

Teachers as Grantseekers: The Privatization of the Urban Public School Teacher

SARA FREEDMAN

Boston College

This article explores the impact of grantseeking on urban public school teachers. It first analyzes how grantseeking, primarily but not exclusively promoted by numerous private and corporate foundations, has introduced urban teachers to and fostered among them some of the central tenets of the movement to privatize education—to “market” one’s teaching as a product and oneself as a valuable commodity; to embrace competition and the creation of self-selected communities; and to replace a commitment to a broad-based democracy in which the needs of all are met with fulfilling the needs of the “deserving” few.

The article next discusses the ways in which specific assumptions about urban teachers have influenced the development of such grant competitions. It also discusses the ways these assumptions promote the ability of a very limited number of high status urban teachers to successfully compete in such competitions while working to exclude others, particularly teachers of color and those whose native language is not English.

The article then presents a case history of one grantseeker to illustrate the contradictory effects of teachers’ participation in privately funded grant programs. It ends by raising questions about the purpose and effect of grantseeking in education and its potential role in changing the dominant means of educating children in the United States from a public school system subject to community wide support and governance—in theory if not in practice—to an increasingly privatized one.

I was just a few minutes early for my interview with Maria Santos,¹ a bilingual special education teacher, but I could not figure out how to enter the school. We had arranged to meet in her classroom so that I could interview her in my role as the evaluator of a grant-funded professional development program that awards grants to teachers to develop curriculum materials and disseminate them to other teachers. I know how little time city teachers have during the school day outside of their teaching duties. I really didn’t want to be late, but it didn’t seem that I would ever be able to get inside. Most schools in this urban district are locked during the day. Many have several formal entrances that were used in years past but today are more ornamental than useful. The trick is to find one door with a small buzzer which, when pushed,

Teachers College Record Volume 102, Number 2, February 2000, pp. 398–441

Copyright © by Teachers College, Columbia University

0161-4681

This document is available at: <http://www.asu.edu/educ/eps/CERU/Articles/CERU-0002-93-OWI.pdf>

summons someone from the office—often a small child—who is responsible for opening the door and screening all who wish to enter. Often no one ever comes.

Luckily, I saw a young woman approaching. As she opened one of the doors I slipped in behind her. She asked me whom I wanted to see and then gave me directions to Ms. Santos' room. I found out later that my guide was the principal. She asked me no questions, but seemed to regard visits to Maria as fairly commonplace. As I made my way, the corridors were quiet and orderly, dark with old, brown paint, and lined with a mixture of 50 year old photographs and colorful artwork from today's pupils.

I located Maria's small resource room up a flight of stairs and around to the side. Through the broken window panes that made up the upper part of her classroom door, I could see Maria sitting with her back to the hallway. I knocked. Without turning around, she signaled me to come in. She was busy typing on a portable mini-electronic typewriter. Next to her was a grant application. We had scheduled this meeting several weeks in advance, but Maria told me, somewhat apologetically, that she had only limited time to give me because she had a number of grant applications with deadlines this week.

This was the first time I saw how profound a change grantseeking had made in the life of teachers since I was laid off from my own job as a schoolteacher, 15 years ago. Here was a teacher whose weekly, if not daily, routine was to write grants for herself and her school. There were enough grants to which she could apply that could keep her filling out such requests at the rate of two or three a week throughout the entire school year. The stark contrast between the very closed world of this teacher's school—literally locked away from the outside world—and the expansive, seemingly boundless world that corporate and private foundation-sponsored grant competitions were apparently inviting urban teachers to enter struck me with great force.

INTRODUCTION

As the above vignette suggests, grantseeking is a way of life in urban schools today. Specially designated development officers seek grants for district wide projects while enterprising principals and parents pursue grants for existing schools and programs and to provide startup funds for new "break the mold" enterprises. Teachers like Maria Santos, whose sanctioned role up to recent times has been confined almost exclusively to classroom activities and concerns, are also urged to take on the role of grantseekers to fund projects and materials for their individual classrooms and schools (Bauer, 1993; Berns, Libby, & O'Connor, 1991; Novelli, 1994; Richardson, 1993) and to create and sustain networks to reform classroom practice and school structures (Lieberman, 1996; Useem et al., 1995).

The popular media and funding agencies, as well as many teachers, now promote the idea that the "good" teacher, especially the "good" urban

teacher, accepts responsibility for and is adept at raising such funds for her classroom, her school, her school system, and her own professional development. Indeed, many of the other new roles created for teachers in the modern day reform movement—teacher as researcher/published author, teacher as mentor to colleagues and prospective teachers, teacher as curriculum developer, teacher as budget manager, personnel director, and project director, depend on teachers' abilities to "work the funding system" by meeting with foundation officers, writing award-winning grants, establishing nationally recognized networks with other successful teacher/grant-seekers and cooperating with public relations departments in publicizing grant-funded activities. Without the additional funds and perquisites grants provide to teachers, many of the new out-of-the-classroom roles now available to particular groups of teachers would simply not be possible (Etlin, 1993; Hill, 1993a; Lieberman, 1996; Little, 1993; Useem et al., 1995).

Given the enormous increase in such programs and their potential impact on individual teachers, their students, and their school systems, it is curious that little research attention has been directed to the role of private funding in supporting many of them, despite the fact that funding shifts from public to private in other areas of the educational system have been well documented and debated in the popular press and in the research community. The effort to place management of public schools in the hands of private corporations, for example, the move to create charter schools removed from public control and scrutiny, and the provision of state funds for vouchers to be used in private schools have generated much debate (American Federation of Labor, 1994; Ascher, Frucher, & Berne, 1996; Chubb & Moe, 1990; Cookson, 1994; Fine, 1994; Freedman, 1999; Hakim, Seidenstat, & Bowman, 1994; Hill, Pierce, & Guthrie, 1997; Lowe & Miner, 1993; Richards, Shore, & Sawicky, 1996; Saks, 1995; Wells, Cookson, Chubb, Moe, & Howe, 1991). Less publicized has been the growth in private funding in education in the form of grant competitions that have increased inequities among individual schools and classrooms, particularly in urban school districts where many corporate and private foundations concentrate their K-12 funding efforts (Foundation Center, 1996; IMPACT II, 1989; Weisman, 1992; Winerip, 1993).

The Role of Grantseeking in the Movement to Privatize Public Education

I have conducted several studies in the past five years designed to explore the impact of private grant giving on urban teachers. I first examined the most common type of grant program available to urban teachers in Northbridge,² a major city located in the eastern United States (Freedman, 1989). I later expanded the study to include urban teachers' participation as grant-seekers in several region-wide, competitively selected grant programs designed

to create networks of teacher leaders in the region in which Northbridge is located (Freedman, 1993, 1994, 1996). I have reviewed over 500 grant applications submitted by individual teachers over the course of 15 years and examined extensive survey data collected from 125 teachers who participated in the region-wide network of teachers, 10 of whom work in Northbridge. I have also conducted multiple return interviews with 30 teachers who work in the city's public school system and are among the most active teacher/grantseekers in the district.

On the basis of these studies, I argue that the growing participation of select groups of urban teachers in private grantgiving programs available to them on district, state, and national levels has critical ideological, structural, and cultural links to the movement to privatize public education (Gormley, 1991; Hill, Pierce, & Guthrie, 1997; Murphy, 1996). In this article, I first discuss the ways in which specific and different assumptions about the proper roles and aspirations of urban teachers have influenced the development of the competitions and the ability of specific groups of urban teachers to participate in them. I next analyze how private foundations have introduced urban teachers to and promoted among them some of the central tenets of the movement to privatize education—to “market” and package one's teaching as a product and oneself as a valuable commodity; to embrace competition and the creation of self-selected or self-selecting communities; and to replace a commitment to a broad-based democracy in which the needs of all those who are underserved and marginalized in society are met with fulfilling the needs of the “deserving” few (Blackmore, 1997; Henig, 1994; Kenway, 1995; Whitty, 1997).

I then present Maria Santos' history as a grantseeker to illustrate the effects of teachers' participation in two different kinds of grantfunding programs for which funders seek the active participation of teachers—those funding materials for teachers' own classrooms or professional development and those promoting school-wide initiatives such as school based management, parent outreach, and community building. The case study demonstrates how the administrative category of grantseeker—which seemingly strips the teacher of any but her professional attributes and competitively certified meritorious qualifications—actually intersects with, is deeply influenced by, and significantly affects other historically situated categories such as her race, class, ethnicity, linguistic community, and age cohort. It also illustrates how a very successful teacher/grantseeker works to resist some of the central tenets of the privatization movement by creating alternative visions and realities despite the enormous power, the considerable funds, and the approval of social elites that the privatization movement now commands. I conclude the article by raising questions about the purpose and effect of grantseeking in education and its potential role in changing the dominant means of educating children in the United States

from a public school system subject to community-wide support and governance—in theory if not in practice—to an increasingly privatized one.

Throughout the article I raise two critical concerns: (1) that under the guise of meritocracy, teacher empowerment, and better educational opportunities for urban students, private grant giving and the resultant grant-seeking are redefining the political economy of teachers in this urban district in ways that are exacerbating race, class, and gender inequality for teachers and students alike and (2) that private grant giving is undermining the ability of all urban teachers to work toward critically needed and effective educational reform for urban students.

Focus on urban teachers. I focus particularly on teachers working in a large urban school district because (1) the often documented and severe problems in urban schools have especially been singled out by privatization advocates as a justification for the movement to privatize public schools (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Hill, Pierce, & Guthrie, 1997; Murphy, 1996; Ravitch & Viteritti, 1996) and (2) many of the privately funded grant programs focus on urban education and individual urban teachers. An important sector of the business community, including representatives of a number of the corporations that fund such foundations and the grant competitions they sponsor targeting urban teachers, have vocally castigated urban public school systems for serious failures. They are especially outspoken about what they see as the inability of urban schools to prepare students to meet corporate workplace needs (Apple, 1996; Molnar, 1997; Spring, 1998).

National reports and the local press in Northbridge repeatedly link the perceived poor quality of education received in urban schools with the perceived poor quality of urban-based teachers. These same papers have also reported a sharp increase in the number of teachers of color working within the district and those whose native language is not English. Not a few articles have questioned the credentials of these teachers (Barnicle, 1996; Cohen, 1990; Daley, 1998). According to these articles, such groups of teachers, with a few well publicized and notable exceptions, are undermining the education of urban students and the ability of other teachers to teach effectively.

The newspapers in which these articles appear also regularly report on the deep divisions and factionalism among faculties working in urban schools. The serious schisms that characterize Northbridge school staffs, along with the continual negative stereotyping of urban school teachers as a group within the popular press and the general public, have a profound impact on the teachers working in the district. Acknowledging this impact, prestigious local and national private and corporate foundations, a number of whom have funded reports that proclaim the inadequacies of urban teach-

ers, have encouraged and financially supported select groups of teachers to establish or join networks of like-minded individuals as a critical component of many of the curricular and pedagogically based competitive grant programs they support. The desire to receive such support and be accepted by such protected enclaves within which teachers can share common concerns, pedagogical approaches, and dilemmas while escaping the serious divisions, the limiting restrictions, and the negative stereotyping that plague urban teachers as a group is exceptionally appealing.

Focus on urban women teachers. Women teachers make up 75% of the teaching force in Northbridge, a percentage similar to that of other teaching forces, urban and suburban, nationwide (Division of Research and Evaluation, 1996; National Education Association, 1997). For many women teachers, whose participation in such urban based teacher networks exceeds even their high percentages in the general teacher population, such groups are especially attractive (Biklen, 1995; Freedman, Jackson, & Boles, 1983; Troen & Boles, 1992).³ As a number of feminist scholars have noted, the ideal of community, of small, emotionally intimate face-to-face affiliations, was an early organizing principle of the modern feminist movement and its popular manifestations—consciousness raising groups, study groups, reading groups, art collectives, and choirs. Women, feminist scholars began to note, had always organized a plethora of grassroots organizations and collectivities. Certain groups of women saw these communities and networks as a way of mitigating the alienation, degradation, and isolation of the dominant society (Morgan, 1970; Treblicot, 1984; Young, 1990).

