



THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS®
OF THE FAIRFAX AREA

Fairfax VOTER

October 2011

Volume 64, Issue 2

The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

Part of the impetus for LWVUS's study of the Role of the Federal Government in Education was the development of the Common Core Standards, a set of national educational standards and a related system of assessments in core subject areas. The standards were in response to the growing realization of the widely varying requirements for graduation and the difficulties students face who move from area to area. The debate over the acceptance by states of these standards has moved into consideration of other roles the federal government does play or should play. At a time when the political climate is leading to debate about the role of the federal government in many aspects of our lives, this is a worthy subject. You will need some time to digest it; don't wait until the last minute. Non-unit attendees, remember that you can mail your answers to the consensus questions to the League office or email by downloading the questions from the website.

Calendar

October

- 1 **Super Saturday:** Voters Service
Briefing/At Large unit: Packard Center, 10a.m.
November *VOTER* deadline
- 2 LWVFA/FCCPTA At-Large School Board
debate
- 4 Fundraiser, Dogfish Head Alehouse
- 7-8 Yom Kippur
- 9 Clifton Day
- 10 Columbus Day
- 10-13 **Unit meetings**
- 11 Woodlake Towers election
- 15 Vale Schoolhouse celebration, noon-4
- 17 Mason District debate, Annandale United
Methodist Church, 7 p.m.
Last day to register to vote in General Election
- 19 **LWVFA Board meeting,**
Packard Center, 10 a.m.
Candidate Meet & Greet meetings
- 24 George Mason and Pohick Libraries, 7-9
p.m.
- 25 Sherwood Library, 7-9 p.m.
- 26 Centreville, Chantilly and Tysons Pimmit
Libraries, 7-9 p.m.
- 29 Reston and Fairfax Libraries, 7-9p.m.

Inside This Issue

Presidents' Message	2
WRT Scheduled – December 7	2
Last Call for Annual Dues	2
LWVFA to Host Mason Dist. Candidates	2
Member Obituaries	3
Voting Rights Protection	3
Testimony Before School Board	3
League Fundraiser October 4	3
Make Time to Volunteer in October	4
League to Sponsor Meet & Greet	4
Role of Federal Government in Education	EF 1-10
Consensus Questions on Federal Role in Education	5
New Laws on Domestic Violence	8
From The LWVUS President	8
What's on the Ballot	9
Unit Meeting Locations	11



Presidents' Message



This month is all about Voter Service! We have volunteer activities for everyone: distributing "What's on the Ballot" (WOTB) and our new Redistricting Flyer and registering voters on Super Saturday; staffing Candidates' Meet and Greets at the libraries and debates/forums; and promoting our Voter's Guides. This is fundamental League business. To do a good job, we need everyone's help and participation. Every hour that you can give is needed and will be greatly appreciated.

The Meet and Greets are something LWVFA is trying out. We mailed 99 invitations to candidates for the Meet and Greets. Yes, 99. With so many candidates, it was hard to choose which races we thought we should highlight with debates and forums. Well, they are **all** important, hence the Meet and Greets. We may find we prefer this form of educating the public and providing for public participation. People will be able to ask the candidates the questions and discuss the issues that are most important to them. Not all questions at debates and forums touch on the issues most important to each person, and time is limited. Yes, it will be limited at the Meet and Greets as well, but we do believe people will have a better chance of getting their issue questions answered.

So, let's get ready to join our members in doing what we are best noted for -- educating the public about who is running, drawing attention to the issues, and getting people out to vote. All elections are important, but especially the local ones. See you at our planned events. Volunteer!!

Janey & Julie

Women's Roundtable Scheduled for December 7

Mark Your Calendars! Women's Roundtable Pre-session and Lunch will be held on December 7 in Richmond. Learn about the upcoming legislative session including proposed bills scheduled to be introduced in January 2012. More information to follow as it becomes available.

Last Call for Annual Dues

The League's membership year began on July 1, 2011. If you have not yet sent in your dues, please do it today. **THIS IS THE LAST FAIRFAX VOTER UNPAID MEMBERS WILL RECEIVE.** Individual dues are \$65; household dues are \$90; students are \$32.50. Donations are always welcome. Make your check payable to LWVFA, and mail to LWVFA, 4026 Hummer Road, Annandale, VA 22003.

LWVFA to Host Mason District Debates

Mason District Council and LWVFA are co-sponsoring a debate for Mason District Board of Supervisors and the State Senate Districts 35 and 37 candidates as well as an open house forum for the At-Large Fairfax County School Board candidates. The School Board candidates will each speak for 3 minutes before the debates. Anne Kanter, LWVFA past president, will serve as moderator. The event will be held Monday, October 17, at 7 p.m. at the Annandale United Methodist Church located at 6935 Columbia Pike, Annandale. Please come and join us.

