

September 8, 2016

FEDERAL POLICY INSTITUTE
EDPA 4899.002 CRN 31999
Syllabus for 2016-2017

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
Teaching Assistant: Jessie Roth: jr3587@tc.columbia.edu
Assistant at Yale: Louise Scrivani: louise.scrivani@yale.edu
Office Hours: By appointment; Please arrange through Louise

COURSE MEETINGS

<i>Introductory Session I</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>September 13, 2016</i>	<i>5:10 - 7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell</i>
<i>Introductory Session II</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>October 4, 2016</i>	<i>5:10 - 7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell</i>
<i>Introductory Session III</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>October 25, 2016</i>	<i>5:10 - 7pm</i>	<i>306 Russell</i>
<i>Policy Institute in D.C.</i>	<i>M-F</i>	<i>January 9-13, 2017*</i>	<i>9am - 5pm</i>	<i>TBA</i>
<i>Follow-Up Session I</i>	<i>Tues.</i>	<i>January 31, 2017</i>	<i>5:10 - 7pm</i>	<i>TBA</i>
<i>Follow-Up Session II</i>	<i>Thurs.</i>	<i>February 2, 2017</i>	<i>5:10 - 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

September 8, 2016

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 of which will cover 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 each 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 (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.

September 8, 2016

PROJECT I: Short Analytic Paper. The analytic paper provides an opportunity for students to reflect on their understandings of federal policy and the governance of education. Students will complete a 3-page analytic paper that responds to a specific policy question, using and citing all the readings from Session II of the syllabus. On a fourth and final page, students must include three questions they hope to have addressed as a result of their 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; the questions will be amalgamated and shared with guest speakers in Washington.

The paper is due by 5:00 PM Tuesday, October 4, 2016 by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Jessie Roth. The question for Project I will be handed out in class on September 13, 2016.

PROJECT II: Group Presentation on Legislation. The presentation, a group effort, is 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/ESSA, 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 understandable 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 15 minutes. Within the first 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 three minute Q&A, in which the group must address questions raised by the rest of the class, so that the total amount of time allocated for each presentation is 15 minutes. In addition, students must 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, as well as the handout.

A single plan detailing the prospective presentation process and each student's role therein is due from each group by 5:00 PM on Friday, October 14, 2016 by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Jessie Roth. The email should indicate what, if any, technology will be needed. Presentations will take place at our meeting on October 25, 2016.

PROJECT III: Policy Analysis. The 10-page policy analysis examines a critical educational policy issue/problem that should be addressed by federal policy. The policy analysis should include empirical and evaluative research and 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, and key players); (Part V) make a cogent set of policy recommendations; and (Part VI) delineate the likelihood of their implementation in the current policy context.

September 8, 2016

Identification of your social problem/policy analysis topic for approval is due by email to Professor Kagan and Jessie Roth by 5:00 PM on November 8, 2016. Policy topics should be three sentences in length. Written policy analyses are due by 5:00 PM on Friday, January 27, 2017 by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Jessie Roth.

PROJECT IV: Mock Testimony. Students will prepare and present a mock testimony using the material from Project III above. This testimony should be designed to persuade legislators to create policy that incorporates the recommendations 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) using data/research to substantiate the magnitude/intensity of the social problem, options available to the policy maker, and recommendation/s along with the rationale for making it/them. 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 (1 and ½ pages) is due by 5:00 PM on Friday, January 27, 2017, with the Policy Analysis, by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Jessie Roth. Three-minute oral presentations will be made on January 31, 2017 and February 2, 2017.

COURSE GRADING

- | | |
|--|-----|
| • Project I – Short Analytic Paper | 15% |
| • Project II – Group Presentation on Legislation | 15% |
| • Project III – Policy Analysis | 40% |
| • Project IV – Mock Testimony | 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 13, 2016
Course Overview and Alumni Panel

Introductory Session II: Tuesday, October 4, 2016
The Federal Role: Policies and Perspectives

September 8, 2016

Required for everyone:

Hill, P. T. (2000). The federal role in education. In D. Ravitch (Ed.), *Brookings papers on education policy, 2000* (pp. 11-40). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press. Retrieved from <http://muse.jhu.edu/article/26432/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. Retrieved from <http://epx.sagepub.com/content/17/3/343.full.pdf>

Jennings, J. (2015). Fresh thinking about the federal role in education. In J. Jennings (Ed.), *Presidents, congress, and the public schools: The politics of education reform* (pp. 157-217). Cambridge: Harvard Education Press.

