all of the CPS public hearings for each of the schools in Englewood and West Englewood to hear all of the testimony from all the community members who testified. Third, drawing from my historical research on Chicago’s education policy, specifically around the way capital investment was used to maintain school and housing segregation, coupled with the fact that school building maintenance was listed as a potential determining factor for the 2013 school actions, I decided to see if the condition of the infrastructure of the school buildings in Englewood and West Englewood had any correlation to whether or not the school was selected to close. For this analysis, in July of 2013, after the school action announcement, I went to each school in Englewood and West Englewood and took pictures.

Next, to get an understanding of the school landscape, I put together a map of Englewood and West Englewood, using large printouts of the neighborhood maps dated June 2010, downloaded from the City of Chicago website (City of Chicago Community Maps). I identified and labeled all the schools in Englewood and West Englewood. I then mapped all of the school actions from 2002 through 2013, and posted the corresponding picture next to each school. The maps used to conduct the mapping analysis were city neighborhood maps dated June 2010, downloaded from the City of Chicago website (City of Chicago Community Maps). See Figure 1 for a picture of the original wall map analysis. The maps presented in the finding sections are created based on this original analysis.
Methods of Data Analysis:

There are three types of data analyzed for the purposes of this research. First, an analysis was conducted of the list of school actions implemented in 2013 to determine if there were any patterns specific to the location of the school actions. Second, four maps were created to illustrate the school landscape at specific points in time based off the original larger, wall map analysis and school data collection from the CPS website. The first map illustrates how historical education policy coupled with the city’s race politics influenced the development of the school landscape prior to neoliberal reform. This map identifies the schools built in Englewood and West Englewood during the tenure of CPS Superintendent Benjamin C. Willis (1953-1966) compared to the schools built prior to 1953. The historical significance of this time period will be discussed in greater detail in the following chapter. The second map illustrates school actions in Englewood and West Englewood between 2002 and 2012. The third map illustrates the school actions of 2013 in Englewood and West Englewood. The fourth map illustrates the school landscape of Englewood and West Englewood as of June 2015. The third and final method of analysis was conducted with enrollment data for all schools in Englewood and West Englewood for 2006 through 2013 obtained from the CPS website. This analysis logged, summed and compared the enrollment data for district run neighborhood schools, privately run neighborhood schools, district run selective enrollment schools, district run magnet schools and privately run charter or contract schools. The intent of this analysis is to determine if there is extra-local competition between schools in the school marketplace of Englewood and West Englewood.
Researcher Positionality

My positionality as a qualitative researcher is shaped by my identity and my life experiences. For the purposes of this study, it is important to emphasize two points that influence my lens as a researcher. First, I attended public neighborhood schools from 1st through 12th grade in Evanston, a suburb of Chicago and thus, I have a personal understanding of the experience of growing up in public neighborhood schools. For both this research and my experience working in an after school program at a neighborhood school in Englewood, as part of a program through the Egan Office of Urban Education and Community Partnerships, my experience attending neighborhood schools serves as a point of comparison to the experience of students attending school, neighborhood or charter, within a school marketplace. Moreover, I have reflected on the way in which my school experience was very much shaped by the public, neighborhood component of the Evanston school landscape. For example, when I started first grade I went to the same school as my younger brother, my two cousins and every other kid that lived on our block. I made friends with kids who lived within a mile radius of my home. As a student growing up in a neighborhood school environment, my family life, neighborhood and community were very intertwined in my school experience. This supportive infrastructure was pivotal in life in events such as entering high school with a freshman class of over 800 students. The idea seemed daunting initially but over time, given I had grown up with a third of my classmates, high school became an extension of my community experience. While I didn’t know it as a teenager, this community experience would become a larger part of my adult life. It has been almost twenty years since I graduated high school and today, walking around Evanston it is common for me to bump into someone I grew up with, or someone’s parents or someone that worked at the high school. Even as an adult living in Chicago, I consider Evanston
as my community and my home. This life experience has created a point of comparison for my lens as a researcher. During my time working at a neighborhood school in Englewood I became acutely aware of how the experience of attending a neighborhood school in a district with charter schools is very much different from my experience. It is common to speak with students whose siblings, even if they are close in age, go to another school. Some students live close enough to walk home from school while others don’t. If there is a change in a student’s housing situation, it can require an adjustment as to where the student should attend school. Additionally, the processes and pressures of the school marketplace create stress for students, particularly for eighth graders preparing to graduate and go on to high school. Students preparing for high school in CPS are required to apply to high school and if they don’t get admitted to a school they apply to, their “fall back” school is the neighborhood school. The students I worked with described the neighborhood high school as dangerous and scary. Thus, for the eighth graders I worked with, graduating and entering high school was a severe life stress because if they did not obtain admission to a lottery or selective enrollment school, there is a perception that neighborhood schools are not only bad academically but also unsafe. As a researcher, comparing my students’ experience transitioning to high school to that of my own, I began to understand one of the many ways in which neoliberal education reform creates heightened stress for students because there is a high level of uncertainty associated with the “freedom” and unknown of the market.

Finally, the second component of my researcher lens that must be articulated is that I did not grow up in Englewood and West Englewood, nor have I lived there. Thus, while my research is about Englewood and West Englewood, I believe it is important to state that I am not from the community and therefore, it is not my intent to speak for the community.
Limitations of Research Design

This research has a specific focus of the neoliberalization of the school landscape, just one of many neoliberalization processes in education reform. Thus, the analysis and discussion in this work does not address the larger scope of neoliberalization of education, nor the neoliberalization of space in a broader context than just education reform. Neoliberal education reform is just one component of the neoliberalization of this two neighborhood zone. A study that could take on an analysis with a larger scope of neoliberal processes, beyond the focus of education reform, would provide a more extensive analysis of the neoliberalization of the space and interconnection of these processes across the multi-scale networks of globalization.
The History of Race, Space, Capital and Education Reform in Chicago

The city of Chicago has many nicknames: The Windy City, The City of Big Shoulders, and The City That Works. Chicago is also known as the “experimental laboratory” for neoliberal policy reform. Not only was Chicago the pilot city for the implementation of neoliberal reform for public housing and public education, but it is also the city that has used these policies most extensively. Moreover, it is the city that has experienced the most drastic restructuring of urban space through these policies. Specific to education, Chicago has closed the most schools in the country, not only in 2013, but also over the past two decades. It is no coincidence that the city leading the nation in school closings, an initiative that disproportionately impacts African American students at a national level, is also the nation’s most segregated city. A study released in 2012 by the Manhattan Institute states that an analysis of census data for the nation’s large metropolitan cities found that while Chicago had the second largest decline in segregation between 2000 and 2010, the city continued to hold the title as the most segregated city in the nation (Glaeser, E. and Vigdor, J., 2012).

In order to discuss the way in which neoliberal policy reform influences spatial restructuring in the city, we must understand the historical conditions for the way in which race and racism influenced the geographic development of the city landscape prior to the implementation of neoliberal policy. The mapping of spatio-historical conditions also provides context for the way in which racism influenced capital investment and thus, the development of the school landscape across the city’s geographic landscape. Over the course of the first half of the 20th century, growing populations and the eruptions of racial conflict created and reinforced rigid housing segregation, maintained block by block, neighborhood by neighborhood. This was further reinforced through education policy that dictated what school a student attended based on
the block of the student’s home. Thus, prior to neoliberal reform, segregated public schools were directly connected to segregated housing in Chicago. A historical inquiry is key to understanding how the school landscape was created through historically specific regulatory failures and political struggles of Englewood/West Englewood and the city of Chicago as a whole. While the city’s history is long and complex, the intent of this section is to provide a brief history of the way in which race and racism shaped Chicago’s landscape geographically and how that influenced where and how capital resources were used throughout the school district. This historical context will be used in a similar way to Goldberg’s model of *racial americanzation* to argue the racial significance of having the majority of the school closings over the past two decades be on the south and west side of the city. A snapshot of Chicago’s map today speaks to the current race dynamics of the city as there are core structural components of the city map with significant historical connotations around what is considered a White neighborhood vs. a Black neighborhood. However, after close to four decades of neoliberal restructuring and extensive gentrification, parts of these core components have become fragmented and leaving only traces of the city’s history. It is important to consider several pivotal points in time in the course of the city’s history to understand the fundamentals of Chicago’s communities across the city’s landscape of neighborhoods and within the neighborhoods, the landscape of the public schools.

*The Early 1900’s, The Great Migration and the Race Riots of 1919*

Chicago’s rapid population growth at the turn of the 20th century lay the foundation for the structural components of Chicago’s segregated landscape that are still relevant in Chicago’s current city map. Chicago’s population was growing rapidly as Poles, Jews, Italians, Russians, Hungarians and Greeks came from Europe searching for economic opportunity. By 1910, 2
million people lived in Chicago, many near the city’s industrial downtown in culturally segregated, impoverished neighborhoods. With the start of the Great Migration in 1915, African American families began to leave the South and move to northern cities such as Chicago. Chicago’s African American population expanded quickly and made up 4 percent of the city population by 1920. By the end of the Great Migration in 1970, more than 1 million African Americans would have moved from the South to Chicago.

As people arrived in Chicago and began looking for jobs, they were confronted with racial and ethnic discrimination in the labor market. The definitions and roles of race and ethnicity were defined in the context of one’s status as an American. Specifically, Whiteness was associated with one’s status as an American and not necessarily one’s skin color. In his book, *Working Toward Whiteness*, David R. Roediger describes how while there was a firm distinction between “nation-races” and “color-races” new immigrants were not considered White. Additionally, immigrants’ non-White status was also very much associated with poverty. Race thus became something that was “both biological and cultural, both “inherited” and “achieved”” (Roediger, 2005). As a result, European immigrants in search of economic prosperity fell into what Roediger refers to as “inbetweenness”, a space where one’s identity is in transition through assimilation, typically over the course of several generations, into a “White American”. This process of immigrants working toward assimilation resulted, particularly in the labor market, in the teaching of the importance of being “not Black”. New immigrants worked toward developing White identity through economic stability through home ownership and the pursuit of the American Dream. Thus, neighborhoods became an aspect of identity, and immigrants worked to keep their neighborhoods segregated as a way of solidifying their Whiteness, and thus American status, through restrictive housing covenants.
The African American population in Chicago lived predominantly in what was referred to as the Black Belt, on the south side of the city. As the African American population in Chicago grew, the Black Belt became overcrowded and the shortage of housing forced African Americans to seek housing elsewhere, putting pressure on the neighborhood borders with the Irish on the West side and the Jews on the east. If African Americans were able to obtain housing in a neighborhood on the edge of the Black Belt, which typically involved paying more than market value, White immigrants would leave the neighborhood in fear of the loss of property value and the loss of their new White identity. This process created and maintained segregation and neighborhood divisions, some of which are still relevant in Chicago’s current city map.

In April of 1917, at a Chicago Real Estate Board meeting, questions were raised about the “invasion of white residence districts by the Negroes” (Anderson & Pickering, 1986). The board responded by creating the Special Committee on Negro Housing to make recommendations on how to handle what they referred to as a “growing threat” (Anderson & Pickering, 1986). The committee recommended the need for a policy of neighborhood segregation which focused not only on housing segregation but also segregation of schools. Anderson and Pickering quote the committee’s following decisions: “with respect to the “great migration of negroes”, some feasible, practical, and humane method must be devised to house and school them”. The Chicago Real Estate Board concluded by adopting a practice of block-by-block concentration and expansion of the Black population to protect White real estate owners from the loss of property value when Black families move onto the block. It is also important to note that this block-by-block segregation was used to the advantage of real estate brokers who would make money on both ends of the transaction, raising the price of a home for a Black family restricted to purchasing a home on a specific block and lowering the sale price for a
home to a White family desperately trying to cut their losses and move to another neighborhood. Once World War I started, the building of housing stopped and there began to be a shortage of housing in the city. This added to the racial friction in housing as property owners continued to push to keep Black families from moving onto White blocks. Between July 1917 and March 1921 on average a house was bombed every twenty days to retaliate against Black families that moved onto a White block.

