



November 2011

League of Women Voters of Bellingham/Whatcom County

The Federal Role in Education Consensus Meeting

Bellingham Public Library

9:15 a.m.-noon , November 19th, 2011

Speakers

Ron Cowen Bellingham School District CFO

Margot Schenet, Education Analyst, Congressional Research Service (ret.)

Stephanie Strow Middle School Curriculum Association, Fairhaven Middle School teacher

Dr. Paula Weaver Early Childhood Education Specialist

Speakers have been chosen to give background information to inform our consensus process. Background papers available in Oct. and Nov. VOTERS

ALL MEMBERS ARE URGED TO ATTEND THIS IMPORTANT MEETING

The general public is invited but only members can participate in the consensus

***Members only—If your last name begins with A through L, please bring cookies, sweet breads, or fruit to be served at this event.**

Inside this issue:

Speak up...Education	2
Wine & Cheese	3
Consensus Questions	4
Study Materials	7
Food for Thought	9
Glossary	10
Program Calendar	16

Quick Updates:

The New Member Welcome Tea is coming soon –Nov.9th. 3-5:30 at 1350 Clearbrook Ave. We would like to invite any member who hasn't come to one of these events: it's a good way to meet some leaguers informally and learn a bit about what we do. Please RSVP to our league phone at 734-2366

Party Time: Our fourth annual popular wine and cheese event **Conversations with Elected Officials** will be November 30th from 5:30 pm- 7:30pm at the YWCA ball room. We will be calling on members to contribute hors d'oeuvres for this event. Bring them and stay for a chance to schmooze with your

fellow leaguers and the men and women you have just elected.

Art for the League: And don't forget time is running out to buy raffle tickets for the beautiful painting by Kay Ingram. The winner will be drawn during our Conversations with Elected Officials event. Only \$! Each and all proceeds benefit our league.

Something New -

If you see a message from LWV of Bellingham/Whatcom County in your e-mail please be sure to take a moment to open it up. It is a new message system we are using to get news and information to you more easily. Please check it out.

Presidents Column

The world is marching. And yes, even here in Bellingham we are seeing people on the streets making their voice heard. I find it a healthy sign when the citizenry is engaged. One of the most interesting aspects of the Occupy movement is their use of consensus. This time-treasured League technique we use to establish our positions is defined by the Occupy movement thusly:

“Consensus is an inclusive and non hierarchical process for group decision making. It is a method by which the input of ideas of all participants are gathered and synthesized in order to arrive at a final decision acceptable to all....Consensus means that the group has come to a decision in which everyone feels their position on the matter was considered carefully and addressed as much as possible...when consensus works properly, collective intelligence does come up

with better solutions than could individuals.”

Consensus is the focus of our **November 19th meeting**, where we the LWV of Bellingham/ Whatcom will meet to listen, exchange views and arrive at a consensus on the **national study—The Federal Role in Education**. We will host a panel of expert speakers on the 19th. Our research papers are available on the website. Both of these resources will be helpful as we come together to answer the questions that were prepared by the national league.

So I urge you to do your homework by reading the material, then listen to the presentation on the 19th, and you will be ready to engage in a challenging and rewarding experience. This is what Leaguers do best.

Jayne Freudenberger

Speak Up About the Role of the Federal Government in Education

Join our discussion on November 19 about the appropriate role the federal government in our public schools. Specifically, this national LWVUS study focuses on the funding and equity issues addressed in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act - last reauthorized by Congress as ‘No Child Left Behind’ and on the adoption of national Common Core Standards and Assessments.

What’s consensus? It’s not a simple vote; instead it is the agreement leaguers reach through discussion. At our meeting members will discuss each of the questions that LWVUS has posed in their study, and everyone will have an opportunity to express their viewpoint. If the group comes to general agreement about the best response to a question, then they have consensus. The discussion will be carefully timed and facilitated so that each of the study questions can be addressed.