The popularity of such groups formed outside of teaching soon began to influence women teachers' lives within schools, particularly as a way of gaining control over their working lives and of validating their own contributions to the reform movement that were often marginalized or trivialized by more powerful elements of the educational hierarchy (Freedman, Jackson, & Boles, 1983; Munro, 1998; Weiler, 1986). Distinctly different from the compulsory faculty meetings and officially sanctioned in-service workshops that were long the traditional staple of school districts, networks create a self-empowering atmosphere. Lieberman appropriates the term "just in time" from the private sector where it originated to capture the newly emerging culture in teaching that these networks are creating and their attraction to certain groups of teachers.⁴ "In an atmosphere of trust and support, networkers contribute to and gain access to 'just in time' learning (solving immediate problems of practice), as well as grapple with problems in greater depth and complexity" (Lieberman, 1996).

Lieberman notes that such groups allow their members to "have a sense of being part of a special group or movement" (Parker, p. 7, in Lieberman

& Ordnick, 1996, p. 9), whose members are celebrated for working hard to better educate the children who attend their schools. Thus funders have structured these curricular based programs to capitalize on the desire of many women teachers to develop close ties with other teachers in these almost exclusively female networks. In doing so, funders have created an expectation that "good" teachers, especially "good" women teachers, are responsible for raising funds from private sources to develop and nurture the teacher networks that foster effective education for urban children and to provide the critically needed resources such teachers need.

However, as the work of Delpit, King, and other scholars in education (Delpit, 1995; Foster, 1992; hooks, 1995; King, 1991; Ladson-Billings, 1994) has so graphically demonstrated, such communities of teachers, funded to a great extent by private funds (Lieberman, 1996; Useem, 1995), may at first appear to be in the best interests of such children but on closer examination often re-create and reinforce discriminatory hierarchical divisions within American society. Built on the ethos of a meritocratic elite, these communities or networks may then become another way that one group with relatively greater power than others maintains power over less privileged groups within an increasingly hierarchical, dichotomized, and privatized world. Delpit and King's research, along with the the research on grant-seeking discussed in this article, suggests that if the self-selected or competitively selected networks that private grant giving have helped to shape, support, and celebrate do not consciously examine the ways in which they may be re-creating such hierarchies, they are far more likely to do so. Such networks are far more likely to jeopardize their ability to realize their most cherished goal: to create and institute culturally sensitive and intellectually rigorous educational opportunities for the students they teach.

POTENTIAL BENEFITS AND DRAWBACKS OF GRANT FUNDED PROGRAMS TO URBAN TEACHERS

Benefits

In the Northbridge school system, a small minority of dedicated grant-seekers within the general population of public school teachers has been remarkably successful in receiving grant funded awards on an almost continuous basis. In an urban district where many classrooms lack basic supplies, the classrooms of successful teacher/grantseekers are stocked with thousands, sometimes tens of thousands of dollars in computer equipment, telephone and satellite hook-ups, and in-class libraries of trade books, reference materials, and CD-ROMs (Hill, 1993a, 1993b; Kantrowitz, 1993). In addition to the obvious monetary advantages, such grants carry other dis-

tinct benefits for urban teachers. They promise teachers a measure of relief from the restrictions and bureaucratic roadblocks common to urban schools and the often degrading, unhealthy, and appallingly hazardous conditions that many urban teachers and students endure on a daily basis. A veteran grantseeker comments on the leverage her success in fundraising has given her:

When you go back to the schools you can say to the principal, which you couldn't say before, "No, I won't do that project you want me to do only because of the publicity you want. If you want me to do it, this is the way I want it. Otherwise I won't do it."

Grants provide a system-wide mechanism for publicly recognizing and rewarding those teachers who have successfully competed with their peers with little of the controversy and none of the contractual problems that proposals such as affirmative action, merit pay, and differentiated staffing have elicited. As in other urban districts, competitive grant programs create networks for such Northbridge teachers beyond what is available to them within their individual schools, helping to break down the isolation endemic to teachers' working lives (Lieberman, 1996; Pennell & Firestone, 1996). One veteran teacher discusses the critical role such programs play for veteran teachers in a school system that many teachers perceive as punishing on a daily basis:

I think anybody who can stay in a system that is as dehumanizing as this one is for 25 years and still have energy and ideas and creativity and enthusiasm, to me that's a marvel. They just keep going and I don't know if I could do it without this program.

Through grant funded programs, teachers gain entry into a select group of teachers whom the grants define as exemplary and with whom, as a result of the meetings, receptions, and out-of-state trips that are often compulsory or rewarded as part of these grants, they often develop strong bonds:

If I was going to put it down to a common denominator of all of it, it's a network of support. It's identifying and having an opportunity to talk with teachers who share whether it's a particular philosophy, whether it's a particular goal, whether it's just a commitment to on-going learning for themselves, there's a network of teachers that I have now hooked into. That's probably the most important thing.

A newly hired teacher comments on the difference between her perception of the majority of teachers whom she had encountered in the elementary school in which she was working and those who had been selected to receive grants from a grant funded project. She expresses gratitude for

meeting such teachers and notes how important this discovery is to her desire to remain in urban education:

I think that the first meeting I just looked around the whole entire room and said, “Wow, these are all people who are doing interesting and innovative things in their classrooms.” So there is hope that I can stay. You don’t have to go into your classroom and close your door and keep your mouth shut. Because there are people here who I feel comfortable with, who want to share with me. The project is really the only way that I have of getting that.

Others note the special importance of such networks to women teachers. Despite or perhaps because of the many demands grant funded programs place on teachers in terms of time and commitment to other teachers in the network, they attract an almost exclusively female membership. One woman teacher remarks,

It is almost totally women. Lots of possible reasons. I think women certainly need and want collegiality more than men. Women connect in ways that men often don’t. And we like staying connected to the classroom.

An administrator in the system corroborates this observation:

These people have developed a bond between each other, and with the [female] administrator of the program. They seem to have social interactions, they enjoy much of it. And it’s an extension of what they’re already doing in the classroom. High school teachers, men especially, aren’t looking for the social interaction.

Drawbacks

Successful grantseeking, however, is not without drawbacks for those who participate as well as for those who do not. There is no promise of a stable source of funding for the programs these teachers have developed, no matter how meritorious the programs on which they have worked. At the same time that teachers are increasingly urged to fund special programs for their individual classrooms, clusters, and schools, there has been a reduction or total curtailment of discretionary funds provided by the public school system to teachers for materials and resources that are crucial to such “add ons” (Bean & Loar, 1994; Hart, 1992; Ribadeneira, 1991). Individual teachers may not have the budget to buy even the basal reader mandated by the central administration despite the fact that students are tested and teachers evaluated on the progress students are making in mas-

tering these texts (Johnson, 1997a; Schmidt, 1991). One of the most successful teacher/grantseekers declares:

I write them because I still want to be a good teacher and I want my kids to get a number one education and that's the only way that they're going to get it because the system . . . the city is not going to give me the resources I need, so the only way I'm going to get these types of things in my classroom is to write grants to get them.

The underlying message is that the only way to gain the funds needed to teach effectively is to emulate the latest preferred program and hope to have one's classroom, cluster, or school chosen as a model site, if only for a few years until another program catches the attention of individual funders or central administration, or to create a school of one's own that will make the teacher again eligible for such funds (Instructor, 1997; Leonard, 1992; Winerip, 1993).

In addition, the sheer proliferation of grants coming into a school as well as their conflicting purposes, sponsors, and overlapping timetables often work to undermine and destabilize the work of teachers—both those active in pursuing grants and those who are not—no matter how highly the teachers evaluate the merits of individual programs. Grant funded programs are sensitive to cycles of corporate boom and bust, proliferating when companies and the general economy appear strong and declining during recessions. Even when funds from specific private donors are assured, the grant program itself does not insure that teachers who were awarded grants can carry out the programs for which they received funds, or that they can do so under conditions similar to those existing when the grants were conceived and written. In periods of recurring layoffs and staff displacements interspersed with spurts of intensive hiring to which urban school systems have been particularly susceptible, grants have little or no effect on whether the teachers receiving them will retain their jobs or specific teaching positions.

A principal from the district told of a teacher who received notice of a grant award for a whole school project that she had conceived and spearheaded at the same time that she was reassigned to a different school. Another teacher comments on the bitter lesson she and other teachers in her school learned from that experience, feeling that the administration had encouraged the reassigned teacher to develop the project and write the grant without letting her know that she would probably not retain her position in the school:

When people want to use you they want to use all the labor that you have produced and whatever but when it comes time for any kind of credits or whatever they either take it or when there are problems, they turn around and blame you or don't support you. I just have

been involved in so many things where people's jobs depended on things that I began to read other people's hidden agendas.

Thus, active grantseekers run the real risk of investing a great deal of time and emotional commitment to projects they may never be able to carry out or continue beyond the time frame of the initial grant (Cohen, 1990).

Nor do grants always work to relieve the day-to-day isolation of the classroom teacher from other teachers, a condition long considered endemic to teaching and lamented by researchers, policy analysts, and teachers alike. Some teachers reported that while grantseeking has allowed them to develop strong bonds and alternative communities with other teachers outside of their buildings, it has also worked to distance them from the teachers in their own buildings and grade levels. One schism that has developed is that between those who feel comfortable writing in the particular formal style of grant proposals and have the time to do so, and those who do not. Successful grantseekers, while proud of their ability to pound out a winning grant under the very short turnaround time that characterizes many of these grants, are also uneasy with the notion that a good grant writer is necessarily a good teacher or, more importantly, that a good teacher is necessarily a good grant writer.

People are uncomfortable writing. That doesn't mean they are bad teachers. There is a person in this building who is a terrific teacher but she would never apply for a grant, even though she teaches writing and does a great job of it. Why does this person make all of these expectations for the kids when she won't do it herself?

Another successful grantseeker discusses this seeming paradox, acknowledging how difficult her own initial entry was into grantseeking and why writing to promote one's classroom and oneself is not a natural act for many urban teachers, the great majority of whom come from working-class and lower-middle-class backgrounds like her own. She describes the way in which grantseeking assumes a specific kind of cultural capital that has historically been the hallmark and the road to advancement within middle-class and upper-middle-class, male dominated professional positions—the ability to run meetings and conferences, to prepare publicity packages, to garner publicity for the teacher's program, to market that program, to write effective proposals, and to meet with foundation directors as peers (Bourdieu, 1977). The world of grantseeking has introduced this kind of cultural capital into teaching, establishing its various permutations as the accepted criteria for identifying exemplary teachers and rewarding them as most deserving. Until the advent of such grant giving and grantseeking, this kind of cultural capital was not part of the world of many urban teachers,

who more usually concentrate on day-to-day, emotionally and intellectually engulfing work with children. She explains:

I went out of elementary school to high school to the state teachers college to a classroom and that's where I've stayed and that's where I've poured all my energy—with little kids, day after day. I never went in between that business world or that foundation world that people meet in and that some of the new teachers come from and then usually go back to pretty quickly. So when you're appalled that teachers like me can't write, when you're appalled that we can't speak or run meetings with bigwigs, it's because we've never done it before. And they really only choose a few of us to get the encouragement and the time to do it well enough to feel comfortable. And the worst thing would be to put out that effort, publicly, by going to all these introductory meetings, and then not get the grant.

