

# Politics of Education BULLETIN

POLITICS OF EDUCATION  
ASSOCIATION

VOLUME 26, ISSUE 1      FALL  
2002



## FLORIDA'S TWO VOUCHER PROGRAMS: What the Research Tells Us

CAROLYN HERRINGTON, Florida State University

### *The History of Private School Vouchers in Florida*

Florida has two voucher programs: the Opportunity Scholarship Program for students assigned to failing schools and John M. McKay Scholarships for Students with Disabilities, a program designed for students whose parents are not satisfied with their children's progress in public schools. These two scholarship programs are the only statewide voucher programs in the nation.

Vouchers in Florida have been supported for two major reasons. First, they offer parents and students a choice, particularly low-income students who are overly represented in low-performing schools. Advocates argue that these students deserve to have the same choice that students in higher income families have had all along, because of their ability to choose where they live and to pay for private education. Second, advocates also argue that vouchers will create markets for *students in failing schools*.

### *Vouchers for students in "failing" schools*

Passed in 1999, the Opportunity Scholarship Program is part of a broader statewide accountability system (the A+ Plan) including

four major components: student assessment, school grading ("A" through "F" for each school), public information on school performance, and consequences for students and schools. As a major consequence for schools, the Opportunity Scholarship Program offers vouchers to students attending public schools that have received a failing grade for two out of four consecutive years, regardless of their achievement level or family income. (Continued on p. 2.)

## MESSAGE FROM THE PEA PREZ

**Kenneth K. Wong**, Vanderbilt University

Greetings! You have given me a lot of good ideas on how to move PEA forward at our well-attended business meeting in New Orleans. Since AERA, many of you have generously accepted my invitation to serve on committee assignments. I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your commitment to the PEA. It is because of your support that we are able to maintain this association for 33 years! (Continued on p. 6.)

**(Continued from p. 1.)**

Students may use the vouchers to attend a participating private school; religious or non-religious; or to attend a public school (in the same or another school district) earning a grade of “C” or better. A private school must accept the voucher provided by the state as full tuition and fees for each student. The State sends the private school a check - made out to the parent, not the school – to cover the tuition cost to the participating private school.

The parent must endorse the check. A student’s parent or guardian may choose to return the student to an eligible public school at any time, upon reasonable notice.

In 2000-01, two elementary schools in Escambia County received two “F”s in four years making their students eligible for vouchers; 57 accepted vouchers to private schools. Ten additional schools in Dade, Orange, and Palm Beach counties were designated as failing schools in the summer of 2002. As of the beginning of the 2002-03 school year, Florida had a total of 624 students receiving opportunity scholarships to private schools, including 580 new voucher students from Dade, Orange, and Palm Beach Counties, and 44 students who are continuing vouchers in Escambia County from the previous school year.

***Vouchers for students with disabilities.***

McKay Scholarships allow a parent who is dissatisfied with their child’s educational progress in a Florida public school to request a voucher (“McKay Scholarship”) for a private school or to enroll their child in another public school that better meets their child’s needs. Students with disabilities include those who are mentally handicapped, speech and language impaired, deaf or hard-of-hearing, visually impaired, dual sensory impaired, physically impaired, emotionally handicapped, specific learning disabled, hospitalized or homebound, or autistic. The program began as a pilot with two students in 1999-00 and was expanded statewide in 2000-01. By the beginning of the 2002-03

school year, 7,500 students with disabilities were receiving McKay scholarships to private schools.

***Legal Challenges***

A lawsuit (*Holmes v. Bush*) challenging the constitutionality of Florida’s Opportunity Scholarship Program was filed within 24 hours after passage of the A+ plan legislation in 1999. This case affects only the Opportunity Scholarship Program because McKay Scholarships for Students with Disabilities did not exist at the time the lawsuit was filed. For the past three years, *Holmes v. Bush* has been working its way through the state court system.