LWVFA Fairfax VOTER 2011 - 2012

This newsletter, partially funded by the League of Women Voters of Fairfax Area Education Fund, is published 10 times each year from September to June by:

The League of Women Voters of the Fairfax Area
4026 Hummer Road
Annandale, VA 22003-2403
703-658-9150 (Info/fax/answering machine)
www.lwv-fairfax.org league@lwv-fairfax.org

Co-President:s Jane E. George 703-631-2293
janeyg16@verizon.net
Julia Jones 703-476-8347
dave.julie.jones@verizon.net
Editor: Ron Page 703-690-0908
pagegolfer@cox.net
Coordinator: Liz Brooke 703-281-3380
lizbrooke@cox.net

Subscriptions to the *Fairfax VOTER* are available to non-Fairfax League members for \$15 per annum. Send your check to the above address and request a subscription.

Please e-mail address corrections to the office
or call 703-658-9150

Member Obituaries

Margaret “Peg” Aalfs, 89, of Lake Ridge, formerly of McLean, died on September 9, 2011. She was a math teacher at Langley High School and an active member of the League.

Minerva Wilson Andrews, 86, of Charlottesville, formerly of McLean, passed away on September 4. She was the first woman graduate of the University of Virginia Law School, a former president of LWVFA, and for many years served as our League’s registered agent in Richmond.

Marjorie Bell passed away August 21 at age 97. She was a long time member of the Chantilly-Herndon Day unit. She had a great interest in politics and the League and loved discussing them. LWVFA EF gratefully acknowledges a donation from Sheilah Musselman in Marge’s honor.

Nancy Guille, 76, died of pneumonia on August 16 at Virginia Hospital Center in Arlington. She was a volunteer, board member and lobbyist for the League of Women Voters in Northern Virginia, California and Hawaii. She was active in the old Mount Vernon Unit.

Sibyl Vanneman died at age 90 on August 20. A community activist and avid gardener, Sibyl was a charter member and second president of the Falls Church LWV. She moved to Fairfax County years ago, where she was valued member of the Mclean unit. Last February, she shared her memories of her suffragist mother in the *VOTER*.

Kelly Relates LWVFA Position on Recess Length to School Board

On July 29, Helen Kelly spoke to the Fairfax County School Board for League President Janey George on behalf of Fairfax Area League members.

She stated the League’s support for the recommendations of the School Health Advisory Committee and the National Association for Sport and Physical Education that the minimum daily recess period should be at least 20 minutes in length.

She cited the most recent Fairfax County Youth Survey, which reports that only one-third of county students get the minimum recommended amount of daily exercise. She also quoted the U.S. Department of Education, the Centers for Disease Control, and the National Association for the Education of Young Children who report that school recess is “an integral component of a child’s physical, social and academic development.”

Her statement recognized that the overall amount of time children spend in school would need to be increased by 50 minutes per week with this requirement. She closed by urging the Board to adopt the 20-minute minimum daily recess period for the 2012-2013 school year.

Don’t Forget the League Fundraiser Tuesday, October 4

Enjoy a great meal and help the League raise money! On Tuesday, October 4, the Centreville/Chantilly unit is sponsoring a fundraiser at the Dogfish Head Alehouse in the Greenbriar Shopping Center on Route 50 (13401 Lee Jackson Memorial Hwy) in Fairfax. Fifteen percent of the day’s proceeds will be contributed by the restaurant to the League. This is a great opportunity for a social event for your entire unit or a group of friends, and a chance for unaffiliated members to meet more Leaguers. Hours are 11:30 am – 11:00 pm. We will have a table in the lobby with voter registration and League materials. Please volunteer for a two-hour shift at the table by contacting Sheilah Musselman at 703-631-9682 or shemuss1@gmail.com.

News from LWVUS: Voting Rights Protection – Hard at Work and Having an Impact

Leagues’ work to protect voting rights continues to have an impact at the state level. In South Carolina, the state League signed on to a letter to the U.S. Department of Justice asking the government to deny pre-clearance on the newly-passed state voter ID law. In New Hampshire, the state League has been in the spotlight for its work to sustain a veto of the controversial voter ID requirement in that state. The *Manchester Union Leader* covered the story. Other coverage includes NH Public Radio, an Associated Press story in the *Houston Chronicle*, and *NH Watchdog*.

