

Pay for succe\$\$

Ted and Heidi Cruz, Goldman Sachs, Kickbacks and Paybacks, Common Core, and Special Education... All Rolled Into One Big, Fat Mess

When Donald Trump, the presumptive nominee for President, stated in his message to the American people, "There is so much, waste, fraud, and abuse," the establishment elite come to mind. Especially when investigating the shenanigans and abuses in the new federal education legislation, ESSA, Every Student Succeeds Act. Finally, someone with guts is saying it's time to clean house. Thank you, Mr. Trump!

Although Senator Cruz has suspended his campaign, it is very clear that his lawyerly word "suspend" did not mean withdraw and he intends to fight Donald Trump for a contested convention. Please continue the support and vote in the remaining primaries to establish Mr. Trump with the needed 1237 delegates to secure the nomination.

Senator Cruz also says he will do away with Common Core if he is elected President, but his globalist agenda speaks otherwise.

Here are some key education issues:

- What Is 'Pay For Success' in the New ESSA Federal Education Law and Why Should Parents of Special Education Children Be Alarmed?
- Why Are Business Investors Paid A Kickback For Children NOT To Receive Special Education Services That Are Guaranteed To Them Through Federal Law?
- Should Republicans Use Vulnerable Special Education Children To Be Sold For a Profit \$\$\$?
- What Does Goldman Sachs Have To Do With Common Core and Special Education, and Why Are They Reaping In The Cash?
- What Do Ted and Heidi Cruz Know About Goldman Sachs, Common

Core, and 'Pay For Success' That Helps Put "Gold in Someone's Sacks"?

There is a lot of hankie-pankie going on in the U.S. Department of Education and nobody seems to be able to pinpoint the collusion in a public/private financial partnership deal with Goldman Sachs called Pay For Success, PFS.

Senator Cruz did not mention once that Pay For Success, PFS, was rigged into the federal education legislation, ESSA. In fact, Senator Ted Cruz did NOT even vote on the day of the passage of ESSA. Why didn't Sen. Cruz vote against this bill?

It was Goldman Sachs that had funded Senator Cruz for his entry into the Presidential Race. Heidi Cruz works for Goldman Sachs and is currently on leave while her husband runs as a candidate for President. Is this why they felt silence was "golden"?

Perhaps Heidi Cruz can explain Pay For Success to Special Education parents since she announced that education is her primary goal. We might also ask her to explain the federal education fake CHOICE. Or ask her about the psychological child abuse on children in the classroom that would CONTINUE in Pay For Success because Common Core psychological interventions were legislated through ESSA.

[NOTE: Senator Cruz's controversial S 306 that supports federal CHOICE ropes private, religious, and homeschools into Common Core with federal Title I portability funds. Senator Cruz is in the perfect position to attach his CHOICE amendment to federal legislation at any time in the future as a sitting Senator. Supporting S 306 and federal CHOICE proves Senator Cruz will NOT do away with Common Core. (See the list of my previous articles at the bottom of this article.)]

Senator Hatch (R-UT) slipped Pay For Success into the new federal education law, ESSA, Every Student Succeeds Act, and

uses a preschool in Utah as a pilot. Goldman Sachs is rewarded a kickback for every child who isn't sent to Special Education. Goldman Sachs, who provided loans and is a silent funder for the Cruz campaign, is reeling in financial rewards for education programs already implemented and paid with Special Education funding. What's going on? (Source)

WHAT IS PAY FOR SUCCESS?

Pay For Success was legislated in the Reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Act, now called the Every Student Succeeds Act of 2015. The ESSA was passed by both Republican Houses of Congress. Legitimate questions and issues have been raised by In the Public Interest about how the Pay for Success (PFS) program was evaluated, including:

"PFS brings venture capital to the provision of public services. Investors provide the up-front funds for critical preventive services with the expectation of receiving a return on their investment. The theory is that the private investment dollars can fill a funding gap when government doesn't have adequate financial resources to spend on prevention activities. Under a PFS arrangement, the government repays the loan with interest if pre-determined social outcome targets are met. The theory presumes that even after paying the investors and service providers, the state ultimately reaps financial savings through foregone budget dollars spent to address future more costly, but now avoided, social problems." [Emphasis added] (Source)

The implementation of Pay For Success, PFS, is a system of kickbacks called Social Impact Bonds, creating a public/private partnership where government strikes deals (contracting mechanisms) with outside businesses and investment financiers to provide capital to accomplish ESSA Common Core psychological/mental health intervention goals on ALL children at school. Therefore, supposedly, fewer children are referred to Special Education.