In August 2002, the Circuit Court in Leon County ruled private school vouchers unconstitutional, stating that parental endorsement of the voucher payment to a private school is the equivalent of “indirect” aid to a “church, sect, religious denomination or sectarian institution” prohibited under Article 1, Section 3 of the Florida Constitution. While the case is on appeal, the 624 eligible students who have opted for private school vouchers in 2002-03, will be able to proceed with their plans. *Holmes v. Bush* is expected to reach the Florida Supreme Court within the next year.

**Research on Florida’s  
Voucher Programs**

Research on the effects of school vouchers in Florida is at an early stage. To date, research has focused on Florida’s Opportunity Scholarship Program, which has received the most attention, even though it’s the smaller of Florida’s two voucher programs. At this point, we know very little about the McKay Scholarships for Students with Disabilities other than the number of participating students and schools.

Impacts of Florida’s Opportunity Scholarship Program have been difficult to measure because few students have been eligible and subsequently elected to participate. By the end of the 2001-02 school year, only two public schools in Florida (both elementary schools in

Escambia County) had met the voucher criteria (two “F”s in four consecutive years). In those schools, only 57 students had opted for a voucher to attend a private school.

The majority of Florida parents with children in failing public schools keep their children where they are. Of those who leave, most select another public school. According to the Choice Office at the Florida Department of Education, of the 9,000 students in Dade, Orange and Palm Beach counties who became eligible for vouchers at the beginning of 2002-03 school year, only 580 (6.4%) opted for a private school voucher. Another 909 (10%) decided to go to another public school and that number is expected to grow throughout the year as a result of open enrollment. This response could change over time, for example, if many more students become eligible for vouchers or as parents become more familiar with the program.

Nevertheless, preliminary analysis offers some lessons to be learned. Various researchers have been examining the effects of school vouchers in Florida. Similar research questions have been asked from different perspectives. This policy brief summarizes these findings to inform policymakers as they continue to shape the A+ Plan to meet its intended goals.

#### ***Has the A+ plan been working?***

The consensus is generally yes. Overall, student performance on the Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test (FCAT) has improved. The incentives appear to be working. However, the A+ Plan has multiple incentives for schools: the threat of vouchers, the stigma of an “F” grade, and increased resources targeted to low-performing schools. The A+ Plan also has consequences for students, retention in 3rd grade if FCAT reading proficiency standards are not met and inability to earn a regular high school diploma without passing the FCAT.

#### ***Do vouchers have an impact?***

Whether vouchers have an impact depends on the problem they are intended to solve: low student achievement, the racial/ethnic

achievement gap, or parental dissatisfaction with their child’s education. What does research tell us? It’s too early to tell, but preliminary research provides lessons to be learned.

#### ***Student achievement***

Some evidence supports the claim that vouchers have a positive impact on student achievement, particularly for African American students. A RAND study found no overall evidence of benefit or harm, and a small positive effect on the achievement of African-American students. A Brookings Institution study also found a positive effect for African American students.

Other research has found that while vouchers may result in improved student achievement, particularly for African Americans, the effects tend to be small or limited in scope. A Stanford University study indicated that the effects of vouchers are smaller than voucher proponents claim. In analyzing Florida’s school-level FCAT data, research at the Economic Policy Institute found a voucher effect of only 0.02 standard deviation which is equivalent to a very small (0.8% percentile) increase in FCAT achievement.

#### ***Reducing the Achievement Gap***

The Brookings Institution found that vouchers reduced the achievement gap between blacks and whites, but only in one grade. Dr. Douglas Harris at the Economic Policy Institute questions whether it’s realistic to expect much impact on this outcome. First, there is no clear explanation why African-American students show greater gains than other students. Further research beyond test score analysis would be needed to shed light on this question. Second, even if the effect for African American students is real, it is not likely to have any sizeable effect on the achievement gap.

Assume that a large voucher is offered to all African American K-12 students in Florida. If 50% of the students actually accept the voucher, 40% of those students actually stay at their new school, and their test score gains are large

enough to reduce the gap by 20%, the state's overall test score gap would decrease by only 4%. Not enough students would actually opt for the vouchers and for those that do, the effects would not be large enough to reduce the achievement gap found in the general student population.

