FEDERAL GOVERNMENT POLICIES: ROCKING THE SCHOOLHOUSE

By Karen Adair, LWVS-KC Education Committee

This month we kick off our League of Women Voters’ 2011-2012 Public Education Series by focusing on the national study “The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education.” Delegates to the LWVUS Biennial Convention in Atlanta, Georgia, adopted the study in June 2010. The study materials, published in this Voter, begin with the statement, “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.” But the federal government’s current role in public education sparks frequent debates.

Please note that our forum this month will be on a different day, at an earlier time, and in a different location: We will be meeting on Tuesday, November 1, at 7:00 p.m. at Town Hall. Taking our forum to a larger location and a wider audience will educate our community, as well as ourselves, on this topic.

The Education Committee, chaired by Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, has lined up the following speakers to discuss the impact of federal policies on our state and local schools:

Randy Dorn, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Susan Enfield, Interim Superintendent, Seattle School District

Mary Lindquist, President, Washington Education Association

Frank Ordway, Director of Government Relations, League of Education Voters

Nancy Beadie and Marge Plecki, Professors, University of Washington, College of Education

In November unit meetings we will discuss consensus questions provided by the LWVUS. Don’t miss this opportunity to have a say in our national positions and action on education policies in the future.

The study materials that appear in this Voter include five background papers, along with a longer set of consensus questions than usual. It’s a great deal of information to cover in one meeting. You can prepare ahead of time by reading about this material now. Deadline for getting consensus forms back to the committee: November 21st. That’s the final date we can receive consensus forms in order to have them tabulated and reported to national by their deadline.

Coming in March is the second event in our LWV 2011-2012 Public Education Series: Fostering Teacher Effectiveness—No Easy Answers, the local study by our own Education Committee. This month’s national study will provide information essential to understanding local issues, so save this Voter to go along with the March study materials.
Connecting with Judy

As you know, we have monthly unit meetings to discuss our selected program topics. These units are the grass roots of our organization—they develop consensus on issues that they have studied. That unit consensus is in turn the basis of positions that we develop and may act upon. Units will be asked to reach consensus several times this year, for instance now, in November, on the national role in education and in March on the local study of what makes for an effective teacher. The recordings from all the units will be compiled and—perhaps—a new position will be formed on which advocacy and action can be taken.

Getting to a well-crafted position requires many things. Unit members should come prepared by having read the materials. The discussion leaders can become informed by attending the discussion leaders briefing, usually held before the monthly forum. (Others are welcome to attend.) Hearing from topic experts is a terrific way to get information to enhance discussion and understanding of issues. The more members who attend these, the better. Forums are usually the first Thursday of the month, but our November forum will be at Town hall on Tuesday, November 1; the briefing will be on Thursday, November 3, at the League office.

Robust units are essential to the process. We are fortunate to have long-standing units but we need to keep revitalizing them. It’s important to reach out to new members to help them find a suitable role in League. Finding ways to welcome them, offering rides, explaining League jargon, connecting them with other aspects of League such as the standing issue committees or volunteer opportunities—these are all essential to attracting and keeping new members. Who do you know who might find League as valuable in their lives as you do? Newly retired people? Parents whose kids are in school? Your son or daughter? Perhaps we need to form a new unit of young professionals.

Units are the grass roots of an effective League; they are important to developing informed citizens and they can provide much personal satisfaction. They are a place for lively discussions with others, a place to gain discussion skills and knowledge, and a place to form connections with other bright, active men and women. Thanks for your efforts to make them thrive.

Linette Bixby is our unit coordinator and a conduit of information between you and the Board. To reach her, see her contact information on the back page of every Voter.

Good discussions are essential for a sound basis for action. Besides having read the materials found in the Voter or on our website (just google League of Women Voters of Seattle), members should freely contribute their ideas to the discussion. Good listening skills are important, too, for good discussions. It’s as vital to share the floor as it is to share different points of view. The discussion leader may need to bring wanderers back to the topic to make sure there is enough time to reach consensus. Consensus is reached when a substantial number of the group can agree or live with the idea. And, of course, partisanship should be avoided. The final, crucial step? Get the unit recordings back to office where they can be compiled. The deadline is November 21st.

Judy Bevington, President
League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County
# November/December

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sunday</th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>Forum: The Role of the Federal Gov’t in Public Education 7:00 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>November 1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitoll Hill/Montlake Fundraiser 5:00 p.m.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Voter Deadline</td>
<td>GENERAL ELECTION</td>
<td>Discussion Leaders’ Briefing 6:30 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>International Relations Committee 12:45 p.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation Committee 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>National Education Study - Unit Consensus Reports Due</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>December 1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Land Use/Waterfront Committee 10:00 a.m.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Units are meeting during shaded period)

**NOVEMBER**

- **Forum:** The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education
  - **Tuesday, November 1**
    - 7:00 p.m.
    - Town Hall Downstairs
- **Discussion Leaders’ Briefing**
  - **Thursday, November 3**
    - 6:30 p.m.
    - League Office
- **Board Meeting**
  - **Saturday, November 5**
    - 9:00 a.m. – noon
    - League Office

**DECEMBER**

- **LWVWA Action Workshop**
  - **Saturday, November 19**
    - 9:30 a.m. – 2:30 p.m.
    - St. Andrews Lutheran Church, Bellevue
  - **November 7**
    - National Education Study
      - Unit Consensus Reports Due
      - Monday, November 21
        - 11 a.m.
        - League Office
    - **Economics and Taxation Committee**
      - **Saturday, November 26**
        - 11 a.m.
        - 909 E. Newton St., #D-9
    - **Land Use/Waterfront Committee**
      - **Tuesday, November 29**
        - 10:00 a.m. – noon
        - League Office

**NO VOTER DEADLINE IN DECEMBER**

- **Materials for January due November 7**
The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC) presents a public forum each month (except December) between August and May, generally on the first Thursday of the month at 7:30 p.m. The expert speakers at each forum focus on a topic chosen by the Board with advice from the members. We also provide information on the topic in the *Voter*. Those topics are then discussed at unit meetings during the following weeks; unit meetings are open to all. See the list of units at the end of this *Voter* for a discussion in your neighborhood.

Most forums are held at the Seattle First Baptist Church, but occasionally they are scheduled in other locations and times. Because of the broad community interest in public education, we are holding the November forum, “The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education,” at Town Hall Downstairs. This forum will be held on November 1, the first Tuesday of the month, rather than on Thursday. The briefing for discussion leaders will be held in the League office from 6:30 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. on Thursday, November 3. The schedule of upcoming forums for 2011-2012 appears above; check your *Voter* or the LWVS-KC website (seattlelwv.org) each month for up-to-date information.

Again, please note that the November forum will be held on November 1, the first Tuesday of the month.

**Diversity Policy**

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County (LWVS-KC), in both its values and practices, affirms its beliefs and commitment to diversity and pluralism, which means there shall be no barriers to participation in any activity of the League on the basis of gender, race, creed, age, sexual orientation, national origin, or disability.

LWVS-KC recognizes that diverse perspectives are important and necessary for responsible and representative decision-making. LWVS-KC subscribes to the belief that diversity and pluralism are fundamental to the values it upholds and that this inclusiveness enhances the organization’s ability to respond more effectively to changing conditions and needs.

LWVS-KC affirms its commitment to reflecting the diversity of Americans in its membership, board, staff, and programs.
Board Briefs by Joanna Cullen, Secretary

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County met on Saturday, October 8th, 2011. This is a summary of their work.

