



Voter of Southwest Santa Clara Valley



July/August, 2011

League of Women Voters

League of Women Voters Contacts

LWV Southwest Santa Clara Valley

P.O. Box 2865

Saratoga, CA 95070-0865

408 867-VOTE (8683)

www.lwv-sw-santaclara-valley.org

Bay Area League of Women Voters

1611 Telegraph Avenue, Suite 300

Oakland, CA 94612

Telephone: 510 839-1608

Fax: 510 839-1610

<http://lwvba.ca.lwvnet.org>

League of Women Voters California

1107 9th Street Suite #300

Sacramento, CA 95814

Phone: 916 442-7215

Fax: 916 442-7362

<http://ca.lwv.org>

League of Women Voters

1730 M Street NW, Suite 1000,

Washington, DC 20036-4508

Phone: 202-429-1965

Fax: 202-429-0854

<http://www.lwv.org>

<http://ca.lwv.org/membersonly>

In This Issue

President's Message	2
Board Bytes	3
California Redistricting	4
Observer Volunteers	4
More On Redistricting	4
LWV Bay Area Convention, 2012	4
Federal Government Role In Public Education	5, 6, 7
Open Calendars for Legislatures	8
National LWV Council 2011	8
Bay Area League Day	8
LWVUS Clean Air Promise	9
Air Quality Mixed Results	9
LWVSWSCV Annual Board Reports	10
Monthly Calendar	11
Event Details	12

Federal Government Role in Education Study



Preparation Reading
in this Issue
for

Consensus Meetings
September 27
October 12

See pages 5 through 7.

California Redistricting

How Will It Affect the
State and Our Local Communities?

with Speakers

Terry Christensen & Susanne Wilson

Coming
September 14, 2011

See page 4 for more information.



President's Letter

It is my honor to have been selected to serve as the president of the League of Women Voters of Southwest Santa Clara Valley! In my short tenure, I've learned that LWVUS encourages each league to recruit, retain and promote new members to leadership roles. Well, our league seems to have really internalized that process — selecting me after just two short months of membership! I do know that I will work hard with all of you this year, the 100th Anniversary Year of California women getting the right to vote, and, hopefully, reward your trust.

Leadership jobs are always hard to fill, and I do know I have big shoes to fill — the past presidents and Board members have done an outstanding job in keeping this local chapter of the League vital and thriving. Thank you to Jane Catalano, our outgoing president, and her Board for their leadership, commitment, and hard work over the last year.

At our first Board meeting on July 6, Shirley Hill, VP of Program Planning, shared the initial topics she and her committee have identified for focus this coming year and they are really relevant and exciting. The first event, scheduled for September 14 at the Campbell Community Center, will be on Redistricting — a process that impacts all of us Californians in terms of senate districts, assembly districts, and county supervisor districts, etc. The eyes of the country are on California, which appointed a citizens' committee to study and make recommendations for redistricting rather than leaving it up to the legislators to determine. Kudos

to Shirley and her team for all the work they have done thus far.

As many of you know, I was motivated to join LWVSWSCV because I wanted to participate in the League's National Study on the Role of the Federal Government in Public Education that will address the issues of equity, funding, and standards/assessment/accountability — areas that are key for on-going improvement and excellence in our public schools. I'm happy to report that the National League has provided great articles related to each area, in addition to the two books recommended for reading. In this issue, you will find a lot of information about the National Study as the time for the consensus meetings is drawing near, and we do want all who participate in those meetings to have read and processed the background information. Three summary articles are featured in this issue, and two more summary articles will be published in the September issue. The complete articles can be accessed on the LWVUS website. Please contact Shirley Hill at shillca@aol.com and/or Carol Petersen at carol_home@yahoo.com if you'd like more information about this study and/or the study materials. Committee members are also reminded that their attendance is strongly requested at the next committee meeting scheduled for August 22 at the Saratoga Library.

Thanks to meeting another new, local League president, I was reminded that one of my heroes, Eleanor Roosevelt, was a League member. In 1921 she was a local League delegate to the national convention in Cleveland. Twenty years later, as First Lady, she addressed the 1940 LWVUS convention and recalled a speech of Minnie Fisher Cunningham, famous Texas suffragist (1882-1964), which made her feel "that you had no right to be a slacker as a citizen; you had no right not to take an active part in what was happening to your country as a whole." Many, many years later, the League of Women Voters still lives those ideals, and I look forward to our work together to further them this year!