The consensus questions and study reading material are included in this Voter (please cite page #) and on our website. Other articles were published in the October Voter and distributed at the September membership meeting. Additional background material is posted on our website:

<http://www.lwvbellinghamwhatcom.org/EducationStudy.html>

Our meeting will start with a panel of guest speakers sharing their perspectives on the topic and then members will break into small groups to tackle the consensus questions. This promises to be a lively discussion with the usual cookies, coffee & tea to energize the group

Guest Speakers and Topics

- Ron Cowen - The role of federal funds in our local school programs.

Ron Cowen is presently the Assistant Superintendent of Business and Operations for Bellingham Public Schools, Ron is a Bellingham native with K-12 classroom teaching experience and previously served as Director of Business and Operations for Bellingham Public Schools.

- Margot Schenet - How federal policies and mandates have influenced our public schools. Margot Schenet worked as an Education Policy Analyst in the Congressional Research Service, Library of

Speak Up About ...Education, cont'd

Congress, Ms Schenet has insights about much of the federal education legislation since the mid-1960s to the present from inside the Beltway. She has done considerable research and writing on Pell Grants, affirmative action, and other topics related to public policy. Margot has been an active participant in this LWV Education study.

- Stephanie Strow - The impact of *Common Core Standards and Assessments on classroom practice and student learning*.

Stephanie Strow is a 7th Grade Social Studies teacher at Fairhaven Middle School, Regional Trustee for the National Middle School Association, and President of the Washington Association of Middle Level Education (WAMLE).

- Dr. Paula Weaver -*The good, bad, and the ugly in federal policies that impact early childhood education*.

Dr. Weaver was Assistant Professor in the School of Education in Early Childhood Education at the University of Texas, Arlington. She is also is a Founding Board Member of The North Hills School which is among the first 20 charters granted in Texas and is held as a model for rigorous, integrated curriculum, fiscal responsibility, and strategic vision. She is presently the Director of Curriculum Development for Spratt-Shaw College and has been an active participant in this LWV Education study.

>> Doors will open at 9:15 and the meeting will start promptly at 9:30 on Saturday, November 19 at the Bellingham Central Library.

Wine & Cheese with Elected Officials

Mark your calendars for our popular evening of lively conversations with elected officials and league friends on November 30, 2011. This event has become a festive tradition for the Bellingham/Whatcom League, so we're inviting our local elected and retiring public officials to join us once again. The event is an opportunity to chat about issues or just get to know your elected officials and their spouses a bit better.

Date: November 30, 2011

Time: 5:30 - 7:30 PM

Location: YWCA Ballroom

Parking available on the street and in First Presbyterian Church lot

Corner of Maple & Laurel Streets

The table will be set with tempting appetizers donated by some of our culinarily talented members and our own sommeliers will be serving some good wines as well as non-alcoholic sparkling beverages. You are welcome to bring your spouse or a friend to enjoy the evening.

RSVP (360) 734-2360 or email ProgramChair@LWVbellinghamwhatcom.org

Public Education Study Consensus Question

GENERAL QUESTIONS

The current role of the federal government in public education is:

Much too small too small about right too large much too large

What should be the role of the federal government in public education? (Rank)

To ensure that all students preK-12 receive a quality education.

To develop accountability measures that will study the progress of all students so that they achieve adequate yearly progress.

To mandate Common Core Standards for all students K-12.

To monitor state efforts for funding

To measure teacher effectiveness through test data.

A quality public education is important to perpetuate a strong and viable democracy.

Strongly agree Agree No consensus Disagree Strongly disagree

Common Core Standards

Currently the governors and state education officers have developed Common Core Standards that are national but not federal. Should the standards be mandated of the states in order to obtain federal funding? (Choose one)

Special grant programs such as Race to the Top

All programs under Elementary and Secondary Education Act where the needs qualify for funding.

All programs receiving federal funding from any source

All of the above

None of the above

Should there be a national assessment aligned with the common cores standards?

Yes

No

If Yes, Should implementation be voluntary or federally mandated? (choose one)

Voluntary

Mandated

Mandated, if fully funded

If No, what other accountability measures might you suggest? (choose one)

Continue to allow the states to develop their own assessments.