### ***Parent Satisfaction***

Vouchers appear to have their greatest impact on improving parent satisfaction. National research studies generally shows that parent satisfaction is higher for those who switch schools, not surprising given that dissatisfied parents are more likely to take this action. However, this finding does suggest that vouchers may have their greatest benefit on important outcomes other than student achievement.

### ***Is the threat of vouchers an incentive for schools to improve?***

If the threat of vouchers motivates schools to improve, we would expect lower performing schools (because they are at greater risk of qualifying for vouchers) to show greater improvement on FCAT scores than higher performing schools. This motivation should be strongest for "F" schools.

Research undertaken by Dr. Jay Greene at the Manhattan Institute for Policy Research found that lower graded schools do show greater FCAT improvement than higher graded schools, even when regression to the mean is taken into account. Also, when schools in the low "D" range are compared with those in the high "F" range, the latter show greater gains than the former even though they are similar in most respects, except their motivation to improve. If the "F" school receives a second "F" in the next three years, all of their students become eligible for vouchers. It has been estimated that the following additional per-pupil spending would be required to achieve equivalent results: \$888 for reading, \$3,484 for mathematics and \$2,805 for writing. Higher dollar amounts reflect that greater gains were achieved in those subject areas.

Critics note that the difference between the low "D" and high "F" school improvements is small. However, the effect actually may be underestimated because low "D" schools would be expected to respond to the threat of vouchers to some extent as well.

### ***What else could explain the effects of the A+ Plan?***

The threat of vouchers is a possible explanation for the impact of the A+ Plan. However, the plan includes multiple incentives for low-performing schools that could account for results: the threat of vouchers, the stigma of an "F" grade, or increased resources targeted at low-performing schools. Even before Florida's voucher program went into effect in 1999, evidence indicates that other factors played a role in school improvement. For example, in 1995, 158 schools were identified a "critically low" by 1997 this number had declined to 30 schools statewide.

### ***Will the effects of the A+ Plan continue into the future?***

Effects could plateau, expand or decline. In other areas of the nation where voucher programs have been operating longer than in Florida, the effects of vouchers have peaked after about three years. In Florida, vouchers have been examined only in the short term. From 1999-00 to 2001-02, students in only two schools in Florida were eligible to receive vouchers. Even for these students, researchers have had only one year of gain scores because FCAT testing was not expanded to grades 3-8 until 2000-01. Additional years of data on more schools and students should be analyzed before we can determine whether effects are real or sustained over time and across student populations.

### ***Unintended Consequences.***

Anecdotal evidence from Florida, Virginia and California suggests that schools respond to accountability plan incentives in unintended ways: i.e., strategies for "Gaming" the system. "Teaching to the test" has received the most

attention thus far, although this method could be positive if the test is tied to real, meaningful standards. In Florida, preliminary data analysis indicates that some schools “punish to the test” - increasing discipline of low performing students around test time. In Virginia, schools have been found to “feed to the test; use the school nutrition program to boost calories on test days. In California, schools have been “zoning to the test”; re-zoning schools to redistribute poor-performing students among public schools. And, *Resource manipulation*: Some schools assign their best teachers to the grades that are tested, targeting resources to those being tested.

***Shaping the test pool:*** Early evidence suggests that schools in Florida threatened by vouchers are identifying more low performing students as learning disabled. School grades are based on test results for standard curriculum students only.

#### ***Are vouchers cost-effective?***

Voucher proponents argue that private schools could achieve the same or better results than public schools at a lower cost. Opponents counter that private schools accepting voucher students save money in undesirable ways, for example, by limiting special services and extracurricular activities or hiring less experienced teachers at lower salaries than their more experienced counterparts in public schools. So far in Florida, no hard evidence supports either claim.

#### **Conclusion**

In summary, definitive conclusions about the effects of vouchers in Florida would be premature for several reasons. First, Florida has had the only statewide voucher programs in the nation; but as of the 2001-02 school year, only two schools had met the criterion making students eligible to receive vouchers (two “F” grades in a consecutive four-year period).