Events
Kathy Sakahara and the event team reported that they are really looking forward to an exciting and fun political party and auction event on October 23rd. All is set with speaker Stephanie Koontz. Board members were asked to continue with outreach for attendance and sponsors.

Forums and Voter Service
The October Ballot Issues forum was well-attended, with very strong speakers for all sides of the issues. Kudos to Julie Anne Kempf who put this together along with ballot summaries. The summaries are finished and will be on the League web site soon.

The LWVS-KC November forum for the LWVUS study on the role of the federal government in education will be at Town Hall. Jeannette Johnson will coordinate the TV taping and some of the other PR for this program and Kelly Powers will coordinate audience development.

Cyndi Woods reported that she has scheduled at least 18 Speakers' Bureau events; she thanked Julie Anne Kempf, Dana Twight, Ellen Barton, and Pat McCann for their work in this area.

This has been an especially busy and gratifying season. However, there have been times that volunteers have been overwhelmed with the amount of work and by the time conflicts among so many Speakers' Bureau engagements.

Seattle and South King County Merger
The South King County League is officially dissolved and the funds from those accounts are being transferred to those of Seattle-King County. M/S/C The Board approved a motion to use $2000.00 of a grant that South County had received from the Mukilteo Tribe for the purchase of a portable microphone system to do exactly that. Mary Ehlers suggested that we work with King County Library System to post our events on the library web site.

Personnel
There were more than 80 applications submitted for the office administration position that the League advertised. Applications are being screened to determine which applicants will be contacted for more information.

Challenges
A public relations point person is still needed and we are just beginning to get a good team in place to support local unit development, which is key to maintaining and building the League.

Endorsements
M/S/C After rigorous deliberation on two different motions regarding this issue, the Board decided to recommend that voters “reject” the November 2011 ballot measure that would allow the city to collect a $60.00 car tab fee over 10 years for transportation projects.

M/S/C After a robust conversation and deliberations on two different motions, the Board could not reach consensus on whether to recommend that voters reject or accept the Families and Education Levy that will be on the November 2011 ballot. The board was fairly evenly split on the issue and decided to make no recommendation on how to vote on this measure.

The Action Committee has emailed a copy of the proposed action process to the Board; unless they receive comments that indicate that it needs to be revised, the committee will soon move forward with action on these endorsements.
Committees

**Economics and Taxation Committee**
**Date:** Saturday, November 26  
**Time:** 11:00 a.m.  
**Place:** 909 E. Newton, #D9  
**RSVP:** lwvseattlenora@yahoo.com

The committee is studying the book *Age of Greed: The Triumph of Finance and the Decline of America, 1970-Present*, by Jeff Madrick. This is a fascinating book; it was reviewed by Paul Krugman in the New York Review of Books.

**Education Committee**

The Education Committee is currently completing work on the study “Fostering Teacher Effectiveness: No Easy Answers.” It is not holding regularly scheduled meetings at this time. Upon completion of the study, the Education Committee will resume its regular mission and announce a monthly meeting time.

**Immigration Committee**

Contact Committee Chair Barbara Reid for meeting information at barbereid@yahoo.com or 206-329-4848.

**International Relations Committee**
**Date:** Monday, November 7  
**Time:** 12:45  
**Place:** League Office

The International Relations Committee will be developing program ideas to engage the larger membership and community, with a view toward the 2012 elections. Though not required reading, the inspiring and thought-provoking book *A Letter to America*, by David Boren, will inform our discussion. The meeting will also include our regular sharing of “hot topic” international issues.

For further information contact Becky Castilleja, Chair, at telbalto@yahoo.com.

**Land Use/Waterfront Committee**
**Date:** Tuesday, November 29  
**Time:** 10 a.m. – noon  
**Place:** League Office

We encourage participation in our issue committees. Often there are excellent speakers who provide informative presentations.

**Transportation Committee**
**Date:** Tuesday, November 15  
**Time:** 10 a.m. – noon  
**Place:** League Office

Mission Statement

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County, a nonpartisan political organization, encourages informed and active participation in government, works to increase understanding of major public policy issues and influences public policy through education and advocacy.
King County Connects - Announcements

**GIFT FROM NANCY BAGLEY**

The Education Fund has been the recipient of a substantial gift from Nancy Bagley. Nancy took advantage of an IRS rule currently in effect, but only through the end of 2011, that pertains to IRA owners over age 70 1/2. This rule allows IRA owners to donate, tax free, directly from their IRAs to qualifying charitable organizations like the LWV Seattle-King County Education Fund. You, too, may be able to take advantage of this opportunity to support the Education Fund with tax-free dollars.

Nancy was a founder of our Education Fund when she was president, she has worked on natural resource issues, she’s on the current Education Committee, and she has given countless hours of fine work to the League. And now comes this wonderful contribution to help us do our work.

We are grateful, Nancy.

**CENTRAL WATERFRONT PROJECT**

This just in from Jan O’Connor, Co-Chair, Land Use/Waterfront Committee:

On October 27, the Central Waterfront Project is giving a presentation called Design Update and Idea Sharing. It takes place at Bell Harbor Conference Center, Pier 66. Food and music will begin at 5:00 p.m. and the presentation will begin at 6:30 p.m. Jan reports that she has attended these presentations in the past and found them “very worthwhile.”

On October 29 and 30, kids will be featured on the waterfront - the usual Halloween activities. The Waterfront Project will have a family photo booth from 10 a.m.-4 p.m. at Waterfront Park.

**SNEAK PEEK AT THE NEXT LEGISLATIVE SESSION**

On Sunday, November 6, from 5 to 7 p.m., the Capitol Hill/Montlake Unit will host **Senator Ed Murray**, with comments on the upcoming legislative session. The gathering will be at the home of Vicky Downs, 909 E. Newton Street, Unit D-9. Wine and generous hors d’oeuvres will be served. There is a suggested contribution of $20; this is a unit fundraiser.

**VOTE-BY-MAIL STUDY**

The Vote by Mail Study is seeking additional members who wish to help with the study. We have jobs large and small, including many that can be done at home or at the Seattle-King County League office, whichever you prefer. Committee meetings will be kept to a non-burdensome number.

You, too, can be a co-author, as a committee member, of an important and potentially groundbreaking study!

**PLEASE VOLUNTEER TODAY.**

For more information or to volunteer, please contact mailballotstudy@seattlelwv.org or call the League office at 206-329-4848 and ask for information to be mailed to you about participating in the Mail Ballot Study.
GREAT DECISIONS 2012

The League of Women Voters of Seattle - King County is planning for the GREAT DECISIONS discussion groups to begin in February 2012. This annual study program of the Foreign Policy Association has proved to be a valuable complement to League’s program. Briefing books can be ordered from the non-profit, non-partisan Foreign Policy Association at www.fpa.org or 800-477-5836. Look for more details in next month’s Voter.

GREAT DECISIONS TOPICS FOR 2012

- Middle East Realignment
- Promoting Democracy
- Mexico
- Cybersecurity
- Exit From Iraq and Afghanistan
- State of the Oceans
- Indonesia
- Energy Geopolitics

LWVWA ACTION WORKSHOP

The League of Women Voters of Washington (LWVWA) will be holding their 2011 Action Workshop (for those of us west of the mountains) in Bellevue on Saturday, November 19th from 9:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m., with lunch provided. The venue will be St. Andrews Lutheran Church, 2650 148th Avenue SE, Bellevue.

