

# Education Update

To: LWVO

From: Joan Platz

Education Update for April 26, 2010

1) 128th General Assembly: The Ohio House and Senate are not holding sessions this week, and only two committees, the House Civil and Commercial Law and the Senate Judiciary - Criminal Justice, are meeting.

\*The School Funding Advisory Council will meet on April 27, 2010 at the Ohio School Boards Association, 8050 North High Street, Columbus, OH.

The Traditional Public/Community School Collaboration Subcommittee, chaired by Dr. Renee Middleton, will meet at 11:00 AM.

The Council will meet from 12:30-1:00 PM, and subcommittee meetings will follow from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM.

For more information please visit

<http://education.ohio.gov/GD/Templates/Pages/SFAC/SFACPrimary.aspx?page=678>.

2) National Education News

\*The Governor of Maryland, Martin O'Malley, signed into law on April 13, 2010 SB 778 (Raskin), Student Information. The new law prohibits school districts from automatically releasing information about high school students to military recruiters gathered through the administration of the Armed Services Vocational Aptitude Battery (ASVAB). The new Maryland law requires all public schools to choose "Option 8" as the reporting option for military recruiters, which means that decisions to share student information with military recruiters will be made by students and parents. The type of information that was being shared with recruiters included social security numbers, career plans, demographic information, and the results of the ASVAB assessment. Several organizations, including the Maryland PTA, the Maryland Coalition to Protect Student Privacy, the Maryland NAACP, the Maryland ACLU, Progressive Maryland, and Peace Action Montgomery, advocated for the changes included in the new law. For more information about the law please visit

<http://www.governor.maryland.gov/documents/100413billsigned.pdf>.

\*The U.S. House passed the Fitness Integrated with Teaching (FIT) Kids Act (H.R. 1585) on April 21, 2010 by voice vote. Representative George Miller, chair of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and Representatives Ron Kind and Zach Wamp sponsored the bill.

The bill has the support of several organizations, including the American Heart Association, American School Health Association, Healthy Schools Campaign, National Association for County and City Health Officials, National Recreation and Park Association, the YMCA, American College of Sports Medicine, the Sporting Goods Manufacturing Association (SGMA), the National Association for Sport and Physical Education (NASPE), and physical fitness activist, Richard Simmons.

The bill requires schools that receive Title 1 aid to do the following:

- post on their websites and make available to families information about school district programs and policies regarding nutrition and physical education and activity; the curriculum for physical education; the amount of time students in grades K-12 participate in physical education classes by grade level; a description of facilities available for PE; and information about health and wellness councils at schools;
- submit to the state data about the amount of time students spend in PE classes.

The bill does not include funding for these activities. For more information please visit <http://edlabor.house.gov/newsroom/2010/04/richard-simmons-american-heart.shtml>

3) Report Identifies Trends in School Choice: The U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, National Center for Education Statistics, released on April 8, 2010 a report entitled, "Trends in the Use of School Choice" by S. Grady and S. Bielick. This report is based on data from the National Household Education Survey (NHES), and includes information on the following:

- where students attend schools, such as public schools (assigned and chosen), private schools (religious and nonsectarian) between 1993-2007
- student enrollment in charter schools in 2007
- demographic characteristics of homeschooled students in 2007, and
- parent satisfaction and involvement in their children's schools

According to the report,

\*From 1993 to 2007, the percentage of students enrolled in assigned public schools decreased from 80 percent to 73 percent. This trend was evident for White students; Black students; nonpoor students; students whose parents' highest level of education was some college or graduate or professional education; students in two-parent households; and students from all regions (East, West, Midwest, South) of the country.

\*The percentage of students attending public chosen schools increased from 11 percent in 1993 to 16 percent in 2007, while the percent of students attending private schools held steady. (8 percent in 1993 and 9 percent in 2007.)

\*The trend away from attending assigned public schools was not shared by all types of students. No measurable difference was found in the percentage of students enrolled in assigned public schools from 1993 to 2007 for the following students: Hispanic students, near-poor and poor students, students in one-parent households, and students whose parents' highest level of education was a high school diploma or GED or less.

\*Enrollment differences were identified in the types of schools attended across demographic groups in 2007. For example, a higher percentage of Black students (24 percent) than White students (13 percent) were enrolled in chosen public schools, and a higher percentage of non-poor students (4 percent) than poor or near-poor students (1 percent) enrolled in nonsectarian private schools.

\*A higher percentage of students in assigned public schools than in any other school type had parents who had less than a high school diploma or GED (8 percent vs. 5 percent for students in chosen public schools, 1 percent for students in religious private schools, and 2 percent for students in nonsectarian private schools).

\*About 2 percent of students in grades 1 -12 were enrolled in charter schools in 2007. A higher percentage of charter school students were from cities (64 percent) compared with students in other public schools (30 percent).

\*About 2.9 percent of all students ages 5 - 17 were homeschooled in 2007, most of them on a full-time basis. A larger percentage of students in two-parent households were homeschooled (3.6 percent) compared with students in one-parent households (1.0 percent). A greater percentage of students living in rural locales were homeschooled (4.9 percent) than were students living in cities or suburbs (2.0 percent vs. 2.7 percent, respectively).