Eleanor Yick, President
(408)-354-7473, egyick@me.com

2011-2012 Board of Directors

Officers

President, Eleanor Yick
 First VP – Administration, Dale Hill
 Second VP – Program, Shirley Hill
 Third VP – Membership, Jane Ellis
 Secretary, Marge Bunyard
 Treasurer, Marge Gorrell
 Action State and National
 Michelle Shimada
 Bay Area Representative
 Meg Giberson
 Education, Carol Petersen
 Natural Resources, Nancy Hobbs
 Observers, Raquel Durand
 Public Relations, Joan Sarlo
 Voters Service Coordinator
 Josie Geisen
 Voter Editor, Cherri Nelson

Off-Board

Clip 'n Come, Margaret Rezowalli
 Communications, Marilyn Buelteman
 Finance Drive, Dick Kelkenberg
 Great Decisions Co-Chairs
 Anne & Al Stewart
 Health Care, Barbara Lea
 Housing, Margaret Bard
 Immigration, Patty Weber
 League Phone, Carol Petersen
 Member Database, Linda King
 National Study Co-Chairs
 Carol Petersen, Shirley Hill
 Nominating Committee Chair
 Jane Ellis
 Publications, Sharon Snyder
 Santa Clara County Council Chair
 Margaret Bard
 Smart Voter, Michelle Shimada
 Telephone Tree, Natalie Heling
 Voters Service
 Candidate Forums, Josie Geisen
 Pros & Cons, Carol Petersen
 Registration, Dan Hoffman
 Web Page Co-Chairs,
 Barbara Lea & Sharon Snyder

Board Bytes

Board Meeting of June 1

Redistricting – Jane Catalano attended the May 19 County Redistricting Committee meeting and Patty Weber and Ann Roberts reported on the State Redistricting Commission meeting. No solid recommendations were made.



Observer Corp Chair – Patty Weber announced that Raquel Durand will be the new Chair.

LWVUS Controversy – Board discussed reactions to TV ads naming Missouri Democratic Senator and Massachusetts Republican Senator for their failure to support the Clean Air Act. Purpose was to have President Elect Eleanor Yick hear Board opinions in preparation for attendance at the LWV National Council meeting she is attending. President Catalano read remarks from LWV members all over nation responding critically to Leagues naming of two legislators. Some questioned that LWVUS actions threatened LWV non-partisan handling of future issues League supported or opposed. The Board did not take a position pro or con, but urged Eleanor Yick to keep board reactions in mind when attending LWVUS meeting.

Program Committee – Ann Roberts reviewed and praised the work of her committee.

Gift for President – The Board presented President Catalano a lovely necklace for her service.

Board Training – Past State President, Jackie Jacobberger, conducted board training. Some of the issues she covered were the LWV mission, levels of advocacy positions (local, state, Bay Area, & national), studies, Board teamwork, separation of charitable funds from administrative funds, fund raising duties, by-laws versus policy-making with handouts for all parts of her presentation. Her training session was split into 2 parts, with a nice break to share a potluck lunch. All was held at Dale Hill's home from 9:30A.M.-3:30P.M. This thorough training was appreciated by all present.

Board Meeting of July 6

New President – Eleanor Yick presided over her first meeting which began with approval of the June minutes.

Treasurer's Report – Marge Gorrell reported on the June 30 ending balance including rent for the Fire Department room for 2011-12 for board meetings. When she presented the budget for 2011-12, the Board asked her to look into the status of insurance covering directors and officers.

LWVUS Council – Eleanor Yick opened with a reading of *The Goose Story*, which follows. The controversial LWV TV ads, naming senators in MA and MO who voted against EPA laws protecting public health, were discussed. Eleanor felt discussion was handled well by LWVUS President MacNamara. Though there had were advocates with opposing views, attendees were united in criticism of the non-disclosure of the League's money source for the ads.

Voter ID – States are passing laws requiring voters to present photo ID when voting. LWV opposes this plan, considering it voter suppression.

Webinars – Dates in June, July, August, and September given out promoting Leagues' use of the Internet more effectively including Facebook and Skype.

Calendar Planning Meeting – The next Board Meeting on August 3 will be a calendar planning meeting.

Education Study Program – The Board agreed to co-sponsor and publicize an Education Study Program with Palo Alto on Tuesday, September 20 at Palo Alto High School with Stanford Professor Linda Darling-Hammond.

Program – Shirley Hill discussed the year's calendar of events. The first meeting on the Status of Redistricting will be on September 14.

August Fundraiser – Status of the fundraiser showing of *Iron Jawed Angels*, the chronicling of women getting the vote, was discussed. Members considered this program to be better used in the high schools and West Valley College classes to promote voter registration, rather than as a fundraiser.

Membership Renewals - Follow-up letters and e-mails will be pursued.

Action - Michelle Shimada reported urging people to contact President Obama to support EPA standards.

Bay Area – State fire protection will be the next big issue to tackle.

Voters Service – Josie Geisen said first emphasis will be on voter registration at schools and farmers markets. Pros & Cons presentations on initiatives may be lining up for the spring primaries.