Make the Time to Volunteer in October

By Rona Ackerman, Executive Director

You told the Board that you wanted more Voters Service and community involvement, and October is a month filled with it! Please take a moment to review this list and volunteer for at least one of these wonderful opportunities!

Oct 1 Super Saturday- hand out “What’s on the Ballot” and voter registration forms at local libraries

How to volunteer: Contact your unit chair or Julie Jones at 703-476-8347 or dave.julie.jones@verizon.net

Oct 4, 11 a.m.–11 p.m. Dogfish Head Alehouse Fundraiser – hand out information about the League, “What’s on the Ballot,” and voter registration forms during a two-hour shift

How to volunteer: Contact Sheilah Musselman at 703-631-9682 or shemuss1@gmail.com.

Oct 9, 9-5 Clifton Day - hand out information about the League, “What’s on the Ballot,” and voter registration forms during a two- hour shift

How to volunteer: Contact Lois Page at 703-690-0908 or loismpage@cox.net

Oct 11, 5:30 p.m. Woodlake Towers Election, Falls Church – serve as election officer for this community election, which also earns money for the League

How to volunteer: Contact Kay McQuie at 703-765-7104 or kaymcquie@aol.com

Oct 15, 12-4 Vale Schoolhouse celebration- hand out information about the League, “What’s on the Ballot,” and voter registration forms

How to volunteer: Contact Kathleen Pablo at 703-644-1555 or kmpablo@cox.net

Oct 17, 7 p.m. Mason District Debate – serve as timer, greeter or hand out League and voter registration materials at this debate for candidates for Mason District.

How to Volunteer: Contact Janey George at JaneyG16@verizon.net or 703-631-2293

Oct 24-29 Candidate Meet and Greets at various libraries- introduce the candidates or serve as a greeter or League representative. See article in this Voter for more information.

How to volunteer: Contact your unit chair or Julie Jones at (703) 476-8347 dave.julie.jones@verizon.net

Volunteers are still needed for League positions this year. Contact Rona Ackerman at league@lwv-fairfax.org or 703-282-2262

Board Members: Program, Voters Service Outreach

Off-Board Committees: Budget, By-laws, Elections, Environment Chair, Financial Review (Audit), Fundraising, Program

Observer Corps: Board of Supervisors, School Board, Towns of Clifton, Herndon or Vienna, City of Fairfax

Citizen Committees: Fairfax County Airports Advisory Committee, Fairfax County Public Schools Advanced Academic Programs Advisory Committee (formerly GTAC)

Finally, to volunteer to work on a study on the Tysons Corner development, please contact Liz Brooke at 703-281-3380 or lizbrooke@cox.net

League to Sponsor Meet and Greet Local Candidates

The Meet and Greet Local Candidates events are beginning to take shape. We appreciate the number of volunteers who have indicated their willingness to help. We still could use more help in staffing the libraries so that each of us has a smaller task to accomplish. Check the schedule and see where you can help. You can sign up at your unit meeting or contact Julia Jones directly, at 703-476-8347 or (dave.julie.jones@verizon.net). Volunteers will be contacted about their “assignment” closer to the time of the events. The Fairfax County Public Library has set up the following schedule to accommodate members in each district:

<u>Date and Time</u>	<u>Library</u>	<u>Governmental Dits</u>
Mon, Oct. 24, 7-9	George Mason Pohick	Mason Braddock
Tues, Oct. 25, 7-9	Sherwood	Lee and Mt. Vernon
Wed, Oct. 26, 7-9	Centreville Tysons-Pimmit	Springfield Providence and Dranesville
	Chantilly	Sully
Sat, Oct. 29, 2-4	Fairfax Reston	Fairfax City Hunter Mill and Dranesville

The LWVUS Education Study . . .

The Role of the Federal Government in Public Education

By Peggy Hill, Co-Chair, Texas; Joanne Leavitt, Co-Chair, California; Pat Aaron, Illinois; Sanford Ostro, Massachusetts; Carolyn Jefferson-Jenkins, Colorado; Patricia Libutti, New Jersey; Jean Pierce, Illinois; and Janelle Rivers, South Carolina

I. 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.

2. 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. (See Table 1.)

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

Table 1 - 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	Integrates early childhood education to low-income parents for children, birth through age 7, and integrates adult education and early childhood learning with family literacy programs.
Early Head start	1995	Funds programs for low-income families supporting 2 generations, usually mothers and infants and toddlers.
Title I of ESEA	Many	Local education agencies apply to state agencies for approval of the program that is subsequently funded by the federal government. This grant is formula funded.
No Child Left Behind	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 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	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.