Suggest that the local education districts use their own assessments or adopt one that is a nationally norm-referenced assessment such as the Stanford Achievement Test or Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Suggest that districts use a portfolio type of assessment where student projects and activities would be scored holistically

National standards should lead to: (choose one)

A nationally mandated curriculum to be aligned to the national standards and assessments.

A national curriculum that is only suggested but not mandated.

A suggested structure for states and local education agencies to develop their own curriculum.

No national curriculum.

Public Education Study Consensus Question, cont'd

What role should the national assessment consortia play in student evaluation? (Rank order)

Provide an assessment system that is aligned to the Common Core Standards.

Provide comparison data showing progress toward reaching Common Core Standards.

Provide criteria for determining readiness for college and careers.

Provide information to students, parents, teachers and school districts about student achievement.

Provide diagnostic information on each child.

Data from the national assessments are often difficult for parents, teachers and others to understand. If we have a national assessment, what information is most important to be reported to parents, teachers, students and the community? (choose one)

Data should be “norm referenced” (where students are ranked) for district comparison only.

Data should be “criterion referenced” and clearly informative so that teachers, parents, and students know how individual students have mastered criteria established at a national level.

Data should be used to determine “cut” scores knowing if students have mastered requirements for special grade levels.

Information from nationally required assessment data should be used to (Choose one):

Sanction schools not measuring up to the specific levels

Reward schools that achieve high scores

Rank teachers based on student test score data

Reward teachers who have exemplary scores

Inform districts how their population compares to others similar to theirs.

Funding and Equity

In the past most of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funding has been non-competitive based on need. All/Any Schools that prove they fall under the federal guidelines for funding receive those funds. However, competitive grants are now being proposed to states/districts who meet certain federal requirements, such as Race to the Top. Which would be appropriate: (choose one)

Non-competitive funding for all applicants meeting requirements

A combination of non-competitive and competitive grants

Competitive grants only

No federal funding

If the federal government’s role is the concern of the “common good” then: (choose one)

Mandates only should be sanctioned.

Mandates and funding should both be provided.

Funding should be provided through grants only.

A combination of funded mandates and grants should apply.

No mandates should be required and limited grants for innovation available.

Equity in public education means equitable access to: (Rank order)

high quality teaching/learning

adequate and current learning materials

clean and well maintained physical facilities

Public Education Study Consensus Question, cont'd

food and health care
safe and secure neighborhoods
secure housing

Currently Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) funding is considered “categorical” rather than for general use. This means that it can only be used with special populations for special purposes. ESEA should remain targeted toward poverty and special needs.

Strongly agree Agree No consensus Disagree Strongly disagree

The federal government has a role in supporting early childhood education, birth to 5 for all children?

Strongly agree Agree No consensus Disagree Strongly disagree

Federal support for early childhood education programs (e.g.Head Start, Title I, Special Education, Early Start) should include funding for parent education and support regarding child development, child health and nutrition, and access to other supportive services, such as mental health as needed.

Strongly Agree Agree No consensus Disagree Strongly Disagree

This funding should be extended to :

All children only those with special needs special needs first

Help Wanted

The state budget is \$2 million dollars in arrears and as the legislature gears up for a special session to address this, most of the talks are centered on cuts in basic health and education.

Susan Eidenschink from the LWVWA would like help with lobbying efforts to point out to our legislators the fallacy in cost savings when basic health priorities are slashed. This work will be done through computer and e-mails.

Please let us know if you are willing to work with Susan.

Email Co-pres1@bellinghamwhatcom.org

The League is also looking for a member to represent us at **Whatcom Fair Voting** meetings. **Whatcom Fair Voting** is a non-partisan ad-hoc grass-roots group working to promote electoral process integrity. The group meets monthly on a Thursday morning.

If you are interested please Email

Co-pres2@bellinghamwhatcom.org

A Big Thank You

Our three **election forums** were recorded for rebroadcast on the city’s channel BTV10. Janice Keller and the production crew were professional and helpful to us all in facilitating this public service. Watching and listening to the candidates has been a useful tool to help the County’s residents vote and we would like to thank the city and all the staff that made it possible.