Second, vouchers are only one component of Florida’s A+ accountability plan, so their effects are difficult to isolate from school

grading, consequences for students, and other elements of the plan.

Third, researchers have not had access to individual student achievement data in Florida, so studies to date have relied on aggregate school-level data, which have serious limitations. School-level gains are calculated based on year-to-year comparisons of different sets of students attending the same grade tested. Therefore, effects could be attributed to differences in student characteristics between year 1 and year 2. To remedy this problem, researchers need access to student level data, so that for each school, gains can be computed for individual students as they progress through different grade levels.

#### ***Future Research***

The primary contribution of future research will be to help policymakers understand what are the real effects of the A+ Plan and how they can minimize its unintended consequences while maximizing its positive benefits.

The A+ Plan has had an impact. Why? We don’t know. A major challenge will be teasing out alternative explanations: the threat of vouchers, stigma avoidance, and targeted resource distribution to low-performing schools. Schools respond to incentives in both desired and undesired ways. Policymakers need to know what mechanisms lead to good outcomes so that they can make policy adjustments accordingly.

Dr. David Figlio at the University of Florida, with colleagues at the Urban Institute and Princeton University, is conducting a multi-year evaluation of Florida’s A+ Plan. This project just completed a survey of Florida’s teachers and principals selected from a universal sample of public schools in Florida. Results are expected to be published in late Fall of 2002.

By the summer of 2003, Florida will have experienced a major change in its school grading system that should affect stigma avoidance but not the threat of vouchers. At that time, quasi-experimental studies can be conducted, teasing out the effects of vouchers and other A+ Plan

components, looking at different patterns of school grades across multiple-years.

At this point, moreover, research can play a more important role by focusing on broader questions, specifically: (1) How can the A+ Plan and all its elements best achieve its intended goals? (2) What adjustments need to be made? (3) What other elements or approaches would make the plan more effective? (4) What is the impact of the A+ Plan on the local educational system, schools, and students? (5) How are various groups of students and schools differentially affected by these voucher programs?

If Florida's voucher program is ruled constitutional by the Florida Supreme Court, research will have a key role in informing policy-makers and the public about the specific effects of vouchers. This court ruling in *Holmes v. Bush* may influence the decisions of policymakers as they seek to revise the A+ Plan or help parents of voucher-eligible children to make their choice decisions. Among the most important questions to ask are:

1. Who chooses vouchers and why? What are the characteristics and public school experiences of voucher students and their parents?

2. Who doesn't choose vouchers? Why not? What are the characteristics and public school experiences of these parents and students?

3. How do vouchers affect students and parents? Do voucher students show significant achievement gains? Are these gains greater than for students who do not choose vouchers? Do vouchers affect different groups of students in different ways? Does parental satisfaction improve?

4. How do vouchers affect public and even private schools? To what extent does the threat of vouchers motivate schools to improve? What changes do schools and school districts make in response (a) to the threat of vouchers and (b) to having their students actually become eligible for vouchers? For both proponents and opponents, private (religious) school vouchers will continue

to be a moral issue. What do we want as a society? Do we want universal choice so that parents can make their own decisions about what's best for their children, particularly low-income parents whose children are most likely to be trapped in low-performing schools?

Or do we want public schools to be the only form of publicly funded K-12 education because we value public schools as fundamental democratic institutions?

For reasons of democracy, equity, and school quality, some people--including practitioners and researchers--have suggested separating the accountability and choice issues. The question, "Should we have choice?" ultimately may not be a question that research can answer. It's an issue that the citizenry must confront as other states and districts adopt vouchers and other forms of privatization in education.

---

This policy brief was prepared for a May 22, 2002 symposium hosted by Florida State University for policy-makers, educational practitioners, local school districts, university faculty and private sector policy groups. Symposium speakers included:

**Dr. Carolyn Herrington**, Director, Florida Education Policy Studies, Learning Systems Institute, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL.