Goldman Sachs has piloted a PFS investment in a preschool in Utah. Yes, the same Utah that heralds Senator Hatch who included PFS as an amendment to ESSA. [NOTE: Senator Mike Lee (R-UT) recently praised the Pay For Success program in Utah. Senator Lee also was the co-sponsor of S 306 with Senator Cruz, which pushes Common Core on all private, religious, and homeschools. Senator Lee has endorsed Senator Ted Cruz for President.]

But the controversy concerning this experimental program using handicapped children for monetary gain is that Special Education funding and service interventions are already being paid through IDEA, Individuals With Disabilities Education Act (Special Education) funds for a program that says children are not going to be referred to Special Education services. WHAT?! The results are that fewer truly Special Education children are sent forward for an IEP evaluation because Special Education services are already being administered. But supposedly the reason Goldman Sachs is getting a pay-out is because children aren't sent to Special Education. Is this double-speak, double-dipping, or both?

Let's spell this out:

1. Use Special Education Common Core/psychological interventions and Special Education funds FIRST on the entire classroom;
2. Do NOT send truly handicapped Special Education children for their guaranteed legal evaluation;
3. Use more Special Education intensive psychological interventions on children not meeting Common Core psychological standards;
4. Then reap the benefits for children not sent to Special Education even though Special Education funds were used in the first place;
5. Then pay Goldman Sachs a reward because FEWER children were sent to Special Education. What?!!!

Little do parents realize that Common Core for babies and preschool programs in the pilot preschool program (and all Common Core K-12 schools) have an inordinate amount of social, emotional, and behavioral conditioning using Common Core psychological behavior modification programs. These programs originated in Applied Behavior Analysis, an applied intensive behavior modification program researched on autistic children to be able to function in the real world. Parental knowledge or consent is not provided for this Common Core psychobabble.

Pay For Success is a lousy concept of corruption using children for profit, called taxpayer double dipping, and paying someone off to do the dipping. Is this really reaping financial savings for the government? This is all done with a little twist of ethics—redefining the interventions, using handicapped children to provide a basis for a money grab, psychological child abuse for using these concepts on normal children, and gobs of federal money. This scheme should be turning many heads and must be investigated. [Source]

The pilot program in Utah used PFS as an intervention program in preschool. Goldman Sachs was paid an outcome payment of \$2589.70 for each student not referred to Special Education. This program pays back a percentage of the investment to the financial partnership if FEWER children are reported to special education. But, did anyone question the programs or funding to create these statistics BEFORE this kickback was evaluated? NO! Questions were posed, but little has been done to stop the child abuse or the financial bleeding.

Understanding ESSA

The concept of direct student services, services carried out by IDEA Special Education funding, is the Common Core concept reinforced in the new federal education legislation, ESSA. Universal School-Wide Intervention Systems are blanketed on ALL children. ALL children are “At-Risk” and must be psychoanalyzed and treated in a three tiered process in the

normal classroom. ALL CHILDREN are treated with psychological techniques normally used for severely handicapped students. The reason psychological techniques are used is because Common Core includes psychological non-academic behavioral standards (See both graphs that design behavioral interventions.)

Children with true mental or physical handicaps are NOT apprised with an actual IEP, or referred for a true special education evaluation, until going through the Response to Intervention (RTI) three-tiered process in the regular classroom. These services are based on the conditioning processes developed through Applied Behavior Analysis. Applied Behavior Analysis, a psychological conditioning technique, was renamed Response to Intervention to make it more palatable to parents.

The following behavior modification techniques are being used in the classroom and are actually listed in the ESSA legislation: response to interventions, RTI; positive behavior interventions supports, PBIS; multi-tiered system of supports, MTSS; School-wide multi-tiered system of supports, SWTSS; early intervening services, EIS; Specialized Instructional Support Services, SISS; and Universal Design for Learning, UDL.

These behavioral interventions are all paid for with special education IDEA funds. Therefore, fewer children are referred to Special Education because they had already received Special Education services to meet Common Core. This is the double-dip.

There is also great controversy surrounding the implementation of these behavior modification/affective programs on normal children. The development of these programs was first researched from Applied Behavior Analysis with research on autistic children. The US Department of Education has stated that these techniques are "scientific research based interventions" to meet the government desired goals. However,

the government had NOT released the standards of what would be taught, tested, and scored in the affective domain. The Department catapulted the techniques onto normal children citing "prevention". It uses extreme behavior modification techniques on children because Common Core standards named affective/subjective group-think outcomes to be achieved in the normal classroom.