This is a good opportunity to hear about upcoming state issues and to learn strategies for action. Those same strategies—with a change of targets--can be transferred to our local arenas.

This is also a great chance for new members to meet some longstanding Leaguers who are skilled in “action” efforts. Even if you aren’t sure you’re ready to join in those efforts yourself, you’ll feel much more conversant with the process after this workshop. Action is at the heart of League.

You can register online or by phone or use the form below, taken from the LWVWA website:

League of Women Voters of Washington
ACTION WORKSHOP 2011 - Bellevue, November 19, 2011

REGISTRATION
Cost: $25 per person
Lunch Provided

Name ________________________________________________________________

Phone/email_____________________________________________________________

___VISA  ___M/C

Card # ___________________________________________________________ Exp. Date _____

___Check made out to LWVWA enclosed

Mail to: LWVWA, 4730 University Way NE, Suite 720, Seattle WA 98105
PRESIDENT’S WORD TO THE WISE FOR NOVEMBER
BY JUDY BEVINGTON, PRESIDENT, LWVS-KC

R-E-S-P-E-C-T! Wasn’t that once a popular song?

Let’s start singing that around our office. We have many fine people in League; they have terrific communication skills and the ability to do high level work. But in the crush of too much work and too many deadlines, it is easy to give civility a pass. I read that about 80% of people have experienced incivility in the workplace. Let’s take care that we aren’t in the wrong part of that statistic.

A typical situation is when a person or a group has worked really hard on a project and then, instead of receiving thanks and appreciation, they get input that seems critical and disparaging. This is a particular problem when the “input” comes late in the project and deadlines are approaching. How can we vet our work and get the benefits of the views of others, so as to make it a better product, without ending up sad, mad, and wondering why we are spending time on such a thankless job?

From my vantage point, I offer some suggestions:
➢ Try to simplify jobs and get help.
➢ Get input early in the process.
➢ Develop a tough skin. (One of my best friends has said to me for years, “Thick skin, Judy, thick skin”; I’m happy to report that I have the hide of a rhinoceros now.)
➢ Try not to take criticism too personally or be too defensive.

But what I most want to address is the way we communicate our advice and differences.
➢ Give advice gently and helpfully, not critically. We may not realize it, but our tone of voice or choice of words can send the meta-message, “Do it my way, Stupid.” Be hard on issues but soft on people.
➢ We DO have differences. We all know intelligent people can come to different conclusions. We may need to be reminded of the story of the ants on the elephant; each one reports an entirely different critter based on a limited frame of reference. No one has the whole story.
➢ We need to support our positions with facts and information, not personal aspersions, eye rolls, and ultimatums.
➢ We do sometimes have legitimate complaints. Let’s offer them as suggestions for improvement, not criticism. People are working hard and doing their best.

We all get tired and crabby; we don’t always give or receive input, advice, or criticism in a respectful way. But let’s give some thought to how we are treating our co-workers and value-mates. Are we being critical and curmudgeonly or supportive and mentoring? Are our remarks gratuitous and hurtful or helpful? People are not happy with incivility in paid employment. Where the pay is the occasional cup of coffee, we would do well to raise our respect quotient and be supporters and co-mentors of each other. In a rancorous election season, let’s be exemplars of respectful communication and go for 0% incivility.
Voter Service

VOTER SERVICE--VOTER REGISTRATION & SPEAKERS’ BUREAU
By Cyndi Woods, Voter Service Co-Chair

As we said last month, this is the peak of the Voter Services season. It feels like I’m watching trees change color before my eyes but I know it’s just that time flies when we’re busy; and we are surely busy this election season.

With the deadline to register to vote in the November 8th general election looming, we were able to register new, young voters at South Lake Alternative High School just in time for them to be eligible to vote in this election. It was a real opportunity to further our League mission of educating voters to become informed and active participants in government. We answered a lot of students’ questions about the local and state issues that will be on the November 8 ballot. It sounds like they are all anxious to vote for president next year so we’ll certainly return to South Lake to register any new voters turning 18 in time for that election.

We’ve had a record number of requests from local organizations for Speakers’ Bureau presentations about the ballot measures this year. It’s exciting to see the interest in this up-coming election, especially because so many of the issues are local. If you attended our forum on October 6th, you know that there are some really interesting, dare I say contentious issues on this ballot. We’re finding people are grateful to the League for providing unbiased, nonpartisan information to help them be informed voters.

Thank you to all our Voter Service volunteers. You allow us to provide voters with educational opportunities that no other organization can match.

RHUBARB CREAM CAKE
Got some rhubarb to use up? At its summer retreat the Board was treated to Mary Ehler’s delicious Rhubarb Cream Cake. Mary has graciously given us permission to print her recipe.

If you have some League-worthy recipes, especially if you have a recipe you particularly associate with a favorite League event, send it along to the editor for inclusion in the Voter.
Good things and good memories are to be shared.

RHUBARB CREAM CAKE
1 box yellow cake mix
4-6 cups rhubarb
1 cup sugar
1 cup half and half

Make up cake mix per box instructions. Pour into 9x12 baking pan. Cut up 4 to 6 cups raw rhubarb and sprinkle over the top of the cake batter. Sprinkle cup of sugar over rhubarb. Carefully pour 1 cup half and half over sugar.
Bake at 350 deg. for 1 hour.

Thanks, Mary!
Joel Bakan’s excellent op-ed in the August 22, 2011 issue of The New York Times made me eager to read his book. In his first chapter, he writes that corporations “are programmed to put their missions of creating wealth for their owners above everything else and to view anything and everything [including nature and children] as opportunities to exploit for profit.”

He shows us that many animated on-line games such as “Whack Your Soul Mate” and “Boneless Girl” are both popular and widely available to children on the web. Addictinggames.com is “one of the web’s premier casual games sites.” For adolescent children who are naturally “fascinated by violence, horror, cruelty and sex, especially when parents disapprove,” such sites can be irresistible. He describes the various ways in which social media for children use their viewers to influence each other and their parents. Giving away “free” virtual treats for virtual pets and warning a child that his “pet might die” while the child is on a family vacation are tactics I found especially alarming because we took real pets seriously in my family.

Bakan’s chapter “The New Curriculum of Childhood” describes myriad ways in which marketers pull children’s loyalties away from their parents. Imagine driving your sons or daughters to a sports appointment while each is in his own world listening to his own music. On television, companies such as Nickelodeon aim “to create a place where kids could [listen and/or play] and feel empowered”. The idea is to give them an escape from the “clean-up-your-room-do-your-homework drudgery of their parents’ regime” and have fun. What comes with this fun is a host of issues such as “addiction” to the media, difficulty developing deep relationships, and an inability to create one’s own happiness. There is also the issue of sexualizing violence, which tends to have a malign affect on children’s ideas about the purpose of life and about their growing relationship to things rather than to people.

A chapter called “Prescriptions for Profit” outlines the ways in which pharmaceutical companies have “medicalized” normal behavior. Nowadays hundreds of thousands of children (mostly boys) line up daily to receive prescribed drugs at school so they will not fidget and move about too much and won’t look moody or depressed. The tactics “Big Pharma” uses to influence parents (and through them, doctors) include ghostwriting researchers’ work, sponsoring speeches by doctors who advance specific brands, providing seminars at plushy resorts for doctors, and controlling clinical trials to suppress negative research findings.

