

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 044 - FOLDER -006

[02/08/1999]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-1999 16:20:25.00

SUBJECT: revised talking points

TO: Maria Echaveste (CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Melissa G. Green (CN=Melissa G. Green/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Gene B. Sperling (CN=Gene B. Sperling/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Janet Murguia (CN=Janet Murguia/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jessica L. Gibson (CN=Jessica L. Gibson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Paul E. Begala (CN=Paul E. Begala/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ron Klain (CN=Ron Klain/O=OVP @ OVP [UNKNOWN])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Ann F. Lewis (CN=Ann F. Lewis/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jake Siewert (CN=Jake Siewert/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Bruce N. Reed (CN=Bruce N. Reed/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Minyon Moore (CN=Minyon Moore/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Charles M. Brain (CN=Charles M. Brain/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Lawrence J. Stein (CN=Lawrence J. Stein/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Steve Ricchetti (CN=Steve Ricchetti/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Draft 2/9/99 4:20pm

PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON
TALKING POINTS FOR HOUSE DEMOCRATIC RETREAT
GREENBRIAR, WEST VIRGINIA
February 9, 1999

Tribute to Rep. Gephardt. Let me begin by thanking, and honoring, one of the greatest leaders of our party and our nation □) Dick Gephardt. Dick□,s decision to stay in the Congress means we have an even better chance of retaking the House. It means that □) after decades in which Democrats by habit eagerly formed a circular firing squad □) we will go to the voters united and strong, a mature governing party. Most important of all, it will give him a free hand to fight for the ideals for which we stand. Thank you for the leadership you have shown □) waging what I believe was a very important fight for the Constitution. And it goes without saying that I am personally very grateful as well, to him and to all of you.

I want to talk to you briefly about the opportunity now before our nation and our party. On the edge of the 21st Century, we have put forward a new vision for this new era. Our opponents have offered only their old slogans -- old wine in old bottles. We now have a chance for a major debate on the future of our country. And we are right.

The Democratic Party has helped create a □+new dawn for America.□, In 1992, the world had changed, but our government had not -- and our people were falling behind. We put forward a new vision, based on our oldest values -- opportunity, responsibility, community -- to renew our economy and our nation. It wasn□,t easy. Thanks to the courage of this caucus, we put in place a new economic plan. And look at the results. If we had gone before the American people and said: vote for us, adopt our economic plan, and you will see: The longest peacetime recovery in history. P eacetime unemployment the lowest since 1957. Welfare rolls have cut nearly in half. And the budget deficit, \$290 billion in 1992? Now it□,s a surplus. People would have said we were crazy.

And we should be proud of how we did it. We balanced the budget -- but at the same time we nearly doubled investment in education and training. We raised the minimum wage and guaranteed family leave. And now, this expansion is at long last beginning to lift the hopes of those who have been left behind. Wages are rising at more than twice the rate of inflation. Black and Hispanic unemployment are at the lowest levels ever measured. Poverty is down. Because of what you have done, this rising tide is finally lifting all boats.

Our party should be proud of what we did to bring about these good times. But our party and our nation cannot be complacent. We cannot rest on old victories. We cannot go to the voters based on what we have done -- but on what we must do now and in the future. We have a duty to see to it that prosperity is widely shared, that our values continue to be supported in our schools and our communities; that our nation remains strong. If we are not willing to do it now, with our economy expanding, when will we do it?

The contrast between our two parties gave us an historic advance at the polls in 1998. We were the party of new ideas; they were the party of old slogans and tired notions that were shopworn in the 1920s. We were the party of progress; they were the party of partisanship. We were rewarded because we stood together. And I believe we are now seen as the party

that stands for the interest of ordinary people □) that stands for getting things done --that focuses not on the obsessions of Washington but the challenges facing families in their daily lives.

In 1999 and 2000, the best thing we can do is to continue to advance our new vision and fight for our values □) to be the party that unhesitatingly tries to make progress for the people. We have a lot to get done. And let me be clear: we will work with Republicans when and if they are ready to support these key priorities.

First and foremost, to prepare for the 21st Century we must prepare for the □&senior boom.□8 You all heard my proposal for what we should do with the surplus. We must save Social Security now. Now, I have put forward my plan, a plan that was written in close consultation with the leaders of this caucus. I am determined to continue to work together. The Republicans have said they agree to use 62% of the surplus to save Social Security. We should hold them to it.

Then we must focus on Medicare. I propose that we use 15% of the surplus to strengthen Medicare, and extend its life for another 10 years, while we work on longer term reforms that can improve quality and meet needs such as prescription drugs. As for the Republicans, if they agree to use 15% of the surplus for Medicare, then we will be happy to work with them to do so.

I have proposed that we use 12% of the surplus for tax relief through USA Accounts -- a universal savings plan in which the government will help the hardest pressed working people to save. That□,s the right kind of tax relief -- targeted and responsible, after we save Social Security and Medicare.

Make no mistake: By standing together last year, we set the terms of the budget. Now, with huge surpluses and a renewed Republican call for massive across the board tax cuts, if we stand together again for fiscal responsibility and the needs of our nation, we can set the agenda again.

Second, we should act boldly on education. Last year, by fighting to begin hiring 100,000 teachers, and refusing to agree to a budget until progress was made on education, we won a substantive and a political victory.

We should press forward. We should insist that this year□,s budget continue to hire teachers.

We should pass the school construction bill that will modernize or build 5000 schools [Rangel/Lowey]. Now, the Republicans have finally concluded that it□,s simply not wise to be seen as against school modernization, and for kids learning in trailers. So now they say they have a plan. Our plan will get the resources into the hands of the school districts that truly need it; theirs will funnel the money to districts that don□,t. Ours will make sure that the money is actually used for school construction; theirs doesn□,t. If the Republicans will work on a real school modernization bill -- not one that tries to slap a coat of pain on the problem -- we will work with them. And if not, we will fight for what we know our children need.

And we should lead the way to strengthen our public schools. This year, you will be called upon to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. The federal government already invests \$15 billion in K-12 education. I will send to you what we are calling the Education

Accountability Act that will seek to dramatically change the way that those funds are used. No child in America should be passed from grade to grade if they have not mastered the material, we must end social promotion -- and we must do it the right way, with after school and summer school to help all students achieve. I want to thank Reps. Clay, Lowey, Ford, Lynn Woolsey in expanding the 21st Century After School program. No child in America should be trapped in a failing school. School districts must turn their failing schools around, or shut them down () and we should provide the help so they can do that. No child should be taught by an unqualified teacher. Every parent should have access to information and choice. And schools must have and enforce discipline codes.

The Republicans have challenged this approach; they say that this amounts to an intrusive overreach from Washington. I am eager for a national debate on education. If the Republicans are willing to agree to end social promotion, expand afterschool, turn around failing schools, and all the other elements of our accountability agenda, we should work with them.

Third, we must pass a strong and enforceable Patients Bill of Rights. [Dingell, Stark, and Sherrod Brown] Last year the differences between our Bill of Rights and what I called their Bill of Goods were plain. Many of you saw the chart that I toted around the country -- and I'm ready to do it again. A real Patients Bill of Rights is enforceable, guarantees continuity of care, the right to see a specialist, emergency room treatment, and medical records privacy. And it covers many more people than the Republican alternative. I want to make bipartisan progress on this again. If Republicans want to work with us on a strong and enforceable Patients Bill of Rights () the real deal, not a hollow promise () we will work with them.

I believe there are other important steps to take in health care () including the proposal for a long term care tax credit.

There are other areas in which we have a chance to act and a duty to lead. We should raise the minimum wage. We should insist on what I have called the New Markets Initiative to bring private capital into the inner city, poor rural communities. [Rangel, LaFalce, Velasquez, Clyburn, Roybal-Allard, and Waters]. We should push for the livability agenda I outlined in the State of the Union () and we are working with the Livable Communities Task Force. We should press for a strong Crime Bill for the 21st Century. We should insist that the majority bring the bipartisan campaign finance reform bill to a vote.

