

FEDERAL POLICY INSTITUTE
EDPA 4899.001 CRN 31407

Syllabus for 2013-2014

Sharon Lynn 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
Phone: 212-678-8255

Email: slk99@tc.columbia.edu

Assistant at TC: Liat (Lily) Segal Graber: segal@tc.columbia.edu

Assistant at Yale: Louise Scrivani: louise.scrivani@yale.edu

Office Hours: By appointment; Please arrange through Louise

Joy YooJeung Nam, Ed.M.

Phone: 212-678-8255

Email: yjnam25@gmail.com

Office Hours: By appointment

COURSE MEETINGS

<i>Introductory Session I</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>September 17, 2013</i>	<i>5:10-7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell Hall</i>
<i>Introductory Session II</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>October 8, 2013</i>	<i>5:10 - 7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell Hall</i>
<i>Introductory Session III</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>October 29, 2013</i>	<i>5:10-7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell Hall</i>
<i>Policy Institute in D.C.</i>	<i>M-F</i>	<i>January 13 -17, 2014*</i>	<i>9am - 5pm</i>	<i>TBA</i>
<i>Follow-Up Session I</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>February 11, 2014</i>	<i>5:00 -7pm</i>	<i>TBA</i>
<i>Follow-Up Session II</i>	<i>Thurs.</i>	<i>February 13, 2014</i>	<i>5:00 - 7pm</i>	<i>TBA</i>

* Policy Institute takes place during Winter Break.

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.

COURSE CONTENT

The course examines the history and current status of federal policy-making through: (a) a week-long intensive institute in Washington, D.C.; (b) five interactive class meetings (three prior to the

D.C. 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, 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

CLASS PARTICIPATION

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. ***Students are expected to attend all five days of the Washington, D.C., 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, D.C.***

PROJECTS

The following projects are to be submitted on the indicated dates (in addition, see the Course Timeline on page 10). Written work must be double-spaced with 1-inch margins and in 12-point Times New Roman type. Papers should follow APA style, and contain a cover page that includes the student's name and e-mail address. The specified page limit for each assignment does not include the cover page and reference list.

PROJECT I: Short Analytic Paper. Complete a 3-page analytic paper that responds to a specific policy question. Please use, and cite, the first six readings from the syllabus to guide your responses. 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. On an additional fourth and final page, please write three questions you hope to have addressed as a result of your participation in the Federal Policy Institute; questions should be one sentence each. These questions may have been evoked by the required readings or by your experience, and may focus on the policy process, policy context, policy themes, or specific policies; they will be amalgamated and shared with guest speakers in Washington. *The paper is due by 5:00 PM Friday, October 4, 2013 by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Joy Nam. The question for Project I will be handed out in class on September 17, 2013.*

PROJECT II: Group Presentation on Legislation. 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 Race to the Top. Students should be thoroughly familiar with the reading(s) 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 implementation evoke. Each presentation should be no longer than 12 minutes. Within the 12 minutes, the group must include an interactive component; i.e., the presentation must involve the rest of the class in some way. Following the presentation, there will be a 3 minute Q&A, in which the group must address questions fielded by the rest of the class. Please also prepare a one-page handout to distribute to the class, addressing the four items described above. Groups will be graded on the content and process of the presentation. *A plan detailing the presentation process to be used and students' roles therein is due from each group by 5:00 PM on Friday, October 18, 2013 by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Joy Nam. In your email, please indicate what, if any, technology you will need. Presentations will take place at our meeting on October 29, 2013. If you are using a Powerpoint, please email it to Joy by 12:00pm on October 29, so she can set it up in advance of the class session.*

PROJECT III: Policy Analysis. 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: (Part I) discuss the nature of the social problem (including its importance, pervasiveness, and research base); (Part II) delineate what federal policy steps have been taken to address the issue (including legislation if

appropriate); (Part III) ; consider the ways in which these steps have and have not been effective; (Part IV) discuss the political dynamic surrounding the issue (supporters, detractors, key players); and (Part V) make a cogent set of policy recommendations; and (Part VI) delineate the likelihood of their implementation in the current policy context. **Identification of your social problem/policy analysis topic for approval is due by email to Professor Kagan and Joy Namby 5:00 PM on November 8, 2013. Policy topics should be no more than three sentences in length. Written policy analyses are due by 5:00 PM on Friday, January 31, 2014 by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Joy Nam.**

PROJECT IV: Mock Testimony. 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 even 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. Focus on Parts I and V from the 10-page policy analysis (Project III above). It is helpful to use advance organizers in the oral presentation. The mock testimony will be three minutes when presented orally and should be no more than one and one-half written pages. Students will be randomly assigned to serve as “senators” for their colleagues’ mock testimonies. **Written testimony is due by 5:00 PM on Friday, January 31, 2014, with your policy analysis, by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Joy Nam. Three-minute oral presentations will be made on February 11 and February 13, 2014.**

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 written testimony
and three-minute oral presentation) | 20% |
| • General Class Participation | 10% |

COURSE TOPICS AND 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 Moodle, unless otherwise specified. **Course readings are subject to change.**

Introductory Session I: Tuesday, September 17, 2013
Course Overview and Alumni Panel

Introductory Session II: Tuesday, October 8, 2013
The Federal Role: Policies and Perspectives

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, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press. Retrieved from: 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, D.C.: Center on Education Policy. Retrieved from: <http://www.cep-dc.org/index.cfm?fuseaction=document.showDocumentByID&DocumentID=100&C:\CFusionMX7\verity\Data\dummy.txt>