The holidays are here -- the season of giving. We hope you will remember our LWV Education Fund when you are considering your holiday or any other charitable contributions. The education fund is a 501©(3) tax deductible organization. We may draw from it for educational efforts for our League including funding for our civic book *The State We’re In-Washington*. Thank you for considering a donation.

Please make out your check to LWVBWC Education Fund to be tax deductible.

The Federal Role in Education Study Material

Please read these short articles from the League of Women Voters of US in preparation for our November 19 meeting . Additional material was included in our October Voter and posted on the website.

<http://www.lwvbellinghamwhatcom.org/EducationStudy.html>

THE HISTORY OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN PUBLIC EDUCATION: WHERE HAVE WE BEEN AND HOW DID WE GET HERE?

Where Have We Been?

From the very beginning of our Republic, a well-educated citizenry was thought to be essential to protect liberty and the general welfare of the people. Even before the Constitution was established, the Land Ordinance of 1785 and the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 included responsibilities of the nation for an education system. Education has long been considered a national concern by the federal government. Through federal action, education has been encouraged and financially supported from the first Northwest Ordinance in 1785 to the present. Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution granted Congress the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the general welfare of the United States. It is under this “general welfare” clause that the federal government has assumed the power to initiate educational activity in its own right and to participate jointly with states, agencies and individuals in educational activities.

During the first century of our new nation, Congress granted more than 77 million acres of the public domain as an endowment for the support of public schools through tracts ceded to the states. In 1841, Congress passed an act that granted 500,000 acres to eight states and later increased land grants to a total of 19 states. The federal government also granted money, such as distributions of surplus federal revenue and reimbursements for war expenses, to states.

Though Congress rarely prescribed that such funds be used only for schools, education continued to be one of the largest expenses of state and local governments so the states used federal funds whenever possible for education.

Two of our constitutional amendments played an important role in public education. In 1791, the 10th Amendment stated, “The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.” Public education was not mentioned as one of those federal powers, and so historically has been delegated to the local and state governments.

In 1868, the 14th Amendment guaranteed rights to all citizens by stating, “all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens in the United States and of the state wherein they reside. No state shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any state deprive any person of life, liberty or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the law.”

Included below is a brief historical overview of federal involvement in public education.

History of the Role of the Federal Government in Public Education: Timeline

Event	Date	Explanation
Land Ordinance & Northwest Ordinance	1785/1787	Requirement of a system of public education to be established in each township formed under a specified formula. Regulated monies raised via taxes and selling or renting land.
Land Grants	1841/1848	Congress granted 77+ million acres of land in the public domain as endowments for support of schools. Federal government also granted surplus money to states for public education.
Early philosophy – first six presidents		Discussion of a national university and urging of federal involvement in public education. Seen as critical to preparation for citizenship in a republican form of government.
First Morrill Act otherwise known as the Land Grant Act	1862	Donated public lands to states to be used for the endowment to support and maintain at least one college with specific purpose of teaching branches of agriculture, mechanic arts and industrial education.
The original Department (Office) of Education established	1867	Began to collect data – information on schools and teaching that would help states establish effective school systems.
Second Morrill Act	1890	Gave the Office of Education responsibility for administering support for the original system of land-grant colleges.
Smith-Hughes Act	1917	Promoted vocational schools
Lanham Act	1941	Eased the burden on communities affected by presence of military and federal installations: payments to school districts.
GI Bill	1944	Provided post secondary education assistance to GIs returning from World War II
George-Barden Act	1946	Provided funding for agricultural, industrial and home economics training for high school students
National Defense Education Act	1958	In response to Soviet Sputnik. NDEA included support for loans to college students in science, mathematics and foreign languages.
Elementary and Secondary Education Act	1965	Established comprehensive set of programs including Title I of federal aid to disadvantaged.
Title IX	1972	Prohibited discrimination in education based on gender.