In particular, teachers discussed the way in which relationships forged between white and African American teachers, relationships that have been tenuous at best in a district characterized by repeated layoffs and dislocations decided on racial lines, are endangered by such competitions and the underlying but never stated assumptions about who is and who isn't a good teacher according to the criteria established by such competitions. This is especially the case when grant programs limit the number of teachers from each building who can receive a grant award during each cycle. One teacher relates a particularly painful realization that she believes is a result of her growing success as a grantseeker, success that is inherently not equally available to all teachers. She describes a mounting tension between herself and another teacher with whom she had previously collaborated on a regular basis:

My relationship with the other teachers, especially Kathy, who I had worked with closely for a long time, really changed once we got those grants. We drifted apart and I sensed a keen competition that I did not want to get into. But there was some kind of competition as to who did it better, who spent more time at it, who would get chosen next. . . . I think people are finally aware of the fact that teachers are really isolated and that compounds the problem. But there is a sense of the have-nots, the ones who haven't bought in or don't have the energy for one reason or another to compete for these grants.

A veteran grantseeker acknowledges these contradictions and conflicts that privately financed, competitive grant programs have created for teachers. While others increasingly identify her as a successful grantseeker and see this as an increase in her status and influence, she continues to define herself primarily as a classroom teacher. She wonders how long she will be

able to sustain this primary identification as the pressure to raise money from private sources increases, when the hallmark of a good teacher becomes the ability to fund-raise rather than educate:

What we're talking about is a fluid moment in how things are done and things are changing. If the state money is coming and going and there's private money that's increasing, it's fluid. At some point it's going to level off and balance, and what's the balance going to be? And will schools have to work as hard to get funding as they do to educate children or will they be able to rely on funding that is there so that they can go off and educate children which is supposed to be the purpose of schools anyway? Or do you end up having to have people who are fundraisers and recruiters when they're supposed to be teaching? Those are the things that I see happening at the moment.

IDEOLOGICAL, POLITICAL, AND ECONOMIC ORIGINS OF GRANTSEEKING TARGETING INDIVIDUAL TEACHERS

Although funding select groups of urban-based teachers to improve urban education on a classroom-by-classroom basis is a common practice among leading corporate and private foundations, only a few years ago this would have seemed quite misguided if not counterproductive by the very institutions now providing such support. In the past decade, several highly publicized national reports identified the teaching force as a major reason for school failure, with high drop-out rates and low test scores in the basic skill areas as documentation of teacher incompetence (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983; Task Force on Education for Economic Growth, 1983; Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy, 1983).

Adding to the seriousness of the charge, these reports—largely financed and/or chaired by prominent representatives of America's major corporations—asserted that the failure of teachers to educate was a major cause of the economic decline and stagnation America was experiencing at the end of the 1970s. Central to their rationale for placing the stagnation and relative decline of U.S. economic preeminence on perceived inadequacies of the public school system was their stated assumption—or at the very least a rationalization they hoped the general public would accept—that the new American workplace was increasingly demanding high level critical thinking skills from the majority of America's workers, and that schools and universities were not providing that kind of education for a critical mass of American workers.

Teachers were held largely responsible for the crisis, especially those working in urban schools. Surprisingly, a few years after these reports were

issued, many of the interest groups that supported their conclusions joined to encourage programs such as school-based management, teacher mentoring, and teacher-to-teacher curriculum development (Holmes Group, 1986; IMPACT II, 1994). Many of the university-based leaders and institutes that developed such programs and the business groups that funded much of the reform movement had not given up the belief that the teaching workforce was inadequate to its task, and most did not challenge the argument that the primary task of schools was to prepare a workforce that would regain America's preeminent global economic role (Kerr, 1983; Sykes, 1983). An important segment, however, opposed the increase in top-down, test-oriented, and rationalized approaches initiated in state legislatures in response to or preceding the national reports, believing these measures useless in addressing teacher inadequacy (David, 1992; Henig, 1994; Kennedy, 1991).

A number of the reports that followed *A Nation at Risk* (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983) focused on the quality of the present, and those needed in the future, teaching workforce (Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy, 1986; Holmes Group, 1986). As the Carnegie report *A Nation Prepared* (1986) declared, without the prerogatives and status that identification with a profession brings, teaching was not able to attract the kind of prospective teachers needed to remedy the current ills of the American educational system and to strike out in the new directions advocated in such reports. The Carnegie report specifically noted the new opportunities available to middle-class women, the lack of which, the report suggested, were the main reason such women had become teachers in previous generations.

Recruiting and retaining prospective teachers from the ranks of such women became a critical element in the movement to reform public education. Guaranteeing autonomy to select groups of such teachers and to individual schools from the dead weight of a bureaucracy characterized as burdensome, meddlesome, unenlightened, and immovable was seen as essential to this campaign. This was seen to be especially important in urban districts, depicted as encumbered with relatively high administrative costs, affirmative action hiring requirements, many different legislative mandates and restrictions, and well-organized, all-powerful unions (Hill, Pierce, & Guthrie, 1997; McDonnell & Pascal, 1988).

So while early programmatic responses to the national reports of the Reagan administration targeted whole school systems, later ones such as the reports published by the Carnegie Foundation and other national foundations have targeted individual schools and individual teachers to circumvent and diffuse the power of central bureaucracies, targeting urban schools in particular as sites for such much needed reform (Farrar & Cipollone, 1988; Foundation Center, 1996). These reform initiatives are predicated on

a belief that all children can learn if their teacher is better prepared and more highly motivated to teach every child to her greatest potential without prejudice or preconceived notions. Some of the researchers supporting this theory added an essential element—the individual school in which she teaches must be organized to allow her to do so. Both teacher and school must have the freedom to exercise the kind of professional judgment that insures effective instruction and learning (Edmonds, 1984; Fine, 1994; Meier, 1995; Purkey & Smith, 1985; Sizer, 1989).

*Role of Foundations and Other Grant-Awarding Bodies
in Developing Competitive Grant Programs*

Crucial to the decentralized philosophy advocated by the effective school and effective teacher movement is a dependency on private funding sources. By the mid-1980s businesses or private foundations began to pay for the great majority of “supplemental” programs that started to mark a school or teacher’s offerings as unique and sustain its better-than-average test scores and other results that prove its status as an “effective” school (Hill, 1993b; Madler, 1996; Robles & Eversley, 1996). As one director of a small magnet school in New York City commented:

Magnets get tons of private contributions. . . . We are a niche within this vast sea of public education. A lot of businesses do not want to give to the traditional big-city school. They see it as throwing money down a well. (Winerip, 1993).

This new wave of private fundings was led in no small part by the business interests that underwrote the national reports. Business interests recognized that additional funds for such “effective” schools were needed. They responded by supporting tax schemes and funding allocations that keep corporate taxes low while giving maximum publicity to individual corporate projects in a limited number of urban schools (Goertz, 1990; Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education, 1990; Molnar, 1997).

Many American companies in recent years have made a crusade of trying to rescue the nation’s deteriorating public schools, casting themselves as white knights whose donations help the cause. But at the same time, many of these companies are extracting as many sizable tax breaks as they can from their communities, cutting off money needed to finance public education. (Celis, 1991)

Funding to the public schools (Council for Aid to Education, 1993) increased dramatically to support these new initiatives. Between 1984 and 1988 the number of business/education initiatives rose 234%—from 42,200 to 140,800 (Branch, 1991). By the 1990s, prominent national corporations

such as the Annenberg Foundation and the Lila Wallace/Reader's Digest Foundation began awarding unprecedented large sums of money to fund comprehensive plans in a number of cities across the country, combining large-scale system-wide reform efforts with individual school and teacher awards (Foundation Center, 1996).

Through the grant award programs provided by such foundations and other school/business partnerships, businesses—at least to their own satisfaction—have proven their commitment to education and willingness to nurture a group within their own ranks with proprietary and vested interests in continuing and increasing business influence in the schools. At the same time, grant-funded projects, taken as a whole, have developed a track record as major players in education—beyond the “narrow vocationalism” of the past when companies supported projects that directly served their own purposes (Business and the Public Schools Committee for Economic Development, 1985; Molnar, 1997; Weisman, 1992).

As such funding patterns have accelerated, they have moved from the outer limits of the educational world to the center of educational debate and program development. Competitive grant-award programs have thus become a major means of identifying, publicizing, and developing new programs in schools, following the guidelines established by the awarding foundations or agencies. The grantseeking process now provides a mechanism by which foundations, for a limited amount of money, can decide exactly how many schools, school systems, and/or teachers they will fund, at what level of funding, and toward which goals. Using the *modus operandi* of venture capitalists operating in the private sector, these foundations retain the ability to shift funds quickly from one project to another “hotter” project or teacher as interest in the now established program wanes—“just in time production” on a classroom-by-classroom, teacher-by-teacher, level.

Having acknowledged the resistance that organized teachers' groups have sustained against merit pay, differentiated staffing, and affirmative action in Northbridge—all defined as stifling the autonomy and creativity of gifted teachers—the business community has greatly amplified the availability of competitive grants to individual teachers (Foundation Center, 1996; Leonard, 1992; Lobman, 1992), thereby creating such hierarchies unofficially and without resistance. Grantseeking has thus become a well organized and accepted way for specific groups of urban teachers to translate the entrepreneurial model and cultural milieu of middle-class professionalism into their own teaching situations.

The Enterprise of Grantseeking: Packaging and Marketing the “Product”

As Leonard (1992) points out, the fiscal structure of private foundations (and the tax laws that established them) create a strong incentive for private

and corporate foundations to seek new projects and abandon old ones, no matter how meritorious they have proven to be. She writes,

Foundations generally have a stable endowment and, therefore, a stable income, so that in order to fund new programs, they must discontinue old programs. This fact helps explain why most grants are restricted to two to five years, and why projects rather than institutions are the major beneficiaries of foundation help.

In order to comply with such financial and legal requirements, foundations structure grant-funded competitions as a means of discovering ever new programs and product lines, much like corporations seeking new or enhanced product lines as a means of capturing new markets or retaining an existing client base. The majority of these grant competitions therefore ask teachers to compete not as classroom teachers but as curriculum developers. Given the limited time teachers have to develop these projects and the competing demands on their time, much of the material submitted as part of a teacher's curriculum project is that developed by a variety of sources, gathered and shaped by the teacher/demonstrator. Teachers are, however, required to describe these units as ones for which they can claim sole ownership, valorizing origination over adaptation and collaboration and having the simple good sense of being able to recognize good material and teach it effectively. In order to compete successfully in these contests and be identified as a successful teacher, they must adopt the strategies and writing style of the successful marketer and entrepreneur and cast other teachers in the role of prospective consumers searching for "ready made" goods.

Nor are teachers always free to use the money as they might wish to use it, despite the oft-repeated rhetoric that private funds allow teachers and schools to develop programs to meet the needs that have been identified within the school by school staffs. Rather, teachers often feel the pressure to satisfy the "agendas," as they call them, of powerful private funding sources whose priorities as leaders in the field of school reform may compel them to establish goals quite different from those that would be set by the individual school or classroom teacher. One veteran teacher remarks:

A lot of these grants have their own agendas and their own guidelines of what they want to have. Right now this fund wants their new grants to have a curricular component where they basically, not sell it, but it can be replicated. And I'm not sure that we need money in our school for that kind of thing. It's complicated. Yes, we want money for science, but no, we don't really want the money to write curriculum for other programs but to develop our programs here and convince teachers here to use them.