Let me conclude with a word on what our vision must be. For all the vicissitudes of the moment, we are politically very well positioned for the elections in the Year 2000. I believe we can and will retake the House and hold the White House () and I will do everything I can to make that happen. But we should never lose sight of why we are in this position. It is because we have stood before the public as one Party, a united party that can govern, focused on the future. If we keep our eyes on the 21st Century, we will enter that century victorious.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Leanne A. Shimabukuro (CN=Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 7-FEB-1999 16:45:31.00

SUBJECT: Monday drug event -- update

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Jose Cerda III (CN=Jose Cerda III/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I tried paging you earlier -- I wanted to be sure that you knew that the President won't be attending the drug event on Monday. The VP will do the event in his place. We made a decision to go ahead and give the VP's office our draft press paper to work from since they're on such short notice.

Thanks,
Leanne

----- Forwarded by Leanne A. Shimabukuro/OPD/EOP on
02/07/99 04:39 PM -----

Leanne A. Shimabukuro
02/05/99 10:53:18 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP, Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
cc: Jose Cerda III/OPD/EOP
Subject: please review

One pager and Q&A attached for the drug event on Monday morning. McCaffrey will be briefing the press corps after the event. We are off the hook for the event brief - Cabinet Affairs/ONDCP are submitting it. Yipee.

Also, you should already have it, but the most recent version of the remarks are copied onto the bottom of this email.

Thanks,
Leanne

Revised Draft 2/5/99 9:00pm
Tamagni

PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON

REMARKS FOR ANTI-DRUG EVENT
THE OLD EXECUTIVE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC
February 8, 1999

Acknowledgments: VP Gore; AG Reno; Sec. Shalala; ONDCP Dir. Gen. McCaffrey ; Jessica Hulse [HULL-see]; Rhode Island AG Sheldon Whitehouse.

I want to start by thanking Jessica Hulse for sharing her story. Just finding the courage and strength to survive and even thrive in a home where drugs -- not parents -- are in control is remarkable. But your commitment to make sure that no other child has to live through the fear and uncertainty you endured is an inspiration for us all. You are a truly exceptional young woman, and I thank you for being here today.

I know from my own experience what it feels like to have a family member caught in the deadly grip of drugs. My own brother nearly died of a cocaine addiction -- and I have asked myself hundreds of times why I didn't see it -- and what I could have done to stop it if I had. I know that my experience is not unique -- that thousands of families suffer through that nightmare of powerlessness and frustration.

But one of the most important things that Jessica's story and the ads from our media campaign teach us is that we do have the power to fight drugs. If each of us takes action, at every level of government, in every community, in every house of faith, and in every home ... if we reach out to our young people -- as parents, mentors, and peers -- before drug dealers reach them ... if we join forces, united and relentless in our determination to win this war, we can make our nation stronger than ever in the 21st Century.

For years, it seemed that crime was an insurmountable and ever-increasing problem. But we put in place a tough, smart anti-crime plan, with police, tougher punishment, and better prevention. Six years later, we know that our strategy is working -- beyond our expectations. Around the country, in cities large and small, crime is down to its lowest rates in 25 years.

We are beginning to win the war against crime, and we can win the war against drugs -- by marshaling the forces and resources of our nation. Year after year, my administration has secured the largest anti-drug budgets in history, with more money for drug enforcement agents, for border and customs control, for education and outreach, for treatment and prevention. Under the leadership of General Barry McCaffrey at the Office of National Drug Control Policy, our efforts have begun to pay off. Overall drug use by adults has dropped to more than half of its highest levels in 1979. Even drug use by our young people -- which seemed to be getting worse every year -- has finally begun to decline.

But when drug dealers still roam our streets and rob our children of their dreams, when drug-related crime still ravages our neighborhoods, we know we must do more. With our economy the strongest in a generation and our confidence rising, we have a rare opportunity -- and an obligation -- to redouble our efforts in the war against drugs.

We must start by recognizing that our nation's drug problem was not born in isolation and does not exist in a vacuum. It is an interconnected problem -- so our solutions must also be interconnected.

To deal with the drug problem, we need to do more to expand opportunity and create jobs for young people, especially in communities that have too

often been passed by in good times. That means bringing the spark of enterprise to inner cities, with more tax incentives for businesses and investors, and expanded credit for low-income entrepreneurs. It means strengthening the summer jobs programs that help so many young people build a brighter future.

To deal with the drug problem, we need to do more to improve our schools and help all of our students to reach high standards. We need more afterschool and summer school programs to keep young people learning in the classroom in the hours between when school lets out and parents come home from work -- the hours when young people are more likely to fall prey to drugs.

And to deal with the drug problem, we need a comprehensive anti-drug effort that fights drugs on every front and uses every weapon we possess.

That is why I am so pleased to release our 1999 National Drug Control Strategy. This is not a short-term plan designed to produce short-lived results. It is a comprehensive, long-term strategy, with more money for drug testing and treatment ... better drug-law enforcement in our communities and better drug control on our borders ... and better anti-drug education for young people, including our media campaign.

And our plan is backed by the largest anti-drug budget ever presented to the Congress: My balanced budget for 2000 -- the first budget of the 21st Century -- includes nearly \$18 billion to keep drugs away from our borders, off of our streets, and out of our children's reach.

I want to say a special word about our National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign. We launched this campaign last year because we knew that when it comes to fighting drugs, attitudes drive actions. Young people who understand the damage drugs can do to their lives -- and the lives of the people they love -- are simply less likely to use them.

Since we kicked off the campaign in July, we have reached literally millions of young people with a powerful message: drugs are illegal, drugs are wrong, and drugs can kill you. Although it is too early to fully measure our success, we are seeing evidence that our anti-drug message is getting through. And with ads in 10 languages, we are reaching young people of every ethnicity and national origin.

One big reason for this success is the remarkable response of the private sector to my challenge to join our fight against drugs. In six months, our campaign has generated more than \$165 million in matching contributions for paid anti-drug ads. Virtually every major network has produced high profile anti-drug public service announcements with their best known celebrities -- you just saw a few of those -- and donated air time to scores of non-profit organizations for their own anti-drug PSAs.

I am very proud of everything we are doing -- especially at the ONDCP -- to fight drugs. But making our anti-drug strategy work is not a job for just one agency, but for every agency, 365 days of the year. That is why I have called on my Cabinet to redouble their efforts in our fight against drugs.

I have asked Education Secretary Riley to build on our efforts to keep our schools safe, by strengthening the Safe and Drug Free Schools initiative, and encouraging more school districts to start afterschool programs.

I have asked Health and Human Services Secretary Shalala to help our young people stay off of drugs by increasing our efforts to promote drug treatment and prevention programs around the country.

I have asked Attorney General Reno to push forward with more drug testing of prisoners and parolees, and more police on the streets of our communities, to break the deadly cycle between crime and drugs. I have also asked her to redouble our efforts against drug trafficking by organized crime groups.

I have asked Transportation Secretary Slater to maintain the vigorous maritime interdiction operations against drug traffickers that are such an important part of our supply-side anti-drug strategy.

I have asked Treasury Secretary Rubin to step up anti-money laundering efforts and work harder than ever, along with the Justice Department, to keep drugs from crossing our borders.

I have asked Defense Secretary Cohen to intensify his on-going efforts to use the unique capabilities of our military to support our drug law enforcement efforts, especially along our Southwest border.

And I have asked Secretary of State Albright to continue our partnership with other nations -- particularly in the Western Hemisphere Drug Alliance -- to fight the global drug problem.

Next week, I will travel to Mexico, one of our strongest and most important partners in the fight against drugs. A major portion of the drugs that come into our country come through Mexico, across the 2,000 mile border we share. This illegal drug trade endangers Mexicans and Americans -- and it is in our nations' mutual interest to work together to shut it down.