The final chapters focus on schools. Even under President Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan there is a lot of corporate influence in the education world. Charter schools are paid with public funds, but are run by private groups, sometimes by for-profit organizations. With an emphasis by all schools on test scores, children are losing out on a chance to learn to love learning for its own sake. The testing business is booming and Bakan shows how the emphasis on tests tends to narrow the minds of students.

Bakan writes that the desire of test makers to make money above all else means they use the cheapest employees to score the tests in the most efficient way possible. Needless to say there is little testing of deep analysis and little opportunity for tests to measure such things as character development, or the ability to think outside the box, to imagine, or to demonstrate good citizenship.

This is a well-researched, short, and thought-provoking book about a topic that is profoundly important for anyone who cares about education or children.

The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV.
BOOK REVIEW by Susan Sanders

Incognito: The Secret Lives of the Brain by David Eagleman

David Eagleman is a neuroscientist at Baylor College of Medicine, where he directs the Laboratory for Perception and Action and the Initiative on Neuroscience and Law. In Incognito, Dr. Eagleman compares our conscious mind to the place our planet holds in our galaxy, off to the side and not as consequential as the “team of rivals” within our brain that mull over ideas long before our conscious mind has its eureka moment. Our conscious mind trains the team, modulates its activities, and then primarily drifts off until there are inconsistencies between expectation and events and we have to pay attention.

He cites many examples of what we’ve learned: some females have an extra color photoreceptor and can see more hues than most of us; some people have “joined” senses to see words in color and tastes with shape; all of us have a retinal blind spot where our brains paint in the missing image. A most astonishing idea is that the brain doesn’t need the eyes to see; perhaps any sensory input will do. Currently, there are sensors that sit on the tongue and allow the blind to see, divers to navigate through murky water, and soldiers to view 360 degrees of landscape.

The book is a fascinating read, and several items make it particularly interesting for League: two are the illusion-of-truth effect and criminal punishment.

The discussion of the illusion-of-truth effect details studies that prove what advertisers and political campaigners have banked on for years: we are more likely to believe a statement is true if we’ve heard it before, even if the study tester tells the subject the statement is false.

“Blameworthiness” is the wrong question to ask when ordering punishment for crime when what we really care about is future likelihood of reoffending. Dr. Eagleman divides criminal sentencing into three categories: rehabilitation where available, prison punishment to modify future behavior, and warehousing the remainder. Some impulse-driven criminals, e.g., addicts, purse-snatchers, etc., might choose to train themselves to reduce the primacy of their impulses and therefore rehabilitation could bring them back. The author stresses that this is behavior modification exercised by the criminal, rather than imposed by the state (as in One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest). Science can help supply rational ways of sentencing and suggestions for rehabilitation; these ideas are evolving and not foolproof, but better than the blameworthiness model we mostly use today.

In the matter of nature vs. nurture, Dr Eagleman believes we are constructed from a genetic blueprint that environment overlays but that we choose neither – there is no free will. However, he concludes with the quip that “if our brains were simple enough to be understood, we wouldn’t be smart enough to understand them.”

The opinions in this review are personal and do not represent those of the LWV.
CONSSENSUS ON LEAGUE POSITIONS

BY NORA LEECH

We have many opportunities to take positions this year. There are four studies: two from the national League of Women Voters (education in November and privatization in February) and two from our very own Seattle-King County League (education in March and vote by mail in May).

For each of these, League members will be reading thoughtful background papers on the topic written by League members, listening to speakers at a League forum presenting differing and balanced sides to the issue, and then—at unit meetings—discussing the consensus questions.

For the Seattle League, there is a three-person committee selected by the President that is charged with compiling the unit responses and determining if there is a consensus for our Seattle League. In the case of a national study, the results are then forwarded to the national League. For local studies, results are presented to the Seattle board, which will consider whether they should be voted on, as a new position perhaps, at the next annual meeting.

What is consensus?

In your unit, you will be charged with assessing whether there is consensus or not in your group for each of the consensus questions. In the document League Basics, p.13, LWVUS defines consensus as “not a simple majority, nor unanimity; rather it is the overall sense of the group as expressed through the exchange of ideas and opinions.” After listening to the discussion, the unit leaders will have to use good judgment to decide whether their members have reached consensus for each question.

General guidelines.

If there are one or two members vociferously objecting, do they, in your judgment, represent the sense of the body? Are they 2 of 4 members or are they 2 of 20 members.

Members only. Please note that only current members can vote on League positions. If you are in doubt, call the office. (People must be officially registered as members before the day of the discussions.) Others are guests. Please limit the discussion to primarily members although you have discretion to include others within reason.

DEADLINES. Your results must be submitted, usually, to the Seattle League office by the end of the month: November 21st for National Education Study (to meet a national deadline); Feb. 29th for Privatization; and March 31st for the local education study.

When submitting your responses to the Seattle office you must include:

➢ Unit name
➢ Person submitting the responses
➢ Date
➢ Number of members in attendance
➢ Number of guests in attendance and
➢ The responses to the questions.
November Program: LWVUS Education Study

The LWVUS Education Study

The Education Study scope is broad and includes the following areas under the role of the federal government in public education (preK through grade 12): the history, funding, and equity issues which are addressed under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and the common core standards/assessments which are required for many federal grant programs but are national, not federal. The culminating position will address only those issues delineated in the scope.

The Committee:

Peggy Hill, Co-Chair
Texas

Joanne Leavitt, Co-Chair
California

Pat Aaron
Illinois

Sanford Ostroy
Massachusetts

Carolyn Jefferson-Jenkins
Colorado

Patricia Libutti
New Jersey

Jean Pierce
Illinois

Janelle Rivers
South Carolina

The League of Women Voters of Seattle-King County Education Committee prepared the forum and members of the committee are resources for unit discussion of the study:

Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis, Chair
Karen Adair
Nancy Bagley
Joanna Cullen
Jeanette Johnson
Kelly Powers
Dana Twight, Moderator
PUBLIC EDUCATION STUDY - CONSENSUS QUESTIONS

In order to cover the 15 consensus questions during your unit meeting, it is important to stay on topic no matter how fascinating a side trip may be. We highly recommend that units begin with question 4 and work through question 15, and then circle back to answer questions 1-3. National says, “While questions 1-3 may seem simple, they are important to developing strong positions.” Thank you for doing your homework and for working on this gratifying and challenging study. This is your unit’s opportunity to have a say in our national league’s positions and action on education policies in the future.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

1. The current role of the federal government in public education is
   Much too small  Too small  About right  Too large  Much too large

2. What should be the role of the federal government in public education? (Rank)
   a. To ensure that all students preK-12 receive a quality education.
   b. To develop accountability measures that will study the progress of all students so that they achieve adequate yearly progress.
   c. To mandate Common Core Standards for all students K-12.
   d. To monitor state efforts for funding
   e. To measure teacher effectiveness through test data.