This conflict over neighborhoods transformed into a universal conflict over public space, from neighborhoods and schools, to parks and beaches. As the Black Belt on the city’s South Side continued to expand, racial and ethnic tensions continued to grow until they finally exploded. On July 27, 1919, at the Twenty-ninth Street beach, Eugene Williams, an African American boy, swam into the area of the beach that was designated for Whites only. He was stoned to death by a group of White boys. Immediately mob fighting began between Blacks and Whites, initiating the Race Riots of 1919. Rioting lasted for six days. White youth gangs, also known at the time as athletic clubs, from the Irish neighborhoods west of the Black Belt, invaded the neighborhood attacking African Americans and burning their homes. These athletic clubs, such as the Hamburg, were financially sponsored by the ward politicians to protect the neighborhood and were key instigators of the riot (Drake and Clayton, 1945). John M. Hagedorn’s article, “Race Not Space: A Revisionist History of Gangs in Chicago” describes how black youth gangs fought back to protect the Black Belt against the racist White gangs such as the Hamburg Athletic Club. At the time of the riots, Richard J. Daley was 19-years old and a member of the Hamburg gang. He grew up and pursued a career in politics and served as the Mayor of Chicago from 1955 to 1976.
The Race Riot of 1919 resulted in a worsening of racial friction across the city and a growing perception by many White Chicagoans that Blacks were a “problem” and the solution to the violence was more strict enforcement of segregation. St. Clair and Clayton describe this pivotal moment in time for the relationship between Blacks and Whites in Chicago. “[T]he fact remains that the Great Migration and the Race Riot of 1919 profoundly altered relationships between Negroes and the White residents of Chicago and changed the basic economic and social structure of the Negro community.” Efforts were made to formalize block by block segregation. White homeowners began to use “restrictive covenants” which were added to property titles, where the home buyer entered into an agreement with the other home owners of the block not to sell or rent the home to African Americans. In 1922, the Board of Education adopted a strict policy of neighborhood schools requiring children to attend the school assigned to their specific block. This put schools in the middle of the racial conflict by generating separate schools for Black and White children based on where they lived. Thus, education policy combined with the real estate board’s policy of block-by-block segregation, effectively reinforcing the lines of segregation in Chicago.

*The Great Depression and the changing of neighborhood boundaries*

The Great Depression halted the booming economic growth of post-World War I. Significant economic pressures were put on the Black Metropolis, formally known as the Black Belt, from all angles. As layoffs began in the factories, Black laborers were the first to lose their jobs and the continuous squeezing of Blacks out of jobs resulted in many out of work, a rising number of Blacks on relief rolls, and widespread poverty. This further exacerbated the economic disparity Blacks already experienced by discrimination in the job market. In *The Philadelphia Negro*, W.E.B. DuBois describes the racial job ceiling that created a racial
distribution of employment and occupations as an institutionalized barrier hindering Blacks’ economic development through discrimination practices by employers and labor unions practices. The discriminatory job ceiling and economic depression were devastating to the economic well-being of the African Americans. By 1939, four out of every ten persons on relief were African American, and five out of every ten African American families were dependent on some type of government aid (Drake and Clayton, 1945).

Simultaneously, African Americans continued to come from the South to Chicago and the Black Metropolis became increasingly more crowded. With the rising demand for additional housing, rent costs began to rise, ranging in 15 percent to 50 percent higher rental costs than those Whites paid for similar living conditions in White neighborhoods. Meanwhile, attempts to move out of Black Metropolis for cheaper rents were blocked by the increasing use of housing covenants. By 1930, restrictive housing covenants covered 75 percent of the city’s residential property, reinforcing the confinement of the African American community to the boundaries of the Black Metropolis (Shipps, 2006; Hirsch, 1983). Over the course of the Great Depression, overcrowding in the Black Metropolis increased, housing costs rose, and growing dilapidated living conditions worsened.

Overcrowding and deteriorating conditions were not only an issue in housing but also an issue with schools within the Black Metropolis. The Great Depression put a severe financial constraint on the Chicago Public School system. The school system at the time had severe debt obligations and so as back taxes didn’t come in, payments weren’t able to be made. Teachers’ salaries were paid months in arrears. Costs were also cut at the expense of the Black schools and Black students.
“Studies made at the time showed that double shifts were almost all in Negro areas,” and there were organized community protests about this situation late in the decade. Citizen research also revealed that “76 percent of the Negro children spent less time in school than white children. Inexperienced teachers were concentrated in Negro schools. Expenditures per pupil showed a racial differentiation. A sample study reported that in 1937-1938, the Board of Education spent $86.07 per pupil in white schools, $82.02 in integrated schools, and $74.02 in Negro schools”.

(Anderson and Pickering, 1986, pp. 52)

By the end of the Depression, the full dimensions of the color line had been exacerbated by the economic pressures of the decade. Housing was rigidly segregated on a block by block basis. Housing in the Black Metropolis was higher priced, schools were overcrowded and underfunded, and there was higher unemployment than in White neighborhoods. Moreover, schools had taken a financial hit as a result of the corrupt politics under the then current mayor, Mayor Kelly. A report conducted in 1944 by the National Education Association found that Chicago Public Schools had been severely compromised. The report stated, “The city is in excellent financial condition... there was no fiscal excuse for the overcrowding that had pushed class sizes above forty everywhere, or for the double shifts in black areas, where congestion was at its worst” (Shipps, 2006). James B. McCahey, the then President of the Chicago School Board was quick to point out the overcrowding in schools in the Black community was not the fault of the school board but rather a result of the current housing market. He suggested that to fix the problem, more schools would be built in Black areas, even while there was decreasing enrollment in White areas. The board created an additional 23,000 seats for Black children in
Black neighborhoods by building 23 new schools over a two year period (Anderson & Pickering, 1986).

While additional schools contained Black children within Black neighborhoods, they did not alleviate the overcrowding; there were just too many people in the Black Metropolis in a space that was too old and run down. During the 1940s and the 1950s, boundaries of the Black Belt set in the 1920s were redefined to be wider on the South Side and into the West Side. For example, on the West Side, the exodus of Jews from North Lawndale created a vacuum that was quickly filled by a housing-starved Black population. With this expansion process came severe racial tension where racially motivated bombing or arson was common. There were large housing riots and mobbing of Black homes by hundreds and sometimes thousands of whites (Hirsch, 1983). Once black residency was established in a given neighborhood, violence shifted toward the use of public spaces such as schools, playgrounds, parks and beaches in that particular neighborhood. It is important to note that by 1950, while racial borders had significantly expanded, there was no change in segregation. In fact, Black isolation was increasing and in Hirsch’s words, “Segregation was not ending. It had merely become time to work out a new geographical accommodation between the races.”

Mayor Richard J. Daley and Chicago’s Civil Rights Struggle

Ironically, during his initial mayoral campaign in 1955, Richard J. Daley described himself as a man who would be an anti-business mayor who would never allow politics or big business to interfere with the Board of Education. However, once he was elected mayor, Richard J. Daley controlled more patronage than any of his mayoral predecessors. Three years prior to taking office, Daley had served as the Cook County Democratic Party leader, a role that allowed him to orchestrate adjustments, shifting the budgetary authority from the city council to the
mayor’s office, giving historically unprecedented power to the mayor of Chicago. He rewarded loyalty with jobs, regardless of competence, and utilized his school board and city commission appointment authority to centralize patronage. With such extreme political power it took only five years for Mayor Daley to direct the majority of Chicago democratic votes, making him the key political ally for any statewide office holder in the state.

Mayor Daley’s focus on redevelopment of the city through massive projects gave him the reputation of a “builder”. During his administration, Chicago experienced numerous expressway and subway projects as well as the building of O’Hare International Airport, the Sears Tower, McCormick Place, and the University of Illinois at Chicago campus. These projects fell in line with the goals of Chicago Commercial Club’s focus on downtown redevelopment at the expense of neighborhood development and when possible, were paid for by federal dollars to help keep taxes low. Moreover, these projects contributed to the economy of the city and those who benefited significantly were the city’s top businessmen in Daley’s secretive inner circle. For example, if Daley wanted to build more schools, he would ask his inner business circle for help in the financing and construction of the project.

This political collaboration worked toward the interests of both the mayor’s office and the needs of Chicago’s business elite. For example, the business elite expressed growing concern that wealthy clientele were less willing to come from the suburbs because of the growing violence and decay of the inner city. This initiated talks in the Daley administration around the need for projects focused on slum clearance and redevelopment. Daley, with the help of his business inner circle, used both public and private funding between the 1950’s and the early 1960’s to build large public housing high-rise complexes throughout Chicago. Federal funding helped reduce the tax burden on the city of projects that created profit for the business
community. While the intent of these projects were effectively slum clearing, the effort was marketed to the public as a way to build as many new housing units as possible while creating access to new improved housing spaces. This elevated the building pressure on the housing market and thus reduced the violence from the racial conflict around housing stock because many of the projects built housing for Blacks living in poverty in Black neighborhoods. From 1955 – 1963, the CHA constructed 21,000 housing units (Hirsch, 1983; Venkatesh, 2000). The building of the Robert Taylor homes represented the promise from the city to remove the ghettos from the black community and provide immediate relief from the overcrowding and dilapidated living conditions of the Black Belt. For White neighborhoods rioting to keep their neighborhoods from becoming integrated, it reduced the rate of White flight to the suburbs.

With time, Chicago would see why what Arnold R. Hirsch has named the Second Ghetto became problematic. Massive public housing high rise buildings such as the Robert Taylor homes effectively contained Blacks in the historical Black Belt. Over time, the city’s continued lack of upkeep of the housing stock transformed these high rises into spaces with high concentration of poverty. Mayor Richard J. Daley, who as a teenager was a leader of the Hamburg Athletic Club, a white racist gang that attacked Blacks during the Race Riots of 1919, now intertwined his personal bias toward segregation through the revitalization projects he led as mayor.

By the end of his term, under pressure from federal lawsuits, the logistics of the collaboration between the mayor’s office and the business elite was adjusted. Public building projects were underwritten by private loans and employed union labor; city services contracted to local businesses, and public-sector union “bargaining” became subsidies for the proscribed patronage. In this new arrangement, Daley got credit for the success of projects, businesses could negotiate deals, union labor was employed and when possible, the federal government
could foot the bill. This new arrangement applied across all divisions of city government, including education policy, and would set the tone and way of “business” in Chicago city politics for decades to come. One additional theme remains constant; capital was utilized for city projects in Black communities only when the projects involved business for White business elites to profit. The building of the public housing high-rises generated banking and construction business, an opportunity for profit and thus, the mayor’s office willingly directed capital toward the project. In comparison, the mayor’s office directed significantly less funding to Black schools in comparison to White schools because, at that point in time, there was no profit potential for the business sector in funding classroom resources. This began to draw attention to the inequalities between schools and thus school segregation, the most contested topic during Mayor Richard J. Daley’s administration.