Kaestle, C. F. (2001). Federal aid to education since World War II: Purposes and politics. In *The future of the federal role in elementary and secondary education* (pp. 13-35). Washington, DC: Center on Education Policy.

Introductory Session III: Tuesday, October 25, 2016
Federal Education Policy in Action

Required for everyone:

Hanushek, E. A., & Lindseth, A. A. (2009). U.S. Education at a crossroads. In E. A. Hanushek & A. A. Lindseth (Eds.), *Schoolhouses, courthouses, and statehouses: Solving the funding-achievement puzzle in America's public schools* (pp. 23-43). Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Kirst, M., & Wirt, F. (2009). The history and evolution of the state role in education policy. In M. Kirst & F. Wirt (Eds.), *The political dynamics of American education* (4th ed.). Richmond, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation. (pp. 229-256).

Required assignment: Read all articles related to your assigned presentation topic. For other topics below, select one of the listed articles. You are expected to read on all policies.

Head Start

Head Start. (2015). *Head Start program facts: Fiscal year 2015*. Head Start. Retrieved from <https://eclkc.ohs.acf.hhs.gov/hslc/data/factsheets/docs/head-start-fact-sheet-fy-2015.pdf>

Minton, S., & Durham, C. (2013). *Low-income families and the cost of child care: State child care subsidies, out-of-pocket expenses, and the cliff effect*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. Retrieved from <http://www.urban.org/sites/default/files/alfresco/publication-pdfs/412982-Low-Income-Families-and-the-Cost-of-Child-Care.PDF>

Ramey, C. T., & Ramey, S. (2010). Head Start: Strategies to improve outcomes for children living in poverty. In R. Haskins & S. Barnett (Eds.), *Investing in young children: New directions in federal preschool and early education policy*, (pp. 60-67). NIEER and the Brookings Center on Children and Families. Retrieved from http://nieer.org/pdf/Investing_in_Young_Children.pdf

Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA)

Russell, J. L. & Bray, L. E. (2013). Crafting coherence from complex policy messages: Educators' perceptions of special education and standards-based accountability policies. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*, 21, 12. Retrieved from <http://epaa.asu.edu/ojs/index.php/epaa/article/download/1044/1051>

Turnbull, H. R. (2005). Individuals with disabilities Education Act reauthorization: Accountability and personal responsibility. *Remedial & Special Education*, 26(6), 320-326. Retrieved from <http://rse.sagepub.com/content/26/6/320.full.pdf>

No Child Left Behind (NCLB)/Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA)

The Commission on No Child Left Behind. (2007). *Beyond NCLB: Fulfilling the promise to our nation's children: Executive summary*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute. Retrieved from <https://www.aucd.org/docs/Aspen%20Commission%20on%20NCLB.pdf>

Executive Office of the President. (2015). *Every student succeeds act: A progress report on elementary and secondary education*. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/whitehouse.gov/files/documents/ESSA_Progress_Report.pdf

Wong, A. (2015). The bloated rhetoric of No Child Left Behind's demise. *The Atlantic*. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/education/archive/2015/12/the-bloated-rhetoric-of-no-child-left-behinds-demise/419688>

Higher Education Act (HEA)

Burke, L. (2014). *Reauthorizing the Higher Education Act: Toward policies that increase access and lower costs*. Washington, DC: The Heritage Foundation. Retrieved from http://thf_media.s3.amazonaws.com/2014/pdf/BG2941.pdf

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

Friedel, J. (2011). Where has vocational education gone? The impact of federal legislation on the expectations, design, and function of vocational education. *American Education History Journal*, 38(1/2), 37-53.

September 8, 2016

Race to the Top

Department of Education. (2014). Setting the pace: Expanding opportunity for America's students under Race to the Top. Washington, DC: White House. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/sites/default/files/docs/settingthepacertreport_3-2414_b.pdf

Hess, R. (2014). Race to the Top, wasn't [Web log post]. Retrieved from http://blogs.edweek.org/edweek/rick_hess_straight_up/2014/07/race_to_the_top_wasnt.html?r=155665987&preview=1

Klein, A. (2014, April 15). Race to the Top: A road map [Multimedia graphic]. Retrieved from <http://www.edweek.org/ew/section/multimedia/rtt-road-map.html>

Policy Institute in Washington, D.C.: January 9-13, 2017 **Transcendent Themes in Federal Education Policy**

