

FEDERAL POLICY INSTITUTE
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY
2009-2010

C&T 4899 CRN 31131
HUDF 4899 CRN 31662

Sharon L. Kagan, Ed.D.
*Virginia and Leonard Marx Professor
of Early Childhood and Family Policy
Co-Director, National Center for Children and Families
Grace Dodge Hall #371
212-678-8255
sharon.kagan@columbia.edu
Office Hours: By appointment*

Nahliah Webber, Teaching Assistant
nlw2119@columbia.edu

COURSE MEETINGS*

<i>Introductory Session I</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>October 13, 2009</i>	<i>5pm - 7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell Hall</i>
<i>Introductory Session II</i>	<i>Wed.,</i>	<i>November 4, 2009</i>	<i>5pm - 7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell Hall</i>
<i>Introductory Session III</i>	<i>Thurs.</i>	<i>December 3, 2009</i>	<i>5pm - 7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell Hall</i>
<i>Policy Institute in DC</i>	<i>M-F</i>	<i>January, 11-15, 2010</i>	<i>9am - 5pm</i>	<i>To Be Announced</i>
<i>Follow-Up Session I</i>	<i>Tues,</i>	<i>February 9, 2010</i>	<i>5pm - 7pm</i>	<i>To Be Announced</i>
<i>Follow-Up Session II</i>	<i>Thurs,</i>	<i>February 11, 2010</i>	<i>5pm - 7pm</i>	<i>To Be Announced</i>

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Federal education policy shapes the reality of contemporary American education. Sometimes obvious and sometimes subtle, education policy simultaneously unleashes possibilities and produces contentious polemics that reverberate through American schools and educational institutions. As a result, understanding the realities of federal policy construction and implementation is essential not only for educational leaders, but also for all who hope to improve the nature of American education. That understanding is perhaps best derived by combining policy theory and first-hand experience with individuals who make and influence federal educational policy.

* *The College will make reasonable accommodations for persons with documented disabilities. Students are encouraged to contact the Office of Access and Services for Individuals with Disabilities for information about registration (166 Thorndike Hall). Services are available only to students who are registered and submit appropriate documentation. As your instructor, I am happy to discuss specific needs with you as well.*

COURSE CONTENT

The course examines the history and current status of federal policy-making through: (a) a week-long intensive institute in Washington, DC; (b) five interactive class meetings (three prior to the DC trip and two following); (c) a set of policy-related readings; and (d) the completion of all assignments. The course uses pre- and post-Washington assignments to prepare for and reinforce field-based work during the Washington week. While in Washington (January 11-15, 2010), participants will meet with leading federal policy makers from the legislative and executive branches of government, along with prominent representatives from key professional, advocacy, think tank, and membership organizations. In addition to discussing major current legislation and policy trends, participants will learn how the federal policy process impacts educational excellence and equity, with a focus on four contemporary issues:

- The Impact of the Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Movement on American Education
- Teacher Quality: Policies and Prospects
- Balancing the Public and Private Roles in Education
- The Social Context of Education (including Welfare, Social Equity, and Workforce Development)

Upon return from Washington, students will be expected to prepare a policy paper and to present mock legislative testimony, both covering the same self-selected topic.

COURSE GOALS

Upon completion of the course, students will be able to:

- Understand different conceptions of the policy process;
- Identify key policy players, entities, and organizations, indicating how they influence the policy process;
- Discern how policy is constructed and implemented;
- Be familiar with current major education policy;
- Demonstrate a clear knowledge of contemporary policy themes;
- Identify critical policy challenges facing educational leaders;
- Write a policy analysis on a topic of professional interest; and
- Present “mock” testimony on the topic selected for the policy analysis.

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

The course requires the active participation of all involved. Therefore, it is expected that participants will complete all assigned readings and be prepared to discuss their content. ***All students are expected to attend all five days of the DC portion of the Institute from 9:00 am to 5:00 pm, as well as all five TC-based classes, without exception.*** Participation in the evening event/s in Washington is optional. ***Students are responsible for organizing and financing their own food and lodging in, and transportation to and from, Washington.***

The following projects are to be submitted on the indicated dates. Written work must have a cover page that includes the student's name and e-mail address[†], be double-spaced with 1-inch margins, and be in 12-point Times Roman type.

