The Civil Rights Project

Proyecto Derechos Civiles

Bringing Civil Rights Research to Bear on Voucher Programs: Are the Promises Realized?

Monday, March 5, 2018

Dirksen Senate Office Building: Room SD-G50

AGENDA

10:00 **Introduction:** Gary Orfield, Civil Rights Project, UCLA
@CRPatUCLA @orfieldtweet

10:05 **Presentations (7 minutes each):**

10:06 **Private Schools in American Education: A Small Sector Still Lagging in Diversity**
Jongyeon Ee, Civil Rights Project, UCLA
Co-authors Gary Orfield and Jennifer Teitell, UCLA
@CRPatUCLA @orfieldtweets

10:14 **Lessons Learned from Indiana's Choice Scholarship Program**
Mark Berends, Center for Research on Educational Opportunity, Univ. of Notre Dame
Co-authors **R. Joseph Waddington**, Univ. of Kentucky and **Megan Austin**, American Institutes for Research
@berendma @EdStatsGuy @maustin1

10:22 **Washington, D.C.'s Opportunity Scholarship Program: Civil Rights Implications**
Mary Levy, PhD, budget and policy analyst, DC public education
@MaryLevy17

10:30 **Private School Vouchers: Legal Challenges and Civil Rights Protections**
Preston Green, Neag School of Education, University of Connecticut
Co-author, Kevin Welner, Univ. of Colorado, Boulder
@DrPrestonGreen @NEPCtweet

10:38 **Commentary**: **Tom Gentzel**, National School Boards Association
@NSBAComm @Tom_NSBA

10:44 **Q&A**

11:27 **Summary and Wrap-up**: Gary Orfield

Materials will be posted on-line at: http://www.civilrightsproject.ucla.edu

Private Schools in American Education: A Small Sector Still Lagging in Diversity

By Jongyeon Ee, Gary Orfield and Jennifer Teitell

Highlights Summary

Private schools have a long and important tradition in U.S. education and have been the focus of a great deal of political controversy in recent years. There is deep division among Americans over the desirability of using public funds to finance vouchers for private education—an issue that has become the leading educational goal of the Trump Administration. Surveys of the public show that substantial majorities of Americans do not favor voucher policies, yet these efforts have long been supported by significant shares of the public, the religious groups that operate nonpublic schools, and leaders of one of our national parties. This deep division is reflected in the extraordinary differences among the states in their adoption of voucher policies over the past two decades. Examining these differences, along with data on national and regional trends in private education, provides a useful framework for considering the relationship between private school enrollment and the impact of voucher policies.

This report explores how the size and share of private education has changed in the U.S. over two decades, from 1995 to 2015-16 (the most recent federal data), along with how the students are divided among different kinds of private schools: secular, Catholic, and non-Catholic religious schools. It also examines the racial composition of these schools, providing key data for evaluating the civil rights dimension of private schooling and voucher policies. The civil rights questions concern how well private schools serve students of color, what kinds of schools these students attend, how segregated they are, and whether students of color are getting a major share of the growth of private schools in the areas they are growing, especially in the South.

Key findings of the report include:

- Student enrollment in private schools peaked in 2001 and has moderately declined over the past fifteen years. In 2015, private schools served 9 percent of the nation's students and accounted for 28 percent of the nation's schools.

- Private schools seem to compete with charter schools. Since its appearance a decade ago, the growth of charter schools is noticeable. In 2015, private schools serve 4.9 million students while charter schools enroll 2.7 million students.

- The 2015 racial composition of private school enrollment was 68.6% white, 9.3% black, 10.4% Hispanic, 6.9% Asian. The student body of public schools differed substantially from private schools, comprising 48.7% white, 15.2% black, 26.3% Hispanic, and 5.4% Asian students,

- Private school attendance rates among white students have not changed over time—one in eight white students in the nation attend private schools. Meanwhile, private school attendance rates among non-white students have slightly declined.

As of 2015, 5.6 percent of blacks, 3.8 percent of Hispanics, and 11.3 percent of Asians in the nation are enrolled in private schools.

- Student from low-income families are underrepresented in private schools, accounting for 9% of the private school student body. The secular sector in particular has the smallest percentage of poor students: 5.4%. In public schools, poor students make up more than 50% of student enrollment.