Marge Bunyard, Secretary

Teamwork: The Goose Story

The next time you see geese heading south for the winter, flying along in a V formation, you might be interested in knowing what science has discovered about why they fly that way.

It has been learned, that as each bird flaps its wings, it creates an uplift for the bird immediately following. By flying in a V formation, the whole flock adds at least 71% greater flying range than if each bird flew on its own. **People who share some direction and sense of community can get where they are going quicker and easier, because they are traveling on the thrust of one another.** When a goose falls out of formation, it suddenly feels the draft and resistance of trying to go it alone, and quickly gets into formation to take advantage of the lifting power of the bird immediately in front. **A high performing team has members who are all headed in the same direction, and complement and collaborate with one another.** When the leader gets tired, he rotates back in the wing, and another goose flies to take point.

Great teams share the leadership role when different skills are needed. The geese honk from behind to encourage those up front to keep up their speed. **Recognition of effort and accomplishment is the ultimate motivational tool.**

Finally, when one goose gets sick, or is wounded by a gun shot and falls out, two geese fall out of formation and follow him until he is able to fly, then they launch out on their own, or with another formation to catch up with the group. **On all successful teams, members support and protect one another at all times. We are stronger when we know our teammates are there for us.**

California Redistricting

What is redistricting and why does it occur every 10 years?

September 14, 2011, 7:15P.M. at the Campbell Community Center.

The two speakers are Terry Christensen & Susanne Wilson

Our United States Constitution directs Congress to count the population in a federal census every ten years to determine Congressional representation for the 436 seats. California is the most populous state which has 53 representatives. States and communities must also realign district boundaries to maintain the principal of "one person, one vote."

Susanne Wilson served on the San Jose City Council, on the Santa Clara County Board of Supervisors, and was the first woman president of the Association of Bay Area Governments, and also chaired the Santa Clara County Citizens Redistricting Commission.

Terry Christensen is a professor of political science at San Jose State University. He specializes in state and local politics. He is the author or co-author of nine books. Thirty years ago, he formed an internship program that he still directs to provide opportunities for students to participate in many diverse civic groups.

Observer Volunteers

After volunteering as an observer for the League and my community, I was asked and appointed to become the Observer's Director a few weeks ago. In taking over this position for the July 2011 to June 2012 year, I've discovered that volunteers are needed for the communities of Saratoga, Monte Sereno, Los Gatos and Campbell. If you are interested in the issues for your community, please contact me for instructions and subsequent meetings.

Raquel Durand, Observer Director
sra_durand@yahoo.com, (408) 255-4285



More On Redistricting

The CA Citizens Redistricting Commission has released the first draft of all the CA state related districts. You may see the detailed maps by going to <http://wedrawthelines.ca.gov/maps/first-drafts.html>. There are major changes to the district lines. One of the goals, to nest two CA legislative districts into one CA senate district, was accomplished. Public hearings continue. The final maps with their new numbers will be announced on August 15.

The Santa Clara County Citizens Advisory Commission held its last meeting May 19. It voted to submit all 13 of the maps drawn and accepted by the commission to the SCC Board of Supervisors together with its minutes and the issues presented by the cities and public. No recommendations were made as to how the county should proceed.

June 6 the Board of Supervisors (BOS) heard the report of the Commission, discussed the options and decided to consider adjustments to the current districts, called Map 1, at their regular June 21 BOS meeting. Sunnyvale had requested to be placed in one district rather than two districts, which would have resulted in major changes to all the districts. Their request was denied.

On June 21 the BOS approved a redistricting plan. To view the County Redistricting Map go to <http://www.sccgov.org/> and hit redistricting under hot items. Based upon the current districts three obvious changes were, moving Monte Sereno back to District 1, moving a piece of Sunnyvale to District 5 and moving the rural area around Mount Hamilton to District 3 from District 1. A number of other smaller changes occurred mostly along the southern edge of San Jose. The margin of population deviation is 9.6%. Several more formal hearings are scheduled to meet requirements for processing the ordinance, but no changes are expected.

Phyllis Cassel, LWV Palo Alto

LWVC Convention

Four of us were thankful for the opportunity to attend the State Convention held in Ventura, California. It was a great learning opportunity to see the "big picture" of the LWVC education and advocacy efforts. The Convention voted on the 2011-13 State League program that we will support:

- Continued support and monitoring of redistricting implementation
- An update study of the Initiative and Referendum process, which was last looked at in 1999 and is seen by many to need major reform
- Education and advocacy on state and local finances, concentrating especially on voter education around the state budget
- Community education on the Initiative and Referendum process to accompany the update study

Delegates also voted to amend two existing positions to make them more robust and relevant. The Juvenile Justice position now opposes trying youths as adults, and the Election Systems position now specifically supports Ranked Choice Voting for all single seat offices (such as City Council) where it previously only named executive offices.