3. A quality public education is important to perpetuate a strong and viable democracy.
   Strongly agree  Agree  No consensus  Disagree  Strongly disagree

Please share any comments your League has concerning the topics covered in the General Consensus Questions. (250 word maximum)

COMMON CORE STANDARDS

4. 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)
   a. Special grant programs such as Race to the Top
   b. All programs under Elementary and Secondary Education Act where the needs qualify for funding.
   c. All programs receiving federal funding from any source
   d. All of the above
   e. None of the above

5. 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)
   a. Voluntary
   b. Mandated
   c. Mandated, if fully funded
If No, what other accountability measures might you suggest? (choose one)
   a. Continue to allow the states to develop their own assessments.
   b. 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*.
   c. Suggest that districts use a portfolio type of assessment where student projects and activities would be scored holistically

6. National standards should lead to: (choose one)
   a. A nationally mandated curriculum to be aligned to the national standards and assessments.
   b. A national curriculum that is only suggested but not mandated.
   c. A suggested structure for states and local education agencies to develop their own curriculum.
   d. No national curriculum.

7. What role should the national assessment consortia play in student evaluation? (Rank order)
   a. Provide an assessment system that is aligned to the Common Core Standards.
   b. Provide comparison data showing progress toward reaching Common Core Standards.
   c. Provide criteria for determining readiness for college and careers.
   d. Provide information to students, parents, teachers and school districts about student achievement.
   e. Provide diagnostic information on each child.

8. 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)
   a. Data should be “norm referenced” (where students are ranked) for district comparison only.
   b. 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.
   c. Data should be used to determine “cut” scores knowing if students have mastered requirements for special grade levels.

9. Information from nationally required assessment data should be used to (Choose one):
   a. Sanction schools not measuring up to the specific levels
   b. Reward schools that achieve high scores
   c. Rank teachers based on student test score data
   d. Reward teachers who have exemplary scores
   e. Inform districts how their population compares to others similar to theirs.

Please share any comments your League has concerning the topics covered in the Common Core Standards Questions. (250 word maximum):
FUNDING AND EQUITY
10. 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)
   a. Non-competitive funding for all applicants meeting requirements
   b. A combination of non-competitive and competitive grants
   c. Competitive grants only
   d. No federal funding

11. If the federal government’s role is the concern of the “common good” then: (choose one)
   a. Mandates only should be sanctioned.
   b. Mandates and funding should both be provided.
   c. Funding should be provided through grants only.
   d. A combination of funded mandates and grants should apply.
   e. No mandates should be required and limited grants for innovation available.

12. Equity in public education means equitable access to: (Rank order)
    a. high quality teaching/learning
    b. adequate and current learning materials
    c. clean and well maintained physical facilities
    d. food and health care
    e. safe and secure neighborhoods
    f. secure housing

13. 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

14. 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

15. 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.
    a. Strongly Agree      Agree      No consensus     Disagree  Strongly Disagree
    b. This funding should be extended to:
       All children       Only those with special needs        Special needs first

Please share any comments your League has concerning the topics covered in the Funding and Equity Questions. (250 word maximum)
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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Ordinance &amp; Northwest Ordinance</td>
<td>1785/1787</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Grants</td>
<td>1841/1848</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early philosophy – first six presidents</td>
<td></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Morrill Act otherwise known as the Land Grant Act</td>
<td>1862</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The original Department (Office) of Education established</td>
<td>1867</td>
<td>Began to collect data – information on schools and teaching that would help states establish effective school systems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Morrill Act</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>Gave the Office of Education responsibility for administering support for the original system of land-grant colleges.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith-Hughes Act</td>
<td>1917</td>
<td>Promoted vocational schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanham Act Impact Aid laws</td>
<td>1941</td>
<td>Eased the burden on communities affected by presence of military and federal installations: payments to school districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI Bill</td>
<td>1944</td>
<td>Provided post secondary education assistance to GIs returning from World War II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George-Barden Act</td>
<td>1946</td>
<td>Provided funding for agricultural, industrial and home economics training for high school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Defense Education Act</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>In response to Soviet Sputnik. NDEA included support for loans to college students in science, mathematics and foreign languages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary and Secondary Education Act</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Established comprehensive set of programs including Title I of federal aid to disadvantaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title IX</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>Prohibited discrimination in education based on gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Prohibited discrimination based on disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department of Education</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Recognized the important role of public education in our country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Testing Service (ETS) and NAEP</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Federal government transferred responsibility for administering the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to ETS: the nation’s report card.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nation at Risk</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Report indicating that the USA was falling behind in education achievement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| President G.H. Bush | 1989-1992 | “Indian Education Bill of Rights”  
K-12 Drug awareness model  
Advisory committee on Hispanic education  
America 2000 education reform program  
Work began on national standards |
| President G.W. Bush | 2001-2008 | Reauthorization of ESEA –No Child Left Behind. |
| President Barack Obama | 2009- | President Obama’s Blueprint for Reform – Reauthorization of ESEA.  
Race to the Top: Grants awarded to states with innovative ideas that accepted the Common Core Standards. |
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THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN PUBLIC EDUCATION:
EQUITY AND FUNDING

Public school funding comes from many sources – federal, state and local taxes as well as grants provided by both governmental and nongovernmental agencies. The federal government adds less than 10 percent to local education budgets, yet it contributes significantly to the rules for how the funding is used. Additionally, the United States invests 5 percent of the GDP in public education. Nearly half of the k-12 education funding in the United States is intended to come from the states, drawn from a combination of income taxes, fees and other taxes. However, some states resemble Illinois, where the state’s share is only 27 percent. The remainder usually comes from local property taxes.

EQUITY
States that rely heavily on property taxes to fund education tend to have large inequities in school funding, which mirror the inequity of wealth in society-at-large. Hurst (2007) noted that inequities in wealth stem from the fact that wealthy people earn much of their income from investments and/or inherited funds, while the poor earn all of their income from jobs and they spend it on food, shelter, transportation, etc. In the United States, the wealthiest 20 percent own 84 percent of the total wealth.

Inequities in school funding reflect housing patterns. During the past 50 years since Brown vs. Board of Education, schools have become re-segregated (Ladson-Billings, 2006). Currently, three-fourths of the Black and Latino/a students attend schools that are predominately non-white.

ADEQUACY
Since, 1990, rather than looking at equity, most lawsuits have focused on adequacy—whether a state is providing local districts with just enough funding and resources to give all students a basic education. Odden and Picus (2008) developed a model calculating the cost of an adequate education. They defined an adequate education as one that includes factors such as a full-day kindergarten, core class sizes of 15 for grades K-3, 25 for grades 4-6 and specialist teachers. The cost of an adequate education varies. For instance, more money is needed to educate students from impoverished communities and students with special needs.

FUNDING PRIORITIES
When schools are not funded adequately, this has a long-lasting impact. For instance, Darling-Hammond (2010) noted that dropouts cost the country at least $200 billion a year in lost wages and taxes, costs for social services and crime. Since the 1980s, national investments have spent three times more on the prison system than on education. Data show that the national average for educating a child is $9500, while it costs $43,000 per year to keep a person incarcerated. With 5 percent of the world’s population in the United States, we house 25 percent of the world criminals (Kang & Hong, 2008).

NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND (NCLB)
In 2001, President George W. Bush signed the reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act, “No Child Left
Behind,” which was intended to close achievement gaps, particularly for minority children. However, data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) reveal that scores were higher in math and reading for minority students before NCLB. One provision of NCLB permitted parents to remove a student from a low-performing school and transfer to another, better performing school. They would receive a voucher which would pay some of the cost of attending another school – public or private. Additionally, courts and education agencies stepped in to “remediate.” The sanctions imposed by NCLB had the effect of punishing or threatening punishment to low-performing schools and teachers, sending them the message that they were incompetent and that they should not have the right to make decisions about how to educate students. Studies (Reeve, 2009) showed that threatening public schools and teachers with punishment had harmful effects on students who remained in the public schools.