The Alliance Against Drugs that President Zedillo and I adopted together in 1997 is beginning to make progress -- and I am committed to building on that progress, sharing resources, information, and experience. I am very pleased that last Thursday, the Mexican government announced it will be spending \$400 to \$500 million over three years to buy new planes, ships, radar and law enforcement equipment. I look forward to discussing ways we can extend our cooperation when I meet with President Zedillo.

Our battle against drugs is a fight to the finish -- and it is not a job for government alone. It will take all of our efforts and energy, all of our courage and compassion. It will take every one of us, looking ahead to a day when the scourge of drugs no longer threaten our children, our communities, or our collective future. I believe that we will reach that day, working together, and I look forward to working with all of you to build a stronger nation for the 21st Century.

Thank you.

###

The 1999 National Drug Control Strategy **February 8, 1999**

Today at Presidential Hall, President Clinton will release the *1999 National Drug Control Strategy*, a comprehensive long-term plan to reduce drug use and availability to historic new lows. The *Strategy* is backed by a \$17.8 billion counter-drug budget -- the largest ever presented to Congress. The President will also highlight the extraordinary efforts of the private sector to join forces with the successful Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign to get the right message to kids, parents, and teachers on drugs.

A long term commitment to fight drugs. Year in and year out, the Clinton Administration has proposed the largest anti-drug budgets ever, helping to increase federal counter-drug spending by nearly 40% between FY 93 and FY 99. Our sustained effort is having an impact: overall drug use is half the level it was at its peak in the 1970's; drug-related murders are down by 40 percent since 1992; the first-ever paid anti-drug media campaign has been launched nationwide; and youth drug use is on the decline for the second year in a row. The *1999 National Drug Control Strategy* builds on this progress and takes the next steps to reduce drug use and availability across the board.

Keeping kids the number one priority. If our children can make it to adulthood free of substance abuse, the vast majority will avoid addiction for the rest of their lives. That is why the first goal of the *Strategy* is to educate and enable kids to reject drugs. And while recent studies show declining youth drug use in 1997 and 1998, we have more work to do. The President's *Strategy* and FY 2000 budget reflect a strong commitment to meeting this challenge:

- **\$195 Million for National Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign.** The President's budget continues this unprecedented, 5-year campaign to use the full power of the mass media to educate millions of young people, parents, teachers and mentors about the dangers of drugs. In just six months, the private sector has joined our national effort and made over \$165 million in matching contributions -- helping us to reach even more people by creating their own anti-drug ads, producing shows about drug prevention, and giving scores of non-profit organizations free air time to run their drug-related messages.
- **\$590 Million for Safe and Drug-Free Schools.** In addition to calling for increased funds, the President is committed to reforming the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Program to make it even more effective. The President's proposal will require schools to adopt rigorous, comprehensive school safety plans that include tough, but fair discipline policies; safe passage to and from schools; effective drug and violence policies and programs; annual school safety and drug use report cards; and links to after school programs.

Breaking the iron link between drugs and crime. A third of state prisoners and one in five federal prisoners commit their crimes under the influence of drugs. Nearly 20 percent of state prisoners and 15 percent of federal inmates commit their crimes to buy drugs. The President's budget provides new resources for states and localities to break crime-committing addicts of their

addictions and reduce recidivism:

- \$215 Million for Zero Tolerance Drug Supervision. The President proposes the most comprehensive drug supervision ever to help keep offenders drug- and crime-free: \$100 million in new funds to help states and localities to drug test, treat, and sanction prisoners, parolees and probationers; \$50 million to expand innovative drug courts; and \$65 million for residential drug treatment for prisoners with the most serious drug problems.

Strengthening law enforcement. One of the *Strategy's* goals is to increase the safety of America's citizens by substantially reducing drug-related crime and violence. To help keep crime coming down to record low levels, the President's budget includes:

- \$1.275 Billion for a 21st Century Policing Initiative, to help communities hire, redeploy and retain up to 50,000 law enforcement officers with an effort to target crime and drug "hot spots"; to equip officers with the latest crime-fighting technologies; and to engage entire communities to work together to prevent and fight crime.
- \$22 Million Increase for DEA Drug Intelligence, including \$13 million to assist the Drug Enforcement Agency (DEA) with its efforts to automate and improve access to critical law enforcement and intelligence information, and \$9 million to support investigations to dismantle drug trafficking organizations.

Closing the treatment gap. Dependence on drugs exacts an enormous toll in individuals, their families, businesses, communities, and the nation. Treatment can help end dependence on addictive drugs -- and its destructive consequences. To help make treatment available to more Americans in need, the President's budget provides:

- \$85 Million to Increase Drug Treatment. The President's budget provides an additional \$55 million in Targeted Capacity Grants to expand the availability of drug treatment to meet existing or emerging needs, and \$30 million more for the Substance Abuse Block Grant -- the backbone of federal efforts to help states and localities reduce the gap between those seeking treatment and the capacity of the public treatment system.

Stopping drugs at the border and breaking foreign sources of supply. The *Strategy* will help shield our borders and strengthen multinational cooperation on drugs by including:

- \$50 Million Increase for the Southwest Border. The President's budget includes additional funds for INS to deploy "force multiplying" technology, such as infrared and color cameras and ground sensors to aid Border Patrol enforcement and drug interdiction efforts.
- \$29 Million More for International Programs, to fund the State Department's International Narcotics Law Enforcement Affairs' efforts in the Andean countries, and Mexico, and to provide assistance to enhance multinational cooperation in our anti-drug efforts.

1999 National Drug Control Strategy
Questions and Answers
February 8, 19998

Q. What is the President announcing today?

- A. President Clinton will release the *1999 National Drug Control Strategy*. The ONDCP Reauthorization Act of 1998 requires the President to submit a long-term plan to reduce illegal drug use and availability and its consequences. Within the *Strategy* is a detailed report on the nation's drug abuse profile and a comprehensive plan to cut drug use by 50% by 2007.

The President will also highlight the extraordinary efforts of the private sector to join forces with the successful Youth Anti-Drug Media Campaign to get the right message to kids, parents, and teachers on drugs. In just six months, the private sector has committed \$165 million in matching contributions to our media campaign.

Q. What are the highlights of the new *Strategy*?

- A. The *1999 Strategy* builds on the President's previous national strategies. It refines the mid- and long-term targets presented last year for reducing drug use and availability by 50 percent by the year 2007. It also sets the target of reducing the criminal consequences of drug abuse by 30 percent and the health and social consequences by 25 percent by 2007. The *1999 Strategy* will serve as a strong guide in our national drug control efforts for the next five years.

Q. Why isn't the *Strategy* more ambitious? Can't we do better than cut drug abuse by 50 percent by 2007?

- A. Reducing and stopping drug use requires fundamental changes in the attitudes of millions of Americans, and that shift in attitude is more gradual than we would wish. The *Strategy* promotes a steady pressure against drug use and underscores why drug control must be lifted out of partisan conflict. The Administration's long-term plan to reduce drug use by 50 percent to the lowest levels ever in our national experience is based on an historical perspective that is essential in the campaign against drug abuse -- not on simplistic solutions and sound bites that won't impact this difficult problem.

Q. Doesn't your budget fall short of what is needed to implement your strategy and the corresponding performance measures?

A. No. The President's FY 2000 budget supports the goals and objectives of the National Drug Control Strategy through increases in areas identified as funding priorities. The proposed FY2000 anti-drug budget is \$17.8 billion-- \$735 million (+4.3) over FY 1999 regular, non-emergency appropriations. Our budget provides increases of \$210 million (+3.6 in FY 2000 over FY 1999 regular appropriations) to support drug education, prevention and treatment, and increases supply reduction programs by \$524.8 million (+4.7 in FY 2000 over FY 1999 regular appropriations). Interdiction resources, mostly for one-time capital acquisitions, will increase significantly in 1999 as the result of a Congressional appropriation of \$870 million for international drug-control and interdiction spending.