LWV members will be invited to get involved with all these efforts as California faces some of the biggest challenges in its history, both political and economic, and citizens look to the League to help them meet these challenges by doing what we do best: making democracy work.

Eleanor Yick, President

On the LWV California web site – We've been featuring press, photos, and more on our new LWVC Facebook page at: <https://www.facebook.com/pages/League-of-Women-Voters-of-California/144367618967227>. Workshop presentations, handouts and other resources are being posted to the state members-only site.

Eleanor Yick, President

LWVBA Convention, 2012

Plan ahead, MAY 5! The convention will be Saturday, May 5, 2012. Mark your League calendar now to avoid conflicts.

Federal Government Role in Public Education Study



Education Advocates,

Lots of exciting things have been happening for our National Education Study this summer.

Public Schools 101

Hurray! The consensus questions have arrived from LWVUS and background material that had been filtering out has now been published on the LWVUS website.

Ouch! A final submission date for our study report to LWVUS has also been decided which pushes up our timeline. We are expected to complete our background study, have our consensus meetings, complete our League's report for board approval and submit the final report to National by November 30. This necessitates an urgency to "get hot" on our sub-committee activities and disseminate this information for you.

A Great Opportunity! Linda Darling-Hammond, of Stanford University and President Obama's education advisory committee, has agreed to a speaking engagement, arranged by the LWV Palo Alto and co-sponsored by Palo Alto High School PTA and the LWVs of Santa Clara County (SCC), on Tuesday, Sept. 20 at 7:00 in the evening at PAHS Theatre.

A Little Light Summer Reading! We've been provided resource articles by LWVUS and are snowing you all with digested facts in this and the next *Voter*. These are summary articles of the LWVUS Education Study materials. Three articles in this issue are: *The Historical Background, National Funding and Impact on Early Childhood Education, and Common Core Standards*. Two more articles for the next *Voter* will be *Equity and Funding, and Funding for Special Needs Children*.

Your Homework! We are encouraging all of you interested members to read, digest and mull over the breadth and depth of this information. Full study materials have been posted on the LWVUS website.

Extra Credit! For those of you who like "to read more about it," here are directions, provided by Ellen Wheeler, our

Education Chair for SCC, to the abridged and unabridged articles (It's easy!):

1. Go to www.LWV.org
2. On that homepage you'll see a list of topics in a blue bar along the top. Click <For Members>.
3. On that Members page pull down menu, click on <Projects and Programs>.
4. On that Templates page, you'll see <Taskforces and Studies>. Click on <The Education Study>.
5. There you'll see on the right side, the sections: *Background Papers* and *Voter Articles*. Click on <Background Papers> for the unabridged articles. Or, click on <Voter Ready Articles> for the abridged articles version that we are printing in our *Voters*.
6. This will also give you all the in-depth references if you care to pursue them.

Extra, Extra Credit! LWVUS is also recommending two books for eager readers: *The Flat World for Education: How America's Commitment to Equity Will Determine our Future* by Stanford Professor Linda Darling-Hammond, and *The Death and Life of the Great American School Systems* by Diane Ravitch. To add some ballast, Ellen also personally recommends *Schoolhouses, Courthouses, and Statehouses: Solving the Funding-Achievement Puzzle in America's Public Schools* by Eric Hanushek, a Hoover fellow and a member of Congressman Honda's Equity Commission.

Plan Ahead! Because of the complexity of this study, we are planning two consensus meetings this fall to discuss the issues and answer the consensus questions, after having done our reading homework ahead of time.

Our first discussion/consensus meeting is Tuesday, September 27 at 2 P.M.

Our second discussion/consensus meeting is Wednesday, Oct. 12 at 7 P.M.

The location of these meetings will be announced in future *Voters*.

Heads up! We will only be discussing and coming to consensus on the first half of the study questions at the first meeting. At the second meeting, we will discuss and come to consensus on the second half of the study questions. So, make sure and

come to BOTH meetings if you want to have your opinions counted for all issues in the study. ALL members are invited to attend and participate, so we hope to see you at our meetings in September and October!

Carol Petersen, (408) 867-5499

carolp_home@yahoo.com

Shirley Hill, (408) 356-4460

shillca@aol.com

Adapted from an article by Ellen Wheeler, LWV LA/MV and SCC Ed Committee Chair

History of Federal Government's Role in Public Education

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,

Continued on page 6

Federal Government Role in Public Education Study (Cont.)

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.”

More of this article can be read on the national League web site at: <http://www.lvv.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=17613>. The latter part of this article provides an interesting historical timeline overview of federal involvement 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.