An entire industry has sprung up to meet the needs of school staff who wish to or are forced to participate in grantseeking. Grantseekers' guides for teachers and newly hired school development directors are now available. In the state in which Northbridge is located, the state's professional development office conducts a two-day grantsmanship institute specifically geared to teachers and individual school staffs. The institute provides workshops on how to search for grants, how to write successful grants, how to establish tax-exempt entities, and how to approach interested funders. Conspicuously missing is any critique of such funding patterns or the connections between the private foundations who fund these grants and their histories of fighting progressive tax programs.

PROJECT IMAGINE: THE GRANTSEEKER'S POINT OF ENTRY

Program Imagine⁵ is the major source of funds for Northbridge teachers as well as the stepping stone to more remunerative state and national grant competitions. The locally based program is part of a nationally disseminated model program for the professional development of teachers that was introduced in 1980 in a number of large city school systems, county-wide school systems, and states through the initiative and backing of major corporate foundations, joined by community based and local foundations. At present, there are over 15 sites nationwide, with many suburban sites added to the urban sites initially part of the network.

The Northbridge public school system received its first grant in this program from a local private foundation in 1983, awarding the first grants in 1984 for the school year 1985–86. These grants, each worth \$500, were awarded to teachers to demonstrate curriculum they had developed to other teachers who would then write proposals, worth \$250, to adapt the curricula. This demonstrator/adaptor professional development program has continued to award at least one cycle of grants each school year, with a minimum of 200 teachers participating in each cycle. Staff time is contributed by the city's central school administration as a form of in-kind contribution.

Seven hundred ninety-seven teachers working in the city (19% of all teachers) received at least one grant during the seven-year period of grant giving for which data was collected. The data suggest that those who received the largest number of the more highly paying demonstrator grants are drawn disproportionately from white teachers, those whose native language is English, and those who are graduates of private institutions of higher education. This was also the case among the teachers who received the largest number of grants, both as adaptors and demonstrators. Of 33 teachers (4%) who received the most money,

- 85% were white, compared to 65% within the general teacher population of the city;
- 15% were African Americans, compared to 25% within the general city teacher population; and
- 1% were a native speaker of a language other than English, compared to 10% of native speakers of languages other than English within the general teacher population in the school system.⁶

Table 1 presents an overview of the number of teachers who received such grants and the cumulative dollar value of the grants they received. It documents the number of times teachers received grants from the largest program to award grants to individual teachers in the system for the seven years when data were collected. Teachers received either adaptor grants worth \$250 or demonstrator grants worth \$500. In a number of those years, more than one cycle of grants was awarded.

As Table 1 shows, while a considerable number of teachers were awarded grants in the program at some time since its inception, the great majority received between one and two grants valued between \$250 and \$750. A much smaller percentage received a far greater number of grants with a considerably larger cash value. In other words, 507 teachers, as a group, received a little over \$125,000 in grant money from the program while 33 teachers, as a group, received \$66,000 based on a conservative estimate, \$80,000 by a less conservative estimate. In a system starved for resources, the grant program exacerbated divisions between resource rich and resource poor classrooms, no matter how valuable the advice and guidance teachers exchanged amongst each other.

In addition, the teachers receiving the highest number of grants for the seven-year period moved from teaching in over twenty different schools to teaching in fewer than six different schools. According to the interview data collected for this study, the network created among most active grant-seekers was a major factor for the steady concentration of resources in a

Table 1. Number of times teachers received grants from Program Imagine and the amount of money they received

	Once	Twice	3×	4×	5×	6×	7×+
# of teachers	507	166	65	26	16	9	8
% of all grants	64%	21%	8%	3%	2%	1%	1%
\$ value	250	500– 750	750– 1,250	1,000– 1,750	1,750– 2,000	2,000– 3,000	2,500– 4,000

small number of schools during that period. Active teacher/grantseekers alerted their fellow grantseekers of prospective openings and actively lobbied for their hiring, pointing out the many resources they could bring to the building and the prospects of future success in grantseeking that would further strengthen the entire school's standing in such competitions. These schools also had a smaller percentage of teachers of color on their faculty than the median in the district as a whole and a smaller percentage of low income students (Division of Research and Evaluation, 1996). The concentration of resources through awarding grants to individual teachers calls into question the ability of such grant-funded programs to promote and sustain system-wide reform, a much touted goal and justification for such award competitions (Mann, 1983; Olson, 1993).

The demographic profile of the 33 teachers who received the most grants suggests the way in which private grant giving exacerbates race and class inequality for teachers and students within this urban district. Of the 17 teachers who received at least six grants from the individual grant program from whose statistics Table 1 was created, 13 were white, 3 were African American, and 1 was Latina. All were women. Many of these teachers were chosen by the grant administrator to participate in national and regional grant activities that provide entry to more prestigious state and national awards providing sabbaticals, travel stipends, and specialized class support. Of the eight teachers who received seven or more grants, six (two African American teachers, one Latina teacher and three white teachers) received undergraduate degrees from selective private institutions and two received doctoral degrees from selective private institutions. While information on the colleges from which teachers were graduated was not available for most teachers who received grants, other studies of public school teachers suggest that the overwhelming majority of teachers teaching in urban centers and in this district specifically received their undergraduate and master's degrees from local public, non-selective institutions (Board of Education, 1991; Kennedy, 1991).

Other factors played an important role in shaping the community of active successful teacher/grantseekers within the urban district. Grant-seeking, like teaching, is labor intensive. According to the data drawn from a previous study on grant-funded programs (Freedman, 1989), most active teacher/grantseekers are childless single women teachers or parents of older children and enjoy the substantial amount of discretionary time required for participation in these contests. In order to compete for the \$250 adaptor award granted by Project Imagine, teachers first had to attend a fair in which teachers who had previously received a demonstrator grant presented their curricula and discussed the way they would be working with adaptors. Once they received the \$250, they were required to fill out several budgetary forms, send in all their receipts, attend at least two all-day public

meetings and four half-day meetings with their demonstrators, and write up a short account to be published in the program's newsletter describing what the grant allowed them to accomplish. Those who were awarded \$500 were required to complete a longer application and attend all the meetings of the adaptors as well as two additional ones to prepare as a group for the dissemination fair. They also attended a compulsory day-long, individually tailored individual consultation with a teacher with extensive private sector experience in marketing educational materials to help them sharpen their presentations for the dissemination fair in which prospective adaptors chose the projects they wished to adapt.

Teachers described such demands as excessive, especially when many of these grants awarded between \$200 and \$250. One teacher felt that such requirements demonstrated a fundamental disrespect for even those teachers the funders were publicly touting in their press releases as especially worthy urban teachers:

If you did it hourly, it's like blood money. How many hours you put in just going to meetings for \$200. I always found that the mandatory sharing meetings were how someone thought how we're supposed to be earning the money. And I thought, "Aren't we earning it by what we're doing with it in the class? Not after school, being here on a clock."

Other teachers understood these demands as reinforcing traditional male/female gender norms, despite their official celebration of the new, "professionalized," gender neutral teacher.

I got to laughing with some teachers who were were talking about the old vision of the single unmarried woman being a school teacher. And I finally figured out why that still makes so much sense. Because we can exhaust ourselves working on these proposals and projects because we don't have to run home and take care of our own kids and families. And so our professional lives are a little bigger than a lot of other people's.

For many teachers who do have family or community commitments, the out-of-classroom, weekend and nighttime demands required in order to receive such grants often preclude their participation no matter how well qualified they might otherwise be. An upper level administrator in the district explained how such time intensive and group intensive demands greatly minimize the participation of male teachers in such programs, especially when the grant money is minimal and can be used solely for classroom use, not as a supplement to teachers' salaries. Male teachers, she explained, primarily work in the high schools and are far more likely to be married heads of households than women teachers. To supplement the

income they receive as teachers as well as to add a male identified job to that of the female identified job as teacher, many have a second, after school job. They have neither time nor incentive to participate in such programs.

High school teachers, especially the men, seem to put a dollar value on their time. And I think the high school teachers look at it and think about the amount of time and commitment and they decide they don't want to do it. Plus they really don't want to mentor any one else in an organized way, other than working maybe one on one with a student teacher they've selected themselves.

A male teacher confirmed this view, noting that he was making an exception by participating in the regional grant program for two very good reasons, from his perspective. The cash value of the grant was quite substantial and the money came in the form of a supplement to his salary.

This looked very good in terms of the money and the time. I am always looking for money to supplement my teaching income so I don't have to work during the summer. And this only took two weeks.

Teachers of color, both male and female, are particularly affected. According to the statewide census of teachers conducted in 1990 (Board of Education, 1991) teachers of color are younger on average than white teachers and are more likely to be actively parenting young children. Grant-funded competitions such as Project Imagine obscure these results by not collecting or distributing the profile of such teacher groups while, in the case of the local Project Imagine described in this study, they continue to showcase the same teachers of color who are consistently successful in these grant competitions. By doing so, the program not only creates the impression that it works to represent the teaching staffs of the district or region as a whole but that it is actually going beyond mandated requirements to create equal opportunity and redress discriminatory hiring and resource allocation patterns.

Data analyzed from a statewide program that selected teachers for participation in a selective academy for teachers designed to create a network of teacher leaders throughout the state corroborated this finding (Freedman, 1994). The program granted larger awards than Project Imagine and connected teachers to a national network of such academies throughout the country. Eight percent of the teachers were people of color. The African American teachers from Northbridge who participated in the academy were the three who had received the most grants from Project Imagine. Not a single nonnative speaker of English participated as a member of the academy. This omission is especially apparent because the region has a growing percentage of students enrolled in bilingual classes and several of

its bilingual programs are nationally recognized. In fact, some of the notable bilingual programs were represented in the academy, but by teachers who were native speakers of English.

THE CASE STUDY OF A SUCCESSFUL GRANTSEEKER

The following case study analyzes the impact of grantseeking on active teacher/grantseekers, locating one teacher's experience within the world of grantseeking and foundation funding in particular. I present Maria Santos' experience as a grantseeker because it brings into clearest relief, and thus best illustrates, the sharpest contradictions and greatest dilemmas teachers face as grantseekers. At first, the success Maria Santos has had as a grantseeker would appear to validate the position presented by private foundations that the competitive grant process, by providing incentives for urban teachers to compete in grant competitions, and awarding the best grantseekers among them with a continual stream of grant awards, services, and recognition, demonstrates the foundations' stated commitments to increase opportunities and provide greater equity in education for historically oppressed groups in society. It would also seem to demonstrate the claims of the privatization movement in general that competition and a market-based system will "enable teachers and principals to concentrate on making schools more effective. It will also enhance the range of public school options available to families and provide far higher levels of educational equality than now characterize much of American schooling" (Hill, Pierce, & Guthrie, 1997).

The Role of Border Crossers in Grantseeking

However, a more careful analysis drawn from the series of interviews I conducted with Maria Santos and other teachers in which we discussed these issues extensively illustrates a more complex, contradictory effect. A Latina, Maria Santos teaches Latino students in bilingual special education classrooms. By virtue of her teaching position and language of origin, she represents groups that have historically been excluded from power and privilege in American society. However, unlike most bilingual teachers working in the system, she is also from a highly educated middle-class family and is a graduate of a private, selective higher education institution.⁷ These circumstances have provided her, unlike most veteran Latino and many African American and nonnative English speaking teachers working in the school system, with certain forms of economic and cultural capital. Such forms of capital are more regularly available to groups that historically have maintained positions of power and privilege within American society and are the most closely aligned with the professional/managerial class (Board

of Education, 1991; Ehrenreich & Ehrenreich, 1979). In the case study, I discuss how grant-funded competitions continually attract and reward teachers from high status groups while marginalizing the contribution of teachers like Maria Santos when they choose to emphasize their identification and commitment to historically oppressed communities. I also discuss why the majority of teachers working in inner city schools are peripheral to or very much removed from grantseeking and the community of teachers it fosters.