- White students are overrepresented in private schools, making up 69 percent of private school enrollment; they comprise 51 percent of total enrollment of school-aged population in the country. African American and Hispanic students are severely underrepresented in private schools. The latter comprise over 25 percent of students in the public sector but only 10 percent of students in private schools.

- The South has seen an 11% increase in the number of private schools—non-Catholic religious schools in particular—over the past two decades unlike other regions in which private schools have declined over years.

- The number of Catholic private schools and Catholic school enrollment have decreased over the past two decades in the Northeast and Midwest in particular. Enrollment in non-Catholic religious private schools and secular private schools has grown during the same period. The growth of non-Catholic religious schools stands out in the Northeast and the South in particular.

- The South has the largest number of schools for both private and public sectors, which account for one third of the country's schools. Given the number of schools for both private and public systems, private schools are most overrepresented in the Northeast.

- Black and Hispanic private school students on average experience more diversity compared to their peers in public schools. White students are the most isolated group in terms of intergroup contact, and white students in the non-Catholic religious sector across regions have the most limited intergroup experiences, typically attending schools with large white majorities.

- The secular sector has seen the largest increase in diversity over time compared to Catholic and non-Catholic religious schools, although the level of diversity does not reach the same level of public schools.

Indiana's Choice Scholarship: Participation & Impact on Achievement

Megan Austin, Mark Berends, R. Joseph Waddington

Highlights Summary

The Indiana Choice Scholarship Program (ICSP), launched in 2011, offers an opportunity to study how a large-scale K-12 private school tuition voucher program works and to analyze the results it has produced in its first few years. Indiana's school voucher program is the nation's largest voucher program, accounting for nearly 20 percent of all voucher students nationwide, with 34,299 students receiving vouchers and 313 private schools participating during the 2016–17 academic year. It is unique in that both low- and moderate-income families are eligible for a voucher, and there is no cap on the number of students who can take part. The average scholarship amount, based on the public-school district in which students live, ranges from about $4,500 in Kindergarten to $5,600 in high school.

Our four-year evaluation of the Indiana program is one of a few recent studies that finds statistically significant negative effects on students' mathematics achievement of using a voucher to switch from a public to a private school in the first years after a choice program's launch. These findings are the same for students of all races or ethnicities, whether African American, Latino, white, or multiracial. Our research also indicates that voucher students begin to recoup their academic losses in their third and fourth years of attending a private school. Students transitioning to a private school may need time to acclimate to what are usually more rigorous academic standards and higher expectations for homework and schoolwork.

Who Participates?

About 76 percent of Indiana's private schools—and nearly all its Catholic schools—participate in the voucher program. When examining student participation, we looked at students who joined the program early and students who are participating now, because the program has changed over time. Initially, students could receive a voucher only if they had attended a public school for at least one year, or if they had attended a private school with the help of the state's scholarship tax credit program for tuition-paying families. In 2013, the program expanded eligibility requirements to include siblings of voucher students and allowed students to receive a voucher starting in Kindergarten. Thus, in its first year, 90 percent of Indiana voucher students had previously attended a public school, but by 2016–17, only 45 percent had. In other words, the program started out serving students who wanted to leave public schools, but it now serves a majority of students who have attended private schools from day one.

As the program eligibility requirements changed, so too did the demographics of participating students. In the first year, 24 percent were African American, but this number declined to 12 percent in 2016–17. Conversely, the percentage of white students receiving vouchers increased from 46 percent in the first year to 60 percent

in 2016–17. The shares of Latino students (20 percent) and multiracial students (6–7 percent) remained consistent over time. Statewide in 2016–17, the K–12 student population was 69 percent white, 12 percent African American, 11 percent Hispanic, and 5 percent multiracial.

Statewide, students receiving vouchers were low-achieving before entering private schools. On average, voucher students performed at roughly the 41st percentile at baseline compared to all public- and private-school students statewide and were nearly four percentile points higher achieving at baseline than their same race, low-income peers remaining in public schools. African American voucher students were much lower achieving at baseline, while white students were higher achieving. Voucher students moved to private schools whose students were performing, on average, at the 53rd to 57th percentile in math and English Language Arts (ELA), respectively. Private school principals, teachers, and students we interviewed said that students who transferred into private schools using a voucher had not been required to do much homework in the public schools. Schools responded to their new students by providing more individualized instruction and in some cases, by adding an "ability" group.