<u>Section 504 of the Rehabilitation _____</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>Prohibited discrimination based on disability.</u>
<u>Department of Education cabinet level agency</u>	<u>1980</u>	<u>Recognized the important role of public education in our country.</u>
<u>Educational Testing Service (ETS) and NAEP</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>Federal government transferred responsibility for administering the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to ETS: the nation's report card.</u>
<u>Nation at Risk</u>	<u>1983</u>	<u>Report indicating that the USA was falling behind in education achievement.</u>
<u>President G.H. Bush</u>	<u>1989-1992</u>	<u>"Indian Education Bill of Rights"</u> <u>K-12 Drug awareness model</u> <u>Advisory committee on Hispanic education</u> <u>America 2000 education reform program</u> <u>Work began on national standards</u>
<u>President W. Clinton</u>	<u>1993-1999</u>	<u>Academics 2000 offered grant to states / local school districts for innovation. Teach for America.</u>
<u>President G.W. Bush</u>	<u>2001-2008</u>	<u>Reauthorization of ESEA –No Child Left Behind.</u>
<u>President Barack Obama</u>	<u>2009 -</u>	<u>President Obama's Blueprint for Reform – Reauthorization of ESEA.</u> <u>Race to the Top: Grants awarded to states with innovative ideas that accepted the Common Core Standards.</u>

Produced by the LWVUS The Education Study: The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

© 2011 by the League of Women Voters of the United States

Some Food for Thought

Looking ahead — our January 21, 2012 meeting is scheduled at the YWCA ballroom and will focus on program planning. We're going to make it a potluck lunch and will talk about options for our national program and positions. On alternate years LWVUS asks us to evaluate options for future program topics and also to review our current positions and determine those that should be updated. We will do this around the table as we enjoy a hearty winter potluck. The boards will also reveal ideas for a new local project.

Role of the Federal Government in Education: Where are we Now and the Impact Upon Early Childhood Education

The United States has changed dramatically since the early debates on public schools. The responsibility for education for the common good shifted from mainly local control to state control. Now, in 2011, attention is coming from the federal government and national organizations to control standards.

Congress is currently in a debate and stalemate over the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (1965 ESEA, reauthorized as “No Child Left Behind” in 2001). Major issues include the purpose and role of the federal government in public education.

Pro: An increased role of the federal government in education ensures equal education opportunities for all children across the country, so that we will be better prepared to compete globally. The federal government has always had a part in distributing funding to state and local school districts for specific needs, so there will be more consistency

Con: Education has traditionally been a local and state issue. An increased role of the federal government will add to the number of unfunded federal mandates (laws passed with no monetary support). Decisions at the local level best serve the needs of students in the local area.

Funding for Early Childhood Education

This Brief covers the reasons for the federal role in public education relating to early childhood, the importance of parent education, and the pros and cons related to federal intervention in early childhood education.

The National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) creates standards and guidance for early childhood providers across the country. Their position statements promote and endorse an integrated, well-financed system of early care and education for the learning and development of all children, including children in poverty.

(cont'd on page 11)

Glossary

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): States are required by the No Child Left Behind Act to establish academic standards in reading and math and yearly targets for the percentage of students scoring proficient in these standards. AYP means a school/district has met the target for the year.

Assessments: Standardized tests of student achievement which can be **norm-referenced**, i.e. designed to rank students in order to compare them, typically with percentile scores, or **criterion-referenced**, i.e. designed to determine how well students have mastered particular academic standards or objectives.

Common Core Standards: A set of academic standards in reading and math setting out what students are expected to learn at different ages/grade levels that has been developed by the National Governors’ Association and the Council of Chief State School Officers. A majority of states have adopted these standards and the federal government recently awarded funds to two state **consortia** to develop assessments based on these standards.

Curriculum: An education plan that spells out goals and objectives, including academic standards, such as the Common Core, how to achieve these, and methods and materials to be used.

Cut Scores: A specific score on a test that separates students into categories, such as proficient or not, or passing and failing.