- ***PROJECT I*** – Complete a ***short analytic paper*** that responds to a specific policy question. The analytic paper will prepare students for the Washington visit and, incorporating themes from the first six readings on the syllabus, will provide an opportunity for students to reflect on their understandings of federal policy. The paper must be no more than three pages. On an additional fourth and final page, students are asked to present questions or issues that each hopes to have addressed as a result of his/her participation in the Federal Policy Institute. These questions/issues may have been evoked by the required readings or by the student's experience, and may focus on the policy process, policy context, policy themes, or specific policies. ***The paper is due by 5:00 PM Sunday, November 15, 2009 by e-mail to Professor Kagan (sharon.kagan@columbia.edu) and Nahliah Webber (nlw2119@columbia.edu). The paper question will be handed out in class on October 13, 2009.***

- ***PROJECT II*** – Present, with a group of students, an overview of one piece of federal education policy, highlighting its inherent themes and tensions. Each group will be assigned one of the following: Head Start; IDEA; NCLB; HEA; or the Seattle/Louisville Supreme Court decisions. Students should be thoroughly familiar with the reading related to their policy and will need to conduct some outside research in order to give a thorough presentation. Each group should devise an interesting way to present the material so that the policy is easily and fully understood by other students in the course. The group should address: 1) the history of the policy, focusing on the problem(s) it seeks to alleviate; 2) who is covered by the policy; 3) what the policy purports to do; and 4) major themes or tensions the policy and its

[†] Teachers College students have the responsibility for activating the Columbia University Network ID (UNI), which includes a free Columbia email account. As official communications from the College – e.g., information on graduation, announcements of closing due to severe storm, flu epidemic, transportation disruption, etc. -- will be sent to the student's Columbia email account, students are responsible for either reading email there, or, for utilizing the mail forwarding option to forward mail from their Columbia account to an email address which they will monitor.

implementation evoke. *A plan detailing the presentation process to be used and students' roles therein is due from each group by 5:00 PM on Wednesday, November 25, 2009 by e-mail to sharon.kagan@columbia.edu and Nahliah Webber (nlw2119@columbia.edu). Presentations will take place at our meeting on December 3, 2009.*

- **PROJECT III** – Complete a *10-page policy analysis* of a critical educational policy issue/problem that should be addressed by federal policy. Including empirical and evaluative research, the policy analysis should provide the intellectual justification for bringing policy attention to the issue. Specifically, the policy analysis should discuss (Part I) the nature of the social problem (including its importance, pervasiveness, and research base); delineate (Part II) what federal policy steps have been taken to address the issue (including legislation if appropriate); consider (Part III) the ways in which these steps have and have not been effective; discuss (Part IV) the political dynamic surrounding the issue (supporters, detractors, key players); and make (Part V) a cogent set of policy recommendations and delineate (Part VI) the likelihood of their implementation in the current policy context. *Identification of your policy analysis topic is due in writing on December 3, 2009 (two to four sentences in hard copy to be turned in for class) and written policy analyses are due by 5:00 PM on Friday, January 29, 2010 by e-mail to sharon.kagan@columbia.edu and Nahliah Webber (nlw2119@columbia.edu).*
- **PROJECT IV** – Using the material from Project III above, *prepare and present mock testimony*. This testimony should be designed to persuade legislators to create policy that incorporates the recommendations you have made in Project III. Because policy makers have very little time [and often less patience with the details of social science research], the testimony should be short, incisive, and presented without jargon. It should consist of an introduction of the topic, a discussion of why it is important to education [and to the policy maker], a delineation of the options available to the policy maker, and your recommendations along with the rationale for them. It is helpful to use advance organizers in the oral presentation. *Testimony will be three minutes when presented orally and should be no more than one and one-half written pages. Written testimony is due by 5:00 PM on Friday, January 29, 2010 with your policy analysis, by e-mail to sharon.kagan@columbia.edu and Nahliah Webber (nlw2119@columbia.edu). Three-minute oral presentations will be made on February 9 and February 11, 2010.*

COURSE GRADING[‡]

- Project I – Short Analytic Paper 15%
- Project II – Group Presentation on Legislation 15%
- Project III – Policy Analysis 40%
- Project IV – Mock Testimony
(combining two-page written testimony
and three-minute presentation) 20%
- General Class Participation 10%

[‡] *The grade of Incomplete will be assigned only when the course attendance requirement has been met but, for reasons satisfactory to the instructor, the granting of a final grade has been postponed because certain course assignments are outstanding. If the outstanding assignments are completed within one calendar year from the date of the close of term in which the grade of Incomplete was received and a final grade submitted, the final grade will be recorded on the permanent transcript, replacing the grade of Incomplete, with a transcript notation indicating the date that the grade of Incomplete was replaced by a final grade. If the outstanding work is not completed within one calendar year from the date of the close of term in which the grade of Incomplete was received, the grade will remain as a permanent Incomplete on the transcript. In such instances, if the course is a required course or part of an approved program of study, students will be required to re-enroll in the course including repayment of all tuition and fee charges for the new registration and satisfactorily complete all course requirements. If the required course is not offered in subsequent terms, the student should speak with the faculty advisor or Program Coordinator about their options for fulfilling the degree requirement. Doctoral students with six or more credits with grades of Incomplete included on their program of study will not be allowed to sit for the certification exam.*

COURSE READINGS

The readings are divided into three topics: (1) The Federal Role: Process and Perspectives; (2) Current Federal Education Policy; and (3) Transcendent Themes in Federal Education Policy. There are two types of readings for this course; required and optional. Required readings must be completed by the date specified. All readings for the course are available on Classweb, unless otherwise specified.

