

2009

A Proposal for Collaborative Enforcement of a Federal Right to Education

Kimberly J. Robinson

University of Richmond, krobins2@richmond.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholarship.richmond.edu/law-faculty-publications>

Recommended Citation

Kimberly J. Robinson, *A Proposal for Collaborative Enforcement of a Federal Right to Education*, in *What is Right for Children?: The Competing Paradigms of Religion and Human Rights* 205 (Martha Fineman & Karen Worthington eds., 2009).

This Book Chapter is brought to you for free and open access by the School of Law at UR Scholarship Repository. It has been accepted for inclusion in Law Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of UR Scholarship Repository. For more information, please contact scholarshiprepository@richmond.edu.

ldren

What is Right for Children?

The Competing Paradigms of Religion and Human Rights

Edited by

MARTHA ALBERTSON FINEMAN
Emory University School of Law, USA

KAREN WORTHINGTON
Emory University School of Law, USA

ASHGATE

© Martha Albertson Fineman and Karen Worthington 2009

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise without the prior permission of the publisher.

Martha Albertson Fineman and Karen Worthington have asserted their right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as the editors of this work.

Published by
Ashgate Publishing Limited
Wey Court East
Union Road
Farnham
Surrey, GU9 7PT
England

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington
VT 05401-4405
USA

www.ashgate.com

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

What is right for children? : the competing paradigms of religion and human rights

1. Children's rights - United States 2. Children's rights - Cross-cultural studies 3. Children's rights - Religious aspects 4. Children - Legal status, laws, etc. - United States

I. Fineman, Martha II. Worthington, Karen
323.3'52

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

What is right for children? : the competing paradigms of religion and human rights / [edited] by Martha Albertson Fineman and Karen Worthington.

p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 978-0-7546-7419-1

1. Freedom of religion--United States. 2. Children's rights--United States--Religious aspects. 3. Parent and child (Law)--United States. 4. International and municipal law--United States. I. Fineman, Martha II. Worthington, Karen.

KF4783.W43 2009
342.7308'772--dc22

2009000941

ISBN 978 0 7546 7419 1



Mixed Sources

Product group from well-managed forests and other controlled sources
www.fsc.org Cert no. SGS-COC-2482
© 1996 Forest Stewardship Council

Printed and bound in Great Britain by
TJ International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

ington 2009

may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval
ans, electronic, mechanical, photocopying,
sion of the publisher.

ington have asserted their right under the
identified as the editors of this work.

Ashgate Publishing Company
Suite 420
101 Cherry Street
Burlington
VT 05401-4405
USA

ata
digns of
's rights -
digious
United

n Data
digns of religion and human rights /
a Worthington.

children's rights--United States--Religious
tes. 4. International and municipal law--
on, Karen.

2009000941

bound in Great Britain by
onal Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall

Contents

Notes on Contributors ix
Acknowledgements xi

Introduction: What is Right for Children? 1
Martha Albertson Fineman

PART I CHILDREN'S RIGHTS AS HUMAN RIGHTS

- 1 The United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child:
Empowering Parents to Protect Their Children's Rights 7
Barbara Bennett Woodhouse and Kathryn A. Johnson
- 2 Child, Family, State, and Gender Equality in Religious Stances
and Human Rights Instruments: A Preliminary Comparison 19
Linda C. McClain
- 3 Rhetoric, Religion, and Human Rights: "Save the Children!" 45
Barbara Stark
- 4 Feminist Fundamentalism on the Frontier between Government
and Family Responsibility for Children 59
Mary Anne Case

PART II CHILDREN IN THE UNITED STATES: THE LEGAL CONTEXT

- 5 Using International Human Rights Law in US Courts: Lessons
from the Campaign Against the Juvenile Death Penalty 83
Linda M. Keller
- 6 The Lesser Culpability of the Juvenile Offender: Trial in Adult
Criminal Court, Incarceration with Adults, and Excessive Sanctions 107
Bernardine Dohrn

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 7 | Parental Rights Doctrine: Creating and Maintaining Maternal Value <i>Annette R. Appell</i> | 123 |
| 8 | Placing Children in Context: Parents, Foster Care, and Poverty <i>Naomi Cahn</i> | 145 |
| 9 | Expanding the Parent–Child–State Triangle in Public Family Law: The Role of Private Providers <i>Susan Vivian Mangold</i> | 169 |
| 10 | Advocating for Children’s Rights in a Lawless Nation: Articulating Rights for Foster Children <i>Barbara Bennett Woodhouse and Brooke Hardy</i> | 195 |
| 11 | A Proposal for Collaborative Enforcement of a Federal Right to Education <i>Kimberly Jenkins Robinson</i> | 205 |
| 12 | Taking Children’s Interests Seriously <i>Martha Albertson Fineman</i> | 229 |