A *Timeline of Major Federal Programs for Early Childhood* up to 2010 is included in this *Voter* as an insert page.

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

possible, providing investments come early and are comprehensive, cohesive, and sustained over time, because it shapes the future and builds equity. Heckman warns that investing later chains us to fixing the missed opportunities of the past that are very costly. Heckman’s research clearly documents the impact of quality early childhood education upon later success in school, and beyond, in health and in economic advantages for society in general.

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

References and charts for this article can be found at the national League’s web site: <http://www.lvv.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&CONTENTID=17612>.

Common Core Values

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

Federal Government Role in Public Education Study (Cont.)

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, Ravitch, 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.

References for Common Core Values can be found at: <http://www.lwv.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=Home&CONTENTID=17611&TEMPLATE=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm>



Please bring these articles, pages 5 through 7 and *Timelines*, with you to the Consensus meetings.

History Timeline

Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

Event	Date	Explanation
Land Ordinance & Northwest Ordinance	1785/1787	Requirement of a system of public education to be established in each township formed under a specified formula. Regulated monies raised via taxes and selling or renting land.
Land Grants	1841/1848	Congress granted 77+ million acres of land in the public domain as endowments for support of schools. Federal government also granted surplus money to states for public education.
Early philosophy – first six presidents		Discussion of a national university and urging of federal involvement in public education. Seen as critical to preparation for citizenship in a republican form of government.
First Morrill Act otherwise known as the Land Grant Act	1862	Donated public lands to states to be used for the endowment to support and maintain at least one college with specific purpose of teaching branches of agriculture, mechanic arts and industrial education.
The original Department (Office) of Education established	1867	Began to collect data – information on schools and teaching that would help states establish effective school systems.
Second Morrill Act	1890	Gave the Office of Education responsibility for administering support for the original system of land-grant colleges.
Smith-Hughes Act	1917	Promoted vocational schools
Lanham Act	1941	Eased the burden on communities affected by presence of military and federal installations: payments to school districts.
Impact Aid laws	1950	
GI Bill	1944	Provided post secondary education assistance to GIs returning from World War II
George-Barden Act	1946	Provided funding for agricultural, industrial and home economics training for high school students
National Defense Education Act	1958	In response to Soviet Sputnik. NDEA included support for loans to college students in science, mathematics and foreign languages.
Elementary & Secondary Education Act	1965	Established comprehensive set of programs including Title I of federal aid to disadvantaged.
Title IX	1972	Prohibited discrimination in education based on gender.
Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act	1973	Prohibited discrimination based on disability.
Department of Education cabinet level agency	1980	Recognized the important role of public education in our country.
Educational Testing Service (ETS) & NAEP	1983	Federal government transferred responsibility for administering the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) to ETS: the nation's report card.
Nation at Risk	1983	Report indicating that the USA was falling behind in education achievement.
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 W. Clinton	1993-1999	Academics 2000 offered grant to states / local school districts for innovation. Teach for America.
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.

**Role of the Federal Government in Public Education
Timeline of Major Federal Programs for Early Childhood up to 2010**

Title	Year	Purpose
Head Start	1965	Funded by U.S. Dept. of Health and Human Services to provide children from low-income families free access to early education. It also includes children who are at risk and with disabilities.
Even Start Title I, Part B.	1988	Integrated early childhood education to low-income parents for children birth through age 7, integrating adult education and early childhood learning with family literacy programs.
Early Head Start	1995	Funded programs for low-income families supporting 2 generations, usually mothers and infants and toddlers.
Title I of Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA)	Many revisions since 1965	Local education agencies apply to state agencies for approval of the program then subsequently funded by the federal government.
No Child Left Behind (NCLB)	2001	Promotes the use of Title I, Part A, to fund pre-school programs, recognizing the importance of preparing children for entering school with language, cognitive and early reading skills.
Early Reading First	2002	Extends the goals of NCLB under Reading First to 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.



Special Education Study Event

Come & Hear

Linda Darling-Hammond

Stanford Professor and Renowned Educator

Speaking On

Equity Issues and Student Achievement

September 20, 2011 • 7:00P.M.

at Palo Alto High School



Open Calendars for State Legislatures

Following is a letter which was approved and sent in for publication to the Mercury News in June. All of the County Council Presidents requested this letter to appear in each League's Voter issues. It is being urged that League members contact their legislators regarding this issue.

The Mercury News has been highlighting a glaring exception to open and transparent government: our state legislators are not allowed to share their calendars with constituents even if they want to! In a recent editorial on the issue, a challenge was issued to League of Women Voters. We have heard that challenge!