(cont'd on page 14)

Timeline of Major Federal Programs For Early Childhood Up to 2010

Title	Year	Purpose
Head Start	1965	Funded by U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services to provide children from low-income families free access to early education. It also includes children who are at risk and with disabilities.
Even Start Title I, Part B.	1988	Integrated early childhood education to low-income parents for children birth through age 7, integrating adult education and early childhood learning with family literacy programs.
Early Head Start	1995	Funded programs for low-income families supporting 2 generations, usually mothers and infants and toddlers.
Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Many revisions since 1965	Local education agencies apply to state agencies for approval of the program that is subsequently funded by the federal government.
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	2001	Promotes the use of Title I, Part A, to fund pre-school programs, recognizing the importance of preparing children for entering school with language, cognitive and early reading skills.
Early Reading First	2002	Extends the goals of NCLB under Reading First to pre-schoolers.
Special Education preschool grants and state grants programs 3-5	2002	Part of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) funding for preschool students ages 3 to 5.
Special Education Grants for Infants and Families	2007	Part C of IDEA (birth to 2 for children with disabilities)
Child Care Development Fund (CCDF)	Many revisions since 1990	The Child Care and Development Fund assists low-income families, families receiving temporary public assistance, and those transitioning from public assistance in obtaining child care so they can work or attend training/education.

The Role of the Federal Government in Education:

Where Are We Now and the Impact Upon Early Childhood Education, cont'd

Pros: From an economic standpoint, achieving equity builds lasting value. Heckman's (2010) research shows that inequality in the development of human capabilities produces negative social and economic outcomes at every level and can be prevented by the proper investment in people. Early childhood education, particularly for disadvantaged children and their families, levels the playing field to provide equal opportunities for success. Every dollar invested in early childhood education returns ten cents on the dollar annually for the life of a child, a 10 percent per year return on investments. Furthermore, solid economic returns are possible, providing investments come early and are comprehensive, cohesive, and sustained over time, because it shapes the future and builds

equity. Heckman warns that investing later chains us to fixing the missed opportunities of the past that are very costly. Heckman's research clearly documents the impact of quality early childhood education upon later success in school, and beyond, in health and in economic advantages for society in general.

Cons: Reasons against the federal involvement in early childhood basically come from providers of childcare centers as well as legislators. Some argue that universal preschool will be too expensive to support and that it will take away funding for K-12 grades. Educators who own and manage private preschools raise concerns that parents will choose "free" preschools instead of private ones.

References

Heckman, J.J. (2010, December). Invest in early childhood development: Reduce deficits, strengthen the economy. Retrieved from <http://www.heckmanequation.org>

Education Liberty Watch (March 20, 2011). Retrieved from <http://edlibertywatch.org/2011/03/studies-on-effectiveness-of-early-childhood-programs/>

Read more contrasting viewpoints:

<http://www.brighthub.com/education/early-childhood/>
<http://edlibertywatch.org/2011/03/studies-on-effectiveness-of-early-childhood-programs/d/articles/47611.aspx#ixzz1FZSLilX8>

Produced by the LWVUS The Education Study: The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

© 2011 by the League of Women Voters of the United States

Welcome to our Newest Members:

June I. Crinkley

Kathi Hiyane-Brown

Linda Hochreiter

Iris Sanderson Jones

Dan and Dewey White

The Role of Federal Government in Public Education:

Legislation and Funding For the Education of Children with Special Needs

In 1965, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) was passed by Congress. ESEA was the center of President Johnson's War on Poverty and was influenced by the Civil Rights Act of 1964. The children who were covered by ESEA in 1965 included those who were disabled and covered by an amendment to the original ESEA (Title IV – Aid to handicapped children).

Within the next decade, the education of disabled children was funded by a separate law: the Education for All Handicapped Children Act of 1975 (EAHCA). Over a 35-year span, the law was reauthorized and became the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), the latest of which was reauthorized in 2004 and called the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act (IDEIA). The upcoming reauthorization of ESEA will also influence how IDEIA is administered and practiced.

IDEIA has four sections that cover the Free and Appropriate Education (FAPE) of 6.6 million disabled children who are age 0-21.