Introductory Session III: Tuesday, October 29, 2013
Current Federal Education Policy

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, NJ: 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 from: <http://pmanna.people.wm.edu/research/Manna2006PolicyHistoryConference.pdf>

Obama, B. (2008). *Barack Obama's Plan for lifetime success through education*. Obama for America Campaign. Retrieved from:
http://obama.3cdn.net/a8dfc36246b3D.C.c3_iem6bxpgh.pdf

Head Start

Haskins, R. (2004). Competing visions. *Education Next*, 4(1), 27-33. Retrieved from:
<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, D.C.: The Aspen Institute. Retrieved from:
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, D.C.: Congressional Research Service. Retrieved from:
http://www.opencrs.com/rpts/IB10097_20041020.pdf

Race to the Top

Brooks, D. (2010, June 3). Race to sanity. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from
http://www.nytimes.com/2010/06/04/opinion/04brooks.html?_r=1

D. Ravitch. (2012, January 31). Does President Obama know what Race to the Top is? [Web log post]. Retrieved from
http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/Bridging-Differences/2012/01/does_president_obama_know_what.html

Smarick, A. (2010). The full story on Race to the Top. *Education Stimulus Watch, Special Report 3*. Washington, D.C.: American Enterprise Institute.

U.S. Department of Education. (2012, May 21). Race to the Top – District Program. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Department of Education. (2009, November). Race to the Top Program: Executive Summary. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Education.

U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services. (2011, July). Race to the Top – Early Learning Challenge: Executive Summary. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Departments of Education and Health and Human Services.

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, D.C.: National Health Policy Forum. Retrieved from: [http://www.nhpf.org/pdfs_ib/IB780_ChilD.C.are\\$ 7-22-02.pdf](http://www.nhpf.org/pdfs_ib/IB780_ChilD.C.are$ 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, NY: CommunityCollegeResearchCenter. Retrieved from: <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=85>

Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

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

Policy Institute in Washington, D.C.: January 13-17, 2014
Transcendent Themes in Federal Education Policy

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, D.C.: Author. Retrieved from: http://skillscommission.org/pdf/exec_sum/ToughChoices_EXECSUM.pdf

Within each of the following themes, one reading focuses on early childhood education, one on K-12 education, and one on higher education. The last theme, “The Social Context of Education,” consists of readings focused on different topics. **Within each theme, one out of 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, D.C.: National Education Goals Panel. Retrieved from: <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, D.C.: Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Retrieved

from: 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, MD: Paul H. Brookes.

K-12 Education:

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

Boyd, D.J., Grossman, P., Lankford, H., Loeb, S., & Wyckoff, J. (2009). Teacher preparation and student achievement. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, 31 (4), 416-440.

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, D.C.: Education Trust.

Retrieved from: <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. Retrieved from: 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*. Retrieved from: <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/Publication.asp?UID=432> (click on "View PDF version" for full article)

COURSE TIMELINE

Tuesday, September 17, 2013

Introductory Session I: Overview of the Course and Alumni Panel

- Question for Project I distributed
- Preferences for Project II work groups solicited

Friday, October 4, 2013

- Project I due by 5:00 PM by e-mail to Professor Kagan and JoyNam.

Tuesday, October 8, 2013

Introductory Session II: The Federal Role: Policies and Perspectives

- Required readings completed
- Work groups and legislation for Project II assigned

Friday, October 18, 2013

- Plan for Project II due by 5:00 PM by e-mail to Professor Kagan and JoyNam.

Tuesday, October 29, 2013

Introductory Session III: Current Federal Education Policy

- Required readings completed
- Project II: Group presentations

Friday, November 8, 2013

- Identification of topic for Project III due by 5:00 PM by email to Professor Kagan and JoyNam.

January 13-17, 2014

Policy Institute in Washington, D.C.

- Required readings completed prior to arrival in Washington, D.C.

Friday, January 31, 2014

- Projects III and IV due by 5:00 PM by e-mail to Professor Kagan and JoyNam.

Tuesday, February 11, 2014

Follow-Up Session I

- Project IV: Mock testimony

Thursday, February 13, 2014

Follow-Up Session II

- Project IV: Mock testimony

Accommodations for students with disabilities

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.

Incompletes

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 Communication

Teachers College students have the responsibility for activating the Columbia University Network ID (UNI), which includes a free TC Gmail 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 TC Gmail account, students are responsible for either reading email there, or, for utilizing the mail forwarding option to forward mail from their TC Gmail account to an email address which they will monitor.

Religious Observances

It is the policy of Teachers College to respect its members' observance of their major religious holidays. Students should notify instructors at the beginning of the semester about their wishes to observe holidays on days when class sessions are scheduled. Where academic scheduling conflicts prove unavoidable, no student will be penalized for absence due to religious reasons, and alternative means will be sought for satisfying the academic requirements involved. If a suitable arrangement cannot be worked out between the student and the instructor, students and instructors should consult the appropriate department chair or director. If an additional appeal is needed, it may be taken to the Provost.

Academic Dishonesty

Students who intentionally submit work either not their own or without clear attribution to the original source, fabricate data or other information, engage in cheating, or misrepresentation of academic records may be subject to charges. Sanctions may include dismissal from the college for violation of the TC principles of academic and professional integrity fundamental to the purpose of the College.