Q. Isn't this *Strategy* deferring accountability to future years? Why not issue an annual report card?

A. The *1999 Strategy* provides a detailed annual update on progress in reducing drug abuse and its consequences. Among the 1999 report's principal conclusions are that drug use among the general population remained statistically unchanged between 1996 and 1997. Drug use among 12-17 year olds declined slightly in 1997 and 1998. In 1996, drug-related deaths leveled off at about 9,300 after climbing throughout the 1990s. Drug-related medical emergencies remained near historic highs but were statistically constant in 1997. The costs of illegal drug abuse were estimated \$110 billion in 1995, 64 percent higher than in 1990. And consumer spending on drugs declined by 37.3 percent from \$91.4 billion in 1988 to \$57.3 billion in 1995.

Q. Can the federal government really accomplish these long-term targets established by this *Strategy*?

A. We can, but to do so, we will need the support of the fifty states and four U.S. territories as well as the thousands of city, county, and local governments threatened by illegal drugs. State governments, for example, have enormous potential for addressing the drug problem. They administer the school systems, exercise far-reaching jurisdictional power, channel money and resources to specific needs, and educate citizens about the dangers of illegal drugs. States' funds account for much of the spending on drug prevention and treatment, providing funds to thousands of community-based treatment programs and prevention providers. Counties and cities play an equally important role, providing essential services such as emergency medical care, education, and law enforcement. All levels of government must become partners with the federal government in countering illegal drugs.

Q. What makes you think you can cut drug use in half by 2007? Did you pick a ten year marker since President Clinton will no longer be in office by that time?

A. After much research and consultation, General McCaffrey recommended the goal of cutting drug use in half over ten years as a tough, but attainable goal. From 1979 to 1996, the number of people using drugs dropped by 49 percent, and the number using cocaine dropped by 70 percent. The critical part of meeting this goal is preventing the next generation of young people from ever starting to use drugs. If we can do this, we will achieve the goal. That is why the *Strategy* reflects the need for an enduring commitment. The long-term marker reflects the fact that there is no quick fix to America's drug problem. Studies show that drug use patterns occur within generational cycles -- drug use falls off, and unless there is ongoing education, young people forget the dangers of drugs. To help us chart these drug use patterns this *Strategy* includes -- as did the 1998 Strategy -- a report on the nation's drug abuse profile.

Q. Why doesn't the spending match the rhetoric? The *Strategy* identifies demand reduction as the priority, yet doesn't it invest more in supply reduction?

A. No. We hope that Congress will support this record drug-control budget. If enacted, spending on prevention will have increased by 53 percent since FY1996 while spending on treatment will have increased by 26 percent. Overall, spending on demand reduction will have increased by 36 percent and outpaced the growth of spending on supply reduction, which will have increased by 30 percent.

Q. Why are congressional critics saying that your drug-control budget doesn't invest sufficiently in supply reduction? And what about the charges that this failure is the reason why youth drug use increased during the 1990's?

A. We are continuing to seek increased funding to reduce the supply of drugs -- our FY 2000 request for supply reduction is over 30% more than in FY 1996. And though we have sought even greater increases during that same period for prevention -- our Strategy's top priority -- we believe that our proposal for supply reduction is more than sufficient. For instance, our Western Hemisphere cocaine control efforts have been extremely successful. Cocaine production in South America has plummeted by 280 metric tons (MTs) since 1995. Coca cultivation has declined by 56 percent in Peru. Expanded Colombian cultivation slightly offset significant reductions in Bolivia and Peru. In 1997, an estimated 289 MTs of cocaine were available in the U.S., the lowest amount since the 1980s and far below the peak of 529 MTs in 1992. And in 1998, 145 MTs of cocaine were seized en route to the U.S.

However, if you really believe that the ready availability of drugs fueled the 1992-1996

increase of drug use rates among 12-17 year-olds, you would target domestically grown marijuana, not South American cocaine. Just 0.6 percent of seventeen-year-olds were using cocaine in 1997, whereas marijuana usage accounts for about 90 percent of illegal drug use among juveniles.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Constance J. Bowers (CN=Constance J. Bowers/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-1999 18:05:12.00

SUBJECT: EOP Comments on ED's Testimony on ESEA

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

To follow are comments on ED's testimony that were provided to me. In addition, there were some additions on school construction that we faxed over to ED directly.

----- Forwarded by Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP on
02/08/99 06:03 PM -----

Daniel I. Werfel
02/08/99 12:43:56 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP@EOP
cc: Daniel J. Chenok/OMB/EOP@EOP
Subject: ED's Testimony on ESEA

OIRA comments follow:

Comment 1: Suggest editing below para

New Flexibility at the Federal Level

The 1994 reauthorization also brought real change to the way we do business at the Department of Education. We made a very determined effort to give States and school districts greater flexibility to make innovations that help all students reach high standards. Our regulatory reform effort, for example, systematically examined every Department regulation and set very specific criteria for regulating only when absolutely necessary. The Office of Management and Budget has supported this approach, and other Federal agencies have since adopted this approach as a model. Under our new regulatory guidelines, only five of the programs included in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization truly required regulations; thus we eliminated a full two-thirds of regulations previously covering elementary and secondary education.

Comment 2: In terms of the language below on ED-FLEX, wasn't there a recent Senate vote which expanded ED-Flex to 50 states. (I may be wrong about this, but please ask ED to verify.) If so, shouldn't that be referenced in the language?

Language in question is - - " We are proposing to expand ED-FLEX to allow all eligible States to participate. I believe such an expansion should be considered in the context of reauthorization, our emphasis on accountability for results, and other programmatic issues. ED-FLEX can be an important tool for accelerating the pace of real reform in our schools, but it must be done thoughtfully. In particular, we must be sensitive to civil rights concerns and be absolutely sure that all protections currently in law are maintained."

Comment 3: Typo on page 17. Sentence should read: "With regard to targeting, the GAO recently reported that Federal programs are much more targeted than State programs."

Comment 4: Editorial suggestion for page 19. Sentence should read: "This is why the President is so strong for dedicated to improved teacher quality and increased accountability."

----- Forwarded by Daniel I. Werfel/OMB/EOP on 02/08/99
11:14 AM -----

Constance J. Bowers

02/08/99 09:27:03 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Janet R. Forsgren/OMB/EOP@EOP, Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP@EOP, Jonathan H. Schnur/OPD/EOP@EOP
Subject: Reminder: ED's Testimony on ESEA

Below is a file containing the text of Sec. Riley's testimony on ESEA for tomorrow.
(A paper copy was provided to you Friday.) Please give me any comments by 1:00 p.m., today. Thanks.

- eseats-1.doc

Message Sent

To: _____
Barbara Chow/OMB/EOP@EOP
Sandra Yamin/OMB/EOP@EOP
Barry White/OMB/EOP@EOP
Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP
Leslie S. Mustain/OMB/EOP@EOP
Wei-Min C. Wang/OMB/EOP@EOP
Daniel J. Chenok/OMB/EOP@EOP
Daniel I. Werfel/OMB/EOP@EOP
Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP@EOP
William H. White Jr./WHO/EOP@EOP
Broderick Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Edward M. Rea/OMB/EOP@EOP
Pamula L. Simms/OMB/EOP@EOP
Shelly A. McAllister/OMB/EOP@EOP
Peter Rundlet/WHO/EOP@EOP
Robert G. Damus/OMB/EOP@EOP

----- Forwarded by Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP on
02/08/99 06:04 PM -----

Tanya E. Martin
02/08/99 01:05:34 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP@EOP
CC:
Subject: Re: Reminder: ED's Testimony on ESEA

Comments in bold:

SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

The Administration's plans for reauthorizing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act have actually taken shape over the past few years in our annual budget requests. These proposals have been designed to strengthen the program by improving accountability and by targeting funds to local educational agencies with significant drug and violence prevention problems and high-quality, research-based programs to address those problems.

Our reauthorization proposal would build on these earlier efforts by emphasizing a schoolwide approach to drug and violence prevention. All school districts receiving funds would be required to develop a comprehensive Safe and Drug-Free Schools plan to ensure that they have a drug-free, safe, and disciplined learning environment. These plans would include for fair and effective discipline policies, safe passage to and from schools, effective research-based drug and violence policies and programs, annual school safety and drug use information for school report cards, and links to after-school programs. These plans would also have to reflect the recently established principles of effectiveness, including the adoption of research-based strategies and setting measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention.