Part A (General Provisions)

Part B (Assistance for Education of All Children with Disabilities)

Part C (Infants and Toddlers with Disabilities)

Part D (National Activities to Improve Education of Children with Disabilities)

Mandates in Special Education Funding

Funding requires adherence to the federal mandates. The most important mandate is the zero-reject policy, under which no child is turned away from educational services. To qualify for special education service, a student must be classified with one (or more) of 13 disabilities now covered by IDEIA. The definition of "a child with a disability" is found in the United States Code, Title 29 1401(3) (A):

- 3) *The term 'child with a disability' means a child—*
- (i) with mental retardation, hearing impairments (including deafness), speech or language impairments, visual impairments (including blindness), serious emotional disturbance (referred to in this chapter as "emotional disturbance"), orthopedic*

impairments, autism, traumatic brain injury, other health impairments, or specific learning disabilities; and (ii) Who, by reason thereof, needs special education and related services.

The federal government demands that states submit plans for the distribution of monies to local agencies for direct instructional programming that adhere to federal mandates. Under each state's laws, an Individualized Educational Program (IEP) is constructed for each child receiving services. The purpose of an IEP is to assure the student of a FAPE, as ensured by law. The child is to be placed in the Least Restrictive Environment (LRE) for education.

In order to qualify for federal funds, state and local agencies are bound to federal guidelines to specify identification procedures and the placement of disabled children. State grant applications for federal funds must include a plan for distribution of the funds to local education agencies (LEAs), as well as sufficient time for the general public to review and comment on the state plan. LEAs receive allotments from the state for their district special education needs. The shortfall in funding then needs to be addressed by the local education agencies.

Current Funding Challenges

Federal Underfunding: *The Education for All Handicapped Children Act (1975)* included legislation for funding local programs through state distribution of 40 percent of the cost. "Full funding" (40 percent) has never happened; the actual amount has varied. There were federal funds covering from 8 to 10 percent of the cost to states ten years ago, according to Katsiyannis, et al. (2001). The FY 2012 U.S. Department of Education Budget lists 17 percent as the current figure, with an estimated \$1,765 cost per pupil. The allotment has increased 1.7 percent in the FY 2012.

Increasing enrollment: Special education enrollment has grown, from **3.8 million** in 1973 to **6.6 million** in 2011. Federal special education support increases for FY 2012 are held at 1.7 percent over FY 2011.

Education and Funding for the Education of Children with Special Needs, cont'd

Maintenance of effort: Because of severe financial straits, more states are applying for waivers to the spending requirement by the federal government for special education funding. The waiver, called a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) has not been easily obtained and involves holding a spending pattern based on the previous year. Waivers were given to Iowa, West Virginia, and Kansas last year; waivers are pending for New

Jersey, South Carolina and Alabama (Shah, 2011).

Inclusion and training: Currently, ninety-five percent of disabled children are educated in inclusive classrooms, the rest being educated in separate classes, institutions or at home. An increase in inclusion practices is a strong possibility for fund-strapped districts (Shah, 2011). The balancing act – attention to finances, while providing for children’s needs – continues to be precarious, and it is also critical to provide teachers with quality in-service training.

References

Katsiyannis, A., Yell, M. & Bradley, R. (2001). Reflections on the 25th anniversary of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Remedial and Special Education, Vol.22, (6), 324-34.

[Shah, N. \(2011, February 14\). States expected to seek special education funding waivers. Education Week. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/02/09/20speced.h30.html>](http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/02/09/20speced.h30.html)

U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Overview. Supporting Individuals with Disabilities. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/>

[about/overview/budget/budget12/summary/edlite-section2b.html](http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget12/summary/edlite-section2b.html)

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics. Digest of Education Statistics. Chapter 2, Table 45. Children 3 to 21 years served under Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, Part B, by type of disability: Selected years, 1976 through 2008-09. Retrieved from http://nces.ed.gov/programs/digest/d10/tables/dt10_045.asp?referrer=list

U.S. Department of Education (2004). Retrieved from <http://www.ed.gov/policy/speced/guid/idea/idea2004.html?>

Glossary, cont'd from page 10 , Elementary and Secondary Education Act(ESEA): This federal statute authorizes funding primarily for specific programs and services to improve equity for disadvantaged children. Since its enactment in 1965, it has been reauthorized and amended periodically, most recently by the **No Child Left Behind Act** in 2002.