Effects on Achievement

Because Indiana does not cap the number of vouchers awarded, it has no lottery process to determine who receives a voucher. Without the benefit of random assignment, we used a variety of statistical approaches to determine the program's impact on student achievement. We focused on students using a voucher to switch from a public to a private school in grades 5–8 during the program's first four years (2011–12 through 2014–15). Because Indiana public and private schools take the same state assessment in grades 3–8, we could identify public-school students who shared similar achievement trajectories and demographic characteristics with these voucher students at baseline (the year prior to a student switching from a public to a private school) and track both groups' academic progress for up to four subsequent years.

Overall, we found an average loss in mathematics of 0.12 standard deviations (roughly 3-4 percentile points) from baseline for students who used a voucher to transfer from public to private schools. The largest losses occurred during years one and two. However, voucher students began to show signs of improvement by their fourth year in a private school, and in that year there was no statistically significant difference between them and their public school peers in terms of total achievement gains from baseline. The negative math effects in the early years are similar to recent findings for students participating in new statewide voucher programs in Louisiana and Ohio, though smaller in magnitude. In ELA, we find no statistically significant average difference in the performance of voucher and public school students in any year. We found little to no variation in these effects based on a student's race or

ethnicity, suggesting that achievement gaps in mathematics were exacerbated in early years and remain steady in ELA.

Implications for Program Design

If states and cities continue to implement parental choice programs, our research to date offers some clear policy implications: (1) allow enough time for schools and families to prepare for the implementation of a voucher program; (2) start with a smaller number of scholarships and use lotteries to determine participation, enabling researchers to better assess early impacts on students; (3) provide broader measures beyond achievement (engagement, motivation, social-emotional skills, persistence) to assess a program's effectiveness; (4) start students earlier in their academic careers to better acclimate students to private schools; (5) ensure the quality of private schools willing to participate; and (6) provide additional teacher training in mathematics instruction and in learning to lead more diverse classrooms.

Outside of choice programs, policymakers should consider other pressing educational policies such as early childhood education, continuing teacher training and professional development, and student funding for postsecondary education, which are likely to provide greater educational opportunities for all students, especially students of color.

For more information, see: Berends, M., Waddington, R. J., & Austin, M. (2018). Lessons learned from Indiana. *Education Next, 18*(2), 50-51, 60-63.
http://educationnext.org/lessons-learned-from-indiana-forum-private-school-choice/

WASHINGTON, D.C.'S OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM: CIVIL RIGHTS IMPLICATIONS

Mary Levy*

Highlights Summary

The District of Columbia has the nation's only school voucher program established and funded by the federal government since 2003. Why? Congressional proponents urged parental choice as a value in itself, principally as a means to equalize educational opportunity for low-income students, giving them the same options as their wealthier peers to receive a higher quality education through escape from low-performing public schools, and to improve DC's public schools through competition.

How has the District of Columbia private school sector changed since then? The number of schools in the entire sector and in the voucher program has declined in the face of increasing competition from DCPS (DC Public School district) schools in affluent neighborhoods and charter schools generally, as well as rising costs and declining enrollment in Catholic Archdiocese schools. Total private school enrollment has both decreased and become whiter, while white enrollment in the public sector has also increased, reflecting a significant increase in the white population.

Effectively, how broad is the choice for DC voucher students? The constraints of affordability, transportation, needs for services such as special education and ESL, and admissions requirements and practice limit the choice considerably. In SY 2011-12, the one year where OSP student enrollment by school is available, students are clustered in low-tuition, religiously affiliated schools in low-to middle income neighborhoods. Very few are enrolled in the elite high-tuition schools in affluent neighborhoods attended by their wealthier peers.

Do participating students receive significant benefit from the program – academic achievement and safety/security, as compared with students in DCPS and charter schools? Evaluations of both phases of the Opportunity Scholarship Program (OSP) program found no significant effect on academic achievement. In the second phase there was some evidence of academic loss. Graduation numbers were significantly higher for the earlier group, but without knowing graduation standards, it is hard to assess this finding. Most families seem sufficiently satisfied to keep their children in the participating private schools, but statistically satisfaction differs little, if at all, from that of families who did not receive awards and remained in their DCPS or charter schools.