A core principle of the League is that democratic government depends upon informed and active participation in government, requiring that governmental bodies protect the citizen's right to know by making public records accessible. Leagues around the country are supporting lobbying disclosure reform, so that information is provided on the pressures exerted on the national policy-making process and citizens are guaranteed access to it. Leagues in California actively advocated for the passage of Proposition 59, "Public Records, Open Meetings" in November of 2004.

On the local level, the League of Women Voters of San Jose/Santa Clara has always been a presence when open government and transparency issues are a concern, most recently on the Sunshine Reform Task Force on which no fewer than four of our members played roles. Through the efforts of this Task Force, open calendars for not only the Mayor and City Council Members, but for top managers and council staff, have been required since September 2007. Weekly postings of the names of participants, who they represent, and the topic of the meeting must be disclosed on the open calendars. Open calendars were part of the Sunshine Reform Task Force's Phase 1, the non-controversial reforms, and were adopted in August, 2007 in a unanimous (11-0) vote. Nora Campos, as a member of City Council, participated in that vote; we are disappointed that she now, as a new Assembly member, rejects that openness she embraced in 2007.

It is puzzling to us how both legislatures' Rules Committees can take such a strong position on withholding calendaring information. The premise of the Legislative Open Records Act - "The Legislature finds and declares that access to information concerning the conduct of the people's business by the Legislature is a fundamental and necessary right of every citizen in this state." (Section 9070, California Government Code) - would seem in fact to demand the opposite! We agree with the Mercury News that having open calendars would add information about special interest visitors to what we know from the bills they sponsor, their votes, and their public statements. Voters deserve to know which lobbyists are meeting with their legislators because not only do lobbyists urge sponsorship of bills, but the interests they represent fund campaigns.

We are surprised that SJMN has been able to find only one legislator, Senator Leland Yee, who has protested this prohibition on release of his calendar to leaders. We feel it is unconscionable to keep this restriction in place. We want to respond to the SJMN challenge by urging our legislators - yes, including Nora Campos - to re-consider their positions of neutrality or opposition to the release of calendars, and to sponsor legislation to change the rulings if needed. Perhaps we should submit this suggestion to Joe Simitian's "There Oughta Be a Law" contest! In addition to our request to the seven Assembly Members and four Senators representing our League members, we encourage other community members to make the same request to their own legislators.

Gloria Chun Hoo, President LWV San Jose
Martha Beattie, President LWVSJ 2010-2011



National LWV Council 2011

Thanks to the League's financial support and my travel schedule, I was able to attend the LWVUS Council. It was held in June in Leesburg, Virginia. More than 100 leaders representing 40 states were present.

After hearing both negative and positive feedback from many leagues about the controversial ads that had run in Massachusetts and Missouri, National clarified that an important part of League work is advocacy and education. These ads were done in support of a health issue—EPA standards and clean air. Regarding the issue of transparency and funding, the League did not release that information in order to keep the focus on the content of the ads. That funding information will be available to the public when year-end tax forms are filed.

Recurring themes emphasized what are we/you willing to do to make the League relevant and more effective today; how do we build a comprehensive 2012 election campaign; and, the need for each League to focus on advocacy efforts, voter registration, voter debate, and voter mobilization. Each League present set goals for their state league and worked on developing a statewide campaign. Jennifer Waggoner, LWV California president, and Helen Hutchinson (Oakland) worked on developing a statewide campaign on state and local finance.

The ending sessions focused on declining finances at the national, state, and local levels due to declining membership. Leagues were encouraged to recruit, retain and promote new leadership. A long brainstorming discussion was held on the PMP and how it can be adjusted, changed, and/or adapted.

Eleanor Yick, President

Bay Area League Day

Housing will be the topic. We are moving the date one week later than usual, to Saturday, February 4, 2012, to avoid our perennial conflict with the Planning and Conservation League's annual symposium in Sacramento.

LWVUS Clean Air Promise

Dear League Leader,

I am writing you today to bring news of the next steps in our work on clean air. As you know, the League has been a leader in enacting, improving and protecting the Clean Air Act for decades. With your help as a League leader, our organization can continue our special role in protecting public health through this historic law.

This message is being sent to you as a follow up to the webinar we conducted on clean air efforts with state League leaders this past Wednesday. We were pleased to have had about 40 leaders participate on that call.

This email and the materials in the link below explain the next phase of our work to defend the Clean Air Act and the EPA's role in enforcing it. You can watch the webinar in its entirety if you wish at <http://lww.adobeconnect.com/p167s8eixeol/>. This message is going to all state and local presidents and all webinar participants, with the exception of those where state League presidents requested that they be the ones to communicate with their local leaders.