Equity: Equity connotes fairness, rather than equal funding as there is recognition that some students are more expensive to educate than others. The terms “equality of opportunity” or “equal opportunity to learn” are also sometimes used in education debates. These terms all imply **access** to what is necessary to have an equal opportunity, opportunity that is often denied children of poverty.

Mandates: Federal requirements tied to the acceptance of federal funds. Specific federal funding streams may have mandates attached for how those funds must be used (i.e., Title I, ESEA funds must be used to supplement resources provided by state and local funds) or the mandates may be “unfunded” (i.e. any educational institution accepting federal funds for whatever purpose is required to abide by Title IX (gender equity).

National vs Federal Initiatives: National initiatives, such as the Common Core are those developed by national organizations without federal requirements or funding. Federal initiatives are those developed by the Federal government using federal funds. Once developed, national initiatives could later be adopted by the federal government or mandated by it.

Race to the Top: A one-time federal competitive grant program which recently awarded funds to 12 states to accelerate education reforms. To compete for the funds, states were required to adopt the Common Core Standards.

Special Education Legislation Milestones

<i>DECADE</i>	<i>CASE/LEGISLATION</i>	<i>RESULT</i>
1950	1954: <i>Brown v. Board of Education</i>	Paved the way for special needs children to receive better education, but at this time children were still denied an education based on their disability.
1960	Bureau of Education for Handicapped Created. 1965: Elementary and Secondary Education Act became law.	No funding for handicapped under federal or state law. Amendment to original ESEA Title IV – Aid to handicapped children.
1970	1972: <i>PARC v Pennsylvania</i> and <i>Mills v. Board of Education</i> 1973: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act became law. 1974: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) became law. 1975: Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) became law.	Ruled: Disabled have equal rights. Protected disabled individuals from discrimination due to disability. Parents gained access to all information maintained by a school district on their students. Free appropriate public education for all handicapped students.
1980	1986: Addition of <i>Handicapped Children's Protection Act</i> to EAHCA.	Mandated that all school students and parents have rights under both Section 504 and EAHCA.
1990	1990: EAHCA amended and called <i>Individuals with Education Disabilities Act</i> (IDEA). 1996: IDEA reauthorized.	IDEA reauthorized. Additions include students to be included in state and national assessments, inclusion (Least Restrictive Environment, LRE). Regular classroom teachers now required to take part in an Individual Education Plan (IEP) team.
2000	2001: No Child Left Behind became the title of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. 2004: Reauthorization of IDEA (P.L. 101-476) now called IDEIA.	Accountability at state and local levels required. School districts are required to provide more instruction and interventions to help prevent enrollment in special education. Response to Intervention (RTI) gains momentum as a screening tool. Students are expected to take responsibility for their behavior and are subject to the same rules as the rest of the students.

Produced by the LWVUS The Education Study: The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

Copyright 2011 by the League of Women Voters of the United States



LWV of Bellingham/Whatcom County
P.O. Box 4041
Bellingham, WA 98227-4041

Phone: 360-734-2366
Fax:360-734-2366
Website:
www.lwvbellinghamwhatcom.org

LWV Bellingham/Whatcom— Proposed Calendar for 2011 / 2012

Updated October 30, 2011

2011

November 19: (Saturday 9:15 -12:00 am) Role of Federal Government in Education Consensus Meeting, Bellingham Public Library

November 30 (Wednesday 5:30- 7:30pm) Conversations with Our Elected Officials (Wine & Cheese Social Event) YWCA

2012

January 21 (Saturday 11:30-1:30pm) Program Planning Potluck: National & Local , YWCA

February 18 (Saturday 9:30am-noon) Conservation District Consensus and Overview of Whatcom County Conservation District Projects needs for public Location - TBD

March 17 (Saturday 9:30am-noon) Privatization of Government Services (LWVUS Study)

Bellingham Public Library

April 21 (Saturday 9:30am-noon) (TBD) Bellingham Public Library

May 21 (Saturday 12:00-3:00pm) Annual Meeting:Topic TBD YWCA

League Website Addresses

League of Women Voters WA —<http://www.lwvwa.org> League of Women Voters US—<http://www.lwv.org/>