**Dr. Jay Greene**, Senior Fellow, Manhattan Institute for Policy Research New York, NY.

**Dr. Douglas Harris**, Economic Policy Institute, Washington, DC.

**Dr. David Figlio**, Professor, University of Florida Department of Economics.

## MESSAGE FROM THE PEA PREZ

(Continued from p. 1).

**Kenneth K. Wong**

To position the association for many more years to come, we need to start thinking about

venues for institutional expansion. At issue is the extent to which PEA can add value to our professional undertakings. Among the issues that we may want to address include:

- 1) How to maintain a focus on the politics of education when many of our research projects are oriented toward policy analysis?
- 2) How to cultivate the commitment of the next generation of scholars to build on the accomplishments of the founding generation of the PEA?
- 3) How can PEA expand its institutional ties to AERA, APSA, and other professional and policy associations to promote the study of school politics and governance?
- 4) How do we make political analysis a central concern of current debate on school reform?
- 5) How do we strengthen our international contacts?

To be sure, we have a solid foundation for significant expansion in the next two years. To start off, I receive great support from V. Darleen Opfer (Secretary) and Lance Fusarelli (Treasurer). Bruce Cooper has provided outstanding stewardship in reviving *the PEA Bulletin*. Bruce and I have discussed the prospect of replacing the printed version with an electronic version of the *Bulletin* (including Web-based) beginning with the next issue. If you have any suggestions on the e-Bulletin, please contact Bruce at [BSCOOPERPH@aol.com](mailto:BSCOOPERPH@aol.com). Our immediate past president, Hanne Mawhinney, has kindly completed the challenging (and thankless) task of updating the membership database. This database will empower us to launch a more aggressive campaign to recruit new members, including graduate students (with reduced membership fee), policymakers, and practitioners. Please send any suggestions on membership recruitment to the new treasurer, Lance at [fusarelli@fordham.edu](mailto:fusarelli@fordham.edu).

As an initial step toward institutional expansion, I have called upon some of you to serve on three committees. First, Robert Crowson is chairing a committee on the future of PEA. Members of the committee include Ben

Levin, Jay Scribner, Doug Mitchell, Bill Firestone, Dorothy Shipp, and Bob Johnson. Its goal is to examine the association's mission, organizational structure, membership recruitment, research agenda, and its relationship with AERA in the future. A draft of the committee report is included in this Bulletin for your inputs at the UCEA. You can also email comments to Bob at [Robert.Crowson@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:Robert.Crowson@vanderbilt.edu).

Second, I have appointed a Committee on Research and Development in Urban Politics of Education to explore new channels through which PEA members can interface with urban leaders. Members of the committee are: Peter Cistone (chair), Marion Orr, Dorothy Shipp, Rey Contreras, Bruce Cooper, and V. Darleen Opfer. The committee expects to circulate a draft report by January 2003.

Third, I have established the Committee on Research and Development in State Politics of Education to consider multiple forums for exchange with policymakers and practitioners at the state level. Members of the committee include: Jim Cibulka (chair), Stephen Clements, Michael McClendon, Karen DeMoss, Lance Fusarelli, and Andrea Rorror. A draft report will be ready by December 2002.

In addition, we are making progress on several fronts. First, the Roald Campbell Award Selection Committee has issued a call for nominations (see this issue of the Bulletin). Members of the committee include David Monk (chair), Jerry Sroufe, and John Rury. Second, our publication committee has kept our yearbooks on track. Members of the committee include John Fitz (chair), Marion Orr, Catherine Lugg, Darleen Opfer, Lisa Cuerars (Sage), and Phil Altbach (Editor, Education Policy). Michael K. McLendon and James Hearn jointly edit the 2003 yearbook on the politics of higher education. Bonnie Johnson and Bill Boyd will edit the 2004 yearbook on the politics of curriculum and instruction. Finally, the Peabody Journal of Education will set aside one issue every two years for a PEA symposium. I am editing the first symposium on the politics of accountability. Please send your suggestions on

future yearbooks and symposia to John Fitz at [jcardiff@ntlworld.com](mailto:jcardiff@ntlworld.com).