After the U.S. Supreme Court’s Brown decision in 1954, political pressures began to mount in Chicago with regard to education funding inequality and school segregation. Chicago’s segregated housing, contained block by block over decades, coupled with the district’s strict policy that required students to attend the neighborhood school assigned to their block, created rigid school segregation. In 1958, an article appearing in the journal Crisis considered the possible implications of the Brown decision on the racially segregated schools of Chicago. It provided data to illustrate the extent to which the school system was segregated, unequally resourced, and in the case of Black schools, severely overcrowded. For example, the article states that, “The average population of the predominantly white elementary schools is 669; of the mixed schools, 947; of the predominantly Negro schools, 1275”. Additionally, it states that black schools accounted for 81 percent of double shift pupils and were assigned a disproportionate number of inexperienced teachers. The article concludes, “In cost and quality
of instruction, school time, districting, and choice of sites, the Chicago Board of Education maintains in practice what amounts to a racially discriminatory policy” (Anderson & Pickering, 1986). Moreover, it claimed these policies had resulted in a school system more segregated than the city as a whole and the neighborhood schools more segregated than their neighborhoods.

In 1956, members of the Black community and civil rights groups began protesting to raise awareness around the overcrowding and poor conditions of Black schools. Meanwhile, “white flight”, where White families leave the city to live in the suburbs, had resulted in the black population quickly becoming an increased proportion of the city population. Regardless, Daley said little about schools and referred all inquiries to then superintendent of Chicago Public Schools, Benjamin C. Willis. Willis was perceived as a solid business manager and was heavily supported by the business community. It is no surprise that he was a firm believer of neighborhood schools and the idea that students needed to attend the school assigned to their district. As protesting continued, Willis’s common rebuttal was that the school board did not maintain records specific to race and that was a reflection of their unbiased approach (Shipps, 2006).

By 1963, the Coordinating Council of Community Organizations (CCCO), an interracial civil rights coalition of community and religious groups began organizing civil rights demonstrations against Chicago’s Jim Crow schools. The coalition included civil rights groups such as NAACP, Urban League, Cook County Bar Association, Teachers for Integrated Schools, TWO, Chatham-Avalon Park Community Council, Englewood Committee for Community Action, Chicago Area Friends of SNCC, Negro American Labor Council, Catholic Interracial Council and Episcopal Society for Cultural and Racial Unity. The key issue of focus was around whether the board was engaged in segregationist practices by reserving some schools for
Whites in spite of unused space and while there was overcrowding in Black and racially changing schools. It is important here to provide some information about the political climate in the city during this time. On the one hand, there were civil rights demonstrations against the conditions of the schools. One the other hand, there was still continued violence around housing, specifically, Whites attacking Blacks if a Black family tried to move to a block that had been predominantly White. Moreover, as the civil rights movement built momentum on a national scale, it further added to the emotion and the momentum of the activities in the city.

Since there was no school data accessible by the public, the NAACP and the Chicago Urban League decided to gather their own data independently. They used housing data, census data and a partial survey conducted by Chicago Teachers’ Union to bring some numbers to the protesters’ claims of overcrowding and poor conditions. Their reports found that significantly more on average was spent on White schools than Black schools and pointed blame to the decades of restrictive housing covenants and lack of action by the school board. To address the overcrowding and keep support from the White community and the city’s business leaders, Willis decided not to bus Black students to underutilized White schools. Instead he decided to build more schools in the Black communities as well as attach trailers, known as Willis Wagons, to already existing schools. In one decade, Willis had 266 new schools built as well as additions to already existing schools. Again, this was a solution to a problem that reinforced housing segregation and created banking and real estate business for Daley’s inner business circle to make profit through city projects. While one could argue that this approach addressed the overcrowding issues, it did not help ensure equality in school funding.

The case of Webb vs. the Board of Education of the City of Chicago was filed in 1963, accusing both the Chicago Board of Education and Willis of deliberately creating and fostering a
racially segregated school system. The case was settled out of court at the end of August and as a part of the settlement, the board agreed to adopt a resolution of commitment to eliminating inequalities in the system, appoint a study panel to recommend a plan for achieving this goal, and produce a racial head count of its students. At the same time, the board approved a transfer plan that allowed the top five percent of students in high schools without honors classes to transfer to schools with honors classes. This decision created uproar in White communities in the city as White parents began to protest, demanding to call off the transferring of Black students to their all White schools. In response to the protests, Willis removed 15 of the 24 schools from the school transfer list. The board pressured Willis to reinstate the schools to the list and Willis responded by submitting his resignation. With the school board divided on support for Willis, over twenty of the city’s top businessmen write a letter to Daley in support of Willis. On October 9, 1963, CCCO announced plans for a boycott of the schools in protest of the board’s refusal of Willis resignation. On October 13, 1963, the Board of Education, in agreement in the Webb case, formally adopted a policy of racial integration pledging to effect the development of a continuous program. Unfortunately, no significant changes came of this pledge. Several days later the board reconciled with Willis and the mayor spoke out against the boycott. On October 22, 1963, 224,770 students boycotted the Chicago Public Schools. That evening ten thousand people protested in the Loop demanding the resignation of Willis, the initiation of studies to assess the current situation of schools in Chicago, and more efforts on integration.

In 1964, two key reports were released from the University of Chicago on school segregation in Chicago. The first report was written by Phillip Hauser. His findings described a system more segregated than civil rights activists’ studies had previously shown concluding that about 85 percent of all students attended segregated schools. Moreover, even after a decade of
the construction Willis initiated, 40 percent of black schools still had more than 35 students per class while there was enough excess capacity in the system’s white schools for about 17,000 students (Shipps, 2006). Additionally, the Hauser report used maps to show that integrated schools in the school system were all at the border of black and white neighborhoods. Robert Havinghurst, another sociologist from the University of Chicago, released a second report with findings from an extensive data collection ordered by the state of Illinois. Havinghurst’s report dug deeper into the vast inequality in Chicago Public Schools. First, Havinghurst grouped the schools based on the socioeconomic status of the surrounding neighborhood and discovered that “inner-city” schools, the lowest of the groups, accounted for 53 percent of the elementary schools and 33 percent of the high schools, most of them in all black neighborhoods. These schools received large numbers of inexperienced, uncertified teachers and had high principal turnover. School performance data, revealed for the first time in a study, showed a high correlation with race. On most measures, “white schools” fared better than “black schools,” and “high-status schools” fared better than “inner-city schools”. While on the one hand, these reports created an analysis from the academy regarding segregation in Chicago public schools and that Black schools were inferior to White schools, it failed to suggest that Black schools receive equal resources and funding to White schools. Instead, both studies concluded that to address segregation in the city of Chicago, the city should focus on making itself more attractive for white residents.

In the spring of 1965, CCCO asked Martin Luther King, Jr. for help in their campaign for school integration. Initially King and the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC) planned to help CCCO conduct a nonviolent organizing campaign with a focus on school integration. However, King decided that the primary focus of the Chicago Freedom Movement
(in partnership with CCCO) should be to address and eliminate the institutional forces that created and maintained the slums. While housing was not as contested a topic as schools, segregated housing was directly linked to school segregation and to economic exploitation.

While living in Chicago on the West Side, Martin Luther King Jr. wrote, *Where Do We Go from Here: Chaos or Community?* in which he connects injustice and the unwillingness of whites to pay a significant price to eradicate it. “Freedom,” Martin Luther King says, “is won by a struggle against suffering.”

“For the past year I have been living and working in the ghettos of Chicago. There the problems of poverty and despair are graphically illustrated. The phone rings daily with countless stories of man’s inhumanity to man, and I find myself struggling constantly against the depression and hopelessness which the hearts of our cities pump into the spiritual bloodstream of our lives. This is truly an island of poverty in the midst of an ocean of plenty, for Chicago boasts the highest per capita income of any city in the world. But you would never believe it looking out the windows of my apartment in the slum of Lawndale. From this vantage point you see only hundreds of children playing in the streets, and when you go out and talk to them you see the light of intelligence glowing in their beautiful dark eyes. Then you realize their overwhelming joy because someone has simply stopped to say hello; for they live in a world where even their parents are often forced to ignore them. In the tight squeeze of economic pressure, their mothers and fathers both must work; indeed, more often than not, the father will hold two jobs, one in the day and another at night. With the long distances ghetto parents must travel to work and the emotional exhaustion that comes from the daily
struggle to survive in a hostile world, they are left with too little time or energy to attend to the emotional needs of their growing children.

(King, 1967, pp.113-114)

The Civil Rights Movement brought attention to not only segregation but unequal distribution of financial resources in schools and the variance in housing costs across the color line. Martin Luther King goes on to point out that the cost spent per student in predominantly Black schools is less than that spent in predominantly White schools. In regards to housing, King describes rent in the slums of Lawndale to be more than rent for whites in new apartments in the suburbs. This, he refers to as the “color tax”. While in Chicago, King spoke out about urban poverty and the dynamics of the city that perpetuate poverty. “Poverty,” King describes, “is the consequence of multiple evils: lack of education restricting job opportunities; poor housing with stultified home life and suppressed initiative; fragile relationships with distorted personality development. The logic of this approach suggested that each of these causes be addressed.” He goes on to point out, “At no time has a total, coordinated and fully adequate program been conceived.”

Stokely Carmichael argues in his book, Black Power: The Politics of Liberation, that this is purposeful and a result of pervasive institutional racism. “What has to be understood is that thus far there have been virtually no legitimate programs to deal with the alienation and the oppressive conditions in the ghettos.” Chicago’s history of housing and school policy suggests that the biggest hindrance to finding an adequate program is that those with power don’t want to one to be found. Political and business elites continue, in partnership with the Mayor’s office, to use the ghetto as a vehicle for capital accumulation. Without a ghetto, how would they make
money? On April 9, 1967, a New York Times article highlights Mayor Daley’s unprecedented fourth term victory:

His personal political supremacy has enabled Mayor Daley to run Chicago’s affairs with a relatively free hand. His urban renewal and redevelopment programs have earned him broad support in the business community… Like other big-city mayors, Mr. Daley has no long range plans for coping with the social dislocation caused by the steady growth of the Negro population. He tries to manage the effects of the dislocation and hope for the best.

(Editorial, 1967)

A Brief History of Englewood and West Englewood

As early as the mid-1800s, Englewood had a key function in the city’s economy as the south side hub of railroad transportation, connecting Chicago to the rest of Illinois. Michigan Railroad, Southern Railroad, Northern Indiana Railroad and Rock Island Railroad all passed through the junction of 63rd and LaSalle Street. Englewood began as a working class neighborhood of German, Irish and Swedish immigrants who worked to build the railroads (Roberts and Stamz, 2002). After the Great Chicago Fire of 1871, as city residents began looking for housing outside of the city center, Englewood was considered a prime area for relocation. As the railroad industry grew, Englewood grew into a middle class neighborhood and by 1920, Englewood had a population of 86,619 (Dumke and Polk, 1999). Originally built at the turn of the century, Englewood’s business district located on Halsted between 62nd and 63rd street was a significant economic draw for the neighborhood. By the mid 1930s, after Sears opened a
$1.5 million block long store, Englewood’s business district brought in $30 million annually making it the largest commercial space outside of the loop (Dumke and Polk, 1999).

By 1940, Englewood’s population had grown to nearly 93,000 and West Englewood’s to 64,000. Germans, Irish and Swedes made up the majority of the population. African Americans made up to 2 percent of Englewood’s population and 4 percent of West Englewood’s population (Dumke and Polk, 1999). Over the course of the 1940s and 1950s, as the boundaries of the Black Belt expanded block by block, the percentage of African Americans living in Englewood and West Englewood began to grow, and with it came violent housing riots. One of the city’s largest and most violent housing riots happened in Englewood in November of 1949.