The case study also demonstrates how grantseeking is dependent on the participation of teachers from historically oppressed groups within the United States such as Maria Santos, albeit a small percentage within the larger group of successful teacher/grantseekers, in order to legitimize grantseeking within the wider teaching and educational community as a means of addressing long-standing inequities and community concerns. Teachers from historically oppressed groups who are best positioned to receive such grants, who appear most amenable to the goals and aspirations of the foundations awarding such grants and other forms of privatizing public education, are by the nature of their complex social positions exceptions to the general rule and "border crossers" (Anzaldúa, 1987). Border crossers bridge the gaps between the very different and often antagonistic worlds of privilege and oppression found within and outside of schools in very public and personally assertive ways. As Collins (1991) argues in the case of black women academics, rewards allocated to such border crossers are designed to maintain rather than contest the status quo.

One way of excluding the majority of Black women from the knowledge-validation process is to permit a few Black women to acquire positions of authority in institutions that legitimate knowledge and to encourage them to work within the taken-for-granted assumptions of Black female inferiority shared by the scholarly community and the culture at large. Those Black women who accept these assumptions are likely to be rewarded by their institutions, often at significant personal cost. Those challenging the assumptions run the risk of being ostracized. (Collins, 1989)

Grantseeking, I contend, has introduced the costs and tensions Collins describes as experienced by border crossers within academia to the world of public elementary and secondary schools. Grantseeking can be lonely, it can be schizophrenic, as well as empowering and creative for a teacher such as Maria Santos. Possibly because she *is* a border crosser, at times she was able to transcend the limitations of grantseeking in ways not envisioned nor intended by those awarding the grants. At other times she was not. The case study attempts to illustrate the complexity of her situation.

Clearly, Maria Santos' experience cannot represent that of all other active grantseekers. Yet it is a particularly telling example of the conflicts and contradictions the phenomenon of grantseeking represents for urban school teachers, even for those most successful in this new role. I hope that a discussion of her experience invites a dialogue about teachers' grantseeking and other forms of competitively based funding for schools. I encourage teachers to tell their own stories and raise their own questions about the role of grantseeking in teachers' lives and its influence on the movement to privatize public school education in the United States.

Case Study of a Successful Grantseeker

Maria Santos has been teaching for over 15 years, all within the public schools of Northbridge. During the last five of those years, she has been writing grants. Within that relatively short period of time she has developed an impressive track record, starting with small grants of \$250 for classroom materials for adapting another teacher's project, then moving on to \$750 grants for disseminating curriculum packages in her own classroom and a year-long sabbatical to travel to schools throughout the state demonstrating a special-needs science program. While the school system itself does not routinely provide enough paper and pencils for her class to get through the first half of the year, the cash value of the funds she has received for classroom supplies totals over \$4,000, not including the computer, printer, and modem she was awarded several years ago. The National Science Foundation grant proposal on which she was working at the time of our first interview, which she later would be successful in obtaining, was for a second sabbatical, one that would allow her to research ways in which science curricula could be adapted to bilingual classrooms, with the intention of adapting classroom materials for national dissemination.

Initially Maria entered the world of grantseeking for several reasons. Despite a master's degree in education and science, the only job she could get in the school system was as a temporary teacher's aide, part of a team in which her responsibility was to speak Spanish to the students in several teachers' classrooms. The system had recently come under court order to hire more minority teachers, having refused to hire any but a very small number of minority teachers for many years. Its response was to grant such teachers provisional positions, which made them the most vulnerable for "bumping" from other teachers.

In her third year in the system, Maria accepted the system's offer of a position as the full-time teacher in a bilingual special education class. Along with all the other special education classrooms in the school, her classroom was physically separated from the rest of the school—literally down in the basement. Maria points out the way special education place-

ments were used to continue segregating teachers and students despite court-ordered desegregation:

My classroom which was all Hispanic kids who were labeled behavior problem kids was across the hall from the black kids who were also labeled behavior problems who had a black teacher and all the special needs kids were in that hall, the severely handicapped kids over there. And all these teachers were the most wonderful people. It was an amazing education in segregation and the power of individuals to do things in the context of the chaos and the social system.

Project Imagine transformed this situation by giving her the permission, the encouragement, the guidance, and the money to introduce a multidisciplinary exercise class using dance and music from the Caribbean islands to teach subjects as far ranging as mathematics and biology. An “Anglo” bilingual teacher—a teacher whose native language was English—approached Maria from among the bilingual faculty. In order for the Anglo teacher to continue to receive funds as a “demonstrator” she had to prove that other bilingual teachers were interested in writing “adaptor” grants based on the Anglo teacher’s curriculum. The Anglo teacher asked if Maria would be interested in submitting a proposal to adapt a Project Imagine project that teacher had developed in her own bilingual classroom.

Actually my first grant was supported by another teacher who had already gotten quite a few grants and I think that I was able to connect with her because I am very fluent in English. So, probably my connection with the English language and the English culture made it easier for me to do grant writing to begin with.

The teacher gave Maria a copy of her own grant, showed her how to write the proposal, and read Maria’s grant before it was submitted. The Anglo teacher also served on the team reviewing the proposals for the funding source.

From marginalized bilingual teacher to successful grantseeker. Maria also notes that none of the other bilingual teachers were given a similar invitation—most of them were more veteran teachers than Maria but had received their education outside of the United States and had little experience writing extended reports in English. None of these teachers were part of the network of grantseeking teachers, being seen as outside the definition of those for whom such grants were intended.

Probably the whole nature of bilingual programs not being mainstreamed programs affects teachers’ view of themselves in our community and what they can do. . . . For example, the English speaking

teachers would have more of a network of people who would say, “Oh, do this, do that.”

Anglo bilingual teachers, on the other hand, were far more comfortable conducting formal and informal school business in English than in Spanish. The Anglo teacher was not used to speaking in Spanish even in bilingual department meetings, let alone in one-on-one conversations on such matters as grants for classroom resources.

Receiving the grant, especially one that was coupled with the work of the most successful teacher/grantseeker in the building, identified Maria throughout the school community as someone with initiative and creative teaching ideas, providing a new orientation toward her work, different from that of the other special education and bilingual teachers. The award and the attendant publicity also shifted her identity within the school community, from a bilingual special education teacher to a successful grantseeker, a description that up to then had only included white teachers whose native language was English.

Conflicts arise. Maria soon moved on to the more remunerative part of the grant program—serving as a demonstrator. Through this program she received over \$1,000 to expand the program she had begun as an adaptor and disseminate it to other teachers, thus moving from novice teacher to mentor to regular education and bilingual teachers alike. Maria’s new status encouraged her to confront school-wide inequities. At first the principal had been encouraging, publicizing her grant awards. Her obvious ability to work with students whom other teachers had regarded as uneducable had made her a valuable teacher within the school. Soon the recognition she received outside of the school through the grant program encouraged her to publicly contest the inherent segregation within her own teaching situation. She quickly learned that the high status she enjoyed as a successful grantseeker quickly dropped away once she began to address issues of discrimination. Now she was identified as taking a political, hence, nonprofessional stance.

I was told my confrontative attitude—questioning why special education and especially bilingual special education was so isolated from the rest of the school—was one that was not appreciated and was troublesome for the school. I don’t think I would go that route now but at the time when the issues were critical, when it wasn’t permissible for bilingual teachers to speak Spanish outside the classroom, then I felt that it was the only way to go. Within a year I left the school, it got to be too much.

Successful grantseekers as valuable commodities. The pattern of initial encouragement by the principal, followed by a period of wariness between him and Maria, continued. After each major grant-awarded sabbatical, Maria was assigned to a different school, transferring with her all of the considerable resources she had gathered as a result of her grantseeking. During the past five years, she has worked in three buildings, alternating between working within a single school for a year and disseminating or researching curriculum projects on a state-wide or national basis for a year. Principals aggressive in the search for model programs and grants sought her out at the end of each grant cycle not because of the program for which she had been awarded her sabbatical, but for her potential as a grantseeker, a reason increasingly important in the world of grantseeking. A teacher who can write successful grant proposals is extremely valuable to a school as long as she is willing to write grants for school-wide programs along with ones for her own classroom. Maria's principals have steered grant applications her way and have encouraged her to read over samples of successful grant applications compiled in a resource library. Maria notes:

Generally, the principal says, "Look, here's a grant. Look, here's a grant." And two days later, boom, there's a grant. They're like nothing.

Another reason Maria is valuable to principals and foundations alike is the type of student she teaches—"bilingual students" as categorized by the school system's system of classification. Foundations frequently state their interest in increasing the diversity of the students whom these grants are ultimately designed to benefit. More importantly, they are well aware of the importance of a public campaign that identifies them with supporting the educational needs of populations traditionally excluded from educational gains—African American, Latino, and bilingual being the largest categories of such students—as well as supporting those who have been excluded from the upper level positions within their own workforces in any significant numbers. Making sure that teachers who work in schools with large numbers of these students is a crucial, major reason why urban teachers are encouraged to apply to such funding programs.

Pressure to standardize product, approach, and persona. At the same time, the applications accompanying such programs require all teachers to standardize their approach so that they will appeal to as broad a group of teachers as possible, substantiating the claims for the grant program that they are reaching a broad cross-section of teachers. In most school systems—urban, suburban and rural—this means white teachers from lower-middle-class and middle-class backgrounds. The administrator appointed by the school system to oversee the grant declares:

We want to make sure that teachers feel comfortable adapting other teachers' projects, so we don't want anything too complicated or too specific, something that has the best chance of success—getting other teachers to come out and sign on to this. The adaptability quotient is very important, we look for that.

Paradoxically, teachers are also encouraged to use strategies borrowed from private sector marketing to describe their project as unique and guaranteed to solve a myriad of teaching concerns. Marie recognizes her own cynicism in preparing her applications and in coming up with a catchy title that will entice as well as reassure as many prospective teacher/adapters as possible.

You know they want you to say “whole language,” or “multicultural education,” so you stick those things in but nobody really talks about what they mean. And I do do that kind of teaching, but what I really do in my particular classroom is not what I put in the grant, because I've learned that other teachers don't feel comfortable doing them or can't do them, they're not Latino or they're not from the community or whatever.

The marginalization of bilingual grantseekers. Adding to the homogeneity of projects submitted through grant applications and the teachers who submit them is the fact that most grant programs do not allow bilingual participants to write grant applications in the language in which they teach or award teachers who can write well in both languages, a requirement that would be as difficult for many Anglo bilingual teachers to meet as it would be for other bilingual teachers. While a number of bilingual teachers are among the most successful grantseekers, moving on to other far more prestigious and remunerative programs, Maria is among the few who are native speakers of Spanish, among the few who are bicultural as well as bilingual. Maria attended United States schools starting in the sixth grade in upper-middle-class school systems and private universities, unlike the great majority of bilingual teachers working in the city who did not go to school in English-dominated environments and who come from working-class backgrounds.

Something that's very important to consider is that it's very difficult to be an expert in two languages. So, probably my connection with the English language and the English culture made it easier for me to do grantwriting to begin with.

Maria also comments that language is only one reason native speakers of Spanish do not apply for such grants, beyond the few entry level ones

specifically targeted for bilingual populations. Notions of gender, culture, and the structural location of bilingual education in schools work against the participation and recognition of Latina bilingual teachers in these grant programs, beyond the entry level.

Quite possibly, other influences might be assertiveness issues with regard to the workplace for women. Latina women, you know, this whole thing about speaking out, that could be it.