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.

3. Where Have We Been And How Did We Get Here?

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 (Table 2).

4. 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

**Table 2 - History of the Role of the Federal Government
in Public Education: Timeline**

Event	Date	Explanation
Land Ordinance & Northwest Ordinance	1785/ 1787	Requirement of a system of public education to be established in each township formed under a specified formula. Regulated monies raised via taxes and selling or renting land.
Early philosophy – first six presidents		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 Impact Aid laws	1941	Eased the burden on communities affected by presence of military and federal installations: payments to school districts.
GI Bill	1944	Provided post secondary education assistance to GIs returning from World War II
George-Barden Act	1946	Provided funding for agricultural, industrial and home economics training for high school students.
National Defense Education Act	1958	In response to Soviet Sputnik. NDEA included support for loans to college students in science, mathematics and foreign languages.
Elementary and Secondary Education Act	1965	Established comprehensive set of programs including Title I of federal aid to disadvantaged.
Title IX	1972	Prohibited discrimination in education based on gender.
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) and 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.

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>.

5. 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

I. Common Core Standards

Albert Shanker Institute. (2011, March 7). A call for common content: Core curriculum must build a bridge from standards to achievement. Retrieved from <http://www.ashankerinst.org/curriculum.html>

Baker, E.L., Barton, P.E., Darling-Hammond, L., Haertel, E., Ladd, H.F., Linn, R.L., Ravitch, D., Rothstein, R., Richardson, R.J. & Shepard, L.A. (2010, August). EPI briefing paper: Problems with the use of student test scores to evaluate teachers. Retrieved from Economic Policy Institute: http://epi.3cdn.net/b9667271ee6c154195_t9m6iij8k.pdf

Carmichael, S. M., Martino, G., Porter-Magee, K. & Wilson, W.S. (2010, July). The state of state standards--and the Common Core--in 2010. Retrieved from http://www.edexcellencemedia.net/publications/2010/201007_state_education_standards_common_standards/SOSSandCC2010_FullReportFINAL.pdf

"Closing the Door on Innovation: Why One National Curriculum Is Bad for America." Retrieved from http://www.k12innovation.com/Manifesto/V2_Home.html

Common Core Standards Initiative. (2010). Common Core Standards Initiative. Retrieved from <http://www.corestandards.org>

Cronin, J., Dahlin, M., Adkins, D. & Kingsbury, G.G. (2007, October). The proficiency illusion. Retrieved from <http://www.edexcellence.net/publications-issues/publications/theproficiencyillusion.html>

Gewertz, C. (March 7, 2011). Leaders call for shared curriculum guidelines. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/articles/2011/03/09/23curriculum.h30.html?tkn=SONFPm%2FzybaH3Jupk0%2FYdzDaTb7O0ajGL04&cmp=clp-edweek>

Gewertz, C. (May 9, 2011). Conservative 'Manifesto' Blasts Shared Curriculum, Tests. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/curriculum/2011/05/conservative_manifesto_blasts.html

Rothman, R. (2009, December 19). Common Standards: The time is now. Issue Brief. P.5. Retrieved from <http://www.all4ed.org/files/TheTimeIsNow.pdf>

TIME. (2010, September 9). TIME poll results: Americans' views on teacher tenure, merit pay, and other education reforms. Retrieved from <http://www.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,2016994,00.html>

U.S. Department of Education. (2010, March 13). Elementary and Secondary Education: ESEA reauthorization: A blueprint for reform. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/index.html><http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/leg/blueprint/index.html>

2. Where Are We Now and the Impact Upon Early Childhood Education

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

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

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

3. Where Have We Been And How Did We Get Here? (None cited.)

4. Equity And Funding

Center for Research on Education Outcomes. (2009). Multiple choice: Charter school performance in 16 states. Stanford, CA: CREDO. Retrieved from http://credo.stanford.edu/reports/MULTIPLE_CHOICE_CREDO.pdf

Darling-Hammond, L. (2010). The flat world and education: How America's commitment to equity will determine our future. New York: Teacher College, Columbia University.

Holland, S. (March 9, 2011). Duncan: "No Child Left Behind" Creates failure for U.S. schools. CNN Politics. Retrieved from <http://www.cnn.com/2011/POLITICS/03/09/education.congress/index.html>

Hurst, C.E. (2007). Social inequality: Forms, causes, and consequences. New York: Pearson Education Inc.

Kang, N.H. & Hong, M. (2008). Achieving excellence in teacher workforce and equity in learning opportunities in South Korea. Educational Researcher. 37(4). 200-207.