Program funds would be distributed in larger, more effective grants by requiring States to award competitive grants to a limited number of high-need districts. Program evaluations have consistently found that the current practice of allocating funds by formula to all districts spreads funds too thinly to have a significant impact in most districts.

Finally, we will propose a new provision authorizing the Department to provide emergency services—especially mental health and counseling services—to schools affected by the kind of violence or severe trauma we saw last year in Arkansas, Kentucky, and Oregon. This is the \$12 million Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) initiative included in the President's 2000 budget request. Our reauthorization plan also

would set aside a small amount of funding at the State level to support similar emergency response activities.

----- Forwarded by Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP on 02/08/99 06:04 PM -----

Leslie S. Mustain
02/08/99 02:00:30 PM
Record Type: Record

To: Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP@EOP
cc: Barry White/OMB/EOP@EOP, Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP, Wei-Min C. Wang/OMB/EOP@EOP
Subject: Comments on ESEA Testimony

The following are the ED Branch comments on the ESEA testimony:

1. Page 3, last paragraph under ED-FLEX. If ED is trying to say that they want to expand Ed-Flex as part of the ESEA reauthorization and not as a free-standing bill, they should be more explicit. For example, the testimony could read, "We are proposing to expand ED-FLEX to allow eligible States to participate. I believe such an expansion should be considered, not as a free-standing bill, but in the context of reauthorization,"
2. Page 4, first paragraph. Civil right should be civil rights.
3. Page 6, third full paragraph. The word "proscriptive" should be changed to "prescriptive."
4. Page 11, second paragraph under "Proposed Changes to Title I." This is the first we've heard of a proposed set-aside for professional development in Title I. How does this relate to the increases envisioned for professional development in "Quality Teachers and High Standards in Every Classroom?"
5. Page 12, Quality Teachers and High Standards in Every Classroom program (the so-called "Responsible Block Grant") is not as flexible in this description as it was in previous descriptions. Specifically, the original proposal contained a 20 percent set-aside for competitive grants to LEAs for local systemic improvement, in the tradition of Goals 2000. This is not mentioned in the testimony.
6. Page 14. The Safe, Disciplined, and Drug-Free Schools should make some mention of the Drug Coordinators initiative.

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====
ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

WPCL

2BQJZi|xTimes New Roman (TT)Arial (TT)Courier New (TT)Symbol (TT)Wingdings
(TT)C\ P6QPJ2PQP"d6X@DQ@4a\ P[APAr
P?pQP2?phoenix#C\ P6QP#
The 1999 Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

WPCL

2BQJQZI|xTimes New Roman (TT)Arial (TT)Courier New (TT)Symbol (TT)Wingdings

(TT)C\ P6QPJ2PQP"d6X@DQ@4a\ P[APAr

P?pQP2?phoenix#C\ P6QP#

The 1999 Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education

Ann Olearyegjkristy82Bnheading 1heading 1F<#&J\ P6Q&P#C\

P6QP#heading 2heading 2F<#&J\ P6Q&P#C\ P6QP#heading 3heading 3C9#&J\ P6Q

&P#C\ P6QP#heading 4heading 4C9#&J\ P6Q&P#C\ P6QP#2

tN(

heading 5heading 5F<#&J\ P6Q&P#C\ P6QP#heading 6heading 6F<#&J\ P6Q

C\ P6QP#heading 7heading 7F<#

F\ P6Q

P#C\ P6QP#heading 8heading 8I?#&J\

P6Q&P#C\ P6QP#2*

f

heading 9heading 9 C9#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#Default Paragraph FoDefault Pa

graph Font

11#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#Body TextBody Text;1#&J\ P6Q&P##C\ P6QP#Body T

dy Text 2;1#&J\ P6Q&P##C\ P6QP#2&

\&Body Text 3Body Text 3

>4#&J\ P6Q&P#C\

C\ P6QP#Style0Style0;1#XX2PQXP##C\ P6QP#headerheaderX` hp x (! ! X

ooterfooterX` hp x (! ! X` hp x (#2ZXpage numberpage number11#XP\ P6QXP##C\

P6QP#footnote referencefootnote reference11#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#TitleTitle>4#

k\ P6Q P#C\ P6QP#;1#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#2PPlain TextPlain Text

@##C\ P6QP#Body Text 2Body Text 2;1#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#Body Text Inde

y Text Indent 2;1#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#Body Text Indent 3Body Text Indent 3;1

P\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#2endnote textendnote text;1#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6Q

effootnote ref11#XP\ P6QXP##C\ P6QP#XheaderX` hp x (! #XP\ P6Q

umber#XP\ P6QXP#

"page number"

header! 7

?GO!#C\ P6QP#footerX` hp x (! #^ \ P6QP#2/5/99 DRAFT

footer! 7

?GO!#C\ P6QP#footerX` hp x (! #^ \ P6QP#2/5/99 DRAFT

footer! 7

?GO!#C\ P6QP#heading 2#&J\ P6Q&P#^ \ P6QP#DRAFT TESTIMONY ON ESE

RIZATION

heading 2 XXXX#XP\ P6QXP#

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to present the Administrations views on the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The Administration is working on a detailed reauthorization proposal that we plan to submit for your consideration next month. The Department will also soon submit to Congress several reports evaluating the implementation and impact of Title I, other ESEA programs, and Goals 2000. Today I will provide an overview of our reauthorization efforts, as well as some of our specific recommendations. If there is one overriding principle that defines what we hope to accomplish, it is to end the tyranny of low expectations.

Style0#XX2PQXP##XP\ P6QXP#Let me begin by urging the Committee to develop a single, comprehensive bill reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some have suggested a titlebytitle approach that could lead to a dozen or so separate bills. This concerns me, because we have worked very hard with the Congress in recent years to develop a comprehensive approach to Federal support for education reform. If our efforts are to be successful, it is very import

ant for all the pieces to fit together, complementing and reinforcing each other, and working together to help States, school districts, and schools to make the changes needed to raise achievement for all students. This is why the Administration is developing a single, integrated reauthorization proposal, and I hope you will do the same.

Style0

Style0#XX2PQXP##XP\ P6QXP#I also want to point out that with the nearly simultaneous reauthorization of the Departments Office of Educational Research and Improvement, we have a unique opportunity to align our research agenda with the practices and priorities in elementary and secondary education. We should make every effort to develop researchbased solutions to the many challenges we face in elementary and secondary education, and to get the best information on what works into the hands of parents, teachers, principals, and superintendents across the Nation.

Style0

heading 9#XP\ P6QXP##^\
 heading 9 #XP\ P6QXP# P6QP#BACKGROUND AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This is, of course, this Administrations second opportunity to work with Congress on improving the ESEA. The 1994 reauthorization"the Improving Americas Schools Act"took direct aim at transforming a Federal role that for too long had condoned low expectations and low standards for poor children. Along with the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the 1994 reauthorization reflected a bipartisan effort to raise expectations for all children by helping States and school districts to set high standards and establish goals for improving student achievement. The 1994 Act included provisions to improve teaching and learning, increase flexibility and accountability for States and local school districts, strengthen parent and community involvement, and target resources to the highest poverty schools and communities.

There is strong evidence that these changes, particularly the emphasis on high standards, have helped States and school districts carry out the hard work of real education reform. States that led the way in adopting standardsbased reforms"like Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas"found new support from Federal programs that helped them to raise reading and math achievement.

In other States, the new ESEA and Goals 2000 encouraged and supported improvements in teaching and learning tied to high standards. For example, in a very positive report on Goals 2000 by the General Accounting Office (GAO), we were most pleased that State officials described Goals 2000 as a significant factor in promoting their education reform efforts and a catalyst for change.