These behavior modification techniques are extreme measures that induce artificial stress and depression on normal children who are being forced to change their behavior to the government's desired collectivist standards. To achieve a subjective psychological outcome, psychological techniques must be implemented for behavioral change. When a standard states that your child should have "grit", do parents know and understand the impact of what is measured and scored? A gang member has "grit", but not the behavior most parents feel as acceptable. The question arises: can the U.S. Department of Education and the ESSA legislation LEGALLY implement behavior modification programs on unsuspecting children, especially when parents are in the dark about these radical techniques to change the attitudes, values, beliefs, and dispositions of their children? What happened to academics? The goal is to mold our American children into something less than American.

Goldman Sachs "Golden Sacks"

Mandated Common Core non-academic standards (Title I) and direct student services (IDEA) are used as a template for achieving these goals. Pay for Success equates SUCCESS, where Goldman Sachs has a return on their investment money, when districts DENY special education services to students who should be receiving them. Parents are able to request an IEP Evaluation, but many are NOT apprised of the RTI process. Under Title I, Part D (ii) Pay For Success initiatives, keeping special education students under 1% is incentivized by NOT reporting truly special education children into the IEP process until much later.

Recently, parents sued their school district which denied their child Special Education services until their child went through RTI process and did not include the parents in these evaluations.

Parents of Special Education children should read the following carefully and in its entirety:

“The U.S. Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals recently ruled that a school district’s failure to provide educational testing data to parents violated the procedural requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). Additionally, this failure deprived parents of the opportunity to meaningfully participate in the formation of their child’s individualized education program (IEP).

The parents subsequently brought suit alleging, among other things, that the district’s failure to provide the student’s RTI data constituted a procedural violation of the IDEA, and prevented them from fully participating in the IEP process. The court agreed, finding the district violated the IDEA by failing to ensure the RTI testing data was properly documented, presented to the parents, and carefully considered by the entire IEP team. The court held that the district violated the “procedural safeguards of the IDEA by not providing parents with an opportunity to examine all records relating to C.M [the student].” (Source)

The Utah pilot program boasts, “evidence has shown reduces by 95 percent the need for special education among the low-income students who would otherwise likely be placed in special education programs.” However, the evaluation of the program has been challenged to investigate the impact on vulnerable individuals and the double payment from IDEA funds and investment dollars paid for by the public. How children were measured as needing support and how the children were selected for the ‘Pay For Success’ program is also a major aspect of the challenges to the way this program operates.

There are no procedural safeguards in the RTI process. Parents are NOT given their rights under this process. Parents must demand an investigation. Stop using our children for research. Abide by the Protection of Pupil Rights Amendment to stop the psychological child abuse in the classroom.

The Legal Challenge:

A legal challenge to ESSA must be brought forward stating that it denies parents of truly Special Education children to be involved in their child's evaluations from the beginning when using the following psychological techniques prior to an IEP evaluation: Response To Intervention, RTI; Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports, PBIS; Student Assistance Programs, SAP; Specialized Student Instructional Support, SSIS; Multi-Tiered System of Supports, MTSS; Schoolwide Tiered System of Supports, SWTSS, Early Intervening Services, EIS; Universal Design for Learning, UDI; or other psychological techniques.

A legal challenge must be brought forward by parents stating that normal children in the classroom are receiving Special Education Behavior Modification programs when their children are NOT Special Education students. Parents have NOT been informed of the RTI, PBIS, MTSS, SWTSS, EIS, SISS, UDL, or other mental health psychological programs and interventions performed on their normal children. There is NO disclosure of what the vague non-academic standards are, how they are measured, or the risks involved in changing the attitudes, values, beliefs, and dispositions of their children.

There is NO disclosure of the risk or liability and damage imposed by teachers who are non-certified professional personnel implementing these psychological programs. The school that has trained the teachers in "fidelity", as "research" to implement these psychological programs EXACTLY as they have been developed, may also have liability issues concerning teachers acting as therapists. [See AIR Intensive Interventions]

A legal challenge must be brought forward against Goldman Sachs for receiving kickbacks for children not referred to Special Education when, in fact, Special Education funds have been used prior to those children being evaluated for the Pay For Success program. In effect, Goldman Sachs is paid TO BE SURE ALL KIDS meet Common Core psychological goals.

Ted and Heidi Cruz are certainly on that list of establishment insiders. It is blatantly clear that Ted Cruz's "performance" in suspending his campaign was a total lie after a total shut down in Indiana. Exactly what we would expect from an establishment insider.

Clean house? We must!

Mr. Trump, Save our Children!

© 2016 Anita Hoge – All Rights Reserved