Ladson-Bilings, G.S. Schools. Educational Researcher, 35(7). 3-12.

Odden, A.R. & Picus, L.O. (2008). School finance: A policy perspective (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Reeve, J. (2009). Why teachers adopt a controlling motivating style toward students and how they can become more autonomy supportive. Educational Psychologist, 44 (3), 159-175.

Rouse, C.E. & Barros, L. (2009). School voucher and school achievement: recent evidence, remaining questions. Annual Review of Economics, 1. Retrieved from <http://www.ers.princeton.edu/workingpapers/28ers.pdf> and http://www.nscpe.org/publications_files/OPI63.pdf

Springer, M.G., Ballou, D., Hamilton, L., Le, V., Lockwood, J.R., McCaffrey, D., Pepper, M. and Strecher, B. (2010). Teacher pay for performance: Experimental evidence from the project on incentives in teaching. Nashville, TN: National Center on Performance Incentives at Vanderbilt University. Retrieved from <http://www.hechingerreport.org/static/pointstudy.pdf>

5. Legislation And Funding For The Education Of Children With Special Needs

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

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

U.S. Department of Education. Fiscal Year 2012 Budget Overview. Supporting Individuals with Disabilities. Retrieved from <http://www2.ed.gov/about/overview/budget/budget12/summary/edlite-section2b.html>

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

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

LWVUS Asks Consensus Questions On the Federal Role In Education

Do you sometimes read a League study just before you leave the house to go to a unit meeting? Don't try that this time! The ambitious education study printed in this issue of the *VOTER* is accompanied by 15 consensus questions.

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 pre-K-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

Other consensus questions cover three of the five sections of the study.

1. Common Core Standards (*pp. EF-1-2*)

The first section covers the effort by 44 states and the District of Columbia to develop Common Core standards and assessments. Virginia is one of six states that chose not to participate. The Board of Education unanimously adopted the following statement at its June 24, 2010, meeting in Richmond:

"The Board of Education is committed to the Virginia Standards of Learning (SOL) program and opposed to adoption of the newly developed Common Core State Standards as a prerequisite for participation in federal competitive grant and entitlement programs.

"The Standards of Learning are clear and rigorous and have won the acceptance and trust of Virginia educators. Whatever adjustments might be warranted to ensure alignment of the SOL with the Common Core State Standards can be made within the process through which the Board of Education exercises its constitutional authority to establish standards for the commonwealth's public schools.

Six consensus questions about 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)
 - d. Special grant programs such as Race to the Top
 - e. All programs under Elementary and Secondary Education Act where the needs qualify for funding.
 - f. All programs receiving federal funding from any source

- g. All of the above
- h. None of the above

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

Yes | No

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

- 1. Voluntary
- 2. Mandated
- 3. Mandated, if fully funded

2. If No, what other accountability measures might you suggest? (Choose one)

- 1. Continue to allow the states to develop their own assessments.
- 2. 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*.
- 3. 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)

- 6. A nationally mandated curriculum to be aligned to the national standards and assessments.
- 7. A national curriculum that is only suggested but not mandated.
- 8. A suggested structure for states and local education agencies to develop their own curriculum.
- 9. No national curriculum.

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

- g. Provide an assessment system that is aligned to the Common Core Standards.
- h. Provide comparison data showing progress toward reaching Common Core Standards.
- i. Provide criteria for determining readiness for college and careers.
- j. Provide information to students, parents, teachers and school districts about student achievement.
- k. 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)

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

- j. 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):
- h. Sanction schools not measuring up to the specific levels
 - i. Reward schools that achieve high scores
 - j. Rank teachers based on student test score data
 - k. Reward teachers who have exemplary scores
 - l. Inform districts how their population compares to others similar to theirs.

4. Funding and Equity (pp. EF-4-6)

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)
- j. Non-competitive funding for all applicants meeting requirements
 - k. A combination of non-competitive and competitive grants
 - l. Competitive grants only
 - m. No federal funding
11. If the federal government’s role is the concern of the “common good” then: (choose one)
- k. Mandates only should be sanctioned.
 - l. Mandates and funding should both be provided.
 - m. Funding should be provided through grants only.
 - n. A combination of funded mandates and grants should apply.
 - o. No mandates should be required and limited grants for innovation available.
12. Equity in public education means equitable access to: (Rank order)
- l. high quality teaching/learning
 - m. adequate and current learning materials
 - n. clean and well maintained physical facilities
 - o. food and health care
 - p. safe and secure neighborhoods
 - q. 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

2. Where We Are Now and the Impact Upon Early Childhood Education (pp EF 2-3)

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.