Do participating students experience a greater or lesser degree of racial and ethnic integration than those in DCPS and charter schools? Private schools in DC are less segregated with a large majority of white students, but 70% of participating voucher students were enrolled in severely segregated schools with 90% or more minority students and a full 58% were in all-minority schools.

What information and data not currently available are needed to answer these questions and better evaluate the worth of the program? Basic information is very hard to come by. At the least, we should know the number and names of all private schools and basic statistics such as their enrollment and attendance, OSP enrollment data by school, and quality measures, all of which are now unavailable.

What might a national federal government voucher program look like? The D.C. program is funded completely by federal funds with the added feature of providing public schools with funds they would have had for the private school students they do not enroll – a feature not typical of existing state/local programs. The cost of a nation-wide voucher program would be considerable even without such a pay-off.

Would a federal program even cover the cost of private school tuition and fees, or – like special education – would it become a largely unfunded mandate on state and local government? If the program followed the pattern of the D.C. system, student access would be largely limited to low-tuition schools, most with religious missions. Parents seeking an exit from public schools would sometimes face the issue of placing their children in a school whose basic mission is teaching a religion different from their family's faith. Participating schools would pick their students, and be free to reject students who are low-achieving, with disabilities or with limited English. Accountability would consist of parent ability to move to a different school, without standards for student performance and little data or other information by which to judge quality. As has been found in studies of state and local voucher programs, achievement of participating students would be about the same as their demographically similar public school peers.

**The author wishes to recognize with appreciation the contributions of Maree Sneed and her team from the education law practice of Hogan Lovells US LLP.*

Private School Vouchers: Legal Challenges and Civil Rights Protections

Kevin G. Welner & Preston C. Green

Highlights Summary

The past fifteen years have seen an explosion of private school voucher programs. Half of US states now have some type of program that spends or otherwise subsidies private schooling. Yet most civil rights protections that students enjoy when they attend public schools do not follow them to private schools. Some state voucher laws include no protections or only the most basic protections against discrimination. Even the most protective laws include no safeguards against LGBTQ discrimination and no requirement of addressing the needs of students not fluent in English. Further, these laws contain few or no requirements that private schools meet the needs of students with disabilities, and many explicitly state that students waive their services and protections under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) when choosing to use a voucher.

At a time when the Trump administration and many state policy-makers are pushing for additional growth of voucher policies, it is useful to consider how the shifting schooling landscape impacts such civil rights protections. The basic tendency in the development of voucher law and policy is to initially justify the subsidies in terms of the severe educational needs of students of color and students in poverty attending inferior public schools. As the policies develop, they increasingly move toward general subsidies for private schooling, including support for higher income groups and students who have never attended public schools. Many of the state restrictions on funding nonpublic or religious institutions have been interpreted away by state courts. These trends call into question the ability of voucher programs to serve the vulnerable student populations for whom they were ostensibly created.

In this report, we first detail the evolution of voucher policies, from their roots in the Jim Crow Era to their modern-day applications, including the rise of "neovoucher" programs. Next, we examine past legal challenges to vouchers, concluding that both state and federal constitutional challenges have had very limited success but that there likely remain some future legal impediments to voucher expansion. We discuss factors that may influence the legal justifications of vouchers, including the quality of education for students of color in voucher programs. Following this, we delve into some key policy issues that arise from this shift toward greater public funding of private schools, with a particular focus on civil rights concerns. We conclude with a set of recommendations, again focused on civil rights protections. These recommendations include:

1. Ensuring that state voucher laws include straightforward anti-discrimination provisions that require voucher-accepting private schools to avoid engaging in discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, sex, disability, or sexual orientation
2. Providing stronger protections for disabled students by requiring voucher-accepting private schools to comply with Section 504 of the 1973 Rehabilitation Act and the IDEA
3. Securing better services for ESL students by requiring voucher-accepting private schools to comply with the Equal Education Opportunity Act of 1974
4. Addressing barriers that impede access for low-income students, including lack of transportation, additional tuition charges beyond the value of the voucher, and private schools' option not to participate in subsidized meal programs

PRESENTER AND CO-AUTHOR BIOS

PRESENTERS:

Mark Berends is a professor of sociology at the University of Notre Dame, where he directs the Center for Research on Educational Opportunity (CREO). He has written and published extensively on educational reform, school choice, the effects of family and school changes on student achievement trends and gaps, and the effects of schools and classrooms on student achievement. His research focuses on how school organization and classroom instruction are related to student outcomes, with special attention to disadvantaged students and school reforms aimed at improving their educational opportunities. Professor Berends serves on numerous editorial boards, technical panels, and policy forums; is a Fellow of the American Educational Research Association (AERA); co-editor of AERA's *American Educational Research Journal;* former editor of *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis,* and former vice president of the AERA's Division L, Educational Policy and Politics. His latest books are *School Choice and School Improvement* (Harvard Education Press, 2011), the *International Handbook of the Sociology of Education* (SAGE, forthcoming), the *Handbook of Research on School Choice, 2nd Edition* (Routledge, forthcoming), and *School Choice at the Crossroads: Research Perspectives* (Routledge, forthcoming).

Jongyeon (Joy) Ee is a postdoctoral researcher at the UCLA Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles with experience and expertise in quantitative research design and analysis. Her recent work has focused on school segregation, racial inequality, and school discipline in K-12 schools, and she has been responsible for data analysis for multiple reports released by the UCLA CRP. She has also been deeply interested in education for language-minority students and immigrant students. She conducted several studies in regard to bilingual education and bilingualism, including economic advantages of bilingual abilities and parents' thoughts and attitudes towards dual language programs. She received her Ph.D. in Education from UCLA and an MA degree in the Teaching of English as a Second Language at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Tom Gentzel is the executive director & CEO of the National School Boards Association, and an unabashed advocate for public education and the community leadership essential to its success. He heads a staff of nearly 80 persons and serves a membership comprised of state associations of school boards and their more than 13,000-member school districts. NSBA represents the school board perspective in Congress, federal government agencies, the courts, and national organizations that impact education, and promotes the achievements of public education and the role of school boards through an extensive public advocacy role. Prior to NSBA, Mr. Gentzel served as Executive Director of the Pennsylvania School Boards Association for 11 years. Mr. Gentzel is a former chair of the Organization of State Association Executive Directors and served as an officer for the National School Public Relations Association and as member of the

Outreach Advisory Board for The Pennsylvania State University (PSU). He was appointed by Gov. Tom Ridge (R) and reappointed twice by Gov. Edward Rendell (D) to the Pennsylvania State Advisory Panel on Special Education. In 2009, he was named by the governor to the Pennsylvania Early Learning Council. He previously chaired the Pennsylvania Coalition for Public Education and was founder and coordinator of the Alliance for a School Aid Partnership. He was the 2014 recipient of the Edward Donley Award by the Education Policy and Leadership Center. In 2017, he was recognized in TrustEd's list of 20 education thought leaders for his contribution to the national dialogue on K-12 public education. Mr. Gentzel received a bachelor's degree in Community Development and MPA from PSU.

Preston Green is the John and Carla Klein Professor of Urban Education at the University of Connecticut, Neag School of Education. He is also a professor of educational leadership and law at the University of Connecticut. Dr. Green has written five books and numerous articles and book chapters pertaining to educational law. He primarily focuses on the legal and policy issues pertaining to educational access and school choice. Dr. Green has a B.A. from the University of Virginia, a J.D. from Columbia University, and an Ed.D from Teachers College, Columbia University.

Mary Levy has studied DC public education for almost 40 years. She has consulted for the DC Council, the Chief Financial Officer of the District of Columbia, and public charter school organizations. As the director of the Public Education Reform Project at the Washington Lawyers' Committee for Civil Rights & Urban Affairs, she played a major role in developing the District of Columbia's public school funding system, and participated in the formulation of many major reform plans. Since 1980 she has analyzed DC Public School staffing, budget and expenditures, and monitored the progress of education reform for parent advocacy and school reform organizations. She is a major source for fiscal, statistical and general information on DC Public Schools for the media, government officials and non-profit, business and civic groups. Previously, in private practice with Rauh, Lichtman, Levy & Turner, her work consisted principally of civil litigation in school finance, labor law, civil rights, employment discrimination, and con-stitutional law. Major cases in which she participated include school finance litigations in New York (*Levittown v. Nyquist*), in Maryland (*Somerset County v. Hornbeck*), and the suit compell-ing the U.S. Department of Education to enforce Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (*Adams v. Richardson*. She holds a J.D. from The George Washington University Law Schools, and a Ph.D. from the University of Michigan.