THE FEDERAL ROLE: PROCESS AND PERSPECTIVES: DUE 11/4/089

Required:

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2009). *Reinventing the federal role in education: Supporting the goal of college and career readiness for all students*. Washington D.C.: Author.

Birkland, T. A. (2001). Official actors and their roles in public policy. *An introduction to the policy process: Theories, concepts, and models of public policymaking* (pp. 49-76). Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe Inc.

Fowler, F. (2000). Policy—What it is and where it comes from. *Policy studies for educational leaders: An introduction* (pp. 1-25). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill.

Hill, P. T. (2000). The federal role in education. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy 2000* (pp. 11-40). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. Available here:

http://muse.jhu.edu/journals/brookings_papers_on_education_policy/v2000/2000.1hill.pdf

Hirschland, M. & Steinmo, S. (2003). Correcting the record: Understanding the history of federal intervention and failure in securing U.S. educational reform. *Educational Policy*, 17(3), 343-364.

Kaestle, C. F. (2001). Federal aid to education since World War II: Purposes and politics. *The Future of the Federal Role in Elementary and Secondary Education* (pp. 13-35). Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy. Available here: <http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=document.showDocumentByID&DocumentID=100&C:\CFusionMX7\verity\Data\dummy.txt>

Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2008). *Grading education: Getting accountability right* (pp.13-34). Washington, DC: Economic Policy Institute and New York: Teachers College Press.

CURRENT FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICY: DUE 12/3/09

Required:

Hanushek, E.A. & Lindseth, A. A. (2009). *Schoolhouses, courthouses, and statehouses: Solving the funding-achievement puzzle in America's public schools* (pp. 23-82). Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Manna, P. (2006). Conductor, schoolmarm, or struggling substitute teacher? Explaining the changing federal role in education. Presented at the Policy History Conference, Charlottesville, VA, June. Retrieved, September 7, 2006. Available here: <http://pmanna.people.wm.edu/research/Manna2006PolicyHistoryConference.pdf>

Obama, B. (2008). *Barack Obama's Plan for lifetime success through education*. Obama for America Campaign. Available here: http://obama.3cdn.net/a8dfc36246b3dcc3_iem6bxpgh.pdf

Head Start

Haskins, R. (2004). Competing visions. *Education Next*, 4(1), 27-33. Available here: <http://www.brook.edu/views/articles/haskins/20040219.pdf>

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Turnbull, H. R. (2005). Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Reauthorization: Accountability and Personal Responsibility. *Remedial & Special Education*, 26(6), 320-326.

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)

The Commission on No Child Left Behind. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the promise to our nation's children: Executive summary*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute. Available here: http://www.aspeninstitute.org/atf/cf/%7BDEB6F227-659B-4EC8-8F84-8DF23CA704F5%7D/NCLB_ExSum.pdf

Higher Education Act (HEA)

Stedman, J. B. (2004). *The Higher Education Act: Reauthorization status and issues*. Washington, DC: Congressional Research Service. Available here: http://www.opencrs.com/rpts/IB10097_20041020.pdf

Seattle/Louisville Supreme Court Decisions

Linn, R. L., & Welner, K. G. (2007). *Race-conscious policies for assigning students to schools: Social science research and the Supreme Court cases: Executive Summary*. Washington, DC: National Academy of Education. Available here: http://www.naeducation.org/Meredith_Report_Exec_Summary.pdf.

Optional:

Child Care & Development Block Grant (CCDF)

Koppelman, J. (2002). Federal child care funding for low-income families: How much is needed? [NHPF Issue Brief No. 780]. Washington, DC: National Health Policy Forum. Available here: [http://www.nhpf.org/pdfs_ib/IB780_ChildCare\\$ 7-22-02.pdf](http://www.nhpf.org/pdfs_ib/IB780_ChildCare$ 7-22-02.pdf)

Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act (Perkins Act)

Jacobs, J., & Grubb, W. N. (2003). *The federal role in vocational-technical education* (CCRC Brief No. 18). New York: Community College Research Center. Available here: <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=85> (click on “View PDF version” for full article)

Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

Holzer, H. J., & Waller, M. (2003). *The Workforce Investment Act: Reauthorization to address the “skills gap”* (Research Brief). Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution. Available here: http://www3.brookings.edu/es/urban/publications/20031218_Waller.pdf.