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

Discussion points related to these consensus questions can be found at the following link: http://www.lwv.org/Content/NavigationMenu/ForMembers/Projects/PublicEducation/LeadersGuide/The_Education_Study_.htm

New Laws on Domestic Violence Enacted

By Barbara Nunes, Domestic Violence Chair

In 2007, Linda Boswick , from Henry County, Virginia, was killed by her husband. Linda had a protective order, but that did not protect her. She had been fearful and afraid of her husband, who had shown up at her office previously with a gun. No one thought it would escalate. This time he killed her and himself—too late to call 911.

In 2010, Governor McDonnell issued executive orders to establish a Domestic Violence Prevention Response Advisory Board. It is charged with “developing laws, policies, and proceedings to enhance Virginia’s responses to domestic violence.”

A GPS tracking bill was passed and signed by the governor in 2011. The Linda Boswick Act (HB2106 and SB 925) allows a judge to make GPS tracking a condition of bail or probation. The intent is to warn victims and allow them to take necessary added protection. However, no funds have been appropriated.

The General Assembly passed and the governor signed some other significant laws regarding domestic violence in 2011. HB2089 allows the police to serve an emergency protective order (EPO). Until July 2011, only magistrates and judges could issue EPOs.

HB2063 and SB1222 expand the circumstances under which an individual may request a PO without a warrant, which was required before. Although this does not change domestic violence cases, it is related to people who are dating and in danger of further harm.

HB1757 and SB1199 allow the victim to have her/his address kept confidential to protect his/her whereabouts.

From the LWVUS President . . .

This the tenth anniversary of the 9/11 attacks looms very large in the media and on our minds. It has now become axiomatic to say that everything changed that day. Every generation can remember such a day. For my generation, it was the day President Kennedy was shot, for my father, Pearl Harbor. My children will always remember where they were on 9/11. How these catastrophic events change us depends on how we react. After Pearl Harbor, we fought a war, with an end, against forces of evil. Good thing resulted in the years following these events.

After ten years of fighting the war on terror, we still have the chance to turn the tragedy of 9/11 into something positive for this country, but only if organizations like the League and those who support us have the strength and the courage to raise our voices in support of an open and accepting society. We cannot give up and cannot give in to those who would prefer to hate and to exclude in a vain effort to make us more secure.

In League, Elisabeth



League of Women Voters of the Fairfax Area

WHAT'S ON THE BALLOT

General and Special Elections - November 8, 2011

Fairfax County Registrar's office: 703-222-0776
City of Fairfax Registrar's office: 703-385-7890

League Membership: 703-658-9150
www.lwv-fairfax.org

*incumbent (R) Republican (D) Democrat (L) Libertarian (I) Independent (IG) Green Party

Names must be qualified by the Virginia State Board of Elections to appear on the ballot.

VIRGINIA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE OF VIRGINIA

30th DISTRICT

Timothy T. C. McGhee (R)
Adam P. Ebbin (D)

31st DISTRICT

Caren D. Merrick (R)
Barbara A. Favola (D)

32nd DISTRICT

Patrick N. Forrest (R)
Janet D. Howell (D)*

33rd DISTRICT

Patricia B. Phillips (R)
Mark R. Herring (D)

34th DISTRICT

Gerarda M. Culipher (R)
J. C. "Chap" Petersen (D)*

35th DISTRICT

Robert C. Sarvis (R)
Richard L. "Dick" Saslaw (D)*
Katherine A. Pettigrew (IG)

36th DISTRICT

Jeffery M. Frederick (R)
Linda T. "Toddy" Puller (D)*

37th DISTRICT

Jason A. Flanary (R)
David W. Marsden (D)*

39th DISTRICT

M. Miller Baker (R)
George Lincoln Barker (D)*

HOUSE OF DELEGATES

34th DISTRICT

Barbara J. Comstock (R)*
Pamela B. Danner (D)

35th DISTRICT

Mark L. Keam (D)*

36th DISTRICT

Hugh M. "Mac" Cannon (R)
Kenneth R. "Ken" Plum (D)*

37th DISTRICT

Brian W. Schoeneman (R)
David L. Bulova (D)*

38th DISTRICT

L. Kaye Kory (D)*
James L. "Jim" Leslie (I)

39th DISTRICT

Vivian E. Watts (D)*
Dimitris A. Kolazas (IG)

40th DISTRICT

Timothy D. "Tim" Hugo (R)*
Dianne L. Blais (I)