The riot began because of a rumor that an African American family may be purchasing a home in the area. Arnold R. Hirsch provides a detailed description of how a new homeowner of 5643 S. Peoria held an informal union meeting with some of the guests being African American. A neighbor standing outside the house saw that there were African Americans in the home falsely concluded that it was an indication that African Americans could be looking to buy the house (Hirsch, 1983). She quickly notified the block organization that then mobilized and gathered outside the home to speak to the homeowner and protest the sale of the house to an American American. When community representatives spoke to the homeowner and learned he was Jewish, the rumor turned into a conspiracy theory of a Jewish-Communist plot to destroy the neighborhood. The three day riot began with several hundred people and at its peak involved 10,000 which speaks to extent of the racist anger in the city around African Americans moving into White neighborhoods. However, the demographics of Englewood and West Englewood continued to change. In 1950, African Americans made up 10 percent of Englewood and 6 percent of West Englewood. By the late 1950s the building of the South Expressway, later
renamed the Dan Ryan, displaced thousands of South Side residents. Many African Americans displaced from the construction of the expressway moved into Englewood (Dumek and Polk 1999). With these changing demographics, came the repercussions of the city’s education policy to attempt to negate the violence and maintain housing and school segregation. As a part of Superintendent of Chicago Public Schools Benjamin C. Willis’ plan to build 266 new schools to deal with overcrowding and to reinforce segregation of schools as neighborhood demographics shifted, 10 of the new schools were built in Englewood and West Englewood. By 1960, African Americans made up 69 percent of the population of Englewood and 12 percent of West Englewood. In 1969, Mayor Richard J. Daley decided to revitalize the Englewood shopping district, replacing stores that were run by members of the community, with a shopping mall. Critics argue that this change exacerbated the commercial decline of the space (Dumke and Polk, 1999). The 1970s and 1980s were marked with the completion of white flight from Englewood and West Englewood and an overall general population decline (Dumke and Polk, 1999). In 1970, African Americans accounted for 96 percent of Englewood’s population and 48 percent of West Englewood’s population. More than one in five Englewood residents lived below the poverty line as did one in ten in West Englewood. By 1980, African Americans made up 99 percent of Englewood’s population and 98 percent of West Englewood’s population. The population decline in Englewood and West Englewood from 1930-1980 was more than 50,000 people and never stopped declining.

According to U.S. Census data, since 1970, Englewood/West Englewood has experienced a massive population drop of close to 100,000. In 1970, Englewood/West Englewood had a total population of 151,586 which fell to 66,159 by 2010. As of 2010, 97 percent of the residents living in this two neighborhood zone are African American. This population decline is an
example of one of the findings of the Manhattan Institute study on segregation. The study found that since the 1970’s, “the dominant trend in predominantly black neighborhoods nationwide has been population loss, particularly in the formerly hyper-segregated cities of the Northeast and Midwest, ghetto neighborhoods have witness a profound population decline” (Glaeser and Vigdor, 2012). This massive population decline is illustrative of the economic and political impacts of globalization and the larger neoliberal regime since the 1970s far beyond education and housing reform. Moreover it is an example of what Peck and Tickell (2002) describe as an urban space that through interlocal competition over time, becomes a space of heightened poverty, joblessness, crime and social breakdown, socially and economically isolated from the city.

Since the 1970s the evolution of neoliberal processes has focused on economic management such as deregulation and free markets, coupled with an increase in an interventionist agenda around social issues such as crime and welfare. While the financial markets experienced rapid growth, international institutions monitoring the global economy such as the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) became even more powerful, pushing a clear agenda around free trade, deregulation and unrestricted access to markets. Economic shifts at the global scale created economic repercussions in the U.S. such as the transition from a manufacturing economic to a service economy. The shift in the labor market existed in parallel to social and penal policy that utilized the logics of the market to socialize individual subjects, disciplining and disposing those who were not compliant. The U.S’s declining manufacturing industry was met with the simultaneous recriminalization of poverty, increased policing, large scale incarceration, reduction in welfare funding and the school to prison pipeline. Over time, these neoliberal processes that monitor and contain
become more extreme, dismantling communities and families. Moreover, in neighborhoods such as Englewood and West Englewood, its political and economic isolation from the city is illustrative of the way in which neoliberal policies and process have drained the capital from the space, dismantling the community layer by layer, while containing many of its residents through policing and the privatization of public services for the capital accumulation of others.

The uneven development of the neoliberal city is reflected in Englewood/West Englewood by the destruction of public and community space as a result of the denial of capital investment for the economic benefit of other neighborhoods in the city. Moreover, as Englewood/West Englewood continues to compete against other neighborhoods in the city, and fail, it only further intensifies the instability of the extra-local economy only to be further exacerbated during events such as the foreclosure crisis of 2007 which has left many blocks of Englewood and West Englewood with scattered abandoned buildings and empty grass covered lots. Thus, the CPS suggestion that population decline is the cause for 65 percent of the enrollment decline in neighborhood schools, is a historically and politically loaded one. While I cannot argue that population decline had no impact on enrollment decline, it does not speak to why Englewood/West Englewood is a zone of underutilized school actions. It instead is illustrative of the heightened targeting of post-2008 neoliberal policy on the contradictions and limitations of previous neoliberal policy. To continue with a moving map of the neoliberalization of the Englewood/West Englewood zone, we must first consider the first wave of neoliberal education reform in Chicago.
Neoliberalism in the Global City

Chicago was the first American city to implement two key neoliberal policy experiments, the privatization of public housing and public schools. This first wave of neoliberal reform began in the mid-1990s, at a point in Chicago’s history where it had a national reputation of failure. Chicago had the largest and most deteriorated public housing in the U.S. (Bennett, 2006) as well as a failed public school system. Both reform initiatives were presented by the city as strategic efforts to improve these disinvested, failing public systems through increased funding with public private partnerships and the introduction of a marketplace. Instead, the focus of these public service programs transitioned from serving the public, to maximizing profit by denying accessibility. Moreover, these policies dismantled and rebuilt city space by uprooting and displacing low income and working class communities of color out of Chicago neighborhoods selected for urban renewal. This next section will outline the structures of each of the two neoliberal policies to identify the way in which the implementation of these policies utilized capital to restructure Chicago’s urban landscape prior to 2008.

Neoliberalization of Public Housing: Chicago’s Plan for Transformation

In 2000, the Chicago Housing Authority announced its Plan for Transformation, a $3 billion initiative under the federal program HOPE VI (HOPE stands for Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere). This CHA initiative was presented as an opportunity to fix the city’s dilapidated public housing through the demolition of fifty-one high-rise buildings with a total of 18,000 housing units and the rehabilitation and redevelopment of 25,000 housing units. This plan was also presented as an opportunity to reduce the cost of Section 8 housing to the city by transitioning CHA’s role as the city’s largest Section 8 housing provider to the role of a
facilitator. This was implemented through the bidding out of contracts to private companies to manage new Section 8 buildings and the introduction of Section 8 housing vouchers. A holder of a Section 8 housing voucher could “choose” where they wanted to live by obtaining housing in the private rental market. Another effort to attract private investment was through the plan’s mixed-income housing initiative. Once the high rises were demolished, some of the vacant land was used to build mixed-income condos that included a mix of Section 8 housing units for public housing residents and market rate condos to encourage middle and upper class families to move into the city while creating spaces for private investors to make profit. This component of the plan is based on the false assumption that relocating public housing residents to live in areas that have a mix of incomes, would provide the social and cultural support to public housing residents to “work and socialize” their way out of poverty. The city raised $281 million to pay for its portion of the project through the use of TIF (Tax Increment Financing). In Chicago, TIFs are used to promote economic development in the poorest and most blighted communities. The city first designates the area a TIF district which allows the city to issue debt in the form of bonds to raise cash for the redevelopment of the area. The bonds are to be paid off with the future increase in property taxes generated by the increased real estate value of the market rate condo developments.

The majority of Chicago’s Plan for Transformation was executed over the course of a decade, initiating a vicious and severe restructuring of Chicago’s urban space. The razing of public high rises uprooted and displaced residents to other public housings units or to other housing options in the private market through Section 8 vouchers. The demolition of public housing high rise buildings, the physical infrastructure of a community, left many people without a guaranteed place to relocate (Venkatesh and Celimil, 2004a). The proof of the repercussions of
this neoliberal policy reform is in the numbers. Chicago’s Plan for Transformation, presented as a way to improve the lives of public housing residents in Chicago, resulted in the reduction of the total public housing units in the city from 38,000 to 25,000. Tens of thousands of public housing residents were forced to leave their neighborhoods and seek affordable housing elsewhere. Residents moved to other public housing in the city or through a voucher, to places where the bias of the private market did not prevent them from utilizing the voucher. If residents were able to use their Section 8 voucher, it was typically in neighborhoods farther away from the city center, the surrounding suburbs and in some cases to neighboring states such as Iowa and Indiana (Venkatesh and Celimli, 2004b; Bennett, 2006; Keene, Padilla, Geronimus, 2010; Sink and Ceh, 2011; Popkin, 2013). The number of people in need of public housing is significantly larger than the available units and vouchers. According to the Chicago Housing Authority website, the CHA waitlist for 2014 has 96,000 applicants waiting for a housing unit or voucher to become available (Chicago Housing Authority Website).

**Neoliberalization of Public Education**

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act was passed in 1965 as part of President Lyndon B. Johnson’s War on Poverty. As part of ESEA Act, the federal program Title I was created to distribute financial resources to schools with low-income students. The details and criteria around the funding of Title I have changed since the inception of the program. The iteration of the ESEA Act of 1965 that was used to introduce neoliberal education reform is President George W. Bush’s No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. NCLB introduced the idea that good education can be achieved through high standards, testing and accountability while assigning reform responsibilities to the state. This federal reform required every child to be tested by state tests every year in grades three through eight and once during high school in
reading and mathematics. Second, school reform decisions would be made by the state and not the federal government. Third, low-performing schools would get help to improve. Fourth, students who attend failing schools that did not improve would be able to transfer to another school.

What would become a feverish focus on testing and accountability is driven by the accountability component of the NCLB that required states to establish a timeline for 100 percent of the state’s students to reach proficiency in reading and mathematics by 2013-2014. Thus, the roll of the state is now to monitor schools’ and school districts’ progress. Progress is measured by students’ annual test scores. All public schools that received Title I federal funding were required to annually test their students. These scores would be separated by race, ethnicity, low-income status, disability status, and limited English proficiency. All schools and school districts were expected to make “adequate yearly progress” (AYP), set by the state timeline, for every subgroup toward the goal of 100 percent proficiency by 2013-2014. Schools that did not make AYP for all of the subgroups would be labeled a school in need of improvement. For each consecutive year the school is labeled in need of improvement, the NCLB Act specified corrective action. The first year, the school would be put on notice. The second year the school would be required to offer all its students the right to transfer to a successful school. In the third year, the school would be required to offer free tutoring to low-income students, paid from the districts’ federal funds. In the fourth years, the school would be required to make structural changes in the school such as adjusting the curriculum or staff changes. If a school missed its AYP target for any subgroup for five consecutive years, it was required to restructure which could be one of the following: convert to a charter school, replace the principal and teachers, and turn the school over to private management or to another state run organization to restructure the
school. The NCLB Act declared standardized test scores as the primary measure of a student’s academic ability and thus a measure of school quality. Its solution was to unravel the federal level regulation and pass on control to the state while opening up the public education system to numerous avenues for privatization. Former U.S. Assistant Secretary of Education, Diane Ravitch, argues that the NCLB’s focus on test scores effectively denies any emphasis on curriculum and standards. She describes this change in focus from standards to accountability. “What once was an effort to improve the quality of education turned into an accounting strategy: Measure, then punish or reward” (Ravitch, 2011).