Despite the continued success Maria has had in competitive award programs designed to disseminate the bilingual and bicultural programs she has developed within her classroom on a state-wide basis, she has never been able to demonstrate them to teachers in the buildings to which she has been assigned, all of which have a large bilingual population, other than on a one-shot or informal basis. The very aggressiveness of the principals with whom she has worked and who encouraged her to develop the programs for which she has received state-wide and national recognition have propelled them out of their principalships into upper level administrative positions. Her new principals have little interest in her previously funded award winning programs. Having already been funded, they are no longer useful for attracting money to Maria's new school. New grants demand new models. Nor have any of the foundations or agencies for whom she submits grants asked to see these programs. Instead, Maria offers professional development courses before school or during the teachers' breaks in fulfillment of school-wide proposals written before she entered the school. As a special education teacher, she is not responsible for a single classroom of students throughout an entire day, but has more flexibility and discretion in setting her own schedule, and so has some unscheduled time to provide support to other teachers in the building.

Grantseeker as mentor for new teachers and competitor. Maria frequently seeks out teachers she sees during the day, encouraging them to enter the world of grantseeking by writing grants for the relatively small amounts available to teachers who are just starting out in this new venture. In addition, Maria herself continues to apply to these same grant programs, which unwittingly places her in direct competition with these same teachers. Grant competitions remain the only way she can touch base with teachers on a city-wide basis, maintain her activity in the more modestly based programs that serve as stepping stones to the larger ones, and provide classroom based materials, supplies, and ideas on a regular basis. The system itself funds no professional development programs to individuals or to groups, relying solely on grant-funded programs, either publicly or privately sponsored.

Creation of self-selecting networks. Along with the proposals for direct funds for materials for use or to provide a salary for her own research or work with other teachers, Maria has also written or collaborated on a substantial number of school-wide proposals, hearing about them through the extensive personal and formal networks available to successful teacher/grantwriters. She is on the mailing lists of numerous local, state, and national granting agencies, all of which send out RFPs (requests for proposals). Many publish newsletters alerting their readers in advance to upcoming funding possibilities and providing strategies for successful grantwriting. Some conduct yearly workshops on grantwriting for teachers. Knowing ahead of time that a grant announcement is imminent is particularly important in light of the fact that many of the grants are announced only weeks before they are due, or require teachers to arrange their summer or weekend schedules with only a few weeks' notice. The advance notice, along with the fact that Maria is single, allows her the flexibility not available to many other teachers who cannot rearrange their family lives on short notice, especially since programs often do not notify the teacher if she has been selected to participate until close to the time the workshop is scheduled to start.

Having been chosen by many agencies as a successful grantwriter, Maria is often asked to serve on their review panels, gaining additional information and exposure about the world of grants and grantseeking. These same grant awarding agencies and foundations often turn to such teachers and administrators when the foundations announce a new grant competition, soliciting their submissions in order to insure that they will receive applications from individual schools and teachers with successful track records in grantseeking. Informally, Maria is part of a phone chain of other successful teacher/grantseekers and administrators whom she has met through the grantseeking process. They alert each other about upcoming deadlines and serve as first readers of each others' proposals. As competition for grants intensifies, teachers like Maria seek out other teachers with proven track records in grant writing in order to maximize their own chances of winning the requests of funders to develop grants based on team teaching and collaborative school-based models. These collaborations are the result of a recent trend on the part of foundations to award grants to individual school sites, clusters, or teams with the greatest potential to realize the strategies of those identified as effective schools.

This is in rather stark contrast to the reticence Maria feels in talking with most of the other teachers in her building about the grants she is asked to write by her principal, or the ones she herself is writing even if those grants require the participation of other teachers. The large number of grant opportunities encourages multiple submissions, once someone has mastered the techniques of grant writing. Maria makes the point that no matter what the grant program has targeted as its focus, the applications are

similar in form and substance so that she is tempted continually to write one more grant, having invested time in producing a template from which she can draw or revise for additional submissions.

Disempowerment/empowerment, isolation/community. Despite her mastery of the grant-writing process, the cumulative work load of multiple grant submissions makes finding time to discuss them with the other teachers in her school extremely difficult. Once each grant is handed in, the very uncertainty of the process, combined with the possible combined effects they might have on the other teachers, makes her reluctant to discuss them with other teachers.

I'm aware that teachers think that there's already too much going on, so they don't want to know about any new programs or anything, they just want to be left alone, and I don't want to be someone who's going to bring them another burden. After the proposal is written and handed in who knows if you'll get it or not so there isn't any discussion.

The result is a contradiction: while each grant by itself may have been intended and in theory could empower teachers, together their effect feels the opposite—for the grant writer as well as the teachers for whom the grants are principally intended.

I don't know what it's going to be like in the school once all these grants start coming in because they'll start coming in, I bet you. It's funny, because a lot of the proposals that I write have an empowering focus in terms of serving minority kids and being school-based but it doesn't work out that way, not the way you'd want it to work out. . . . And I'm not going to be here because I've written my own grant.

Moreover, Maria's success outside the classroom has prevented her from maintaining a sense of community and cultural identity within the schools in which she has taught even when the individual grants on which she is working have as their focus introducing or strengthening that culture. Successful grantseekers are required to spend more and more time with other successful grantseekers, whose cultural capital and middle-class orientation support their work as teacher/grantseekers in contrast to the culture and interests of poor inner city communities of color and immigrant communities.

People see you some way or they think, "Oh yeah, she got a grant for working on Hispanic literature or whatever" . . . but people don't know what I'm about really even though I do workshops and I do all these things. There's not a sense of knowing about what I can contribute to the system and I've been in it for almost 15 years. . . .

Yet the very nature of grantseeking isolates the few teachers of color and those from linguistic minority communities from the great majority of teachers who come from similar linguistic or cultural backgrounds and have community based, rather than professionally oriented interests. Maria's success as a grantseeker within the general teacher culture has made it more difficult for her to voice the concerns of her own Latino community, despite the fact that it is her very identification as a Latina and her grounding in that culture that makes her valuable to the mainstream, mostly white community.

That's one of the very big cultural differences between that community and today. . . . People see you in my community and here, you feel like people don't see you. I often have the experience that I'm part of a group that's working on something that I believe in. I've been asked to do the writing in Spanish and every time I say I disagree they don't want to hear it, they don't want to hear it. You can't express conflict with them. All you can do is go, "Oh, my God, I'm going to pull back. How little can I handle and still be part of the group?" because I can't get these kinds of issues addressed, you know. It's "pull back, pull back" to the extent where you can survive in it and still not compromise yourself. If you do try, you might not be asked again. Then you're out of it.

The work to which Maria retreats—research on the origins of scientific understanding within Latino and indigenous cultures—unequivocally recenters her on the ways those cultures differ from and contest the dominant European culture. The year-long grant she has received from a corporate-sponsored foundation will allow her to do such research. Maria is clearly thrilled about the opportunities the new grant will provide for her to delve more directly and intensely into these cultures and translate what she has learned in materials she can use within her own classrooms and, perhaps, within those of other teachers. At the same time, the isolation and destabilization Maria has felt as a result of these experiences continually refocuses her on her classroom, the one place where she has been able to develop a community and unequivocally claim her identity as a bicultural Latina teacher. Grants originally were Maria's vehicle for ending the isolation she felt as a bilingual special education classroom teacher. Ironically, Maria periodically returns to that same isolation as a result of a different kind of isolation she experiences as a grantseeker.

Whatever I do in my classroom as a result of these grants is for my kids, but it's a little island. And that's why it's so frustrating, because it is a little island. It's powerful and it's not powerful.

CONCLUSION

The funding sources that award the grants, the general public, and to some extent teachers themselves have come to accept Maria Santos and other successful teacher/grantseekers as models of the “good” professional teacher. Such teachers combine the entrepreneurial spirit of competitive individualism with an old-fashioned devotion to meeting the needs of the pupils under their charge—the new professional woman combined, and in harmony, with the selfless, caring public servant and mother substitute. Teacher/grantseekers have been featured in newspaper articles, interviewed, and analyzed for research projects and evaluation studies (Kantrowitz, 1993). Through the sponsorship of the grant programs and other competitions fostering other new reform initiated roles for teachers, many have established networks of other successful teacher/grantseekers they have met in national and regional conventions sponsored by the funders of these privately funded programs. They have come to demand that their voices be heard in shaping and leading workshops and programs directed at teachers, with the expectation that they will play a central role in teacher development and school improvement projects (IMPACT II, 1994). At the same time their position within their individual schools or districts is by no means stable, let alone assured.

None of these new roles as yet has officially and substantially removed the grantseekers from the classroom, but the trend is there, at least for a limited number of them. Dedicated teacher/grantseekers in this city school system spend more and more of their time both in and out of school doing what successful grantseekers do—researching what grants are available; consulting with various groups of people with whom they can collaborate on grants or from whom they can gain advice, expertise, encouragement, and information crucial to their success as grantseekers; writing the grant applications; organizing and participating in programs funded by grants; and preparing final reports.

Most of the dedicated teacher/grantseekers now leave their classrooms at least two days a month as part of their involvement in grant-funded programs. A number of them leave more frequently or for long periods of time. Maria Santos, for example, has been on a grant-funded sabbatical two out of the past four years. Active grantseekers recognize that if they remove themselves from the “loop” of grantseeking they will be left with few alternatives for providing the sustenance they now see as essential to their identity as successful teachers and a means of participating in the camaraderie and resource sharing such programs provide. “You are only as good as your last grant,” commented one teacher.

The grant-funded projects for which these teachers receive release time are often incorporated into larger university-initiated grant pro-

grams. Funders have begun to require researchers to document their working relationships with teachers as well as show that the projects in the grant have been developed with the active participation of teachers and to demonstrate that teachers have a sense of ownership and control over the actual activities of the grant. Unlike the university and private sector participants, however, teachers are not paid to write grants. Time spent on writing grants and participation in grant-funded activities often means an overload for them, time taken away from teaching, or more commonly, expended on weekends and late at night after their teaching and family responsibilities are finished. There are virtually no planning grants available to K–12 teachers. At the same time, the presence of student interns, whose roles have been increased in responsibility from those of traditional student teachers, allows their mentors to leave their classrooms easily and without having to compete with the majority of teachers for scarce substitute moneys. Universities therefore are more and more dependent on the goodwill of such teachers but have little incentive to expand the pool of teachers who actually serve in these roles or to encourage and support teachers from groups who are underrepresented among these grantseekers to participate.

Thus grantseeking sanctifies and celebrates a hierarchy within teaching that neatly mirrors the power structure within society at large, all under the guise of insuring more effective teaching to students of color. In the name of educational equity, a competitive process has been put into place that limits access to vital funds that would support educational equity. Grantseeking also works to reinforce a belief in meritocracy and the importance of rewarding the “best and the brightest.” Ironically, such grant-funded competitions mystify the notion of what it takes to write a successful grant application while at the same time often granting them to virtually everyone who applies—a fact unknown by many teachers not active as grantseekers. At the same time these programs steadfastly refuse to provide any concrete criteria for evaluating proposals other than that teachers must fill out the necessary forms and direct their program to meet the focus of the particular grant competition. For example, neither the guidelines, nor the evaluators’ instructions, nor the evaluators’ comments for the two grant programs whose statistics were discussed in this article—a local and a state program awarding grants to “exemplary” teachers—presented any coherent or consistent criteria used to select the applicants to whom the grants were awarded.

The applications did require prospective teacher demonstrators to list all grants they had received, past dissemination efforts, and their professional development activities. Teachers with an established track record in such programs received more points on their grant applications than those who had not previously received a grant—a veterans’ preference if you will. In the few grant cycles in which a number of teachers who applied were

denied grants, these extra points made the difference between those who received grants and those who did not.