41st DISTRICT

Eileen Filler-Corn (D)*
Mike R. Kane (L)

42nd DISTRICT

David B. Albo (R)*
J. R. "Jack" Dobbyn, Jr. (D)

43rd DISTRICT

Mark D. Sickles (D)*

44th DISTRICT

John D. Barsa (R)
Scott A. Surovell (D)*
Joseph A. "Joe" Glean (IG)

45th DISTRICT

David L. Englin (D)*

48th DISTRICT

Robert H. Brink (D)*
Janet Murphy (IG)
Kathy G. Gillette-Mallard (I)

49th DISTRICT

Alfonso H. Lopez (D)

53rd DISTRICT

James M. "Jim" Scott (D)*

67th DISTRICT

James M. "Jim" LeMunyon (R)*
Eric E. Clingan (D)

86th DISTRICT

Thomas Davis Rust (R)*

CONSTITUTIONAL OFFICES

COMMONWEALTH'S ATTORNEY

Raymond F. Morrogh (D)*

SHERIFF

Bill A. Cooper III (R)
Stan G. Barry (D)*

BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

CHAIRMAN

Michael J. "Spike" Williams (R)
Sharon S. Bulova (D)*

Christopher F. DeCarlo (I)

A. Will Radle, Jr. (I)

BRADDOCK DISTRICT

John C. Cook (R)*
Janet S. Oleszek (D)
Carey C. Campbell (IG)

LEE DISTRICT

Jeff C. McKay (D)*

PROVIDENCE DISTRICT

Chris S. Grisafe (R)
Linda Q. Smyth (D)*

DRANESVILLE DISTRICT

Dennis D. Husch (R)
John W. Foust (D)*

MASON DISTRICT

M. David Feld (R)
Penelope A. "Penny" Gross (D)*

SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT

Patrick S. "Pat" Herrity (R)*

HUNTER MILL DISTRICT

Catherine M. Hudgins (D)*

MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT

Gerald W. "Gerry" Hyland (D)*
G. Gail Parker (IG)

SULLY DISTRICT

Michael R. Frey (R)*
Shahid S. Malik (D)

SCHOOL BOARD

MEMBER AT-LARGE (3 seats)

Sheree A. Brown-Kaplan (I)
Lin-Dai Y. Kendall (I)

Lolita I. Mancheno-Smoak (I)
Ryan L. McElveen (I)
Ilryong Moon (I)*

Steven F. Stuban (I)
Theodore J. "Ted" Velkoff (I)

BRADDOCK DISTRICT

Nell J. Hurley (I)
Megan O. McLaughlin (I)

LEE DISTRICT

Tamara J. Derenak Kaufax (I)

PROVIDENCE DISTRICT

Patricia S. "Patty" Reed (I)*

DRANESVILLE DISTRICT

Louise K. Epstein (I)
Jane K. "Janie" Strauss (I)*

MASON DISTRICT

Sandy S. Evans (I)*

SPRINGFIELD DISTRICT

Elizabeth L. Schultz (I)
John F. Wittman (I)

HUNTER MILL DISTRICT

Pat M. Hynes (I)
Nancy A. Linton (I)

MOUNT VERNON DISTRICT

Michele Pilc Nellenbach (I)
Daniel G. "Dan" Storck (I)*

SULLY DISTRICT

Sheila P. Ratnam (I)
Kathy L. Smith (I)*

DIRECTORS, NORTHERN VIRGINIA SOIL AND WATER CONSERVATION DISTRICT (3 seats)

Thomas L. Cranmer (I)
Johna Good Gagnon (I)*

George W. Lamb (I)*
Peter M. Marchetti (I)

John W. Peterson (I)*

2011 SCHOOL BOND REFERENDUM (YES OR NO)

Question: Shall the Board of Supervisors of Fairfax County, Virginia, contract a debt, borrowing money and issuing capital improvement bonds of Fairfax County, Virginia in the maximum aggregate principal amount of \$252,750,000, for the purposes of providing funds, in addition to funds from school bonds previously authorized and any other available funds, to finance, including reimbursement to the County for temporary financing for, the costs of school improvements, including acquiring, building, expanding and renovating properties, including new sites, new buildings or additions, renovations and improvements to existing buildings, and furnishings and equipment, for the Fairfax County public school system?

<http://www.fcps.edu/news/bond11.htm>

This publication was published with funding provided through the LWVFA Education Fund and donations made in memory of Connie Houston.