The NCLB Act set the stage for the introduction of neoliberal education reform at the local level. Chicago, a city with a public school system that has 86 percent low-income students and receives significant Title 1 funding, first tested the possibilities under the NCLB Act in April of 2002. CPS Chief Executive Officer Arne Duncan announced the decision to close and “turnaround” three schools, Williams, Dodge and Terrell that had been chronically low-performing. He was quoted to say, “We don’t believe these schools as they currently exist will ever measure up. There are better education alternatives within walking distance” (Karps, Lutton and Vevea, 2013). Duncan shut down the three schools, replaced the entire school staff and reopened the schools as Renaissance schools. This experiment set the tone for what Mayor Daley announced in June of 2004 as Chicago’s Renaissance 2010 (Ren2010) school reform initiative. Under Ren2010, CPS would seek to create 100 new schools by 2010 which involved the closing of chronically low performing public neighborhood schools and the opening of new improved Renaissance schools. Under Ren2010, between 2002 and 2012, CPS has closed or completely re-staffed more than 100 schools through annual school action announcements. These school actions have disproportionately affected African American schools on the West and
South Sides and many of the closings are clustered around former Chicago Housing Authority developments.

A school action under Ren2010 involved several possible actions. A school could be closed and left closed. A school could be closed and replaced with a new school in the form of a charter, which might have selective enrollment or lottery admissions. A school could be a turnaround school and handed over to be managed by a private organization. The process of each school action is the closing of a neighborhood school, a public anchor of the community, dismantling the connection between the school and the community. This transformation uproots students from their original learning space and breaks up the relationships in that space. Under the NCLB Act, students who attend failed schools have freedom to choose another school.

This opportunity to choose is played in a school marketplace, a key component of neoliberal policy as it allows for competition between schools. This creation of a public school market is necessary under neoliberal ideology to allow for competition. Adam Garoran (2007) utilizes specific phrases to highlight the adjustment from political to economic relationships between schools and students, “[i]n the “open market of schools”, educators are producers of academic outcome, who “step into a contract” and agree to “exchange their service” for federal funding. If these outcomes are not produced, the federal funding is cut off. This “market exchange” creates incentive to improve school quality. Neoliberal ideology suggests that through this competition of the marketplace, public schools are forced to improve, measured by standardized test scores, to compete for resources and over time, failing schools will eventually be weeded out and closed.

While the primary focus of this thesis is on the change of the geographical landscape of schools through neoliberal education reform, it is important to address briefly the larger impact of neoliberal ideology in education reform beyond geography. Neoliberal education reform has
created a heightened focus on testing and accountability and has removed from the conversation the fundamental question of what constitutes good education. In his book, *Good Education in the Age of Measurement*, Gert J.J. Biesta speaks to why this question has disappeared and what is at stake if it is not reincorporated into the focus of education reform. The question of good education has been replaced with the discussions around quality and effectiveness of education, measured through educational outcomes, and monitored by accountability. Biesta argues that these discussions “displace the normative question of good education with technical and managerial questions about the efficiency and effectiveness of process, not what these processes are supposed to be for” (Biesta, 2010). This culture of measuring education has become so all encompassing, evaluating educational “inputs” and “outputs” that Biesta questions the normative validity of our measurements. “The question [is] whether we are indeed measuring what we value, or whether we are just measuring what we can easily measure and thus end up valuing what we (can) measure” (Biesta, 2010). This argument is pivotal. Are standardized tests a measure of critical thinking and creativity? Is a school’s space utilization percentage relevant in a student’s everyday educational experience?

Biesta also argues that this emphasis on measurements and processes in education policy has become the focus and engagement of students, teachers, parents and society. The growing use of measurements in policy decisions has created value on the measurements themselves as opposed to valuing what is being measured. This misguided focus threatens the democratic control of education. He argues that the culture of accountability redefines political relationships into relationships based on economics. This depoliticization of relationships such as between the state and its citizens as well as between the state and schools creates a space where relationships are thought of in terms of economics, similar to the idea of the provider and
the consumer. This type of relationship is evident in as an example, a comment from a parent such as, “Is my child consuming enough of the teacher’s time, to receive the quality education associated with this school.” This is compared to political relationships, with a focus on concern for the common educational good, where an example of a comment from a parent could be, “How as a community are we engaged with the school to contribute to the goals of the school and the community?” Neoliberal culture of accountability creates relationships seeking quality through processes and procedures in a managed, business oriented education landscape. If this neoliberal reform and the focus on measurements is not improving the public education system and threatens the political role of education in democracy, one must question what drives this continued use of neoliberal education reform.

In her book, High Stakes Education, Pauline Lipman argues that the use of measurements and accountability in education reform has created an environment that utilized “high stakes testing” to discipline, regulate and punish students. She argues that neoliberal language emphasizing accountability and standardization has captured the international conversation as the only way to fix “failing” public schools while simultaneously redefining the purpose of education. “[Education is redefined] as job preparation, learning as standardized skills and information, educational quality as measured by test scores, and teaching as the technical delivery of that which is centrally mandated and tested” (Lipman, 2004). Moreover, neoliberal education reform has opened up public schools to the private sector which has replaced accessibility with exclusivity for the purpose of generating profit and is thus racialized social control.

Studies that examine the impact of Chicago’s Renaissance 2010 initiative suggest that the initiative disproportionately impacted African American students and students did not have
significant academic gains because it did not increase access to school quality. Students who were able to transfer to academically stronger receiving schools and were able to develop strong relationships with the teachers did make significant academic gains. Unfortunately, it was not common for a student attending a neighborhood school scheduled to close to transfer to an academically stronger school (de la Torre, 2009b). Students displaced by the closing of their neighborhood school often enrolled in low performing receiving schools. As a result, the more times a student is displaced, the more likely the student will experience displacement again as more schools are closed over time (de la Torre, 2009b). Moreover, residential mobility also creates the possibility for the need to change schools. For example, the increased residential mobility as a result of the displacement through the CHA’s Plan for Transformation initiative, creates greater possibility of a need to change schools for former CHA residents (de la Torre, 2009a). The residential mobility initiated by the displacement through the Plan for Transformation coupled with the school displacement through Renaissance 2010 results in an increase in the causes of mobility for low-income families (Lipman, 2011; de la Torre, 2009a).

In his book, *Capitalizing on Disaster*, Kenneth Saltman argues that both NCLB and Ren2010 involved two stages of capitalizing on disaster. The first stage involves the historical underfunding and disinvestment in public schools, particularly in low income communities of color in cities, that have left public schools in disastrous conditions. The second stage of disaster involves the way in which these reforms create new ways to capitalize on historical disinvestment through Ren2010 which Saltman refers to as “insult and injury added to historical injury”. Saltman argues, “According to its proponents, Renaissance 2010 is a plan for renewal, excellence, and achievement. To its critics, it is a plan for displacement, insecurity, and the theft
of public resources for the poor by the rich” (Saltman, 2007). Under Ren2010, by 2009, CPS had closed 83 schools and opened 155 new schools (Farmer and Poulos, 2015).

Pauline Lipman writes extensively on the ways in which neoliberal housing and school policies in Chicago have been used to privatize public services while simultaneously uproot and displace low income African American and Latino/a communities for gentrification in her book, *The New Political Economy of Urban Education: Neoliberalism, Race, and the Right to the City*. Additionally, she brings much attention to how neoliberal restructuring intensifies structural inequality based on race. Neoliberal urbanism, the spatial reorganization of urban space for the economic benefit of the global city, involves a twofold process. First, these policies declare that certain urban spaces and public institutions are bad, failed and broken in order to justify the introduction of private investment for redevelopment. These projects uproot and displace the community through one or a combination of the following: the closing of public housing, the close of a neighborhood school, residents being priced out of the rental or housing market due to rising housing costs in the area. Moreover, the resulting displacement is presented as an opportunity of “choice” to be “revitalized from the disease of the ghetto” for a better life. In actuality this racialized targeting by neoliberal policies reproduces and perpetuates racialized social inequality through displacement, containment and isolation in other areas of the city or beyond that are considered of lesser value. Lipman speaks to the way in which neoliberal policy creates a social imaginary in the construction of the identity of the individual where, “rather than citizens with rights, we are consumers of services” (Lipman, 2013). The terminology used by neoliberal policies impacts the identity construction of individuals whose communities are dismantled by these policies, all the while utilizing language focused on choice and the responsibility of the individual to be accountable. This, coupled with the neoliberal language of
“freedom” and “choice”, fragments of the founding principles of America, create an illusion that responsible accountable individuals will utilize their freedom of choice for a “better” option in the marketplace. Thus, under this specific use of language, living in poverty is due to the lack of personal responsibility. This reinforces misperceptions around the “culture of poverty” as racialized logic for rolling back Keynesian policies. Lipman points out that this construction of the identity of the individual redefines democracy as choices in the marketplace. This changes the way we as a society think about our social consciousness, the production of our social identities and our perception of our existence in society. However, she concludes that this language intended to socialize compliant individual consumers further perpetuates interlocal competition and the neoliberal process. She states, “it works its way into the discourses and practices of the city through the action of local actors, not just elites, but also marginalized and oppressed people acting in conditions not of their own making” (Lipman, 2013).

Chicago’s Plan for Transformation and Renaissance 2010 are two place-based neoliberal policies that were implemented simultaneously and eventually became intertwined in both their destruction of the inherited local regulatory landscape and the creation of the city’s neoliberal geographical landscape. Between the late 1990s and 2008, these two initiatives, promising massive quality improvement to public housing and public education, misrepresented what would instead be the destructive and violent dismantling of poor communities of color through public and private funding resulting in a reduction in quality and access to services. Moreover, with the introduction of the marketplace and the “freedom” of choice, the city, in this changing political and economic landscape, becomes an arena for interlocal competition where neoliberalization expands to “inhabit not only institutions and places but also the spaces in between” (Peck and Tickell, 2002).
The introduction of the school marketplace with the simultaneous closing of neighborhood schools deemed as failed and the opening of privately operated charter schools created interlocal and extra local competition for students to “choose” a good school. First, Chicago’s Ren2010 introduced the labeling of school performance based on standardized tests scores for neighborhood schools and introduced the school marketplace. Under the guidelines of the NCLB Act, neighborhood schools were rated by the students’ standardized test scores which have been proven to have cultural and class bias. In Chicago, a Level 1 school is considered a top level school and a Level 3 is considered a “failed school” that is on probation due to low standardized test scores. In the marketplace, students could attend their neighborhood public school or apply to attend a charter school. Ren2010 presented charter schools, which are run by non-profit or for-profit institutions, as the “new” and “better” schools. This false rhetoric around the strength of charter schools was unchallengeable because charter schools were not required to post students standardized test scores for the first five years. The creation of the school marketplace, where failed schools were closed to be turned around or replaced by charter schools created a misguided understanding, reinforced by historical context, that public neighborhood schools were bad. As a result, as charter schools opened, under the assumption that charter schools were new, better schools, students began to apply to charter schools with the hopes to leave their neighborhood school which had a negative impact on enrollment for neighborhood schools.

There has been little research conducted to measure how the opening of charter schools creates enrollment decline in neighborhood schools. However, Richard Buddin (2012), conducted the first national study with an analysis of district-level enrollment data for all states with charter schools, revealing how charter schools affected traditional public and private school
enrollments after controlling for changes for the socioeconomic, demographic, and economic conditions of the district. First, the study noted that enrollment patterns varied considerably across schools in urban and non-urban areas. The study listed Chicago to be 99 percent urban and thus a highly urban area. Second, based on enrollment data from 2000-2008, schools in highly urban areas experienced annual enrollment growth of 14.76 percent in charter schools and annual enrollment decline in traditional public schools, private schools, and religious schools. Third, the analysis showed that there are more charters in urban areas with greater population diversity, higher poverty rates, and smaller population growth than non-urban areas. Finally, the study concluded that most charter students are drawn from traditional public schools.

