



The Voter

League of Women Voters of Columbia/Boone

VOLUME 76, NO. 8

AUGUST, 2011

Bring a Friend!

Our annual picnic is a great opportunity to learn about the coming year's activities and to introduce your friends to the League. As we have done in the past, the League will provide sub sandwiches and tableware and members should plan on bringing a side salad or desert to share.

After members have had time to eat and socialize, committee chairs will share what is being planned for the coming year. Updated Citizen Information brochures will be available as well as the latest recycling information and other publications of the League. There will also be an opportunity to obtain the League calendar for 2012 as well as a weekly appointment calendar (new!).

What: Fall Picnic and General Meeting

When: Thursday, August 25, 4:30-6:30 p.m.

Where: Gordon Shelter, Stephens Park

This is a great opportunity to ask questions, renew acquaintance with old friends and make new friends!

Enter the park from Broadway and look for the signs.

UPCOMING EVENTS OF INTEREST

August

- **Board Mtg., Mon., Aug 8, 6:30 pm, Boone Elec. Coop.**
- **Civil Liberties Com. Mtg., Thurs., Aug. 14, 1: 15 pm., Library**
- **Picnic & General Mtg., Thurs., Aug 25, 4:30-6:30 pm.**

September

- **Civil Liberties Com. Mtg., Thurs., Sept. 8, 1: 15 pm., Library**
- **Board Mtg., Mon., Sept. 12, 6:30 pm, Boone Elec. Coop.**
- **Photo ID Forum, Wed., Sept. 14, Boone County Commission Chambers, 7:00 pm**
- **Energy Matters Com. Mtg., Tues., Sept. 20, 1 pm, Lib.**
- **Unit Discussion Mtg. on Education, Wed., Sept. 28, 7 pm, location tba**
- **Unit Discussion Mtg. on Education, Thurs., Sept. 29, 1:30 pm, location tba**

Welcome to our newest member of our League:

Crystal Lovett, 314-393-6726, 3804 Village Park Drive., 65201



People often say that, in a democracy, decisions are made by a majority of the people. Of course, that is not true. Decisions are made by a majority of those who make themselves heard and who vote - a very different thing.

-former Congressman Walter H. Judd

Fact Checking

Want to check the accuracy of allegations or emails? Go to ...

**www.politifact.com or
www.factcheck.org
www.snopes.com**

Summer Part 2



Two more of the Education Study papers (short forms) are included in this issue and the final two will be included in the September issue. However, those seriously interested in the role the federal government has and continues to play in our K-12 public education should read the more lengthy reports on the LWVUS website as well as the consensus questions.. Our local consensus meetings will be in October.

In the meantime, think about how you can celebrate the anniversary of the 19th Amendment, ratified on August 18, 1920, which finally gave women the right to vote.

Linda Kaiser, President

New Climate Change Action and Challenges

The failure of Congress during 2010 to enact a comprehensive climate change bill was a deep disappointment for the LWV and others who understand the dire consequences of unchecked growth of carbon dioxide and other global warming gases. Progress in curbing greenhouse gas emissions nationwide now largely depends on the success of actions by the Environmental Protection Agency.

In January 2011, the Environmental Protection Agency began to phase in regulation of greenhouse gas emissions (GHGs) from major stationary sources, such as power plants and industrial facilities. Electric generating plants and oil refineries together comprise about 40% of all U.S. GHG emissions. Legal challenges were promptly mounted by a variety of industry and businesses groups, several states, and members of Congress.

The new regulations affect only the largest “new or substantially modified facilities” – those that emit at least 75,000 tons of GHGs per year and more than 100-250 tons of a regulated pollutant such as lead, sulfur dioxide, and nitrogen oxide. In order to obtain permits they are required to utilize the “best available control technologies” to minimize GHG emissions. Limits on GHG emissions for both new and existing power plants and oil refineries will be proposed in 2012.

This EPA action stemmed from the 2007 U. S. Supreme Court decision that carbon dioxide and other GHGs meet the definition of “air pollutants” under the Clean Air Act and the EPA’s 2009 “endangerment finding”, after extensive study of scientific evidence, that air pollution from six GHGs, including CO₂, threatens the public health and welfare of current and future generations.

Nevertheless, several bills were introduced in Congress this year challenging EPA’s authority to regulate GHGs. In April, amendments to the Clean Air Act were proposed on the Senate floor that would completely prohibit or seriously limit or delay the EPA from developing or implementing urgently needed regulations to reduce GHG emissions. One amendment came dangerously close to passage; similar Congressional anti-EPA proposals remain a threat.

A new report by the Union of Concerned Scientists adds to concerns about legal delays in curbing GHGs, warning that “unchecked global warming could threaten public health and increase health costs by exacerbating ground-level ozone.” Ground-level ozone, the primary component of smog, is created by oxides of nitrogen (NO_x) and volatile organic chemicals (VOCs) from mobile and industrial sources chemically reacting in hot weather and sunlight.

The report points out that nearly half of Americans live in areas that do not meet the current standard for safe levels of ozone. “Even a small increase in ozone due to a warmer climate would have a significant impact on public health,” said a UCS public health expert. “It would mean more asthma attacks, respiratory illnesses, emergency room trips and premature deaths.”