This Month's Unit Meeting Locations

Topic: Role of the Federal Government in Education

Members and visitors are encouraged to attend any meeting convenient for them, including the "At Large Meeting" and briefing on Saturdays when a briefing is listed. As of September 12, 2011, the locations were correct; please use phone numbers to verify sites and advise of your intent to attend. Some meetings at restaurants may need reservations.

Saturday, October 1

10 a.m. At-Large Unit and Briefing

Packard Center
4026 Hummer Rd
Annandale 22003
Contact: Karole, 703-451-1165

Monday, October 10

1:30 p.m. Greenspring (GSP)

Hunters Crossing Classroom
Spring Village Drive
Springfield 22150
Contact: Kay, 703-644-2670

Tuesday, October 11

10:00 a.m. Centreville-Chantilly (CC)

Sully District Gov. Center
4900 Stonecroft Blvd.
Chantilly, 20151
Contact: Susan, 703-391-0666

Wednesday, October 12

9:30 a.m. Mt. Vernon Day (MVD)

Mt. Vernon District Gov. Center
2511 Parkers Lane
Alexandria 22306
Contact: Joan, 703-765-0799

10 a.m. McLean (MCL)

Star Nut Gourmet
1445 Laughlin Ave.
McLean 22101
Contact: Peggy, 703-532-4417
or Sharone, 703-734-1048

10 a.m. Fairfax Station (FXS)

7902 Bracksford Court
Fairfax Station 22039
Contact: Lois, 703-690-0908

6:15 p.m. Dinner Unit (DU)

Yen Cheng Restaurant
Main Street Center
9992 Main Street, Fairfax 22030
Contact: Tin, 703-207-4669

7:30 p.m. Reston Evening (RE)

Reston Art Gallery at Heron House
Lake Anne Village Center,
Reston 20190
Contact: Lucy, 703-757-5893

Thursday, October 13

9 a.m. Reston Day (RD)

12100 Stirrup Rd.
Reston 20191
Contact: Mia, 703-716-4540

9:30 a.m. Springfield (SPF)

4468 Edan Mae Ct.
Annandale 22004
Contact: Jane, 703-256-7834 or
Karole, 703-451-1165

1 p.m. Fairfax City/Vienna (FX-V)

Oakton Regional Library
10304 Lynnhaven Pl., Oakton 22124
Contact: Anne, 703-938-7304 or
Liz, 703-281-3380

7:45 p.m. Mt. Vernon Evening (MVE)

Paul Spring Retirement Community
Mt. Vernon Room
7116 Fort Hunt Road
Alexandria 22307
Contact: Susan, 703-780-3902

November Meetings:

Bullying in the Fairfax County School System



The League of Women Voters of the Fairfax Area (LWVFA)
4026 Hummer Road, Annandale, VA 22003-2403
703-658-9150. Web address: www.lwv-fairfax.org

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage Paid
Merrifield, VA
Permit No. 1202

Time Sensitive Materials

The LWVFA *Fairfax VOTER* ©
October, 2011

Jane E. George, Co-President
Julia Jones, Co-President
Ron Page, Editor
Liz Brooke, Coordinator

The League of Women Voters is a nonpartisan political organization that encourages the public to play an informed and active role in government. At the local, state, regional and national levels, the League works to influence public policy through education and advocacy. Any citizen of voting age, male or female, may become a member.

LWVFA MEMBERSHIP APPLICATION

(Dues year is July 1 through June 30. Current dues year ends June 30, 2012.)

Membership Category: Individual \$65 ____; Household (2 persons—1 *VOTER*) \$90 ____; Donation \$ ____
Student \$32.50 ____; (Coll. Attending ____)

Membership is: New ____; Renewal ____; Reinstate ____; Subsidy Requested ____

We value membership. A subsidy fund is available, check block above and include whatever you can afford.

Dues are not tax deductible. Tax-deductible donations must be written on a separate check payable to LWVFA Ed. Fund.

Please Print Clearly!

Name _____ Unit _____

Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip + 4 _____

Phone (H) _____ (M) _____ E-Mail _____

Thank you for checking off your interests:

<input type="checkbox"/> County Govt	<input type="checkbox"/> Voting Procedures	<input type="checkbox"/> Health Care	<input type="checkbox"/> Schools
<input type="checkbox"/> Fiscal	<input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Quality	<input type="checkbox"/> Human Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Other (Specify)
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Libraries	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Use Planning	<input type="checkbox"/> Judicial Systems	
<input type="checkbox"/> Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> Water	<input type="checkbox"/> Juvenile Problems	

Mail to: LWVFA, 4026 Hummer Road, Annandale, VA 22003