The introduction of a school marketplace also created competition across schools for capital, particularly with regard to TIF funding for infrastructure improvements. TIF funding is intended to be used for public spaces such as schools, however there is no specification of whether or not the school building is occupied by a charter school or a neighborhood school. Stephanie Farmer and Chris Poulos found that tax increment financing revenues allocated to urban education reform in Chicago are used for the construction of exclusive neoliberal schools where as traditional, open enrollment schools are relatively deprived of tax increment financing for school construction projects. Moreover, the study found that prestigious, selective enrollment and gifted centers are more likely to be supported with TIF dollars in affluent and gentrifying neighborhoods. TIF funding for school construction projects in low-income, predominantly African American neighborhoods is more likely to be used in public private partnerships with exclusive charter or contracts schools that do not have local democratic control and have admissions policies that can exclude neighborhood students from attending. Thus, specific to this study, TIF funding for school construction in Englewood and West Englewood
would be allocated to privatized, charter or contract schools where there is no LSC, or
democratic control of the school. This is problematic because infrastructure improvements are
perceived as an improvement of a school or the differential between a “good school” and a “bad
school”. Thus, the use of capital to improve the infrastructures of schools that fall under the
neoliberal agenda, help promote the attendance of neoliberal schools.

The study by Farmer and Poulos found that between 1986 and 2010, 22 percent of all TIF
revenues had been earmarked for school construction projects. 28 CPS schools received TIF
funds for construction projects, totaling $857.81 million (Farmer and Poulos, 2015). The study
defined four categories of schools. First, neighborhood open enrollment schools which make up
69 percent of the CPS schools. Second, selective enrollment schools which makes up 10 of the
city’s schools. Third, exclusive admissions schools which include charter, contract schools,
small schools and career academies. Fourth, mixed component schools with are a combination
of neighborhood area attendance and regional gifted centers which have exclusive admissions
requirements. Of the $857.81 million in TIF funding, neighborhood schools received 48.3
percent, selective enrollment schools received 32.8 percent, schools with exclusive admission
process received 13.7 percent and mixed component schools received 5.2 percent. The study
concluded that over half of the TIF revenues used for school construction projects went to
schools with some form of selective enrollment or exclusive enrollment. Neighborhood open
enrollment schools received a third less than they would have if TIF funds were allocated equally
across schools. The findings of this study speak to the way in which capital, through neoliberal
financial projects, is invested by the city specific to the neoliberal education reform agenda both
in funding construction that favors selective or exclusive enrollment. Additionally, the study
found a polarized distribution of TIF funding based on tier ratings of socioeconomic status.
Specific to the study, Tier 1 is the lowest and Tier 4 is the highest. The study found that Tier 1 and Tier 4 which represent 50 percent of the CPS students, received three-fourths of the TIF funding. Tier 2 and Tier 3, which represent the working class and middle income students, receive one-fourth of the TIF funding. The authors pointed to this trend as evidence that there is continued support for selective enrollment schools and effort to finance choice schools with exclusive admissions processes and privatized governance structures that are located in lower socio-economic, Tier 1 neighborhoods. Thus, the historical disinvestment in low income African-American and Latino neighborhoods is creating an opportunity for marketized public education to grow in their share of the market in the district’s schools. Finally, the TIF funding from low-income neighborhoods is being utilized to privatize neighborhood schools in the neighborhood. The study concludes that TIF funding used on school construction in Chicago is remaking the “traditional public school system according to market-based principles…resulting in new forms of social polarization and exclusionary education practices that undermine the conditions for equal access and opportunity that are the cornerstone of traditional public schools” (Farmer and Poulos, 2015). Specific to this study, both examples politicize the use of enrollment decline and high maintenance cost as a determining factor to close schools deemed underutilized and highlights how intercompetition in the marketplace, both in the context of a neighborhood as well as in the arena of the city as a whole, favors selective enrollment and exclusive enrollment schools such as charters and contract schools, leaving public neighborhood open enrollment schools to have concentrations of students who are most vulnerable and attend schools with less access to resources.
Post-2008 Neoliberal Education Reform

The resilience of neoliberalism through the global financial meltdown of 2008 and its efficient ability to capitalize on the crisis conditions that followed marks the most recent shift in neoliberalism (Peck, Theodore, and Brenner, 2013). This shift initiated another rescaling of economic flows and networks through glocalization, introducing a new, extra-local level of intercompetition and deepening the entrenchment in neoliberal rationalities and disciplines. This shift and its repercussions are evident in Chicago 2013 school actions.

The Chicago 2013 school actions initiative capitalized on crisis conditions and was driven by the contradictions and failures of neoliberal education reform prior to 2008. The burden of the rescaling initiated by the post-2008 neoliberal shift was passed on to cities. Strapped for cash, cities found themselves in financial crisis and began to adjust their policies to focus on cost cutting. Chicago’s justification for the district’s historically unprecedented 2013 school actions was its $1 billion budget crisis. CPS insisted that to address this budget crisis, there was a need to address the districts “utilization crisis”. This change in focus for Chicago’s neoliberal education policy is reflective of a broader shift in neoliberalism post-2008. Prior to 2013, during the first wave of neoliberal education reform under the Ren2010 initiative, CPS sought to improve schools in the district by closings or turning around schools deemed failed. CPS closed or completely re-staffed 100 schools due to low test score performance while simultaneously opening charter schools. As of 2015, 142 of Chicago Public School District’s 664 schools are charter or contract schools. The failure of this policy is reflective of the fact that this process did not improve the quality of schools in Chicago. This is evident in the fact that many of the charter schools, opened in areas of the city where failed schools were closed, had similar low academic performance levels. However, this policy introduced the school
marketplace and over time, as the district closed low performing neighborhood schools and opened privately run charter schools, the number of district run neighborhood schools began to shrink and with it so too did the number of unionized teacher jobs in the district. While previous neoliberal reform focused on the closing of low performing schools, this new wave of reform has shifted focus to closing underutilized schools that are low performing which effectively measures the irreversible uprooting and displacement impact of the creative destruction of pre-2008 reform.

However, the intertwining of other 2008 crises also influenced enrollment decline in neighborhood schools. For example, the communities heavily hit by the foreclosure crisis experienced population decline. Englewood and West Englewood are two of the hardest hit neighborhoods in Chicago by the foreclosure crisis. By June of 2011, 3,500 properties sat vacant, and the number of vacant properties continued to rise (Olivio, Mullen and Glanton, 2011). An article in Crain’s magazine from November 2013 stated 1 in 6 homes in Englewood were vacant (Gallun and Maidenberg, 2013). It goes on to say that, “a turn down its side streets in Englewood and West Englewood… reveals the impact of decades of poverty and neglect, compounded by the housing crash. Blocks with a half-dozen board-ups are more than common… [T]he private market largely has stopped working. Homes and two-flats are dirt-cheap. But many need so much work and property prices have fallen so much that investors who might have ventured there in the past won’t now. So a lot of homes sit empty, rotting…” (Gallun and Maidenberg, 2013).

The uneven repercussions of the foreclosure crisis across the city’s neighborhoods was not unique to Chicago. Nor was the previous pre-2008 neoliberal education reform introducing the school marketplace, closing neighborhood schools and opening charter schools. As the
repercussions of the global financial crisis of 2008 began to unfold and spread into state and city budgets, cash strapped cities sought to address multiple crisis by cutting costs and off-loading the burden of this rescaling directly onto the most marginalized communities with a heightened level of targeting. Many cash strapped school districts across the country in major cities, particularly in America’s Rust Belt, found themselves in a “utilization crisis” where schools had too few students to fill too many empty desks. This dynamic is another component of post-2008 neoliberal reform, what Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2012) refer to as Fast-Policy Complex, where one model of restructuring is copied in other geographic locations. As neoliberal processes become more deepened in urban space, and time-space compression intensifies, fast-policies such as, closing underutilized schools, appear more frequently and across scales. With each shift in neoliberalism such fast-policy packages become considered as “best practices” or “what works”. It also speaks to why after so many cities, including Chicago, closed underutilized schools, another national trend was revealed: the closure of underutilized schools in urban districts disproportionately impacts low-income, African American students (Lee, 2013b) and the majority of schools closed are located in the most economically challenged areas of the city.

Peck, Theodore and Brenner (2012) describe post-2008 neoliberalism as a time of “extra-local ‘rules of the game’ that continues to be structured according to selectively competitive principles”. Spaces of regulatory change are smaller and more targeted, such as by neighborhood or zone, as a result of cities becoming increasingly interconnected with a transnational governance system. Moreover, the repercussions of this most recent restructuring of neoliberalization processes have acutely targeted neighborhoods of cities’ most marginalized communities unveiling a starkly blunt statement as to how social injustice is perpetuated by the vicious bias of the free-market. This dynamic is evident in 2013 school actions.
This heightening targeting is also reflective in the more acute targeting of the most marginalized students. The schools impacted by the 2013 school actions served a larger share of vulnerable students than did other schools in the district. A research report released by the University of Chicago Consortium on Chicago School Research found that students affected by the 2013 school closings were more likely to receive special education services, be old for their grade, and be in families that have changed residences in the year prior to the school closings. Moreover, while 39 percent of the district’s students are African American and 86 percent of the students received free or reduced-price lunch, 88 percent of the students impacted were African American and 95 percent of the students impacted received free or reduced-priced lunch. Finally, the majority of the schools closed are in neighborhoods hit hardest by the foreclosure crisis and have high levels of crime (de la Torre, Gordon, Moore, and Cowhy, 2015).

The heightened targeting of post-2008 neoliberalism introduced a new extra-local level of intercompetition, allowing for more acute targeting of the local, not just with regards to place, but also to the individual body. While the first wave of neoliberal education reform focused on the performance level of the school, or the performance level of the collective of students enrolled, this new focus is on the number of individual students enrolled in school. This creates a shift from the measurement of standardized test scores to the measurement of individual choice, creating for a more direct relationship between the action of a student’s individual body, to financial resources. This dynamic is pivotal for the analysis of the continued neoliberalization of the school landscape of Englewood and West Englewood after the 2013 school actions to consider the way in which interlocal competition in the school marketplace, where students compete to attend “good” schools, leaving those who aren’t selected to make other choices in the
marketplace to attend schools, controlled by for profit companies, with specific limited possibilities for one’s life trajectory.
Data Collection and Analysis

Identifying Underutilized School Action Zones

An analysis of the 2013 school actions was conducted to determine if there were any specific areas of the city that were more impacted by school actions than other areas. Of the city’s 77 neighborhoods, 35 neighborhoods had at least 1 school action. Of these 35 neighborhoods, Austin, Douglas, East Garfield Park, West Garfield Park, Englewood, West Englewood and West Town had between 7-8 school actions. These neighborhoods are located on the South and West side of the city, similar to previous school actions. However, of these 7 neighborhoods there are 2 sets of 2 neighborhoods that are located next to each other. Specifically, Englewood/West Englewood and East Garfield Park/West Garfield Park. Through this initial analysis, I selected Englewood/West Englewood to be the focus of the study. See Appendix C for a complete list of the neighborhoods with school actions for 2013.