Required for everyone:

Alliance for Excellent Education. (2009). *Reinventing the federal role in education: Supporting the goal of college and career readiness for all students*. Washington DC: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.eplc.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/11/Fed-Role-in-HS-Reform.pdf>

Tucker, M. (2013). *Governing American education: Why this dry subject may hold the key to advances in American education*. Washington, DC: National Center on Education and the Economy. Retrieved from <https://www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/05/TuckerGoverningReport.pdf>

Within each of the following themes, readings focuses on early childhood education, K-12 education, and 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, DC: National Education Goals Panel. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED416033.pdf>

K-12 Education:

Rothstein, R., Jacobsen, R., & Wilder, T. (2008). Weighting the goals of public education: The public's opinion, and our own. In R. Rothstein, R. Jacobsen, & T. Wilder (Eds.), *Grading education: Getting accountability right* (pp. 35-73). New York: Teachers College Press. Retrieved from http://epi.3cdn.net/018e0310b0a63826d0_i8m6i8fep.pdf

September 8, 2016

Higher Education:

Eaton, J. S. (2003). Is accreditation accountable? The continuing conversation between accreditation and the federal government. *CHEA Monograph Series 2003, Number 1*. Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Washington, DC: Council for Higher Education Accreditation. Retrieved from <http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED498353.pdf>

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:

Haertel, E., Rothstein, J., Amrein-Beardsley, A., & Darling-Hammond, L. (2011). *Getting teacher evaluation right: A brief for policymakers*. American Educational Research Association and National Academy of Education, Washington, DC. Retrieved from [http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/News_Media/AERABriefings/Hill%20Brief%20-%20Teacher%20Eval%202011/GettingTeacherEvaluationRightBackgroundPaper\(1\).pdf](http://www.aera.net/Portals/38/docs/News_Media/AERABriefings/Hill%20Brief%20-%20Teacher%20Eval%202011/GettingTeacherEvaluationRightBackgroundPaper(1).pdf)

Hanushek, E. A. (2014). Boosting teacher effectiveness. In C. E. Finn Jr. & R. Sousa (Eds.), *What lies ahead for America's children and their schools* (pp. 23-35), Stanford, CA: Hoover Institution Press. Retrieved from http://dev.hoover.org/sites/default/files/research/docs/finnsousa_whatliesahead_final_ch2.pdf

Mehta, J., & Doctor, J. (2013). Raising the bar for teaching. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 94(7), 8-13.

Higher Education:

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

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:

Klein, J. (2012). The case for the private sector in school reform. The Atlantic. Retrieved from <http://www.theatlantic.com/national/archive/2012/08/the-case-for-the-private-sector-in-school-reform/261215/>

September 8, 2016

Higher Education:

Swenson, C., Warren, D., & 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.jstor.org/stable/pdf/1602765.pdf>

Social Equity:

Duncan, G. J., & Murnane, R. J. (2014). Growing income inequality threatens American education. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 95(6), 8-14. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24374505.pdf>

Workforce Development:

Jacobs, J., & Voorhees, R. A. (2006). *The community college as a nexus for workforce transitions: A critical essay*. Macomb Community College and Columbia University. Retrieved from <http://ccrc.tc.columbia.edu/media/k2/attachments/community-college-nexus-workforce-transitions.pdf>

Follow-Up Session I: Tuesday, January 31, 2017
Student Policy Presentations (Mock Testimony)

Follow-Up Session II: Thursday, February 2, 2017
Student Policy Presentations (Mock Testimony)

September 8, 2016

COURSE TIMELINE

Tuesday, September 13, 2016

Introductory Session I: Overview of the Course and Alumni Panel

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

Tuesday, October 4, 2016

- Project I due by 5:00 PM by e-mail to Professor Kagan and Jessie Roth

Tuesday, October 4, 2016

Introductory Session II: The Federal Role: Policies and Perspectives

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

Friday, October 14, 2016

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

Tuesday, October 25, 2016

Introductory Session III: Current Federal Education Policy

- Required readings completed
- Project II: Group presentations

Friday, November 8, 2016

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

Monday-Friday, January 9-13, 2017

Policy Institute in Washington, D.C.

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

Friday, January 27, 2017

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

Tuesday, January 31, 2017

Follow-Up Session I

- Project IV: Mock testimony

Thursday, February 2, 2017

Follow-Up Session II

- Project IV: Mock testimony

September 8, 2016

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.