The LWVUS has sent letters to Congress opposing efforts to block or undermine EPA regulation of GHGs. Each of us should do the same.

Sources: “Clean Air Act: A New Approach to Regulating Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” Eleanor Revelle, (LWVIL and LWVUS Climate Change Task Force Member) www.lwv.org; World Resources Institute: “Bills that Would Limit EPA Authorities” www.wri.com; “Climate Change and Your Health: Rising Temperature, Worsening Ozone Pollution,” June 2011, www.ucsusa.org

Win Colwill, Co-Chair
Energy Matters Committee

Carrie Chapman Catt and Peace

Carrie Chapman Catt devoted her life to women's suffrage and peace. Carrie said that she became a suffragist at the age of 13 when she realized that her mother could not vote in the 1872 presidential election. College led to her discovery that she had a gift for public speaking. In 1885 she married Leo Chapman who died the following year. She started public speaking on women's suffrage by 1887. Carrie was made recording secretary at the 1889 Iowa suffrage convention. She married again in 1890, this time to George Catt, a man who was very supportive of her suffragist activities. Susan B. Anthony, immediately on becoming President of the National American Women's Suffrage Association (NAWSA) in 1892, brought Carrie into the organization to tap her strong organizational skills and speaking ability. 1900 saw Catt elected to President of the NAWSA. In 1904 Catt became involved in the formation of the International Woman Suffrage Alliance (IWSA) and continued working internationally along with her other duties until her death. That same year she resigned the Presidency of NAWSA when her husband became ill, and cared for him until his death a year later. After George's death she went back to working for suffrage in the U.S. and internationally. Catt was again elected President of NAWSA in 1916, a position she held until its dissolution after the 19th Amendment granting women the right to vote passed in the House.



Carrie Chapman Catt proposed the formation of the League of Women Voters in 1919 as a follow on to the NAWSA. Catt and Mrs. Brooks wrote that year that the LWV would be "a union of all intelligent forces within the state" to attack "illiteracy, social evils, industrial evils." It would be political but not partisan. When the LWV was created in 1920 it was to be "an ongoing organization to secure political education and improve legislation." Catt turned down the chair of the LWV but was appointed Honorary Chair.

Among the speeches interspersing the (first LWV) convention's working sessions was a moving indictment of the horrors of war by Will Irwin, a well-known war correspondent. Catt was to follow with a talk on the psychological aspects of politics; but so stirred was she by Irwin's remarks that she dramatically tore up her prepared text and made an extemporaneous plea for an all-out campaign for peace. Since the politicians had rejected the League of Nations, new solutions would have to be fashioned. "The women in this room can do this thing," she cried. "Let us do it." (Louise Young, *In the Public Interest: The League of Women Voters, 1920-1970* p. 58)

By 1925, Catt had committed herself to world Peace. That year "she led the first meeting of the Committee on the Cause and Cure of War." She chaired this committee for its first 7 years and worked for peace until her 1947 death

The Peace Committee
Dick Parker, Chair.



The LWV CAT TV show for August will be on the Crisis Created by No Child Left Behind. The show will air live at 7:00 p.m. on Wednesday, August 10th.

Can You Help?

The Education Fund, maintained by LWVMO, provides the funding for much of the educational programs that League has sponsored. Last year, these programs included the panel on mental health issues, the impact of climate change on developing countries, an update on the Affordable Care Act and the impact of the Supreme Court's decision on corporate contributions to elections. You can help with this effort.

Donate today to the LWVMO Education Fund and specify the donation is to benefit LWV of Columbia-Boone County. Because the Education Fund is a 501(c)3 entity, your donation is tax deductible. Send your check to our Treasurer, Liz Schmidt, PO Box 239, Columbia, MO 65205. She will make sure it gets to the right place.

Education Study: 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, as of 2010, the United States did 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.

(continued on next page)

Why not national standards or assessments?

The most common arguments against adopting the Common Core Standards for K-12 center on two issues: 1) the cost and difficulty of changing the existing curriculum and assessments and (2) the sovereignty of states in issues related to education and local control. Governor Rick Perry of Texas stated that the Race to the Top funding would only generate a one-time amount of \$75 per student, yet cost Texas taxpayers an additional \$3 million. A third argument is that the individual state standards might be more rigorous. However, states that adopt the Common Core are permitted to add 15 percent more in content.

Another concern is the potential to use scores from the student assessments as a major component of teacher evaluations and merit pay plans, an idea that has popular appeal. (*TIME*, 2010). In August 2010, ten of the nation's premier educational researchers (Baker, Barton, Darling-Hammond, Haertel, Ladd, Linn, Ravitch, Rothstein, Shavelson & Shepard, 2010) co-authored a report that cautioned against relying on student test scores as a major indicator for evaluating teachers, citing the technical problems associated with using scores from standardized student assessments in value-added statistical models.

Does the United States need a national curriculum?