The 2013 school closings were primarily on the South and West side of the city as in previous years, but the mapping of these school actions determined there were two “zones of underutilized school actions”, each made up of two adjacent city neighborhoods. On the West Side, the underutilized school closing zone is in East Garfield Park/West Garfield Park. On the South Side, the underutilized school closing zone is in Englewood/West Englewood. The number of school actions in these zones is higher than any other two neighborhood zone. I selected Englewood/West Englewood, one of the two zones of underutilized school actions, to be the focus of this study.
As African Americans moved into Englewood and West Englewood in the late 1950s and 1960s, CPS Superintendent Willis built eight new schools to reinforce school and housing segregation.
The historical analysis of this study discusses the racial and political history of Chicago and the way in which it influenced education reform and capital investment in education. The intent of this analysis is to provide a broader historical context leading up to the 1950s and 1960s when Englewood and West Englewood began to transition demographically from predominantly White neighborhoods to eventually become predominantly African American. During this time period, the overcrowding in Bronzeville had become so severe that the boundaries began to slowly expand West. Block by block as African American families began to move into Englewood, there was increasing racial unrest, violent riots and over time White families would move out. This transition process was exacerbated in the late 1950s when the building of the Dan Ryan expressway displaced many African Americans from Bronzeville to Englewood. As neighborhoods transitioned, rigid housing segregation was maintained block by block and to maintain school segregation Superintendent Willis had 8 new schools built in Englewood. This new school construction also created business for Daley’s inner circle of businessman.

Map 1 highlights the schools built prior to Willis’s term and the schools built during Willis’ term. The schools marked with green circles are schools built prior to Superintendent Willis taking office and the schools marked in yellow represent the schools built during his term in office. The red dot represents the house where a black man was seen attending a union meeting in a white home which was falsely understood to mean that the black man was purchasing the home and it initiated one of the largest race riots in the history of the city. This map highlights a period in history where capital was used to build schools that appear on the map almost as a wall down the middle of Englewood, to prevent school integration while African Americans moved West, away from the lake and into Englewood. This is relevant to understand the way in which racism and capital investment contributed to the development of the school.
landscape prior to neoliberal education reform. The spatio-history of Englewood and West Englewood tells the story of the neighborhood landscape within the context of the changing demographics of a larger city landscape. Moreover, this period in history marked with the building of new schools speaks to this historically specific school landscape prior to and dismantled through neoliberal education reform.

While Chicago’s Ren2010 began in 2002, it did not create school actions in Englewood and West Englewood until 2006 with the exception of the declaration of Harper High School as a turnaround in 2002. Map 2 highlights school actions between 2002 and 2012 that targeted schools with low performance through the closing of schools or turning around of schools while simultaneously opening privately run charter schools. It is important to note that during this time there were two huge capital investment projects incorporated in this school reform. The first was the closing of Lindblom College Prep High School followed by a $42 million dollar renovation and its reopening as a citywide selective enrollment school which as of July 2013 was a Level 1 school (Moore, 2007). Picture 1 is a picture of Lindblom High School after the renovations. The second project involved the closing of Sir Miles Davis Academy, the construction building of a new school building at the cost of $50 million and the opening of Davis Magnet academy (Moore, 2008). Some of the $50 million came from a federal Magnet School Assistance Program grant of $10.1 million. The grant was designed to provide “magnet makeovers” based on the standards set by the federal No Child Left Behind Act (Mayor’s Press Office, 2008) Picture 2 is a picture of Davis Magnet Academy which as of July 2013 was a Level 3 school. Picture 3 is a picture of Guggenheim Elementary, the one school that was closed in 2008 and left vacant after the first wave a neoliberal education reform between 2002-2012.
Picture 1: Lindblom College Prep High School, West Englewood
Picture 2: Miles Davis Magnet Academy, West Englewood
Picture 3: Guggenheim Elementary School, Englewood
Map 3: School Landscape, School Actions and Charter School Openings in 2013

School Landscape, School Actions and Charter School Openings in 2013
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Map 3 illustrates the school actions of 2013. There are several key components of this round of school actions. First, school actions were allocated to a set of two schools. For example, Wentworth and Altgeld were designated a school action set. The Wentworth school building was closed and the inside of the school, the teachers, the staff and the name was relocated to the Altgeld building. The Altgeld building stayed opened, renamed as Wentworth with Wentworth teachers and staff and the Altgeld teachers and staff would be laid off. School test scores determine which of the two schools’ teachers and staff would remain, however it must be noted that the difference in test scores could be as small as 1 point. At the end of the 2013 school year, both Wentworth and Altgeld were Level 3 schools, the lowest rating in the district. Another common action in 2013 was opening new charter schools to co-locate in a building with a public neighborhood school. Moreover, capital would be allocated for construction projects to adjust the building to house two schools.

Picture 4 is of John Hope College Preparatory High School, a neighborhood high school that after 2013 co-locates with Kipp Bloom Charter School. The construction to adjust the building to house two schools cost the district $6.4 million (Independent Hearing Officer Report: KIPP, 2013) and is an example of how the district uses capital investment to support school actions under the neoliberal agenda.
Intercompetition Across Schools for Student Enrollment

The historical enrollment data listed on each school’s master sheet for Englewood and West Englewood between 2006 through 2013 was logged and summed to see if there was a trend that represented competition across school types. The numbers listed in this report represent all the schools in Englewood and West Englewood. The schools were divided into five types of schools. The first type is a neighborhood school which is run by CPS and has citywide enrollment meaning that students from across the city can attend the school although most of the students are from the attendance boundaries of the school. The schools in this district range from Level 1, the highest, to Level 3. The second school type is a neighborhood school run by a private organization separate from the district but funded with public dollars. Stagg was the only school that fell in this category in 2013 as it was in the process of a turnaround by AUSL and at the time of the school closings it was labeled a Level 3 school. The third type is a district run, selective enrollment school. Lindblom High School is the only selective enrollment school in Englewood and West Englewood. It is a Level 1 school and it has a selective application process requiring a high standardized test score and a transcript. The fourth type is a district run magnet school. There are three schools that fall into this category and at the time of the 2013 school actions their performance levels ranged from Level 1 to Level 3. Students are required to apply for admission to district run magnet schools and are selected through a lottery process. The fifth school type is a charter school which is run by a private non-profit or for-profit organization separate funded by public dollars. At the time of the school actions, only the charter schools that had existed for five years were required to post performance levels. For those schools that posted performance levels, the charter schools ranged from Level 1 to Level 3. Students are required to apply to attend a charter school and are selected through a lottery process.
Table 1 shows that between 2006 and 2013, enrollment in neighborhood schools dropped by 4,705 students while the total enrollment in the two neighborhoods dropped by only 422 students. While this data does not provide a quantitative assessment of how many students left Englewood and West Englewood schools or if students transferred to a school in the two neighborhood zone, it is reasonable to say that the drop in neighborhood school enrollment is not due to the drop in overall enrollment for the two neighborhood zone. This finding disproves the statement by CPS that school actions due to underutilization were in predominantly African American communities because close to 200,000 African Americans have left Chicago over the course of the previous decade. Moreover, the chart illustrates that there was a consistent increase in enrollment in lottery enrollment charter schools. Finally, because school performance level ranged from Level 1 to Level 3 for both district run neighborhood schools and lottery enrollment charter schools, the data suggests that the performance level of a school is not the strongest determinant in enrollment, but instead it is school type.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School Type</th>
<th>Operator</th>
<th>Enrollment</th>
<th>Reporting Year</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood District</td>
<td>Open Enrollment</td>
<td>13,101</td>
<td>12,354</td>
<td>12,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Private</td>
<td>Open Enrollment</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>553</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selective Enrollment District</td>
<td>Application</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnet District</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>1,445</td>
<td>1,402</td>
<td>1,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charter Private</td>
<td>Lottery</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,224</td>
<td>1,562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>15,242</td>
<td>15,740</td>
<td>16,340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Intercompetition for Enrollment In the School Marketplace
Map 4: School Landscape as of June 2015

School Landscape as of June 2015
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Map 4 illustrates the school landscape as of June 2015. There is one charter school for every two neighborhood schools. As a result of the 2013 school actions, there are four vacant buildings. Of the 33 schools, 13 of the schools have some type of application process with selective or lottery enrollment. Since the 2013 schools actions, there have been two new charter schools opened in Englewood, both of which are run by for-profit companies. The first high school is Magic Johnson Academy which has city wide open enrollment and is a part of the Edison Schools. The organization’s website describes the school as “another option” to earn a high school diploma. Specifically it states, “Our student-focused program provides an opportunity to earn a high school diploma at a pace suitable to their schedule, lifestyle and learning needs. Students experience an abbreviated, flexible school day and maximize online learning to focus on required courses and subjects that align with their specific areas of interest” (Magic Johnson Bridgescape Website). The second charter school is Excel Academy, a Camelot school. This school is what the organization calls an accelerated school, however the term accelerated is not intended to refer to academic rigor but instead a shorter period of time to compete a high school diploma. This school is for students who, “have potential, but lack motivation. ... may not display disruptive behavior, but they still require a special program to succeed academically”. Camelot’s curriculum is designed for students to graduate in 2.5 years or less. Based on the Excel class of 2011 of 380 graduates, “most are accepted into post-secondary programs, including college, vocational school and the military”(Camelot Education Website) A year after multiple schools were closed in Englewood and West Englewood due to enrollment decline and underutilization, two new charter schools open. The function these for-profit companies serve is not an accident and is a part of the deepening intensification of the maintenance of control and discipline in neoliberalized urban spaces which is further problematic
in the context of the direct relationship between a student’s school choice and financial resources for a for-profit institution. While a school marketplace suggests open choices, the reality of neighborhoods such as Englewood is that more students in the area will attend a school in the area as opposed to attending a school on the other side of the city. Some of this has to do with students’ access to transportation, where it is the cost and time required to take public transportation each day or whether or not they have a family member who can drive the student to and from school. There is also a very serious and real safety issue for young people walking long distances in parts of Englewood and West Englewood which further reduces the area where their school can be located. Having said this, when some of the schools in this geographic area have enrollment limitations, whether the school is selective enrollment or lottery enrollment, that creates a limitation for those students who are not accepted. The alternative then is to attend a neighborhood school which more likely than not in Englewood and West Englewood receives less financial resources because of interlocal competition and enrollment decline. Moreover, based on experience in working in a neighborhood school in Englewood, I see the how the school marketplace creates additional challenges for neighborhood schools to retain teachers because union teachers fear a Level 3 school could be closed which would leave them out of a job. In this landscape, when for-profit charter or contract schools are introduced, it creates a space where some students’ education trajectory has been decided for them because the few options left are high schools with a reduced curriculum and graduation goals such as vocational school or the military. Moreover, the now direct relationship with the student’s choice to financial resources adds market pressures for the schools to connect with potential students. Camelot schools currently have job postings for recruiters with an education requirement of a
GED to canvas the neighborhood looking for potential students. After all, the more students enroll, the more profit the school makes.
Conclusion

This work examines the neoliberalization of the public school landscape, just one of many components of a larger neoliberal transformation of public education in Chicago. The driving intent behind this effort is to identify how racism is fundamentally embedded in the neoliberal project and thus, to contribute to a large effort of disproving the neoliberal illusion of the “freedom of choice”. This thesis creates a moving map of the neoliberalization of the Englewood/West Englewood public school landscape to provide a spatio-visualization of the heightened targeting and consolidation of the post-2008 neoliberal school actions in Chicago. Moreover, this work determines that enrollment decline in neighborhood schools is less about a decline in population of the two neighborhoods, and more about a rise in enrollment for publically funded, privately run, charter schools. Finally, this work suggests that with each shift in neoliberalism, and the heightened targeting of its repercussions, capital has an increasing power to manage and contain the body in a targeted area.