The teacher/grantseekers themselves have little incentive to increase their numbers and bring in a more diverse population of teachers by demystifying the grantseeking process and award system. As long as their numbers remain relatively small in comparison to the total number of teachers within any one district or across districts, the ability of each of these teacher/grantseekers to make strategic alliances helpful for her own career and the education of the pupils in her individual classroom and school remains strong. A number of these teachers have become active in planning and implementing charter schools, using their experience as successful grantseekers to fund the start-up costs and garner support from public and private sources crucial to launching these new enterprises (Applebone, 1995; Beales, 1995; Richardson, 1993). Other successful teacher/grantseekers have started their own businesses as consultants who enter the classroom to teach discrete units, marketed to fill the demands of ever-changing curriculum frameworks and state-wide testing mandates. The networks they helped create as teacher/grantseekers provide them with ready access to schools and the experience and credentials of a veteran in presenting to fellow teachers (Hunter, 1995).

What would grant-funded programs for teachers and schools—especially those targeting urban teachers—look like that would resolve the contradictions they have created, or does the intrinsic nature of grantseeking prevent such resolutions and lead inevitably to some form of privatization? Given the fact that there is no organized movement inside or outside of schools that questions the very nature of grant funding and the obstacles it creates to real and lasting improvement of urban public school education, these questions are difficult to answer.

The grant system celebrates meritocracy and the role of the individual teacher or school while evoking the promise of better, more equitable, and more progressive schooling within the context of a ever more privatized system. It holds out to teachers the promise that if the funders of these competitions deem them worthy, they too can do what successful dedicated teacher/grantseekers do. At the same time, the widespread practice of grantseeking inherently withholds the means by which to develop and sustain a decent learning environment for their students from all but the most aggressive, most “deserving,” few. Thus, the dynamics and intent of the grantseeking and grant-awarding system force individual teachers and staffs to compete against their next-door neighbors or the next school for the limited number of grants awarded in such competitions.

Grantseeking naturalizes the inequities such competitions create, even celebrates them as being in the best interests of all students—including those sitting in classrooms with few or none of the rich resources available

to those children lucky enough or with parents or caretakers savvy enough to have their child placed in the grantseeker's classroom. Through the magic of the marketplace, other teachers are expected now to seek similar rewards by entering similar contests and, as the theory goes, raise the level of education provided to all students.

Those urban teachers who are uncomfortable with such self-promotion, whose interests lie outside those established by such foundations, who feel intimidated by the formal writing requirements of the grant process, or who simply do not have the time to attend the numerous information sessions, award ceremonies, and corporate public relations events required by many of these programs are increasingly categorized as ineffective advocates for their own students no matter how effective they may be within their own classrooms, schools, or communities. Thus many grantseekers are acutely aware that the competitive system of grantseeking is designed precisely to institutionalize such inequities and reinforce such notions of meritocracy rather than redress them.

These trends are particularly ironic since many grant programs targeting urban school systems were developed initially to encourage teacher-to-teacher support and collaboration as an antidote to a perceived climate of stagnation and resignation and a much lamented lack of professionalism among rank and file teachers (Cruickshank, 1987; Lortie, 1975; Mann, 1983). Thus, urban school systems are urged to implement programs that valorize the autonomy and professionalization of the individual teacher at the same time that they introduce programs to develop a community/school-based management approach. While the potential for conflict appears self-evident, and many teachers are acutely aware of and deeply troubled by these two conflicting goals, school personnel are frequently reluctant to question publicly any program that brings money into the schools and into their own classrooms. In a system starved for funds, any source of funding is considered better than none—and any public discussion is widely viewed as tantamount to treason and a clear sign of “unprofessional” behavior.

More troubling, the rising dominance of competitive grant programs in funding new or innovative programs has worked to diminish the capacity of groups to contest or explore the nature of the issues facing urban schools, while at the same time such grant programs are trumpeted as enabling schools to do just that. By requiring schools and individual teachers to write grant proposals in a way that emphasizes their ability to solve problems defined and targeted by the granting agency, foundations insure that the “hidden curriculum” of grant funding is never open to public scrutiny or debate. To include any qualifications teachers might have about the way the funder has defined the problem or established

criteria for allocating its funds or to argue with the premises of grant competitions themselves would be to effectively remove one's program from any such competitions and the vital funds they provide. Equally disturbing, grantseeking encourages teachers to narrow their interests and concerns to those that focus solely on their individual classroom or school. Responding to requests for proposals effectively suppresses any opportunity to analyze the connections among the allocation of resources across schools and communities, institutional racism and classism in the larger society, and other public policy issues and community-wide concerns central to the life chances of their students and the communities in which those students live.

As I end this article, I want to make clear that I am not presenting a conspiracy theory—that through grantseeking certain sectors within the business community along with private and corporate foundations seek to place urban teachers in the vanguard of those promoting the privatization of public education or even make them willing accomplices in that movement. I *am* arguing that grantseeking has played a critical role in enabling the ideology and ways of thinking of the privatization movement to gain momentum, credibility, and respectability among many sectors of the population, including teachers such as Maria Santos who at the same time are deeply opposed to much of the ideology and many of the goals of the movement to privatize public education.

Many teachers in the urban school system in which this study was conducted see the complexities and contradictions inherent in grantseeking, along with other forms of privatization, but are reluctant as individuals to jeopardize one of the few strategies that has gained them a degree of autonomy, allowed them to develop their own creativity and that of their students, and provided alternatives that could be the basis for system-wide reforms. As long as grant-funded programs are seen as models that ironically cannot be duplicated but must be abandoned for ever-newer ones—a model that neatly emulates the marketplace ethos of grantseeking—the progressive potential for many important and sorely needed reforms in urban education will never be realized. The real dangers grantseeking presents to the reform of urban education, as part of the movement toward the privatization of public education, will surely intensify and overwhelm any such reforms.

Notes

1 Maria Santos is a pseudonym used to protect the confidentiality of the teacher whose experience is highlighted here.

2 Northbridge is a pseudonym for the city in which the studies on grantseeking were conducted.

3 All of the teachers who over time received the most grants and the larger grants in Project Imagine were women. A number of high school male teachers had participated in the first round of such proposals, which awarded grants for developing curriculum rather than demonstrating it to other teachers. These male teachers then began to apply for much larger, state-wide and national grants. They did not continue to submit grants to the local competition, which required them to disseminate their projects to teachers within their own city, attend meetings with other teachers, and act as demonstrators/mentors for other teachers.

4 In the private sector, the term “just in time” is used to describe a highly computerized and efficient system of production and distribution that allows corporations to greatly reduce the number of salaried employees employed in factories and distribution centers and to continually retool their product lines to meet the volatile shifts in market demand and consumer interest. At the same time, “just in time” production methods promote a sense of camaraderie and esprit de corps among the relatively small number of employees hired by such corporations to form teams of designers and production managers who work beyond the nine-to-five, five-day-a-week norm of older forms of production (Kaufmann, Robinson, & Rosenthal, 1991).

5 Project Imagine is the pseudonym for the privately funded grant program described in the article.

6 This teacher, Maria Santos, was also one of five among the 33 most active teachers who taught bilingual classes, but the only one of the five who was not a native speaker of English.

7 I have used the category “Latina” to identify Maria Santos following her self-identification in our interviews. She, along with every non-African American and non-Asian American teacher I interviewed, did not identify herself racially. As Lykes and Mallona (1997) point out, while race is often a critically important category for positioning self and others in the United States, it is less so, and is viewed quite differently, in many Latin American cultures and countries, including the country in which Maria Santos was born. The school system’s system of identifying and coding teachers follows similar, somewhat disjunctive lines in terms of the categories teachers can use to identify themselves. By court order, all teachers in the system are required to self-identify. They can choose to identify themselves using one, and only one, of several racial, ethnic, or language-of-origin categories provided.

References

Note: To preserve the confidentiality of the participants in the research on which this article is based, in the entries for references originating in the school district in which the participants taught, identifying information has been replaced with [Northbridge], the pseudonym used within the article.

- American Federation of Labor. (1994). *The private management of public schools: An analysis of the EAI experience in Baltimore*. Washington, DC: American Federation of Labor.
- Anzaldúa, G. (1987). *Borderlands/La frontera: The new mestiza*. San Francisco: Spinters/Aunt Lute.
- Apple, M. (1996) Introduction. In *Research in education*, 22. Washington, DC: American Educational Research Association.
- Applebone, P. (1995, May 31). New breed of teachers become entrepreneurs and roving innovators. *New York Times*, p. B8.
- Ascher, C., Frucher, N., & Berne, R. (1996). *Hard lessons: Public schools and privatization*. New York: Twentieth Century Fund.
- Barnicle, M. (1996, Sept. 5). Urban teacher’s plea. *Boston Globe*, p. B1.
- Bauer, D. (1993). *Grantseeking primer for classroom leaders*. New York: Scholastic, Inc.

- Beales, J. (1995). *Teachers, Inc.: A private-practice option for educators*. Midland, MI: Mackinac Center for Public Policy.
- Bean, J., & Loar, R. (1994, Dec. 16). Funds raised for schools to buy extras may be used for basics. *Los Angeles Times*, p. A27.
- Berns, B., Libby, B., & O'Connor, K. (1991). *A teacher's guide to fellowships and awards*. Department of Education [Northbridge].
- Biklen, S. (1995). *School work*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Blackmore, J. (1997). Doing "emotional labor" in the education market place: Stories from the field of women in management. *Discourse* 17(3), 337-349.
- Board of Education [Northbridge]. (1991). *Summary and interpretations of 1990 census data*. Author.
- Bourdieu, P. (1977). *Outline of a theory of practice*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Branch, E. (1991). Can business save schools? *Black Enterprise*, 13(3), 39-43.
- Business and the Public Schools Committee for Economic Development. (1985). *Investing in our schools*. New York: New York Research and Policy Committee.
- Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). *A nation prepared: Teachers for the 21st century*. New York: Carnegie Corporation
- Casey, C. (1995). *Work, self and society*. London and New York: Routledge
- Celis, W. (1991, May 22). Educators press for end to corporate tax breaks. *New York Times*, pp. A1, B6.
- Chubb, J., & Moe, T. (1990). *Politics, markets, and America's schools*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institute
- Cohen, M. (1990, May 8). Layoff notices are sent to 8,949 teachers, *Boston Globe*, pp. A1, 10.
- Collins, P. (1991). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Cookson, P. (1994). *School choice: The struggle for the soul of American education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Council for Aid to Education. (1993). *Corporate support of education, 1992*. New York: Council for Aid to Education.
- Cross, C. (1995, June 7). The downsizing of corporate philanthropy: Who will pick up the slack in an age of leaner government? *Education Week*, p. 55.
- Cruickshank, D. (1987). *Reflective teaching*. Reston, VA: Association of Teacher Educators.
- Daley, B. (1998). \$600,000 gift to target dropouts. *Boston Globe*, pp. B1, B3.
- David, M. (1992). Education reform in Britain and the United States. In R. Arnone, P. Altbach, & G. Kelly (Eds.), *Emergent issues in education: Comparative perspectives*, Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Delpit, L. (1995). *Other people's children: Cultural conflicts in the classroom*. New York: New Press.
- Division of Research and Evaluation. (1994). *School profiles*. Public Schools [Northbridge].
- Division of Research and Evaluation. (1996). *School profiles*. Public Schools [Northbridge].
- Drucker, P. (1993). *Post-capitalist society*. New York: Harper.
- Edmonds, R. (1984, Fall). School effects and teacher effects. *Social Policy*, 37-39.
- Ehrenreich, B., & Ehrenreich, J. (1979). The professional managerial class. In P. Walker (Ed.), *Between labor and capital*. Boston: South End Press.
- Etlin, M. (1993, April). Private foundations lend kids a helping hand. *NEA Today*, 11(8), 6.
- Farrar, E., & Cipollone, A. (1988). *The business community and school reform: The compact at five years*. Buffalo: State University of New York at Buffalo.
- Fine, M. (Ed.). (1994). *Chartering urban schools: Reflections on public high schools in the midst of change*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Foster, M. (1992). The politics of race. In K. Weiler & C. Mitchell (Eds.), *What schools can do: Critical pedagogy and practices*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Foundation Center. (1996). *Foundation grant index*. New York: Foundation Center.