PART III COMPARISONS: CHILDREN WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF HUMAN RIGHTS

- | | | |
|----|--|-----|
| 13 | The Child’s Right to Religious Freedom in International Law: The Search for Meaning <i>Ursula Kilkelly</i> | 243 |
| 14 | Clashing Rights and Welfare: A Return to a Rights Discourse in Family Law in the UK? <i>Shazia Choudhry</i> | 269 |
| 15 | Accommodating Children’s Religious Expression in Public Schools: A Comparative Analysis of the Veil and Other Symbols in Western Democracies <i>Catherine J. Ross</i> | 283 |
| 16 | Children, Education, and Rights in a Society Divided by Religion: The Perspectives of Children and Young People <i>Laura Lundy</i> | 311 |

| | |
|--------------------------------|-----|
| Children? | |
| and Maintaining Maternal Value | 123 |
| s, Foster Care, and Poverty | 145 |
| Triangle in Public Family | 169 |
| a Lawless Nation: ren | 195 |
| ooke Hardy | |
| ement of a Federal | 205 |
| y | 229 |

EN WITHIN THE CONTEXT

| | |
|--|-----|
| dom in International Law: | 243 |
| rn to a Rights Discourse | 269 |
| s Expression in Public the Veil and Other Symbols | 283 |
| Society Divided by en and Young People | 311 |

Contents

vii

| | | |
|----|---|-----|
| 17 | Children, International Human Rights, and the Politics of Belonging | 329 |
| | <i>Alice Hearst</i> | |
| 18 | The Right of Children to Be Loved | 347 |
| | <i>S. Matthew Liao</i> | |
| | <i>Appendix</i> | 365 |
| | <i>Bibliography</i> | 389 |
| | <i>Index</i> | 439 |

Chapter 11

A Proposal for Collaborative Enforcement of a Federal Right to Education¹

Kimberly Jenkins Robinson

Our progress as a nation can be no swifter than our progress in education.
John F. Kennedy

In a nation that professes a strong belief in equal opportunity, many public schools in the United States fail to offer children a high-quality education. Low-income, minority, and urban schoolchildren typically attend markedly inferior schools relative to their more affluent and white counterparts (see Carter, Reddick, and Flores, 2004). Research demonstrates that higher teacher quality results in better student achievement but studies show that schools with higher numbers of poor and minority students employ less experienced and less qualified teachers (Ryan, 2004). More than 50 years and a host of educational reform efforts have passed since *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), yet children in poor and disproportionately minority communities still receive vastly unequal educational opportunities (Hochschild and Scovronick, 2003; Ladd and Hansen, 1999).

Disparities in financial resources for schools and districts affect the quality of educational opportunity both within and between states. The burden of interstate disparities falls disproportionately on disadvantaged students who typically have greater educational needs (Liu, 2006). On average, urban districts report higher expenditures than suburban districts, but urban districts spend less money on regular education because they pay more for special education and repairs for older buildings and equipment (Hochschild and Scovronick, 2003; Petrovich, 2005).

Given the disparities in educational opportunities, it is not a surprise that the achievement of many low-income and minority students remains below their more affluent and non-minority peers. Black and Hispanic students complete high school at lower rates than white students, which is particularly troubling because high school plays a determinative role in how individuals will integrate into the workforce and the remainder of society. The achievement gap along racial lines persists even for students from the same socio-economic background (Rothstein, 2004). Students in urban districts often have lower test scores and higher dropout rates (Hochschild and Scovronick, 2003).

The public has not ignored our schools' inadequacies. In the 2000 presidential election, voters ranked education as their top priority. An overview of recent public

¹ This chapter, ©2007 by Kimberly Jenkins Robinson, was originally published in the *UC Davis Law Review*, vol. 40, pp. 1653-1746, © 2007 by The Regents of the University of California. All rights reserved. Reprinted with permission.

opinion polls reveals that generally “the public ... remains very concerned about the performance of American public schools and supports federal leadership in education reform” (McGuinn, 2006, p. 192). Congress passed the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) with bipartisan support, largely because lawmakers agreed that the problems plaguing the nation’s schools should be addressed at the federal level. NCLB requires schools and districts to disaggregate assessment scores by major income and minority groups. The law also holds schools and districts accountable for achievement of those groups by requiring corrective steps if any major subgroup does not achieve the established performance guidelines. However, the law has numerous shortcomings which do not allow it to address longstanding disparities in educational opportunity.