Title# k\ P6Q P#^\
 #XP\ P6QXP# P6QP#Signs of Progress

Partly as a result of changes at the Federal level and our new partnerships with the States, 48 States have developed statelevel standards and two States have pushed for standards at the local level. More importantly, there are promising signs of real progress toward meeting these higher standards. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), for example, has shown significant increases in the percentages of 4th grade students scoring at both the basic and proficient achievement levels in mathematics, particularly among students in highpoverty schools. The National Education Goals Panel reported that between 1990 and 1996, 27 States significantly increased the percentage of 8th graders scoring at either the proficient or the advanced level on the NAEP math test.

Tomorrow the National Center for Education Statistics will release its national report card on reading, and I understand we will see some improvement. Over the past few years a strong, bipartisan consensus has emerged on the importance of helping all children to master reading as the key prerequisite for all further learning. Title I provides substantial resources to help States and school districts improve reading instruction, and last year, Congress on a bipartisan basis passed the Reading Excellence Act to strengthen State and local efforts

rts to improve reading in the early grades. We also now have some 20,000 College WorkStudy students serving as reading tutors.

#^ \ P6QP# □ Leading Edge States □
#XP \ P6QXP#

Turning from the national to the State level, individual States have made notable progress in a very short period of time. Texas, for example, increased the percentage of its 4th grade students scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on the NAEP math test from 15 percent in 1992 to 25 percent in 1996. North Carolina more than doubled the percentage of its 8th graders reaching the same standard in mathematics achievement, from 9 percent in 1990 to 20 percent in 1996.

The National Education Goals Panel issued a report authored by the Rand Corporation that examined the North Carolina and Texas experience. The report found that the most plausible explanation for the test score gains was an organizational environment and incentive structure based on an aligned system of standards, curriculum, and assessments; holding schools accountable for improvement by all students; and critical support from business. As I will explain shortly, we will be trying in this reauthorization to speed up reform by encouraging other States to follow the example of North Carolina and Texas.

#^ \ P6QP# □ New Flexibility at the Federal Level □
#XP \ P6QXP#

The 1994 reauthorization also brought real change to the way we do business at the Department of Education. We made a very determined effort to give States and school districts greater flexibility to make innovations that help all students reach high standards. Our regulatory reform effort, for example, systematically examined every Department regulation and set very specific criteria for regulating only when absolutely necessary. The Office of Management and Budget and other Federal agencies have since adopted this approach as a model. Under our new regulatory guidelines, only five of the programs included in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization truly required regulations; thus we eliminated a full two-thirds of regulations previously covering elementary and secondary education.

Another major improvement was the adoption of a single, consolidated State application for the majority of ESEA programs. Moreover, States submit their single plan just once during the life of the authorization cycle, with brief yearly updates to ensure accountability. Not surprisingly, States reported in fiscal year 1996 that the consolidated application slashed paperwork requirements by 85 percent. I should add that the consolidated applications also encourage a comprehensive approach to planning for the use of Federal funds.

The Department also has vigorously implemented waiver provisions that were included in the 1994 reauthorization, which permit States, school districts, and schools to request waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements that present an obstacle to innovative reform efforts. We set up a Waiver Hot Line and provided comprehensive waiver guidance at our site on the World Wide Web.

Since the reauthorization of ESEA in 1994, the Department has received 648 requests for waivers from States and local districts and granted a total of 357 waivers. Overall, the Department has approved 55 percent and disapproved 8 percent of all waivers requested. The waiver authority has also demonstrated that ESEA is very flexible even without the authority. In fact, 28 percent of waiver applications were withdrawn largely because districts learned that they had sufficient latitude or flexibility under existing law to proceed without a waiver.

#^ \ P6QP# □ EDFLEX □
#XP \ P6QXP#

Another approach to flexibility is the EDFLEX demonstration, which allows the Department to give Statelevel officials authority to approve waivers of certain Federal statutory and regulatory requirements that stand in the way of effective reform at the local level. Under this pilot project, 12 States have been authorized to participate.

We are proposing to expand EDFLEX to allow all eligible States to participate.

I believe such an expansion should be considered in the context of reauthorization, our emphasis on accountability for results, and other programmatic issues. EDFLEX can be an important tool for accelerating the pace of real reform in our schools, but it must be done thoughtfully. In particular, we must be sensitive to civil rights concerns and be absolutely sure that all protections currently in law are maintained.

Body Text#&J\ P6Q&P##XP\ P6QXP#One final issue I want to touch on is the Department's performance in getting Federal education dollars to the local level where they can do the most good. There have been a number of dollars to the classroom proposals over the past two years based on the assumption that the Department of Education retains a significant portion of Federal elementary and secondary appropriations to pay for administrative costs.

The truth is that over 95percent of all the dollars appropriated by Congress for Federal elementary and secondary programs already goes to local school districts. If that number sounds familiar, it is because some of those proposals I mentioned promise to send 95 percent of Federal dollars to the classroom.

I recognize that some may argue about whether the local level is the same as the classroom. My view is that once the funds reach the local level, it is up to local elected school boards to decide how best to spend them to achieve the purposes of the programs enacted by the Congress. We in Washington should not attempt to bypass local school boards and deny them their lawful responsibility to determine how to meet the educational needs of their students.

I believe that these accomplishments" widespread adoption of standards, promising achievement gains nationally and even more improvement in leading edge States, along with new flexibility for States and school districts" show that we were on the right track in 1994. The evidence demonstrates a clear connection between raising standards and raising student achievement. The record also shows, however, that many States and districts are still phasing in the 1994 reforms.

Taken as a whole, this experience provides a compelling argument for the Administration and Congress to keep working together to help States and school districts get high standards into the classroom, and to push for improved incentives and strengthened accountability mechanisms to ensure that these reforms take hold.

#^\ P6QP#[]THE NEXT STEP: TEACHER QUALITY AND
HIGH STANDARDS IN THE CLASSROOM[]XP\ P6QXP#

I want to begin by laying out a broader context for our ESEA reauthorization proposals. In 1994, we broke sharply with the past and made a significant policy shift in putting an end to the practice of giving students a watered down curriculum. I strongly believe that the tyranny of low expectations" and it is tyranny" has been one of the great flaws of American education. We vigorously oppose the idea of dumbing down American education. Instead of dumbing down, we want to achieve up.

To support this effort we have developed a comprehensive threepart strategy of (1)targeting investments to disadvantaged children, with particular attention to the early years of schooling; (2)improving teacher quality, and (3) real accountability. All these pieces need to fit together if we want to raise achiev

ement levels.

First, our investments in the Reading Excellence Act, ClassSize Reduction, education technology, and afterschool programs"to name just a few"are all part of our effort to get teachers and principals the resources they need to raise achievement. We have put a real emphasis on the early years of schooling because research and common sense tells you that if a young person can master the basics early on they get off to a much better start in their education. We want to improve academic achievement for all students, with a special emphasis on closing the gap upward between poor and minority students and other students. This is why, for example, we are such strong supporters of reducing class size in the early grades. Research from the Tennessee STAR study demonstrated that reducing class sizes in the early grades led to higher achievement for all students, with poor and minority students showing the greatest gains.

Second, we think it is absolutely essential to put a highly qualified, dedicated teacher in every classroom in America. John Stanford, the inspiring former superintendent from Seattle who recently passed away, had this marvelous slogan that summed up his philosophy: the victory is in the classroom. If we are going to achieve many more victories in the classroom we simply have to raise teacher quality and get many more certified teachers into our TitleI schools. This is why we asked the Congress to fund a strong teacher quality initiative in reauthorizing the Higher Education Act last year. Our intent here is to make high standards part of every teachers daily lesson plans. I will discuss this part of our proposal in greater detail later on in my testimony.

□

#^ P6QP#Accountability

#XP P6QXP#□

Improved accountability is the third part of our broad strategy of improvement.

We believe that effective accountability measures"what business leaders call quality control measures"can make sure that our new investments are used wisely and actually produce the desired results. It seems to me that if a school district using Federal dollars doesnt act to raise achievement levels and squanders taxpayers dollars the only responsible thing to do is to begin withholding the money. Here it is important to recognize that we are not talking about more regulations. We want better results. There is both a moral and a fiscal dimension to being more accountable. We cannot afford to lose the talents of one child, and we cannot waste the substantial resources entrusted to us by American taxpayers.