The U.S. Department of Education presents the view that, since the developers of the Common Core Standards and the proposed assessments have been groups with state representation rather than the federal government, neither program is a federal initiative. (U.S. Department of Education, 2010, March 13). In March 2011, the Albert Shanker Institute issued a call for common curriculum guidelines (Albert Shanker Institute, 2011; Gewertz, C. 2011, March). This document voices the concern that common assessments are being developed from the common standards with no curriculum in between. In May 2011, another group published an article with a different view: "Closing the Door on Innovation: Why One National Curriculum is Bad for America" (2011), discussed by Gewertz, C. (2011, May). The article also cites the prohibition against a federal curriculum contained in the 1965 ESEA.

PRODUCED BY THE LWVUS THE EDUCATION STUDY: THE ROLE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

© 2011 BY THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS OF THE UNITED STATES

Education Study: 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)

(Continued on next page)



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.

Note: Citations for both articles can be found on the LWVUS website at www.lwv.org in the members section. The final articles, along with the special education legislation milestones will appear in the September Voter.

Condolences to members **Ann Creighton** for the recent death of her husband Donald and **Dorothy Schoech** for the recent death of her partner Elizabeth Barnes.

Officers

President: Linda Kaiser (474-1407)
1st Vice President: Elda Kurzejeski (445-4633)
2nd Vice President: Carol Schreiber (657-1467)
Secretary: Joni O'Connor (234-1012)
Treasurer: Liz Schmidt (445-0655)

Board Members & Committee Chairs

Budget: Shirley Troth (634-6157)
CAT TV: Carol Schreiber (657-1467)
Civil Liberties: Linda Kaiser & Aline Kultgen (449-2149)
Communications: Maydell Senn (445-7844)
Discussion Groups/Unit Meetings: Midge Pinkerton (445-2052)
Education: Holly Burgess (449-0625) & Zona Burk (234-1083)
Energy Matters: Win Colwill (445-4663) & Dick Parker (below)
Historian: Marilyn McLeod (445-3500)
Hospitality: Pam Springsteel (445-0642)
Land Use/Sunshine Coalition: Jo Sapp (443-8964)
Membership: Linda Lenau Brown (447-3939) & Liz Schmidt
Mental Health: Lael Von Holt (443-7747)
Nominating: Sarah Wolcott (449-4407)
Other: Joan Eisenstark (449-5790) & Ava Fajen (424-4254)
Peace: Dick Parker (256-4397)
Voter Editors: Joni O'Connor & Linda Kaiser
Voter Service: Carol Schreiber
Web & Social Media: Rachel Brekhus (875-4295)

Meetings

Board: 2nd Monday, 6:30 pm, Boone Electric Coop
Civil Liberties: 2nd Thurs., 1:15 pm*
Education: 4th Thurs., 6:30 pm*
Energy Matters: 3rd Tuesday, 1 pm*
Fundraising: Varies
Peace: 2nd Fri., 9 am*
Voter Service: Varies*
 *Meetings at Library

Membership

We are now collecting dues through December for 2012. (If you have an "11" after you name, you are presently paid. When you pay for 2012, a "12" will appear after your name. Our "year" runs July 1 to June 30 -- fiscal year.)

To join the League or renew your membership, fill in the information below and mail it, with your check, to Membership Chair, League of Women Voters, PO Box 239, Columbia, MO 65205.

Dues are \$55 for individuals, \$80 for a household and \$15 for local students. (An "11" after your name indicates paid for 2011.)

If you are a member and wish to receive a membership list, please contact Liz Schmidt at 445-0655 or email at lizschmidt@centurytel.net.

Name _____

Email Address _____

Street _____

City _____ State _____ Zip Code _____

Telephone _____

I am particularly interested in _____

(Note: Tax deductible donations to the Education Fund should be a separate check, payable to LWVMO Education Fund.)

For more information, contact Liz Schmidt at 445-0655 or Linda Brown at 447-3939.

Websites

lwwcbc.wordpress.com (local)
lwwmissouri.org (state)
lww.org (national)

Would you like to see the Voter in color? Save the League printing and mailing costs? You can now get the Voter direct to your computer early by contacting co-editor Linda Kaiser at lindaskaiser@gmail.com. Let her know you would like to receive your Voter via email and the email address to which you would like to receive the Voter.



LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS

Columbia – Boone County MO

P.O. Box 239

Columbia, MO 65205

<http://lww.columbia.missouri.org>

**NON PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
COLUMBIA, MO 65201
Permit No. 122**

*LWV: Where hands-on work to safeguard
democracy leads to civic improvement.*

RETURN SERVICE REQUESTED



August 2011						
Sunday	Monday	Tuesday	Wednesday	Thursday	Friday	Saturday
	1	2	3	4	5	6
7	8 Board mtg. 6:30, Boone Electric	9	10	11 Civil Liberties Com., 1:15 pm, Library	12	13
18	15	16	17	18	19	20
21	22	23	24	25 Picnic/Gen. Meeting, Stephens Park, 4-6 pm	26	27
28	29	30	31	Sept 1	Sept 2	Sept 3
Sept 4	Sept 5 Labor Day	Sept 6	Sept 7	Sept 8	Sept 9	Sept 10