In short, the PEA needs your continual support. As always, please feel free to email me at [ken.wong@vanderbilt.edu](mailto:ken.wong@vanderbilt.edu) on how we can improve our association. Thank you,

Kenneth Wong, President of PEA

#### **Announcements:**

At the 2001 PEA annual meeting changes in membership renewal procedures were adopted. These changes respond to several ongoing issues faced by the association for several years. It was decided that membership would run from January to January beginning January 2001. Membership fees of \$25 provide the following benefits:

- *A Politics of Education Yearbook double issue of the Educational Policy beginning with the January/February 2001 edition.*
- *Yearly editions of the PEA Bulletin*
- *Two Newsletters offering advance information on upcoming conferences with affiliated groups and other opportunities.*
- *Potentially significantly reduced purchase costs for a Politics of Education Handbook (currently under development).*
- *Connections with other scholars and practitioners of politics of education, through website and conference sessions.*
- *Access to awards given in the following cycle:*

**2002: Outstanding Dissertation Award** recognizes excellence in doctoral research in the politics of education. It is offered biannually.

**2003: Roald Campbell Award** recognizes those individuals who link research to practice.

**2004: Outstanding Dissertation Award**

**2005: Service Award** is given in recognition of service to the Association

**2006: Stephen K. Bailey Award** is given to recognize outstanding research in the field.

## **MESSAGE FROM THE TREASURER:**

**LANCE D. FUSARELLI  
FORHDAM UNIVERSITY**

The Politics of Education Association is a wonderful organization, filled with interesting and fascinating people. The *PEA Bulletin* is terrific, and the PEA Yearbooks are excellent sources of cutting-edge research in the field.

Unfortunately, as great as PEA is, we can't operate without membership and funds. While a solid, core group of members regularly pay their dues, the majority of people who receive our Bulletin do not (only about 1 in 4 members is currently paid up). As a result, quite frankly, we are going broke. One cost-cutting measure is to produce an electronic version of the *Bulletin*, which we plan to begin in 2003.

When you renew your membership, please include your email address so that we may keep the database current. EVERYONE'S current membership expires December 31, 2002. Anyone seeking to remain a member of PEA for 2003 must send me a check payable to PEA for \$25 (PLEASE pay for only 1 year at a time).

Your new treasurer is a simpleton, all too easily confused, so let's try to keep the process as simple as possible. Anyone who has not paid by the next PEA meeting (in Chicago at AERA) will be dropped from the membership rolls forever. All past debts are hereby forgiven. But if you don't pay \$25 for next year's dues, you will be dropped from the mailing list for eternity and relegated to a life of dreary ignominy, wandering purposelessly through the vast chasm of an empty life (much like Al Gore). So, please, make my holiday and send me your dues for 2003.

Politics of Education Association  
**Bruce S. Cooper**  
**Lance D. Fusarelli**  
**Betty Malen**

ADDRESS TO -

FORDHAM UNIVERSITY  
Graduate School of Education  
113 West 60<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1119  
New York, NY 10023  
USA

THE NEW--

**Politics of Education**  
**BULLETIN**

**Politics of Education Association**  
**Membership Application**

*Name (please print):*

\_\_\_\_\_

*Title:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Affiliation:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Address:*  
\_\_\_\_\_

*City/State/Zip code:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Phone: ( )* \_\_\_\_\_

*For the quickest news on events and opportunities,  
please include your email address, to receive the  
next Bulletin.*

*Email Address:* \_\_\_\_\_

*Enclosed please find a check to PEA for  
\_\_\_\_\_ \$25 for full membership*

Send to **Lance D. Fusarelli, Treas., Fordham University Graduate School of Education, 113 W. 60<sup>th</sup> Street, #1119, New York, NY 10023, USA.**

*Politics of Education BULLETIN* is an official publication of the Politics of Education Association (PEA) and is published three times per year. We encourage authors to submit essays on topics of interest in school policy and politics to the co-editors:

**Bruce S. Cooper** and **Lance D. Fusarelli**, Fordham University Graduate School of Education, 113 West 60<sup>th</sup> Street, Suite 1119, New York, NY 10023. Or call Bruce Cooper at 212-875-9371 or Lance Fusarelli at 212-636-6438. Email addresses are:

[bscooperph@aol.com](mailto:bscooperph@aol.com) OR [fusarelli@hotmail.com](mailto:fusarelli@hotmail.com)

To change the newsletter title, click on it and select the placeholder text (The Journal). Type your title. If your newsletter name is longer than the placeholder text, reduce the point size of the information before you type your text.