Body Text Style0#XX2PQXP##XP P6QXP#

Style0We recognize that a complete accountability system should be multidimensional and include high expectations and accountability for everyone in the system. All of us are responsible for ensuring that all students reach high standards. The accountability measures in our reauthorization proposal are designed to (1)help school districts and states provide students with a high quality education, (2)focus on continuous improvement; and (3)hold students, teachers, principals, schools, and districts to high standards.

It is important to note that our proposed accountability measures reinforce and build on similar provisions approved in 1994, and on what many States are already doing. For example, the underlying structure of the Title I accountability provisions is sound, and States like North Carolina and Texas are emphasizing continuous improvement and holding schools and principals accountable for results. Many States, however, have not fully implemented the TitleI provisions and have moved only tentatively to make other changes based on high standards and accountability. We are proposing several measures to speed up the process.

#^ P6QP#□Meeting State Standards□

#XP P6QXP#

First, we would retain the current law requirement that States establish conten

t and performance standards and assessments aligned to the standards by the 2002 school year. States must also define adequate yearly progress for Title I schools and local school districts in a manner that would result in continuous and substantial progress toward meeting State standards within a reasonable time frame.

□
 #^ \ P6QP#Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools□
 #XP \ P6QXP#

Second, States would be encouraged to take immediate corrective action to turn around the lowest performing schools. Currently, there are over 6,500 schools and 1,300 school districts designated under Title I as in need of improvement.

These schools and districts were placed in school improvement status after making little or no improvement over a period of three years. Many of these schools are still showing no improvement despite receiving additional support. We are saying that enough time has passed with our children in lowperforming schools "it is time to take action now.

States should quickly identify the lowest performing schools and provide additional support and assistance. If any school continues to show no improvement, States should take bold action such as reconstituting the school or closing the school down entirely and reopening it as a fresh new school. The Department's 2000 budget request includes a \$200million setaside to help jumpstart this process of State and district intervention in the lowest performing schools.

#^ \ P6QP#□Annual Report Cards□
 #XP \ P6QXP#

Third, we would require annual report cards at the State, district, and school levels as a condition of receiving ESEA funds. The report cards should provide information on improvement over time or the lack thereof. They should include information on student achievement and other indicators, such as teacher quality, class size, school safety, attendance, and graduation requirements. The report cards should be easily understood by and widely distributed to parents and the public. While 36 States already require report cards, most parents and the majority of teachers say that they have never seen the report cards. Our proposal is intended to give parents a tool they can use to join the debate over bringing high standards into the classroom, to advocate on behalf of their children and their childrens schools, and to work with teachers and principals to make improvements.

Style0#XX2PQXP##XP \ P6QXP#
 Style0I assure you, if parents find out that their children are going to an unruly or unsafe school there will be standingroom only at the next school board meeting and that is a very good thing. If parents discover that test scores are down at their school but up at a nearby school they will start asking questions and spark reform. In short, a good, honest report card gives parents a real accountability tool that allows them to make a difference in the education of their children.

#^ \ P6QP#□Ending Social Promotion□
 #XP \ P6QXP#

Fourth, all States receiving ESEA funds should end the practice of social promotion. I want to be clear that we are against both a policy of social promotion and a policy of retaining students in grade. We are for a policy of preparing children to achieve to high standards. That is why we have pushed so hard for programs like Class Size Reduction, the Reading Excellence Act, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers afterschool initiative, which invest in the early years and help to minimize the number of children at risk of retention in grade.

The Presidents call for an end to social promotion is designed to tell students that performance counts, and to encourage districts and schools to take aggre

ssive action to help all students meet promotion standards on time. States should target their efforts at key transition points, such as the 4th, 8th, and 10th grades. Strategies to end social promotion include early identification and intervention for students who need additional help, extended learning time for students who need extra help, and intensive intervention designed to prevent a student from having to repeat an entire grade.

X` hp x (#7

□?GO!

7

□?GO!7

□?GO!#^\
P6QP#□Ensuring Teacher Quality□

#XP\
P6QXP#

Fifth, we would encourage States and school districts to do more to ensure teacher quality. Less than two weeks ago, we released our first biannual report on Teacher Quality. In releasing this first biannual report, we are making a statement that we are going to keep coming back to the issue of teacher quality again and again. This reports tells us that less than half of Americas teachers feel very well prepared to teach in the modern classroom. Teachers cited four reas of concern: using technology, teaching children from diverse cultures, teaching children with disabilities, and helping LEP students. This study really is a cry for help and we need to respond□.□

I know the Members of this Committee share our concern about teacher quality, and we want to work with you to address that concern. Research shows that qualified teachers are the most important inschool factor in improving student achievement. Far too many classrooms are led by teachers teaching out of field, in dividuals granted emergency certificates who do not meet State certification standards, and even teacher aides with no more than a high school diploma. All of these individuals are trying to do their best"and many are excellent aides"but as long as they do not have the skills of a proven teacher we are shortchanging our students.

Highpoverty urban schools are most likely to suffer from unqualified teachers.

In Los Angeles, for example, 60 percent of the new teachers hired last year did not have a teaching license. Even when urban districts succeed in hiring qualified teachers, attrition rates during the first five years often reach 50 percent. Partly as a result of difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers, Title I schools are hiring teacher aides at twice the rate of certified teachers, and an increasing number of aides are providing direct instruction without a teachers supervision.

Plain Text#d6X@DQ@##XP\
P6QXP#Our ESEA reauthorization proposal would begin to address these problems by encouraging States to adopt challenging, competency examinations for all new teachers that would include assessments of subjectmatter knowledge. We would also work to phase out the use of teacher aides as instructors in Title I schools and urge States to make significant progress in reducing both the number of teachers with emergency certificates and the number of teachers teaching subjects for which they lack adequate preparation. Our proposal also would encourage States and school districts to build career ladders to encourage paraprofessional to become certified teachers.

The issue of improving teacher quality is also of great importance to all of us who want to improve the education of children with disabilities. ESEA is meant to serve all children and there are growing numbers of children with disabilities who have been successfully mainstreamed into regular classrooms. ESEA and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act can work together to make a real difference for many more of these children. The Teacher Quality report told us that the majority of our teachers do not feel as wellprepared as they should to teach children with disabilities. We want to work very hard to make sure that teachers have the skills and the tools they need to teacher these children

to high standards.

We made a good start in improving teacher quality last year when Congress passed "with strong bipartisan support" the new teacher training and recruitment provisions in Title II of the reauthorized Higher Education Act. Our ESEA reauthorization plan would build on this success by providing resources to help states strengthen teacher certification standards and develop new ways to evaluate and compensate teachers. It also will include increased investment in the high quality professional development teachers tell us they need to help all students meet challenging new State standards.

Just as we have real concerns about improving teacher quality, we need to recognize the growing shortage of qualified principals. I was struck by a statistic in a recent article in The Washington Post, which indicated that about 50 percent of all schools face a shortage of qualified principal candidates. That is a very heavy statistic. In response to this and other evidence about the need for better training for principals and other school leaders, our reauthorization proposal will address the issue of developing the next generation of talented principals.

#^ \ P6QP# □ TITLE I □

#XP \ P6QXP#

!Plain Text! I have described some of the key, crosscutting measures for getting high standards into all classrooms. Now I would like to outline some programs specific issues and recommendations, beginning with Title I, which is the largest Federal investment in elementary and secondary education. This \$7.7 billion program reaches more than 45,000 schools in over 13,000 school districts. With the expansion of schoolwide projects following the last reauthorization, the program now serves over 11 million students. In the 1996-97 school year, 36 percent of the children served were white, 30 percent were Hispanic, and 28 percent were African American. Seventeen percent of the children served were limited English proficient.

