Legislative reform of the educational system must be carried out in Chile in order to address the discriminatory impact of privatisation in education. Current discussion in the parliament goes in the direction of eliminating profit, selection (although voluntary interviews will still be authorised) and shared-payment. Such initiatives must be encouraged, but important difficulties remain: the vouchers system, municipalisation and other aspects such as teacher's status, the curricular content of education and selection in private schools.

The Scale of privatisation in Chile
Chile is one of the most privatised education systems in the world, with the highest share (40%) of private expenditure in education at all levels of education, amongst countries in the OECD Program for International Student Assessment (PISA). In Chile, most pupils are enrolled either in an independent private school or in a State-subsidised private school (40% public in Chile; 82% public OECD average).

Privatisation as the result of the State-party' educational policies
Using a demand-side subsidy system of vouchers to finance private and public education (municipal schools and private-subsidised schools), Chile has contributed to the development of a strong private sector in education, at the same time that enrolment in public education has decreased. Thus the number of State-subsidised private schools more than doubled between 1990 and 2012, whereas the number of public
schools strongly decreased.¹ The privatisation approach consisted of two key elements: the increased public funding of privately owned schools through vouchers, and the transfer of teachers from the public to the private sector.

A discriminatory universal voucher system
The implementation of universal vouchers in Chile has discriminatory effects as it creates and deepens segregation in schools. This segregation is a consequence of parental choice, selection and fees, the key element of the voucher system. Surveys indicates that Chilean parents mostly choose schools according to their socio-economic composition. The outcome of this system is greater disparity of educational opportunities and an important social stratification of students between schools, between types of schools, and between municipalities.

The table below shows that 70% of students in public school are from the lower-income households (quintiles I and II), whereas 75% of students in private schools are from the higher-income quintile.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Income quintile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>42.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (subsidized)</td>
<td>22.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private (fee-paying)</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Drago and Paredes (2011) on the basis of the 2006 National Characterisation Socio-Economic Survey (CASEN) database
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