TRANSCENDENT THEMES IN FEDERAL EDUCATION POLICY: DUE 1/11/10

Required:

National Center on Education and the Economy. (2007). *Tough choices or tough times: The report of the New Commission on the Skills of the American Workforce. Executive summary*. Washington, DC: Author. Available here: http://skillscommission.org/pdf/exec_sum/ToughChoices_EXECSUM.pdf

Within each theme, one reading focuses on early childhood education, one on K-12 education, and one on higher education. One **out of the three readings is required**.

The Standards, Assessment, and Accountability Movement

Early Childhood Education:

Shepard, L. A., Kagan, S. L., & Wurtz, E. O. (1998). *Principles and recommendations for early childhood assessments*. Washington, DC: National Education Goals Panel.

Available here:

<http://govinfo.library.unt.edu/negp/Reports/prinrec.pdf#search=%22principles%20and%20recommendations%20for%20early%20childhood%20assessments%22>

K-12 Education:

Barton, P. (2002). *Staying on course in educational reform*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

http://www.ets.org/Media/Education_Topics/pdf/stayoncourse.pdf#search=%22Staying%20on%20course%20in%20educational%20reform%22

Higher Education:

Council for Higher Education Accreditation (2003). *Is accreditation accountable?: The continuing conversation between accreditation and the Federal government*. Washington, DC: Author. Available here:

http://www.chea.org/pdf/CHEAmonograph_Oct03.pdf#search=%22Is%20Accreditation%20Accountable%3F%3A%20The%20continuing%20conversation%20between%20accreditation%20and%20the%20Federal%20government%22

Teacher Quality: Policies and Prospects

Early Childhood Education:

Welch-Ross, M., Wolf, A., Moorehouse, M., & Rathgeb, C. (2006). Improving connections between professional development research and early childhood policies. In M. Zaslow & I. Martinez-Beck (Eds.), *Critical Issues in Early Childhood Professional Development* (pp. 369-394). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

K-12 Education:

Hess, F.M., Rotherham, A.J., & Walsh, K. (2005). *Finding the teachers we need*. San Francisco: WestEd. Available here: www.wested.org/online_pubs/pp-05-01.pdf

Higher Education:

Huang, S., Yi, Y., & Haycock, K. (2002). *Interpret with caution: The first state Title II reports on the quality of teacher preparation*. Washington, DC: Education Trust.

Available here: <http://www2.edtrust.org/NR/rdonlyres/305751B5-7635-4F5E-9BBE-068CF0849150/0/titleII.pdf>

Balancing the Public and Private Sector Roles in Education

Early Childhood Education:

Magenheim, E. (2001). Preschools and privatization. In H. M. Levin (Ed.). *Privatizing Education: Can the marketplace deliver choice, equity, and social cohesion?* (pp. 105-132). Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

K-12 Education:

Hess, F. M. & Finn, C. E. (2004). Inflating the life rafts of NCLB: Making public school choice and supplemental services work for students in troubled schools. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(1), 34.

Higher Education:

Swenson, C., Warren, D., and Boggs, G. (2005). Point/counterpoint: For-profit institutions in the higher education reauthorization. *Change*, 37(3), 20-27.

The Social Context of Education

Welfare:

Shields, M. K. & Behrman, R. E. (2002). Children and welfare reform: Analysis and recommendations. *The Future of Children*, 12(1), 5-25. Available here: http://www.futureofchildren.org/usr_doc/analysis.pdf

Social Equity:

Mathis, W.J. (2005). Bridging the achievement gap: A bridge too far? *Phi Delta Kappan*, 86(8), 590-593.

Workforce Development:

Jacobs, J. and Voorhees, R.A., (2006). *The community college as a nexus for workforce transitions: A critical essay*. Available here: <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=432> (click on "View PDF version" for full article)

COURSE TIMELINE

Tuesday, October 13, 2009 – Introductory Session I: Overview of the Course and Student Panel

- Question for short paper handed out
- Preferences for Project II work groups solicited

Wednesday, November 4, 2009 – Introductory Session II: Background on American Education Policy

- First six readings completed
- Work groups and legislation for Project II assigned

Sunday, November 15, 2009: Short paper due by 5:00 PM by e-mail to sharon.kagan@columbia.edu.

Wednesday, November 25, 2009: Plan for group presentation due by 5:00 PM by e-mail to sharon.kagan@columbia.edu.

Thursday, December 3, 2009 – Introductory Session III: Group Presentations on Critical Policies

- All Current Federal Education Policy required readings completed
- Group presentations
- Identification of policy analysis topic in writing due

January 11-15, 2010: Washington, DC

- All required readings completed

Friday, January 29, 2010: Policy analysis and written testimony due by 5:00 PM by e-mail to sharon.kagan@columbia.edu.

Tuesday, February 9, 2010: Follow-Up Session I

- Mock testimony

Thursday, February 11, 2010: Follow-Up Session II

- Mock testimony