If you want to insert your own picture or logo, click the placeholder picture above or the logo on page 2. Click Picture on the Insert menu, and then locate your artwork.

To resize a picture and keep its original dimensions, click it and drag a corner handle. To reshape a picture, drag one of the middle handles. To crop a picture, press Shift and drag either a corner or middle handle.

Once you have made changes to the newsletter title and picture, you will want to begin to replace the text in the body of this template. There are two ways to do this:

- Select the text and type your information.
- Select a new style from the Style list. For example, this style was created using the List Bullet style. Then, type your text.

To change the shading of text borders, click the cursor on the shaded area. On the Format menu, click Borders And Shading. On the Shading tab, select a new option. On the Borders tab, you can add, remove, or change the color of a border.

There are several section breaks in this template. To create additional section breaks, use the Break command. If nonprinting characters are turned on, you can identify breaks by the double, dotted lines. If the nonprinting characters are not visible, select the Hidden Text option under Nonprinting Characters (Tools-Options-View). To insert a section break, click Break on the Insert menu and then select Continuous.

Use this same method to create a page or column break. On the Insert menu, click Break. Then select either Page Break or Column Break.

If you want to remove the vertical line, click Columns on the Format menu. In the Columns dialog box, select the Line Between check box. You can also use the Columns dialog box to change the number and placement of columns in your newsletter.

## **SAVING YOUR NEWSLETTER**

Click Save As on the File menu, and then type a unique name.

---

### **HIGHLIGHTS**

HOW TO ADD A GRAPHIC TO THIS NEWSLETTER  
HOW TO CHANGE THE COLOR OF TEXT  
HOW TO IMPROVE YOUR NEWSLETTER PRINT QUALITY

---

## Readers Write

**Q** How do I change the color of text?

**A** To change the color of text, select the appropriate paragraph. On the Format menu, click Font and select a color from the Color list.

### Question

Extra space seems to appear between the lines as I type sometimes? What is wrong?

### Answer

Nothing. Depending on how fast you type and the speed of your computer, you may experience momentary lapses of proper line spacing. Word will automatically redraw the screen.

### Question

I would like to mail my newsletter in an envelope. How do I remove the indicia and return address frames?

### Q&A

I would like to change the color of my picture. Can it be done?

Yes. To change the color of a picture, double-click it to activate the picture. Select the area you want to color. On

the Format menu, click Drawing Object. On the Fill tab, under Color, select a new color. In the Picture dialog box, click Close Picture to return to the newsletter.

### Q: Printing

What is the best way to print this newsletter?

### A: Printing

Print page 2 on the back of page 1. Fold the sheet in thirds, like a letter, and mail with or without an envelope. For best results, use a medium- to heavy-weight paper. If you're mailing without an envelope, seal your newsletter with a label.

### QUESTION

How do I add a graphic to my newsletter?

### ANSWER

On the Insert menu, click Frame. Then, place the cursor where you want to insert your graphic. Click and drag the cursor until the frame is the correct size. On the Insert menu, click Picture, and then locate your graphic.

### Q How do I remove the vertical column lines?

**A** Click the cursor in the section you want to change, and click Columns on the Format menu.

Click the Line Between box to turn the column lines to the off position.

*Many styles of various sections are shown on this page. One style is the Format Drop Cap command, which you can use to create the large letters. Quickly copy and paste styles using the edit copy and edit paste commands.*



12345 Main Street  
Any City, State 12345

BULK RATE  
UNITED STATES  
POSTAGE PAID  
PERMIT # 0000  
ANY CITY, ST