In a school district with a student-based budgeting policy where funding for a school is determined by the total student enrollment, growing competition in the school marketplace equates to schools competing for student enrollment. However, the school that spends the most money on recruitment is not likely the best quality school, as money spent on recruitment is less money spent towards a student’s educational experience. Education policy continues to focus on deregulation, allowing for public funds for education to be contracted out to privately managed organizations based on a dollar amount allocated per student. In July of 2015, the House passed a bill that would revise No Child Left Behind to permit low-income students to transfer federal dollars, Title I funding, between districts (Steinhauer, 2015). This further itemization of funding
at the individual level as an effort to “efficiently” fund education serves is a mere distraction to the that public schools have been historically and continue to be severely underfunded.

There is one commonality throughout the neoliberal project: its economic values are in direct conflict with human values. In 1991, my grandfather described this conflict as the driving force in the growing crisis of human values. Dr. Raja Roy Singh, retired Assistant Director General of UNESCO Regional Office for Education in Asian and the Pacific, wrote in his last published writing for UNESCO, *Education for the Twenty-First Century: Asia-Pacific Perspectives* that with the turn of the century, will come an increasing crisis of human values throughout the world. He wrote of this growing crisis in the context of globalization and the power dynamic growing between developed and developing countries however, a similar conflict is the root evil in the neoliberalization of public education in Chicago.

While the knowledge “explosion” is extending man’s mental outreach and technology is utilized to bring wealth and economic power at least to a part of the world, the domain of human values has diminished and continues to erode. There is a deepening sense of crisis moving in like a dark shadow. The peoples of the world are being brought together closer to a degree that each and every part is affected by the fortunes of every other. But that very image of the emerging one world reflects back, magnified, the moral danger to which mankind’s future is being committed by the destructive use of the powers that expanding knowledge has helped to create. So it is that the calm and peace of advancing knowledge is seething with the hidden turbulence at the heart of the human condition...[T]he minds that plan for ultimate destruction are creating new minds that can only function in a destroying environment. It is not that mankind lacks knowledge; it
is wisdom that is in crisis, wisdom that Chinese thinker Mencius almost two thousand years ago defined as “the feeling of right and wrong”…Values are inseparable from a sense of worthiness. They are the very ideas and perceptions through which we experience and interpret our relations to ourselves, to others and the world. This crisis of values is thus to be seen both at the individual and societal levels. In the individual it shows itself in a sense of drift and helplessness, in an alienation of meaning and purpose…The individual becomes an object to be manipulated and disposable. At the societal level, the crisis expresses itself in increasing fragmentations and divisions in the populations, in the diminution of human relationships, increasing depredation of the natural environment, diminished regard or concern for the future and increase in all forms of violence. Underlying the crisis in all its different forms is a persistent undervaluing of the human being.

(Roy Singh, 1991, pp.31-33)

I began this thesis hoping to find an answer as to how to fix the destruction of neoliberalization. Through this work I learned that this destruction is permanent and cannot be undone. So, even if one could convince the leaders of CPS and the mayor that neoliberal education reform creates an unjust and unequal school landscape, what then? As long as Chicago Public Schools continues to have a school marketplace and school choice, the district’s most vulnerable students will predominantly attend the district’s lowest performing schools because that is a fundamental repercussion of the marketplace. Moreover, if policy continues to focus on pinching pennies and measuring what is easily measured, there will be no change in the state of public education.
My grandfather wrote that the *development quest*, while universalistic in nature as a vision of human societies is “lost in the development gaps which divide the advanced countries and the developing countries globally, and within countries, (advanced and developing alike)” because of the exclusive focus on economic growth (Roy Singh, 1991). He suggests that for the 21st century there should be a quest for another development, “calling for new forms of growth which are designed around improving the quality of life of the people”. He describes the development path of this another development must start from “the human base, measuring the socio-cultural and economic progress in terms of meeting human needs, acquiring knowledge, realizing aesthetic gains, controlling social problems and enhancing the quality of life so that individuals may be able to go forward toward their own goals of self-realization” (Roy Singh, 1991). To move forward and build strong public schools, there needs to be a focus on the question of “What is good education?” and an acknowledgement that the current system does not have the capacity to provide all students access to a good education. Fixing this gap cannot be done with bandaid policies or efforts to improve a small handful of schools because in today’s school marketplace, while every student has a choice, there are not enough available seats in strong schools for every student in the district. It is daunting to consider what it would take to create a public education system that is focused on the human base and quality of life of each student but it is approached that should be considered if there is a genuine intent to having strong, quality and safe public schools.
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Appendix A

Excerpt from Public Hearing Defining Utilization Calculation and Application to Altgeld/Wentworth Proposed School Action

According to the Chief Executive Officer’s guidelines for the 2012/2013 school year, the CEO may propose to close a school if it is underutilized based on CPS space utilization standards and student enrollment numbers recorded on the 20th attendance day of the 2012/2013 school year.

The CEO may only propose a closure if the impacted students have the option to enroll in a higher performing school and the resulting space utilization after the closure will not exceed the facility’s enrollment efficiency range as defined by the CPS space utilization standards.

Altgeld is currently located as 1340 West 71st Street. Altgeld is an elementary school that as of the 20th day of attendance for the 2012/2013 school year serves 443 students in prekindergarten and kindergarten through eighth grades.

To understand the enrollment efficiency range of the facility, Chicago Public Schools uses its space utilization standards. The enrollment efficiency range is plus or minus 20 percent of the facility’s ideal enrollment. For elementary school facilities, the ideal enrollment is defined as the number of allotted homerooms multiplied by 30. The number of allotted homeroom classrooms is approximately 76 to 77 percent of the total classrooms available.

As an elementary school’s enrollment increases above the efficiency range, a school may be considered overcrowded as programming options are reduced or compromised.

As an elementary school’s enrollment decreases below the efficiency range, a school may be considered underutilized as classrooms are unused or poorly programmed making the use of limited resources less effective.

A typical elementary school facility has a total of 39 classrooms. Therefore, the number of allotted homerooms, approximately 76 to 77 percent of 39 is 30 classrooms. Multiplying 30 classrooms by 30 equals the ideal enrollment of 900.

Finally, the enrollment efficiency range is plus or minus 20 percent of 900, which is 720 – which is between 720 and 1,080. If a school in this typical elementary facility had an enrollment below 720, it would be considered underutilized.
Alternatively, if the school’s enrollment was above 1,080, it would be considered overcrowded. There are 41 total classes within the Altgeld facility. Approximately 76 to 77 percent of this number is 31, the number of allotted homerooms. This number multiplied by 30 yields that ideal enrollment of the facility, which is 930.

As such, the enrollment efficiency range of the Altgeld facility is between 744 and 1,116 students. As I stated the enrollment of Altgeld as of the 20th day of attendance for the 2012/213 school year is 443. This number is below the enrollment efficiency range and thus, the school is underutilized.

The CEO has proposed that the students from Altgeld be welcomed by Wentworth. Wentworth will be relocated from its present location to the current Altgeld facility at 1340 West 71st street.

If this proposal is approved by the Board of Education for the city of Chicago, the resulting space utilization will not exceed the 1340 West 71st Street facility’s enrollment efficiency range as defined by the CPS space utilisations standards…

Altgeld’s current enrollment of 443 students and Wentworth’s current enrollment of 333 students combines to a total of 776 students within the enrollment efficiency range of the Altgeld facility (Transcript of Testimony, 2013).
The CEO may only propose a closure if the impacted students have the option to enroll in a higher performing school and the resulting space utilization after the closure will not exceed the facility’s enrollment efficiency range as defined by the CPS space utilization standards…

If this proposal is approved, Altgeld students will be welcomed by Wentworth, and Wentworth will relocate to the current Altgeld facility located at 1340 West 71st Street. The facility at 1340 West 71st Street has enough space for Altgeld and Wentworth students, and the resulting combined enrollment will not exceed the facility’s enrollment efficiency range.

When Altgeld students are welcomed by the Wentworth administration staff and students, they will be attending a higher performing school based on the CEO’s guidelines for school actions.

The CEO’s guidelines also define a higher performing elementary school if the performance policy level is equal to be a school performing higher on the majority of four performance metrics for the 2011/2012 school year.

Both Altgeld and Wentworth received a level 3 rating in 2011/2012. Thus, the higher performing school under the guidelines is the one that performed higher on the majority of four performance metrics.

The four performance metrics analyzed are the percentage of points the school received on the performance policy, the ISAT composite meets or exceeds score, the Value added score in reading and the Value added score in math. I will explain each of these metrics below and explain how Wentworth performed higher than Altgeld in 2011/2012.

The first metric to compare is the school’s percentage of points received on the performance policy.

The performance policy bases its rating on a point system. Points are received for the school’s current level of performance and improvement of time on standardized tests and attendance as well as the growth of individual students from year to year on the state test.
For 2011/2012, Wentworth received 45.2 of available points, and Altgeld received 26.2 percent of available points. Thus, Wentworth received a higher percentage of points on the performance policy.

The second metric is the ISAT Meets or Exceeds Composite score, which is the combined result of the ISAT reading, mathematics and science assessments. Wentworth’s ISAT meets or exceeds composite score was 59.4 percent and Altgeld’s meets or exceeds composite score was 66.2 percent.

The third and fourth metrics of the school’s Value-Added are the school’s Value-Added score in reading and math. Value-Added is a component of the performance policy that compares student academic growth on the ISAT at a school with the growth of similar students across the district.

This is done through a regression methodology that controls for nine student level factors including grade level, prior performance on the ISAT, free or reduced lunch eligibility, race or ethnicity, mobility, participation in the Students in Temporary Living Situations program, Individualized Education Program or IEP status, English language learner status and gender.

Controlling for these factors allows us to see how much impact the school had on its average student over the past year. Because we control for prior performance, this metric allows us to identify schools with low test scores where growth is rapid and schools with high test scores where growth is slow.

The Value-Added metric is a standardized measure with a mean of zero. Standardization means that the score is reported in standard deviation units, which is a measure of how far away the school’s score is from the district’s average.

A positive number means that students in the school are growing at a faster pace than similar students in the district. For example, a positive 1 indicates that the school is one standard deviation above the mean, meaning that the school’s students are growing at a faster pace than approximately 84 percent of schools in the district.

A score near zero means that students at the school are growing at about the same pace as similar students in the district and a negative score means that students at the school are growing at a slower pace than similar students in the district.
As you can see, Wentworth’s reading Value-Added score was 0.8 in 2012 and Altgeld’s reading Value-Added score was a negative 4.6. This means that, on average, students at Wentworth grew at a faster pace in reading when compared to students at Altgeld.

Wentworth’s mathematics Value-Added score was a 1.7 in 2012 and Altgeld’s Value-Added score was a negative 2.1. This means that, on average, students at Wentworth grew at a faster pace in mathematics when compared to students at Altgeld.

To summarize, Wentworth performed higher than Altgeld in 2011/2012 on the majority of the metrics identified in the CEO’s guidelines for school actions and thus is a higher performing school (Transcript of Testimony, 2013).
Appendix C

Neighborhood Analysis for 2013 Underutilized School Actions

Neighborhoods with 7-8 School Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>School Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Garfield</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Englewood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Garfield Park</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Town</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Complete List of Neighborhoods and School Actions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood</th>
<th>School Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Gresham</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austin</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Cragin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calumet Heights</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Garfield</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgewater</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Englewood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuller Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Boulevard</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Grand Crossing</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humboldt Park</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyde Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irving Park</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenwood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Square</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near North Side</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near West Side</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New City</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lawndale</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pullman</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravenswood</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseland</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Chicago</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Deering</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Lawndale</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Shore</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uptown</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Heights</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Park</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Englewood</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Garfield Park</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Pullman</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Town</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodlawn</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>