Gary Orfield is a Distinguished Research Professor of Education, Law, Political Science and Urban Planning at the University of California, Los Angeles. His research interests are in the study of civil rights, education policy, urban policy, and minority opportunity. He was co-founder and director of the Harvard Civil Rights Project, and now serves as co-director of the Civil Rights Project/Proyecto Derechos Civiles at UCLA. Orfield is a member of the National Academy of Education and received numerous awards, including the Teachers College Medal, Social Justice Award of the AERA, the American

Political Science Association Charles Merriam Award and honorary PhDs. Orfield's research includes 12 co-authored or co-edited books since 2004 and scores of articles and reports. He has also served as expert witness or special master in more than three dozen class action civil rights cases and as consultant to school districts, federal, state and local governments, civil rights groups and teacher organizations. He and collaborators have submitted amicus briefs to the Supreme Court on all the major school and affirmative action decisions over the last two decades.

CO-AUTHORS:

Megan Austin (Ph.D., Sociology, University of Notre Dame) is a researcher at American Institutes for Research (AIR). Her research focuses on how educational policies and school organizational responses to policy shape student outcomes. At AIR, she partners with state education agencies and other education organizations to build capacity for research use through work with the Midwest Regional Educational Laboratory (REL Midwest) and the State Support Network. She also is designing and directing several research studies related to school choice in Indiana, Georgia, and Texas. She has also published on the promises and challenges of research-practice partnerships. Her dissertation, funded by an AERA/NSF Dissertation Grant, developed a new measure of high school curricular intensity and found that although students' academic course taking has increased over the past several decades, socioeconomic inequalities in course taking have remained steady or increased over time. Her school choice research is published or forthcoming in the *Journal of School Choice,* the *Handbook of Research on School Choice, 2nd Edition* (Routledge, forthcoming), and *School Choice at the Crossroads: Research Perspectives* (Routledge, forthcoming).

Jennifer Teitell is a research coordinator at the UCLA Civil Rights Project working on projects related to school choice and higher education. Teitell received her B.A. in Political Science and Public Affairs from UCLA in 2017. As an undergraduate, she worked as a student researcher for the Civil Rights Project for the forthcoming book *Accountability and Opportunity in Higher Education* (Harvard Education Press, 2018).

Joseph Waddington (Ph.D., Educational Studies, University of Michigan) is an assistant professor in the Department of Educational Policy Studies and Evaluation at the University of Kentucky, where he also holds a secondary appointment in the Martin School of Public Policy and Administration. In Dr. Waddington's research, he focuses on the application of quantitative methods to statewide longitudinal educational databases to understand the effectiveness of school choice programs and policies. Dr. Waddington is currently receiving external funding from the Spencer Foundation and working with colleagues at the University of Notre Dame and NORC at the University of Chicago to study the instructional and organizational conditions under which public and private school choice in Indiana is or is not effective in the elementary and middle grades. He regularly presents his collaborative research at conferences for the American Educational Research Association, the Association for Education Finance and Policy, the

Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management, and the Society for Research on Educational Effectiveness. His research has been published in *Education Finance and Policy*, *Education Next, Journal of Learning Analytics*, and he has a forthcoming book with colleagues, titled *School Choice at the Crossroads: Research Perspectives* (Routledge).

Kevin Wellner is a professor at the University of Colorado Boulder School of Education and director of the National Education Policy Center. He authored or edited a dozen books and more than 100 articles and book chapters, including 2016's law school casebook, Education and the Law (co-authored with Stuart Biegel and Bob Kim) and 2013's Closing the Opportunity Gap (co-edited with Prudence Carter). Welner's present research examines the use and misuse of research in policy making and explores various issues concerning the intersection between education rights litigation and educational opportunity scholarship. Welner was recognized by the American Educational Research Association as a Fellow and received the 2017 AERA's Outstanding Public Communication of Education Research Award, 2006 Early Career Award, and 2004 Palmer O. Johnson Award. The Horace Mann League gave Welner its Outstanding Public Educator Award in 2018. He received his B.A. in Biological Sciences from University of California, Santa Barbara and his J.D. and PhD from UCLA.