On Wednesday, we discussed the exciting new way we'll be working for clean air—through what we're calling the "Clean Air Promise." The Clean Air Promise is designed to allow the public, elected officials and community leaders at all levels to send a strong message that clean air and the EPA have overwhelming public support. The EPA is not a budget item but rather is vital to the health of future generations who, without it, will be just as endangered as polar bears and penguins. It is time for our elected officials to respond to people, not polluters. We are working on this effort with a broad coalition of environmental and public health organizations.

The Clean Air Promise effort will have three components. The first is the launch of the campaign through a League-sponsored television ad which will appear on network stations in Washington, DC and on selected cable outlets starting next week. The ad will feature real children suffering from asthma, a condition aggravated by dirty air, and a request by the mother of such a child that everyone make the promise.

The second component will be a grassroots effort by the League, as well as our partners in the public health and environmental communities, to raise awareness of the public health effects of pollution and the importance of the EPA by asking elected officials, community leaders and citizens to make the promise. The third component is collecting personal stories of those impacted by air pollution. The public will be directed to www.peoplenotpolluters.org (which currently is under development) to make the promise and share their stories. Just like the personal stories that draw members to the League, personal experience makes this issue real.

In terms of the funding, we are not alone in this effort. We have received a grant from NRDC, member of the Partnership Project, for the launching of our effort and we continue to fundraise for our work on the Clean Air Promise. You may see television ads by the American Lung Association and by other groups which drive home the message that pollution is a public health issue.

As leaders in your communities and in League, I would like to thank you for your commitment to protecting the public health and environment and for all of your hard grassroots work to advance those protections. Your feedback on what you need from LWVUS to be successful in this work has been invaluable as we are moving this important work forward.

Together with our coalition friends, we are resetting the debate from the false issue of lost jobs and over-regulation to the real issue—public health. As we expected, efforts to eviscerate the EPA are continuing. The August recess is approaching and the League, in partnership with environmental and public health organizations, will ask members of Congress, other elected officials, key community leaders and the public to make the Clean Air Promise.

The materials that will explain and help you get started on the Clean Air Promise are linked below and can always be found at <http://www.lww.org/AM/Template.cfm?Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=17789>.

In League,
Elisabeth MacNamara, President LWVUS

Air Quality Mixed Results

In its annual State of the Air report for 2011, the national nonprofit American Lung Association devised a grading system and gave all counties in the United States a letter grade based on the federal Environmental Protection Agency's Air Quality Index levels for ozone and particulate matter. In California, however, air quality is monitored and regulated in most cases on the basis of regional air basins that encompass multiple counties, since pollution can easily be transported from one area to another, depending on weather patterns and topography. Transport is particularly evident during large wildfire events.

In the Bay Area, the regional air basin includes the nine counties that surround San Francisco Bay, including Alameda, Contra Costa, Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and southern Solano and Sonoma counties.

Only Sonoma County got straight A's. Marin County received an A for ozone but no grade for particulate matter because data was unavailable. San Mateo County got an A in ozone and a B in particulate matter, and San Francisco, an A and a C respectively. Napa County received a C in ozone and no grade in particulate matter.

According to the report, more improvement is needed in the remaining Bay Area counties to provide clean, healthful air quality. Alameda County got a F in ozone and a D in particulate matter, and Contra Costa, Santa Clara, and Solano counties all got straight F's.

The good news is that air quality in the Bay Area continues to improve. The national clean air standards continue to be exceeded on fewer days and by lesser amounts, as compared with the data in 2010's State of the Air Report.

Dee Sabiston

Read the full article on the Bay Area Monitor's web site at: http://www.bayareamonitor.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=252:region-receives-mixed-results-in-air-quality-report&catid=107:junejuly-2011&Itemid=66.

2010-2011 Annual Board Reports



The three Annual Reports published below complete the series of board reports started in the last edition of the Voter..

Observers

What do Observers do for our League? They are an integral part of our on-the-ground troops. Without our Observers, our League would be 'running silent', unaware of issues affecting our local communities, with no forward scouts to determine a clear way to proceed. Our observers are where the rubber meets the road.

What does this mean? Who informs us of what is going on in the four local cities within our membership? This is where the Observer Corp comes in.

At the national level, we wait for the LWV to inform us and what to do in the way of contacting our national representatives. At the state level, we wait for the LWVC to inform us and what to do to contact our state legislators. At the county level, we wait for the LVW Santa Clara County Council to inform us and what to do about contacting our countywide leaders.

At each City Council Meeting one of our members attends, wearing a LWV button for identification and to let Council Members know that the League is there both for support and to monitor. Observers are there to listen and make note of any City Council action that is related to a League position. They then, submit a report to the Observer Coordinator. The Coordinator will write a report of matters of note and submit it to the *Voter* for all to see. The other thing that the Coordinator does is to report to our local Board anything that seems likely to need our action. The Board decides whether or not to take any action. In most cases, our LWV President writes a letter to the Editor of all local newspapers. But, other courses of action involving our League in the issue are open to us.