- Freedman, S. (1989). *Evaluation report on IMPACT II*. Globe Foundation.
- Freedman, S. (1993). *Evaluation report on the Academy for Teachers*. Institute for Teaching and Learning [Northbridge].
- Freedman, S. (1994). *Teachers as grantseekers: Urban women teachers' perceptions of competitive grant programs for individual teachers*. Unpublished dissertation, University of Massachusetts at Amherst.
- Freedman, S. (1996, December). The lure of privatization: Public school teachers seeking private funds. *Discourse*, 17, 225–242.
- Freedman, S. (1999). To market, to market: Privatizing public education. *Educational Policy*, 13(3), 440–454.
- Freedman, S., Jackson, J., & Boles, K. (1983). Teaching: An imperilled profession. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook on teaching and policy*. New York: Longman.
- Fulton, M., & Long, D. (1993). *School finance litigation: A historical summary*. Denver: Education Commission of the States.
- Goertz, M. (1990) Education politics for a new century: Introduction and review. In D. Mitchell & M. Goertz (Eds.), *Education politics for a new century: The twentieth anniversary politics of education yearbook*. London: Falmer Press.
- Goldberg, C. (1997, July 6). Millionaires of Microsoft redefine philanthropy. *New York Times*, pp. D1–2.
- Goodman, B. (1997, May). Grab these four tax breaks while you still can. *Money*, 26, 23.
- Gormley, W. (1991). *Privatization and its alternatives*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.
- Hakim, S., Seidenstat, P., & Bowman, G. (Eds.). (1994). *Privatizing education and educational choice: Concepts, plans and experience*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Hart, J. (1992, January 5). In Massachusetts, teachers fantasize about the basics. *Boston Globe*, pp. A53, A56.
- Henig, J. (1994). *Rethinking school choice: Limits of the market metaphor*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hill, D. (1993a, November/December). California dreamer. *Teacher Magazine*, 28–33.
- Hill, D. (1993b, March). Overnight sensation: Kay Toliver. *Teacher Magazine*, 21–23.
- Hill, P., Pierce, L., & Guthrie, J. (1997). *Reinventing public education: How contracting can transform America's schools*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Holmes Group. (1986). *Tomorrow's teachers: A report of the Holmes Group*. East Lansing, MI: Holmes Group, Inc.
- hooks, b. (1995). *Teaching to transgress*. New York: Routledge.
- Hunter, R. (1995). Privatization of instruction in public education. *Education and Urban Society*, 27, 154–167.
- IMPACT II. (1989). Meet IMPACT II. *Impact II National Network*. New York: IMPACT II.
- IMPACT II. (1994). How teachers are changing schools. New York: IMPACT II.
- Instructor. (1997). Win those grants. *Instructor*, 106, 65.
- Johnson, M. (1997, April 25). Tax reform proposal killed; House rejects bill as doubts, time takes toll. *Denver Post*, p. B1.
- Johnston, R. (1997, July 9). Booming U.S. economy translates into mixed dividend for education. *Education Week*, p. 16.
- Kantor, H. (1996). Equal opportunity and the federal role in education. *Rethinking Schools*, 11, 1–5.
- Kanter, R. (1992). *The challenge of organizational change*. New York: Free Press.
- Kantrowitz, J. (1993, April 4). Students travel south. *Boston Globe*, p. A55.
- Karp, S. (1995, Summer). Equity suits clog the courts. *Rethinking Schools*, 3, 18–19.
- Karp, S., Lowe, R., Miner, B., & Peterson, B. (1997). *Funding for justice: Money, equity, and the future of public education*. Milwaukee: Rethinking Schools.
- Kaufmann, L., Robinson, B., & Rosenthal, M. (1991). Post-Fordism: Flexible politics in the age of just-in-time production. *Socialist Review*, 21, 53–56.

- Kennedy, M. (1991). *An agenda for research on teacher learning*. East Lansing, MI: National Center for Research on Teacher Learning.
- Kenway, J. (1995, September). *The marketisation of education: Mapping the contours of a feminist perspective*. Paper presented at Feminist Perspectives on the Marketisation of Education Symposium, London Institute of Education.
- Kerr, D. (1983). Teaching competence and teacher education in the United States. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 126–149). New York: Longman.
- King, A. (1997, April). Who benefits from the suspension of Sec. 4980A's excise tax? *Trusts and Estates*, 136, 14–18.
- King, J. (1991). Dysconscious racism: Ideology, identity, and the miseducation of teachers. *Journal of Negro Education*, 60(2), 133–146.
- Ladson-Billings, G. (1994). *The dreamkeepers: Successful teachers of African American children*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Leonard, M. (1992). The response of the private sector: Foundations and entrepreneurs. *Teachers College Record*, 93, 376–381.
- Lieberman, A. (1996). Creating intentional learning communities. *Educational Leadership*, 51–55.
- Lieberman, A., & Grolnick, M. (1996). Networks and reform in American education. *Teachers College Record*, 98(1), 7–45.
- Little, J. (1993). Professional Development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 15(2), 129–151.
- Lobman, T. (1992). Public education and grant-making styles: More money, more vision, more demands. *Teachers College Record*, 93, 382–402.
- Lortie, D. (1975). *Schoolteacher*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Lowe, R., & Miner, B. (Eds.). (1993). *False choices: Why school vouchers threaten our children's future*. Milwaukee, WI: Rethinking Schools.
- Lykes, M. B., & Mallona, A. (1997). Surfacing ourselves: Gringa, white-mestiza, brown? In M. Fine, L. Weis, L. Powell, & L. Wong (Eds.), *Off white: Readings on race, power, and society*. New York: Routledge.
- Madler, M. (1996, Sept. 9). Foundations step in for needy school districts. *Chicago Tribune*, p. 2MC.
- Mann, D. (1983). The impact of IMPACT II. *Teachers College Record*, 84, 837–740.
- Massachusetts Business Alliance for Education. (1990). *Status report: March, 1990*. Boston: Author.
- McDonnell, L., & Fuhrman, S. (1986). The political context of school reform. In V. Mueller & M. McKeown (Eds.), *The fiscal, legal, and political aspects of state reform of elementary and secondary education*. Cambridge, MA: Ballinger Publishing Company.
- McDonnell, L., & Pascal, A. (1988). *Teacher unions and education policy*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND.
- Meier, D. (1995). *The power of their ideas: Lessons for America from a small school in Harlem*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Molnar, A. (1997). *Giving kids the business: The commercialization of America's schools*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Morgan, R. (1970). *Sisterhood is powerful: An anthology of writings from the women's liberation movement*. New York: Random House.
- Munro, P. (1998). *Subject to fiction: Women teachers' life history narratives and the cultural politics of resistance*. Philadelphia: Open University Press.
- Murphy, P. (1996). *The privatization of schooling: Problems and possibilities*. New York: Corwin Press.
- Myers, S. (1995, June 8). New York official warns of layoffs in schools. *New York Times*, pp. A1, B8.
- National Center for Educational Statistics. (1989). *Announcement*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

- National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). *A nation at risk: The imperative for school reform*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- National Education Association. (1986). *Portrait of a public school teacher*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Novelli, J. (1994, July–August). You can get grants. *Instructor*, 104, 33.
- Olson, L. (1993). Progressive-era concept now breaks mold: NASDC schools explore “Project Learning.” *Education Week*, 12(21), 7.
- Parker, A. (1977). *Networks for innovation and problem solving and their use for improving education: A comparative overview*. Unpublished manuscript, School Capacity for Problem Solving Group, National Institutes of Education, Washington, DC.
- Pennell, J., & Firestone, W. (1996). Changing classroom practices through teacher networks: Matching program features with teacher characteristics and circumstances. *Teachers College Record*, 98(1), 46–76.
- Purkey, S., & Smith, M. (1985, January). School reform: The district policy implications of the effective schools literature. *Elementary School Journal*, 85, 353–389.
- Ravitch, D., & Viteritti, J. (Eds.). (1996). *New schools for a new century: The redesign of urban education*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Reed, L. (1995, August 20). Allowing teachers to go into private practice could be an ideal way to reform our schools. *Detroit News & Free Press*, p. G3.
- Ribadeneira, D. (1991, September 26). Schools office blamed for delays. *Boston Globe*, pp. A33, 38.
- Richards, C., Shore, R., & Sawicky, M. (1996). *Risky business: Private management of public schools*. Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute.
- Richardson, J. (1993, May 5). A little cash helps “IMPACT II” teachers make reform reality. *Education Week*, 1, 18.
- Robles, J., & Eversley, M. (1996, October 26). Schools get huge boost. *Detroit News and Free Press*, p. A1.
- Saks, J. (1995). Scrutinizing Edison. *American School Board Journal*, 182(2), 20, 24, 25.
- Schmidt, P. (1991, November 6). Panel urges emergency aid for troubled districts. *Education Week*, 11(10), 17.
- Spring, J. (1998). *Education and the rise of the global economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Sykes, G. (1983). Public policy and the problem of teacher quality: The need for screens and magnets. In L. Shulman & G. Sykes (Eds.), *Handbook of teaching and policy* (pp. 97–125). New York: Longman.
- Task Force on Education for Economic Growth. (1983). *Action for excellence: A comprehensive plan to improve our nation’s schools*. Denver: Education Commission of the States.
- Treblicot, J. (1984). *Mothering: Essays in feminist theory*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld.
- Troen, V., & Boles, K. (1992). *Teachers’ professional development*. Paper presented at Annual Conference of American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Twentieth Century Fund Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy. (1983). *Making the grade*. New York: The Twentieth Century Fund.
- Verstegen, D. (1994). The new wave of school finance litigation. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 76(3), 243–250.
- Useem, E., et al. (1995, April). Urban teacher curriculum networks and systemic change. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Walters, L. (1996, June 5). “School choice” moves ahead despite lack of public funds. *Christian Science Monitor*, 3.
- Weiler, K. (1986). *Women teaching for change: Gender, class and power*. South Hadley, MA: Bergin and Garvey.
- Wells, A. S., Cookson Jr., P. W., Chubb, J. E., Moe, T. M., & Howe II, H. (1991). Politics, markets, and America’s schools: A symposium. *Teachers College Record*, 93(1), 137–173.

- Weisman, J. (1992, January 15). Foundations network seeks to spur systemic reform, *Education Week*, 15.
- Whitty, G. (1990). Creeping privatization and its implications for schooling in the inner city. *The Urban Review*, 22(2), 101–114.
- Whitty, G. (1997). Creating quasi-markets in education. In M. Apple (Ed.), *Review of research in education*. Washington, DC: American Education Research Association.
- Winerup, M. (1993, September 8). In the inner city: A hungry scramble for a few choice classroom seats. *New York Times*, p. B13.
- Young, I. (1990). The ideal of community and the politics of difference. In L. Nicolson (Ed.), *Feminism/postmodernism*. New York: Routledge.

SARA FREEDMAN is assistant professor of education at Boston College, where she teaches courses in the social contexts of education and curriculum and instruction. Her research interests include the politics of gender, race, and class in urban schools and the political economy of schooling within the broader context of post-industrial capitalism. She was a founding member of the Boston Women's Teachers' Group and is on the editorial board of *Radical Teacher*. She presently coordinates the Donovan Teaching Scholars Program at Boston College, which recruits and prepares teachers to work in urban schools.