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Discussion Agenda

- Politics 2014 & Education Legislation
- The Federal Budget & Education
- The Role of the Department of Education
- ESEA and NSBA’s Bill
- Your Action
Congressional Math

U.S. Senate

- 100 seats: 50 needed for majority/60 to break a filibuster
- D’s (53 + 2 I’s): R’s 45
- Seats Up: 35 including 2 special elections
  - D’s: 20 + 1 special election (HI)
  - R’s 13 + 1 special election (S.C.)
- Retirements:
  - D’s: IA/MI/MT/SD/WV
  - R’s: GA/NE
- Vulnerable Incumbents in general election:
  - D: AK/AR/LA—maybe NC
  - R: None (primaries can change result)
Congressional Math

House of Representatives

- 435 Seats: 218 for a majority
- All seats are up
- Current R’s: 234 to D’s 201
- D’s need net gain of 17 seats/R’s can lose 16 seats
- Retirements R’s 13, D’s 5
Congress – After The Shutdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Disapproval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-elect Own member</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republican Party Overall</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republicans in Congress</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Gallup polling showed approval of Congress at 11% in October and 9% in November
The President – After The Healthcare Website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November</th>
<th>Approval</th>
<th>Disapproval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>President Obama (Job)</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Impression</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## South Carolina Education Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.C.</th>
<th>State Allocation</th>
<th>Total Per Pupil</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-10</td>
<td>$1.065 b</td>
<td>$9,008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-11</td>
<td>$0.973 b</td>
<td>$8,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-12</td>
<td>$1.138 b</td>
<td>$9,010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per pupil expenditures flat over three years

*Data provided by South Carolina Department of Education*
South Carolina Federal Grants (in millions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY 2010</th>
<th>FY 2011</th>
<th>FY 2012</th>
<th>FY 2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title I</td>
<td>215.650</td>
<td>220.301</td>
<td>219.300</td>
<td>205.585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IDEA</td>
<td>175.288</td>
<td>140.625</td>
<td>176.828</td>
<td>167.787</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Some districts were cut more than others (Avg. 4.5% over 4 years)
• Sequestration could bring more cuts for FY 2014
• Costs Rise
• State funding is flat
• Academic expectations and requirements on school districts rise
• Enrollments increase in some districts
History of the Federal Role

- The National Purpose Era (Pre-1965)
- The Equity Era (1965-2002)
  - Focus on access/support for high need students
- The Accountability Era (2002-2009)
  - Focus on quality for all students through accountability
- The School Reform Era (Current)
  - Focus on quality for all students by impacting the delivery system
Department of Education Overreach

1. ED has established significant and detailed program initiatives that, in the absence of federal legislation or on the basis of very general language, has:

- Compromised local school board governance
- Limited the flexibility that school districts need to meet local, state, and federal goals
- Imposed unnecessary costs, administrative burdens and negative consequences in the classroom

2. ED’s rules etc. are not adequately responsive to local school operations
Examples of the Overreach

1. Absence of Specific Legislative Authority
   - State Race to the Top grants
   - Grant priorities
   - Local Race to the Top grants
   - NCLB waiver conditions

2. Lack of Responsiveness to Local Concerns
ESEA: House Passed Bill (H.R. 5)

- Grade Testing And Subgroup Reporting Retained
- ED Cannot Add/Delete State Standards, Assessments, Or Accountability System To Approve State Plans
- AYP Removed Without New Performance Goals
- Elements of NSBA Bill (H.R. 1386) Incorporated:
  - ED Prohibited From Mandating/Coercing Standards/Accessments Etc./Imposing Unfunded Costs/Or Exercising Governance/Admin Over Schools Unless in ESEA
  - Local And State Waivers/No Conditions Added
  - Increased Local Input/Higher Standard For Regulations To Be Financially, Operationally, And Educationally Viable At Local Level
ESEA: House Passed Bill (H.R. 5) (Con’t)

- States And School Districts Set Expectations And Determine How To Deal With Low Performance
- Consolidates To 12 Programs
- Eliminates Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements
- Teacher Evaluation Based On Student Outcomes As One Of Multiple Measures Is Optional
- State MOE Eliminated
- Funding Caps At Sequestration Level
- Title I Portability To Traditional/ Charter Public Schools
ESEA: Senate Committee Bill (S. 1094)

- No Caps On Funding
- Authorizes 39 Programs
- Pre-school Program Added
- Race To The Top/ Other Competitive Grants Programs Included
- AYP Replaced By New Performance Goals
- ED Approves Assessment/Accountability Plan Similar To Current Law
- Subgroup Data Reporting Significantly Expanded
- Identifies Criteria For Low Performing Schools And Requires One of Six Turnaround Options
ESEA: Senate Committee Bill (S. 1094) (Con’t)

- Comparability Tied To School Based Budgeting
- Detailed Planning Requirements For Local Use Of Federal Funds Increased
- Retains HQT Requirements For New Teachers Until Growth/Improvement Systems Are In Place
- State Evaluation Systems Must, In Part, Be Based On Outcomes And Other Measures For Prof. Dev. And Assignment Purposes—But Necessarily For Salary And Firing Purposes
Other Issues

- **ED’s renewal process for waivers**
  - Two year waivers: meet plan, monitoring, intervention requirements. Stakeholder involvement required.
  - One year waiver: state success/resolve monitoring issues and meet professional development goals. Stakeholder involvement required.

- **E-Rate expansion under consideration**
  - Raise funding level from $2.25 billion to $5 billion
  - Broadband including capital construction to access broadband

- **School lunch/ Rep Noem’s bill**
  - Allows districts to reject calorie limits for meats, grains, and meat alternatives, provided these use any previous standards
  - Allows districts to waive requirements that are a net cost for competitive foods, school breakfast, and paid meal prices
The Current Challenges For Districts

- Raise achievement for all students to levels that lead other nations

- Serve an increasingly diverse student population of whom around 20% live in poverty and a population that is approaching 40% nonwhite

- Expand program offerings in STEM subjects
The Current Challenges (con’t)

- Attract, develop, retain, incentivize competent teachers—remove failing teachers

- Utilize technology as an educational tool and cost efficient resource

- Build public confidence in public education as the go to delivery system for K-12 education

- Do all of above in a multi-year period of stagnant state/local revenues and rising obligations
South Carolina Delegation

Key Assignments

- Sen Graham: Appropriations Com/ Budget Com
- Sen Scott: Heath, Education, Labor, Pensions Com
- Rep Clyburn: Assistant Democratic Leader
- Rep Wilson: Education and Workforce Com
- Rep Gowdy: Education and Workforce Com
- Rep Rice: Budget Com
Your Action

- Work thru your SCSBA legislative network on federal issues

- Reps/Senators. Key questions for-
  - Both: Will you support increasing education funding? A small investment with a big payoff for South Carolina
  - Senators: Will you introduce or co-sponsor NSBA’s bill to restore local governance from federal overreach?
  - Senators: Will you push for ESEA to be reauthorized in 2014?
  - Reps.: Will you co-sponsor the Noem bill?
NSBA Resources

- Thru your SCSBA network you can access NSBA’s legislative materials/calls to action

- Attend NSBA’s Advocacy Institute
  - February 2-4, 2014

- Thru SCSBA you can participate in the National Connection program