Supporters of NCLB appreciate the increase in accountability for schools and teachers as well as the focus on low scoring sub-groups. Critics of NCLB decry the lack of federal funding for many of the Act’s mandates, the emphasis on penalties, the reliance on standardized tests, and the lack of attention to gifted students as well as to subjects such as science, social studies and the arts. One goal of NCLB has been to offer choice to parents whose children attend poorly performing schools. However, large-scale studies of voucher school students have revealed little difference in their performance compared to public school students with similar backgrounds, and having vouchers has not raised the performance of the most needy students (Rouse & Barrows, 2009). Furthermore, many (Holland, 2011) argue that the NCLB goal of 95 percent of students meeting state standards in reading and math by 2014 is unrealistic.

**Race to the Top (RTTT)**

Race to the Top was signed into law by President Barack Obama in 2009. This program shifted the basis of awarding funds to emphasize competition. Competitive grants reward reform planned in the winning states. Funding is flexible as long as states demonstrate grant dollars are aligned with the agenda outlined in their winning applications. Only twelve states received funding through RttT.

Two of the requirements met by states that received RttT funding were (1) improving teacher and principal effectiveness based on performance and (2) lifting the cap on the number of charter schools that could be created.

While both these funding requirements can be effective, neither is foolproof, and each addresses only one part of the problems schools face. For instance, research studies show that promising increased pay based on teacher effectiveness is not an effective incentive. Furthermore, research showed there is a problem when teacher performance evaluation is based only on student scores in standardized tests (Springer et. al. 2010).

Although there is no question that some charter schools are effective, they have not been the panacea many expected. They were originally proposed as an opportunity for educators to test research-supported methods for reaching hard-to-educate children, and some have done quite well. However, a large-scale research study funded by pro-charter advocates revealed that only 17 percent of the 2403 charter schools had significantly more growth in test scores compared to traditional public schools, and, in fact, 37 percent showed significantly less growth (Center for Research on Education Outcomes, 2009). Furthermore, many
charter schools do not admit and/or retain students who need increased support, e.g., students from impoverished communities and students with special needs.

The progress of the U.S. Department of Education’s Equity and Excellence commissions can be tracked through [http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/eec/index.html](http://www2.ed.gov/about/bdscomm/list/eec/index.html).
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THE ROLE OF THE 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.

**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**


Special Education Legislation Milestones

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DECADE</th>
<th>CASE/LEGISLATION</th>
<th>RESULT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>1954: <em>Brown v. Board of Education</em></td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bureau of Education for Handicapped Created.</td>
<td>No funding for handicapped under federal or state law.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1965: Elementary and Secondary Education Act became law.</td>
<td>Amendment to original ESEA Title IV – Aid to handicapped children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1973: Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act became law.</td>
<td>Protected disabled individuals from discrimination due to disability.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1974: Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act (FERPA) became law.</td>
<td>Parents gained access to all information maintained by a school district on their students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1975: Education for All Handicapped Children Act (EAHCA) became law,</td>
<td>Free appropriate public education for all handicapped students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1986: Addition of <em>Handicapped Children’s Protection Act</em> to EAHCA.</td>
<td>Mandated that all school students and parents have rights under both Section 504 and EAHCA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1990: EAHCA amended and called <em>Individuals with Education Disabilities Act</em> (IDEA).</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1996: IDEA reauthorized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2001: No Child Left Behind became the title of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2004: Reauthorization of IDEA (P.L. 101-476) now called IDEIA.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN PUBLIC 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 across the districts and states.

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.

TIMELINE OF MAJOR FEDERAL PROGRAMS FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD UP TO 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head Start</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>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.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Even Start Title I, Part B.</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Integrated early childhood education to low-income parents for children birth through age 7, integrating adult education and early childhood learning with</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 preschool 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 preschoolers.
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.

**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.
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Read more contrasting viewpoints:
http://www.brighthub.com/education/early-childhood-programs/d/articles/47611.aspx#ixzz1FZSLilX8
COMMON CORE STANDARDS

Students who move from one part of the United States to another during their K-12 school careers are likely to encounter substantial variations in requirements for graduation. The Common Core Standards Initiative (CCSI, 2010) stated: “We need standards to ensure that all students, no matter where they live, are prepared for success in postsecondary education and the workforce. Common standards will help ensure that students are receiving a high quality education consistently, from school to school and state to state. Common standards will provide a greater opportunity to share experiences and best practices within and across states that will improve our ability to best serve the needs of students.”

Currently, standards for student performance vary widely by state. The roots of current state-to-state inconsistencies lie in the fact that public education in the United States has traditionally been a local responsibility. However, textbook publishers have created something of a “de facto” national curriculum, based on market needs. Consequently, many textbooks from major publishers have reflected the curricular choices that were made by educational groups in the largest states. Some publishers do create textbooks and other curricula for smaller markets.

Rothman (2009) summarized the efforts of various groups to create common standards across the United States. Initial efforts to foster development of national standards and a related system of assessments in the core subject areas began in the early 1990’s through awarding grants to a dozen national organizations.

The National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO) launched the Common Core State Standards initiative in March 2009 after the nation's governors agreed in concept to adopt a uniform set of standards. The final report was issued on June 2, 2010 (NGA, 2010), and, by early 2011, 40 states have adopted the Standards. The adopting states are currently aligning them to their own state standards.

The Fordham Institute (Carmichael, et al. 2010) reported that the Common Core standards received high marks when compared to state standards across the country. The Institute suggests that Common Core Standards represent an opportunity for creating consistency and raising standards in all states.

ASSESSMENTS

The implementation of the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 has created a 50-state and 50-test environment in public education. As a result state-to-state expectations and performances vary greatly. States publish annual reports of Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP), which are required by federal law, but the meaning of “proficient” in those reports can vary widely from one state to another (Cronin, et al. 2007).

Larger testing companies market a variety of norm-referenced standardized tests. However, they are designed to rank students, rather than to determine how well students have mastered curricular objectives as criterion-referenced tests would do. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) publishes results that are
technically adequate for state-to-state (and international) comparisons, but that assessment is not designed to produce individual student scores. NAEP requires a large sample of students to produce results. Most school systems are too small to qualify for testing that would produce local NAEP results. The tradition of local governance has led to inconsistent requirements and standards for student performance across the country. Thus, in 2010, the United States does not have a consistent set of academic assessments for grades K-12.

Two coalitions, together representing 44 states and the District of Columbia, won a U.S. Department of Education competition for $330 million dollars federal aid to design “comprehensive assessment systems” aligned to the Common Core and designed to measure whether students are on track for college and career success. The awards, announced in September 2010, were divided between the Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers (PARCC), comprised of 26 states receiving $170 million, and the SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium that comprises 31 states and received $160 million. At least 12 states participated in both coalitions and are waiting to decide which assessment system will best meet their needs. An advantage of having assessments that are used in more than one state is that results from all participating states could be compared.

**WHY NOT NATIONAL STANDARDS OR ASSESSMENTS?**

The most common arguments against adopting the Common Core Standards for K-12 center on two issues: 1) the cost and difficulty of changing the existing curriculum and assessments and (2) the sovereignty of states in issues related to education and local control. Governor Rick Perry of Texas stated that the Race to the Top funding would only generate a one-time amount of $75 per student, yet cost Texas taxpayers an additional $3 million. A third argument is that the individual state standards might be more rigorous. However, states that adopt the Common Core are permitted to add 15 percent more in content.