We have 3 members who have decided to make themselves available to be Observers for next year's course of action. We also have a new Coordinator: Raquel Durand will take over directing our Observers in their assignments and taking from then the information which they have found. Under new leadership, it is hoped that the Observer Corps will continue to be a vital asset.

Patty Weber, Outgoing Coordinator of SSCV Observer Corps

Public Relations

As Publications Chair, I prepared the press releases for all of our public meetings, candidate forums prior to the November 2010 election, and our Pros & Cons team presentations of non-partisan discussions of the propositions on the November 2010 ballot. All this is to assist the public in a better understanding of the issues.

I try to coordinate with our LWVSWSCV website, Smart Voter, and the League of Women Voters of Santa Clara County for their calendars.

This year I tried personal contacts to emphasize press coverage of our events. Reporters would call me both before and after events to clarify the coverage, identify people participating and add additional information.

The most challenging event to publicize was the candidate forum for the Senate Seat vacated when our state senator was appointed Lieutenant Governor. This involved coordination with multiple leagues in five counties with a special effort to contact the Hispanic press. The publicity in advance was not as good as I had anticipated but I did talk editors into sending reporters to cover the event and the subsequent publicity was better than hoped.

It was a good year. I am satisfied with the results. I hope I have added some

enthusiasm to the public and interest in past and coming LWV events. I have been working with Joan Sarlo, my replacement, and will assist her throughout the coming year.

Carol Petersen, Chair

Smart Voter

As Smart Voter Liaison, I proofread political candidates' free web pages for submission on the smartvoter.org web site. I check that the web pages do not mention another candidate for the same race, whether by name or implied. The web pages must meet the following minimum requirements: two lines of biography, three priorities and contact information.

For the June 8, 2010 election, I was responsible for nine political candidates, of which six submitted web pages. That's a 67 percent participation rate. I also uploaded information on three county measures: Measures C, E and G.

For the November 2, 2010 election, I was responsible for 64 candidates. Of those candidates, 52 participated in Smart Voter. That's a 81 percent participation rate. I also uploaded information for Measures M, N and O.

For the May 3, 2011 election, I uploaded information for Measure A.

Of all the counties in California, Santa Clara County has had the highest participation rate of political candidates in Smart Voter.

Michelle Shimada, Liaison

Correction

In the June 2011 newsletter in the *Board Bytes* column on page three, it was reported that 45 Saratoga High School students were registered as new voters. This should have read that 45 Los Gatos High School students were registered as new voters.

August Calendar 2011

Sun	Mon	Tue	Wed	Thu	Fri	Sat
1	2	3	4 LWV Board Meeting 10A.M.	5	6	
7	8	9	10	11 NO Clip N' Come this month.	12	13
14	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22 Education Study Committee 2P.M.	23	24	25	26	27
28	29	30	31			

Join the League of Women Voters

Name: _____

New Member: Membership Renewal:

Address: _____

City, State, Zip: _____

Telephone, Day: _____

Telephone, Evening: _____

E-mail: _____

Mail this coupon with your dues to:

**The League of Women Voters
Southwest Santa Clara Valley
PO Box 2865
Saratoga, CA 95070-0865**

	Jul-Jun 1 year	Jan-Jul 6 months
<input type="checkbox"/> Individual	\$70.00	\$35.00
<input type="checkbox"/> Household	\$105.00	\$52.50
<input type="checkbox"/> Student	\$30.00	\$15.00

Membership year is from 7/1 - 6/30.

Dues and contributions to the League are not tax deductible. Contributions to the Education Fund are deductible to the extent allowed by law. Joining at the local level makes you a member at all levels: County, Bay

🌀 Event Details 🌀

- Aug 3 Wednesday **Board Meeting**, 10:00 A.M. Saratoga Fire Station
NO Meeting **Clip 'n Come**, Will Resume Again in September
- Aug 22 Monday **Education Study Committee Meeting**, 2 P.M.
Saratoga Library, 13650 Saratoga Avenue, Saratoga

🌀 Save the Dates 🌀

- Sept 14 Wednesday **Redistricting, How It Will Affect State & Local Communities**
7:15 P.M. Campbell Community Center, with Speakers
Susanne Wilson & Terry Christensen, **See Page 4**
- Sept 20 Tuesday **Education Event**, Linda Darling-Hammond, 7 P.M.
Palo Alto High School, Palo Alto
- Sept 27 Tuesday **Federal Government Role in Education Study**, 2 P.M.
First Consensus Meeting, **Preparation Materials page 5**
- Oct 12 Wednesday **Federal Government Role in Education Study**, 7 P.M.
Second Consensus Meeting, **Preparation Materials page 6**