This chapter proposes an innovative approach for directing the expanding federal role in education. The proposed approach encourages states to address disparities in opportunity that prevent disadvantaged students from achieving their full potential and builds on the understanding reflected in the NCLB that the federal government will remain critical in public education reform. The proposal re-examines an avenue for federal involvement that the US Supreme Court considered in several cases and scholars have debated for more than 30 years: a federal right to education.

San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez (1973) explicitly offered the Supreme Court the opportunity to recognize education as a fundamental constitutional right when poor, minority schoolchildren residing in districts with “a low property tax base” (*Rodriguez*, 1973, pp. 4–5) challenged the constitutionality of the Texas school financing system. The Court refused to recognize a federal right to education because the Constitution neither explicitly nor implicitly recognized education as a fundamental right. The Court indicated that it lacked the expertise to second-guess complex judgments about educational policies. The Court identified several reasons for deferring to the legislative judgment captured in the school finance scheme, including concerns about the appropriate distribution of power between the federal and state government.

Numerous scholars have disagreed with the Court’s ruling in *Rodriguez* and argued that the United States should recognize a federal right to education (see Chemerinsky, 2004; Sunstein, 2004). However, those arguments envision a court-defined and enforced reform effort. In contrast, this chapter contends that Congress should recognize a federal right to education through spending legislation that the federal and state governments collaboratively enforce. This reconceptualization of the enforcement of a federal right to education draws upon the enforcement mechanisms for a right to education in international human rights law.

This chapter proceeds in four parts. The first part briefly considers the major federal attempts to address inequities in educational opportunity and explains why current federal education legislation will not eliminate persistent disparities in educational opportunities. The first part also presents arguments for why federal action is necessary to address these disparities. The second part considers the human rights enforcement mechanisms for a right to education. The third part then proposes how these models could inform the development and enforcement

of a federal right to education in the United States. The fourth part explores some of the strengths and weaknesses of this chapter's proposed approach.

The Federal Vehicles for Addressing Educational Inequities for Disadvantaged Students and Why a New Federal Approach Is Needed

The efforts to address inferior educational opportunities for minority and low-income schoolchildren over the last half century focused on desegregating public schools, reducing inequities through school finance litigation, and providing additional federal funding to low-income children. While these approaches have resulted in important achievements in the efforts to improve education and to reduce disparities in educational opportunity, many disadvantaged schoolchildren continue to receive a substandard educational experience and substantial interstate and intrastate disparities persist. As this chapter proposes federal legislation to address these concerns, this part highlights the two principal federal approaches to disparities in educational opportunity: school desegregation and legislation to assist low-income children.

School Desegregation

Civil rights advocates initially believed that the 1954 victory in *Brown v. Board of Education (Brown I)* heralded an end to the separate and unequal educational opportunities for minority schoolchildren. In that decision, the Court held that states denied minority schoolchildren "equal educational opportunities" (*Brown I*, 1954, p. 493) when they provided separate schools for white schoolchildren. In striking down the segregated schools, the Court acknowledged the importance of education as the mechanism for exposing children to the building blocks of citizenship, introducing children to cultural norms, and developing the skills necessary to enter the workforce. In light of education's importance, the Court explained that "[s]uch an opportunity, where the state has undertaken to provide it, is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms" (*Brown I*, 1954, p. 493).

To guide lower courts in implementing this groundbreaking decision, the Court in *Brown v. Board of Education (1955) (Brown II)* ordered the states to admit minority schoolchildren to public schools on a non-discriminatory basis "with all deliberate speed" (*Brown II*, 1955, p. 301), a standard that the Court alleged represented an acknowledgment of the complexity of the changes that districts must implement. However, this language opened the door for districts opposed to the decision to move exceedingly slowly or not at all. Those who sought to implement *Brown I* and *Brown II* faced violent and sustained opposition. Many federal courts did little to respond to this violence and instead delayed resolving desegregation litigation or approved superficial changes.

In the face of this resistance, the Court slowly began issuing decisions that signaled it would not tolerate such opposition. Ultimately, though, the Court's decisions