Another concern is the potential to use scores from the student assessments as a major component of teacher evaluations and merit pay plans, an idea that has popular appeal. (*TIME*, 2010). In August 2010, ten of the nation’s premier educational researchers (Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, Ravtich, Rothstein, Shavelson & Shepard, 2010) co-authored a report that cautioned against relying on student test scores as a major indicator for evaluating teachers, citing the technical problems associated with using scores from standardized student assessments in value-added statistical models.

**DOES THE UNITED STATES NEED A NATIONAL CURRICULUM?**

The U.S. Department of Education presents the view that, since the developers of the Common Core Standards and the proposed assessments have been groups with state representation rather than the federal government, neither program is a federal initiative. (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, March 13). In March 2011, the Albert Shanker Institute issued a call for common curriculum guidelines (Albert Shanker Institute, 2011; Gewertz, C. 2011, March). This document voices the concern that common assessments are being developed from the common standards with no curriculum in between. In May 2011, another group published an article with a different view: “Closing the Door on Innovation: Why One National Curriculum is Bad for America” (2011), discussed by Gewertz, C. (2011, May). The article also
cites the prohibition against a federal curriculum contained in the 1965 ESEA.
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Glossary

Adequacy of funding: This is an attempt to define the cost of an education, which would use research and identified methods to enable a high percentage of students to reach or exceed mandated performance levels.

Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP): This is a statewide accountability system, negotiated separately by every state with the U.S. Department of Education and mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 which requires each state to ensure that all schools and districts make Adequate Yearly Progress.

Assessments (Formative vs. Summative): Summative Assessments are given periodically to determine at a particular point in time what students know and do not know in order to make a decision or determine a grade. Many associate summative assessments only with standardized tests such as state assessments, but they are also used as an important part of district and classroom programs.

Formative Assessments are part of the instructional process. When incorporated into classroom practice, they provide the information needed to adjust teaching and learning while they are happening. In this sense, formative assessments inform both teachers and students about student understanding at a point when timely adjustments can be made. These adjustments help to ensure students achieve targeted standards-based learning goals within a set time frame.

Common Core Standards (CCS): The Common Core Standards provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them. The standards are designed to be robust and relevant to the real world, reflecting the knowledge and skills that our young people need for success in college and careers. The initiative is sponsored by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO). As such, the initiative is a national one and neither developed nor funded by the federal government.

Compensatory education: Compensatory education is a legal term used to describe future educational services which courts award to a special needs student under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA) when a school district has failed to provide a free and appropriate public education that meets their needs.

Cut scores: The cut score on a test (or on multiple tests) is the score that separates test takers into various categories, such as a passing score and a failing score, or a selected score and a rejected score. For example, the cut score on most state driving exams is 70%, meaning that anything below that score is a failing grade, and anything above that score is a passing grade.

de facto: in effect; for all intents and purposes
Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) or No Child Left Behind (NCLB): The Act is an extensive statute that funds primary and secondary education, while explicitly forbidding the establishment of a national curriculum. It also emphasizes equal access to education and establishes high standards and accountability. In addition, the bill aims to shorten the achievement gaps between students by providing each child with fair and equal opportunities to achieve an exceptional education. As mandated in the Act, the funds are authorized for professional development, instructional materials, resources to support educational programs and parental involvement promotion. The Act was originally authorized through 1970; however, the government has reauthorized the Act periodically since its enactment. The current reauthorization of ESEA is the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, named and proposed by President George W. Bush. The ESEA also allows military recruiters access to 11th and 12th grade students’ names, addresses and telephone listings when requested.

Equity of funding: An attempt to equalize educational opportunities by sharing resources with equal access across schools.

Equity vs. Equality: Equity connotes fairness, rather than equal funding because there is a growing awareness that some students are more expensive to educate than others. Some educators talk about “equity of opportunity” and “opportunity to learn,” ideas that deal with access to what is deemed necessary to have an equal opportunity, opportunities that are often denied children of poverty.

English Language Learner (ELL) has replaced the term ESL English as Second Language learner. These are students who do not have English as their first language.

Federal vs. National Initiatives refers to both mandates and funding. A national program is one that was developed by a national organization. For example the Common Core Standards were developed by an initiative of the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), and neither was required, promoted or funded by the federal government. Federal refers to those programs that are funded and/or mandated by the federal government. For this study, the Common Core Standards are a national initiative, but the federal government has required it for the grant program, “Race to the Top.” There have long been national standards developed by professional organizations like the National Council of Teacher of Math, English, etc. But to date, there have not been federal standards.

Formula Grant Programs are noncompetitive awards based on a predetermined formula. These programs are sometimes referred to as state-administered programs.

Funding (Categorical vs. General): Categorical funding refers to the funding under the Elementary and Secondary Act which is awarded to districts with specified populations of high needs learners, for example Native Americans, special needs, poverty, etc. General funding is awarded for all children regardless of economic or social category.

GDP: Gross Domestic Product is the market value of all goods and services produced in a country over a period of time.
**Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 (IDEIA)** is a United States federal law that governs how states and public agencies provide early intervention, special education, and related services to children with disabilities. It addresses the educational needs of children with disabilities from birth to age 18 or 21 in cases that involve 13 specified categories of disability. The current law is the reauthorization of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997 commonly referred to as IDEA.

**Norm-referenced Tests vs. Criterion-referenced Tests:** Norm-referenced tests are those that are interpreted by rank ordering children so that on a particular test children are compared to their peers, typically with percentile scores. Criterion-referenced tests are interpreted by comparing student scores to certain objectives or criteria.

**Peer-reviewed journal** is an academic journal edited by acknowledged experts in the broad field. When an article is submitted, an editor sends it to people who are specialists researching the topic addressed in the paper. Based on their feedback, the editor tells the prospective author whether the article is accepted for publication. Some articles are returned for revisions and may be resubmitted to the approval process.

**Pedagogical:** referring to the process of teaching

**Race to the Top:** Race to the Top, abbreviated R2T, RTTT or RTT, is a $4.35 billion U.S. Department of Education program designed to spur reforms in state and local district K-12 education. It is funded by the ED Recovery Act as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 and was announced by President Barack Obama and Secretary of Education Arne Duncan on July 24, 2009.

**Racial Achievement Gap:** This terminology describes differences in educational performance between groups of students compared by race or ethnicity.

**Standards and Curriculum:** Content standards establish the goals of learning whereas curriculum is the “how” to implement the standards or goals with specific materials and instruction to correspond to the standards. The Common Core Standards initiative is a U.S. education initiative that seeks to bring diverse state curricula into alignment with each other by following the principles of standards-based education reform. The initiative, sponsored by the National Governors Association (NGA) and the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO), was announced on June 1, 2009. The initiative’s stated purpose is to provide a consistent, clear understanding of what students are expected to learn, so teachers and parents know what they need to do to help them.

**Performance standards** determine how much of the content standards a student must know in order to reach a particular level, such as “proficient.”

**Curriculum** is an educational plan that spells out which goals and objectives will be achieved, how to achieve those goals and what topics should be covered as well as the methods and materials to
be used for learning and evaluation. Neither the original Elementary and Secondary Education Act nor President Obama’s Blueprint supports federal development of curriculum.