\*In 2007, about 50 percent of students had parents who reported that public school choice was available, and 32 percent had parents who considered other schools. In addition, regardless of whether

the school attended was chosen or assigned, 27 percent had parents who reported that they moved to a neighborhood for the school.

\*Overall, the majority of students in every type of school had parents who reported being very satisfied with all four measures of schooling across all years (with one 1999 exception-48 percent of students in public assigned schools had parents who were very satisfied with their schools).

\*Generally, chosen schools (public or private) were associated with more parental satisfaction and involvement than assigned public schools. In 1993, 1999, 2003, and 2007, a greater percentage of students attending chosen public schools and both types of private schools had parents who were very satisfied with their schools than did students attending assigned public schools.

\*A greater percentage of students enrolled in both nonsectarian and religiously affiliated private schools had parents who reported being involved in various ways in their children's schools than did students enrolled in both types of public schools.

The report is available at <http://nces.ed.gov/pubsearch/pubsinfo.asp?pubid=2010004>.

4) How are Parents Choosing Schools in Arizona? The Morrison Institute for Public Policy at Arizona State University released on April 9, 2010 a report entitled "School Reenrollment: Choosing to Stay. (Issued in Policy Points Vol. 2 Issue 4 April 2010.) The report examines students who reenroll in the same schools in Arizona from one academic year to the next, even though they have other school options, and assesses whether or not reenrollment, or choosing another school, should be used as a measure of school quality.

According to the report, Arizona has one of the most expansive charter school programs in the nation with 477 charter schools and an enrollment of 8 percent of the student population based on 2008 statistics.

The charter school movement is based on the premise that students will leave poor performing schools if options are available, and schools will improve in order to keep students from leaving.

The report notes that there is also an assumption that when students reenroll in low performing traditional public schools the students are "trapped" by "systematic restrictions, individual inertia, or other barriers." This assumption is not applied to students who reenroll in low performing charter schools.

Findings of the Report: According to the report, "The weak trend between measures of school quality and reenrollment rates is likely disconcerting news to Arizona's school choice advocates who are invested in the idea that parents will take advantage of higher quality school choice options. They are not moving in ways that school choice advocates would expect."

\*Eighty-five percent of eligible elementary students reenrolled in the same school they attended at the end of 2008.

\*Reenrollment rates for urban schools and rural schools were similar. (84 percent for urban schools in Maricopa and Pima counties, and 87 percent for rural schools.

\*The percentage of mid-year transfers was slightly higher for charter schools (9 percent) than traditional public schools (7 percent).

\*School reenrollment rates are not uniformly lower for schools with high numbers of students moving in to the school midyear.

\*Arizona's elementary students are more likely to reenroll in traditional public schools than charter schools. (87 percent for traditional public schools and 77 percent for students enrolled in charter schools.)

\*Reenrollment rates for high performing schools (84 percent) and failing schools (82 percent) are similar.

\*Reenrollment rates for high performing traditional public schools (89 percent) are higher than reenrollment rates for high performing charter schools (80 percent).

\*Reenrollment rates for low performing traditional public schools (86 percent) are higher than reenrollment rates for low performing charter schools (71 percent).

The report includes the following policy implications:

\*According to the researchers, policy makers have focused on promoting school choice options and encouraging parents to take advantage of them. However, the results of this study indicate that "policy makers should not overemphasize school choice as a means of reforming public education and instead, work toward policies that improve the schools students are in already. Such policies could include safer schools, increasing afterschool opportunities or linking the delivery of other social services to schools. This shift translates into a reinvestment in public schools, an idea that is overlooked in discourse that becomes preoccupied with school choice."

\*Parents might be relying on factors other than academic ratings when choosing a school. Other factors include informal interpersonal contacts, parent networks, safety, neighborhood cohesion, and

extracurricular offerings. Policy makers at the state and federal levels should recognize these other factors rather than labeling schools based on academic ratings alone.

To read the full report please visit [http://arizonaindicators.org/media/3-25-10\\_policy\\_points\\_reenrollment.pdf](http://arizonaindicators.org/media/3-25-10_policy_points_reenrollment.pdf).

#### 5) Bills Introduced

SJR10 (Seitz) Changes the age at and after which a person may not be elected or appointed to a judicial office, and eliminates the authority of the General Assembly to establish courts of conciliation and to reappoint a Supreme Court commission.

6) Education Leaders Institute: The National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) announced on April 9, 2010 the states that will be participating in the Education Leaders Institute, which will be held on July 26-28, 2010 in Chicago, Illinois. The Oregon Arts Commission, the Washington State Arts Commission, the New Hampshire State Council on the Arts, the Arts Alliance Illinois, and the Ohio Arts Council will lead teams from five states. They will convene state decision makers to "develop and coordinated state arts education strategies to design public education with arts at the core."

The Education Leaders Institute has gathered policy makers, educators, advocates, and artists from 23 states since 2007 to design arts education plans for their respective states and the District of Columbia. Some of the topics that will be discussed include enhancing arts training for generalist classroom teachers; improving networks of educators and arts professionals; arts education policy for middle schools; and the role of the arts in developing 21st century skills.

For more information about the NEA's Education Leaders Institute, please visit <http://arts.endow.gov/news/news10/ELI.html>.

###