**Common Acronyms/Abbreviations**

ACT: American College Test  
AERA: American Educational Research Association  
APA: American Psychological Association  
AYP: Adequate Yearly Progress  
Blueprint: A Blueprint for Reform: The Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act  
BIA: Bureau of Indian Affairs  
BIE: Bureau of Indian Education  
CCR: College and Career Readiness  
CCSI: Common Core Standards Initiative  
CCSSO: Council of Chief State School Officers  
CSSRS: Center for Study of Small Rural Schools  
ELA: English Language Arts  
ELL: English Language Learners  
ESEA: Elementary and Secondary Education Act  
FAPE: Free and Appropriate Education  
HUD: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
IDEA: Individuals with Disabilities Education Act of 1997  
IDEIA: Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004  
IEP: Individualized Education Program  
K-12: Kindergarten through Grade 12  
LEA: Local Education Agency  
LRE: Least Restrictive Environment  
NAEP: National Assessment of Education Progress  
NCES: National Center for Education Statistics  
NCLB: No Child Left Behind  
NCME: National Council on Measurement in Education  
NGA: National Governor’s Association  
OME: Office of Migratory Education  
PARCC: Partnership for Assessment of Readiness for College and Careers  
RTTT: Race to the Top  
SBAC: SMARTER Balanced Assessment Consortium
The Constitution of the United States of America

Article I.
Section 8. The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;
To borrow money on the credit of the United States;
To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;
To establish a uniform rule of naturalization, and uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies throughout the United States;
To coin money, regulate the value thereof, and of foreign coin, and fix the standard of weights and measures;
To provide for the punishment of counterfeiting the securities and current coin of the United States;
To establish post offices and post roads;
To promote the progress of science and useful arts, by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries;
To constitute tribunals inferior to the Supreme Court;
To define and punish piracies and felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations;
To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;
To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;
To provide and maintain a navy;
To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;
To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the union, suppress insurrections and repel invasions;
To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the states respectively, the appointment of the officers, and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;
To exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten miles square) as may, by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of the government of the United States, and to exercise like authority over all places purchased by the consent of the legislature of the state in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings;--And
To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.
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kjorgensen@juno.com 206-329-4848  Federal Way

Thursday, November 17

**BAYVIEW** — Peg Williams
pwilliams@brc-res.com 206-329-4848 9:30 a.m.  Bayview Retirement Community
4th Floor Solarium, 11 W. Aloha St.

**ISSAQUAH DAY** — Margaret Austin
margaret.austin@comcast.net 206-329-4848 10:00 a.m.  Issaquah City Hall, Coho Room
upstairs, 130 E. Sunset Way

**WEST SEATTLE** — Ethel Williams/Amanda Berry
etheljw1@q.com 206-329-4848 12:30 p.m.  The Kenney
amandamberry@earthlink.net 206-329-4848 7125 Fauntleroy Way SW, Seattle

**UNIVERSITY HOUSE/WALLINGFORD**
This unit is in need of a Unit Leader for the Wallingford community. Please contact Membership if you have any questions.
# Board & Committee Contacts

## Executive Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Judy Bevington</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:president@seattlelwv.org">president@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>1st V.P. Voter Service</td>
<td>Cyndi Woods</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cyndiwoods@comcast.net">cyndiwoods@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>2nd V.P. Outreach</td>
<td>Kelly Powers</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:outreach.seattlelwv@gmail.com">outreach.seattlelwv@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>3rd V.P. Public Relations</td>
<td>Jean Carlson</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jean.carlson@att.net">jean.carlson@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>4th V.P. Program</td>
<td>Jeannette Johnson</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeannettejohnson10@msn.com">jeannettejohnson10@msn.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Treasurer</td>
<td>Kati Ortiz</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:treasurer@seattlelwv.org">treasurer@seattlelwv.org</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Joanna Cullen</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jfoxcullen@gmail.com">jfoxcullen@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Action</td>
<td>Linda Brown</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:brownlj@comcast.net">brownlj@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Directors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Action Outreach</td>
<td>Ellen Barton</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eeb0825@yahoo.com">eeb0825@yahoo.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>King County South</td>
<td>Mary Ehlers</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:maryehlers@comcast.net">maryehlers@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Voter Service</td>
<td>Julie Anne Kempf</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:julie@kempf.com">julie@kempf.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Eastside</td>
<td>Shari Lundberg</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:shari.c.lundberg@gmail.com">shari.c.lundberg@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>King County South</td>
<td>Pat McCann</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:thomaspa@nwlink.com">thomaspa@nwlink.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>Ginna Owens</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ginnao@earthlink.net">ginnao@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Event Chair</td>
<td>Kathy Sakahara</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kathysakahara@gmail.com">kathysakahara@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Dana Twilight</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com">membership.seattlelwv@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td>Janet Winans</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:janetwinans@earthlink.net">janetwinans@earthlink.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Education Fund Board

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>President</td>
<td>Nancy Eitreim</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancye@speakeasy.net">nancye@speakeasy.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2013</td>
<td>Secretary</td>
<td>Laraine Volkman</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:laraine.volkman@att.net">laraine.volkman@att.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ruth Schroeder</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:schrdrcrl@comcast.net">schrdrcrl@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Director</td>
<td>Ellyn Swanson</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td>gusel <a href="mailto:lyn@comcast.net">lyn@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Nominating Committee

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Karen Adair</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:adairk@seanet.com">adairk@seanet.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Astrid Berg</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Jeanette Kahlenberg</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kahlenb@gmail.com">kahlenb@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011–2012</td>
<td>Boots Winterstein</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:paulwinterstein@q.com">paulwinterstein@q.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Off-Board Positions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Phone</th>
<th>Email</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unit Coordinator</td>
<td>Linette Bixby</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:linettebixby@gmail.com">linettebixby@gmail.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIS Coordinator</td>
<td>Cynthia Howe</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:howe.john@comcast.net">howe.john@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voter Editor</td>
<td>Nan Moore</td>
<td>206-329-4848</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nanvoter@comcast.net">nanvoter@comcast.net</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Committees

Economics & Taxation: Nora Leech 206-329-4848 LWVseattlenora@yahoo.com
Education, incl. Teacher Study: Lucy Gaskill-Gaddis 206-329-4848 terrylucy2u@comcast.net
Immigration: Barbara Reid 206-329-4848 barbereid@yahoo.com
International Relations: Rebecca Castilleja telbalto@yahoo.com
Land Use/Waterfront: Karen Kane 206-329-4848 kanek@iopener.net
Privatization: Nora Leech 206-329-4848 LWVseattlenora@yahoo.com
Social Justice: Kathleen Randall 206-329-4848 kathleen8@gmail.com
Transportation: Janet Winans 206-329-4848 janetwinans@earthlink.net
Vote by Mail Study: Julie Anne Kempf 206-329-4848 julie@kempf.com
LWV SEATTLE: NOVEMBER FORUM

The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

Town Hall Downstairs
1119 8th Avenue
(Eighth Avenue and Seneca Street)
Seattle, WA

Tuesday, November 1
7:00 p.m. - Forum

All forums are open to the public.

Speakers include:
- **Randy Dorn**, Superintendent of Public Instruction
- **Susan Enfield**, Interim Superintendent, Seattle School District
- **Mary Lindquist**, President, Washington Education Association
- **Frank Ordway**, Director of Government Relations, League of Education Voters
- **Nancy Beadie and Marge Plecki**, Professors, University of Washington, College of Education