Historically, Title I has been the single largest source of federal funding targeted to raising the achievement levels of students in high poverty schools and helping to close the achievement gap between these children and their more advantaged peers. The 1994 reauthorization focused on helping children in high poverty schools reach the same high standards expected of all students through several specific approaches. In particular, States were required to develop content and performance standards in reading and math, with aligned assessments to measure student progress toward meeting the standards.

The 1994 act also improved targeting of resources, expanded the schoolwide approach, and strengthened the focus on parental involvement. With regard to targeting, the GAO recently reported that Federal programs are much more targeted than State programs. On average, for every \$1 a State provided in education aid for each student in a district, the State provided an additional \$0.62 per poor student. For every \$1 of Federal funding districts received for each student, they received an additional \$4.73 in Federal funding per poor student. We believe targeting works, and we recommend leaving in place the Title I allocation formula adopted by the Congress in 1994.

The 1994 Act expanded schoolwide programs by permitting schools with poor children making up at least 50 percent of their enrollment to use Title I funds in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds to upgrade the instructional program of an entire school. To date, the number of schools implementing schoolwide programs has more than quadrupled, from 3,500 to approximately 16,000. And a growing number of parents are more fully involved in their children's education through the use of parent compacts encouraged by the 1994 Act.

I also want to stress that getting parents involved in the process of school reform is often the spark that makes the difference. I have been a strong advocate of increased parental involvement in education for many years and there is a good reason for it. Parents are childrens first teachers and they set the expectations that tell children how hard they should strive to achieve. And teachers tell us again and again that parents are too often the missing part of the education success equation. If you look at the attached chart entitled Making the Grade you will see why we are placing such a strong emphasis on developing compact between parents and schools for our Title I children.

Four years ago, we created the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education with 40 organizations. This Partnership has since grown to 4,700 organizations and it continues to grow quite rapidly. Last month, the Partnership sent out its latest publication a guide that tells teachers how to work better with parents.

#^\
#XP\
P6QP# Progress Since the 1994 Reauthorization
P6QXP#

Current information on Title I indicates progress on several fronts. Title I has contributed to the rapid development of challenging State standards that apply to all students in Title I schools. Teachers in Title I schools are increasingly reporting that standards are helping to guide instruction. Moreover, preliminary data gathered for this reauthorization from States that have implemented the Title I standards and assessment provisions generally show increased achievement levels in highpoverty schools. For the 199798 school year, seven of the 10 States with standards and aligned assessments in place for two years report increasing percentages of students meeting proficient and advance performance standards in schools with poverty rates of at least 50 percent. This Statelevel data is particularly encouraging since final assessments are not required to be in place until school year 20002001. Soon to be released data indicates that Title I is seen as driving standardsbased reform in poor districts and schools. This and other information, including data indicating that TitleI is driving standardsbased reform in poor districts and schools, will be discussed in greater detail in the Congressionally mandated National Assessment of Title I scheduled for release in late February.

Despite these initial signs of progress, I will be the first to tell that we are not anywhere near where we need to be in turning around the thousands of lowperforming high poverty schools that are served by Title I. This is why the President is so strong for improved teacher quality and increased accountability.

We know that there is a great deal of disparity in achievement levels at the state level. As I mentioned earlier in my testimony, a very significant number of paraprofessionals are functioning as teachers and they simply do not have the skills they need to do the jobs demanded of them.

We are not going to turn around the long, sorry history of setting low expectations for our Nations poorest children in just four years. We are on the right course in aligning Title I with the best efforts of State and local school systems. We simply need to stay the course in fitting all the pieces together to raise achievement levels.

In looking at TitleI and its impact, we should keep in mind that despite its size and prominence at the Federal level, Title I represents less than 2 percent of national spending on elementary and secondary education. Title I is effective only when it works in partnership with much larger State and local resources. Nevertheless, Title I can and should do more to assist State and local efforts to raise the educational achievement level of poor and minority children, and this is what we are trying to achieve through our reauthorization proposals.

#^\
P6QP# Proposed Changes to Title I

#XP\ P6QXP#

Building on what we have learned since 1994, our reauthorization proposal would continue to hold at risk children in high-poverty schools to the same high standards expected of all children, to tie Title I to State and local reforms based on high standards, to target resources to areas of greatest need, to support flexibility at the local level to determine instructional practice, and to encourage more effective implementation of schoolwide programs.

In addition to the accountability provisions that apply across the ESEA, we would improve Title I by targeting additional resources to help the lowest-achieving schools and by phasing in a set-aside for professional development aligned to standards. We also would strengthen the schoolwide authority by borrowing some of the successful features of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, such as basing reforms on solid research about what works. And in response to a key recommendation of the reading study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), we are proposing the use of diagnostic assessments in the first grade to ensure the early identification of children with reading difficulties.

Separately, we support the continuation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, which we believe is generating some good models for improving the effectiveness of the broader Title I program and for strengthening both Title I and non-Title I schools.

The Department also is considering proposals to promote high-quality professional development for early childhood educators and others to help children better develop language and literacy skills in the early years. The NAS's reading study presented strong evidence that children who receive enrichment services focused on language and cognitive development in early childhood show significantly higher reading achievement in the later elementary and middle school years. We believe that professional development based on recent research on child language and literacy development "including strategies that could be shared with parents" could make a significant contribution toward the goal of ensuring that every child can read well by the end of the third grade. This proposal would target those children most at risk of experiencing difficulty in learning to read by working with early childhood educators in Head Start and Title I pre-K programs.

Body Text #&J\ P6Q&P##^\ P6QP# HIGH STANDARDS IN THE CLASSROOM

#XP\ P6QXP#

While every State has developed high standards, States and districts now need significant support to continue the hard work of making these high expectations into classroom realities. This is why we are proposing a new initiative called High Standards in the Classroom. This initiative would help States and school districts continue the work of aligning instruction with standards, while focusing most resources on improving teacher quality through high-quality professional development. Our High Standards in the Classroom program would replace the current Goals 2000, Title II, and Title VI programs.

Body Text Body Text 2 #&J\ P6Q&P##XP\ P6QXP#

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future found that the biggest impediment to improving teaching was the lack of access to the kinds of knowledge and skills teachers need to help students succeed. We know from the Commission that most school districts do not direct their professional development funds in a coherent way toward sustained, standards-based, practical and useful learning opportunities for teachers. We need to provide teachers with learning opportunities to change instructional practices in order to ensure that all children are taught to high standards.

Unfortunately, the education community has not done enough to support the professional growth of teachers. Currently, most school districts spend less than 3

percent of their budgets on professional development, while our best private companies spend as much as 10 percent to ensure that their employees have quality training and keep current in their work. If we expect the best from our students, we need to ensure that we are giving our teachers the best support. And, we know it works. In New York City's District 2, former Superintendent Tony Ararado made major investments in professional development"investments that paid off in marked improvement in student achievement.

"□Body Text 2"Body Text#&J\ P6Q&P##XP\ P6QXP#
The 1994 reauthorization included a greater focus on researchbased principles of professional development in the Eisenhower Professional Development program. Despite this emphasis, recent evaluations of the Eisenhower professional development program found that most districts did not receive enough funding to support the kind of ongoing, intensive professional development what we know works best to improve teaching skills.

Body Text As we move into the next phase of standardsbased reform, we must give States and districts the flexibility they need to strengthen their local efforts to implement standards and to improve teacher quality. Funding for High Standards in the Classroom initiative would be allocated by formula to the States, with States retaining 10 percent of their allocations to continue the development of standards and assessments and provide leadership to districts in the work of implementing standards and improving professional development for teachers.

The remaining funds would be awarded to school districts through a State-run competitive process based on district plans to implement standards in schools and to invest in professional development in core subject areas, with a focus and a priority on science and mathematics. Distributing the funding through a competitive process would promote innovation and encourage careful planning, while ensuring that a significant number of districts have sufficient funding to implement the kind of comprehensive professional development programs that we know work. Through the success of Goals 2000, we know that competitive grants have already proved to be an effective vehicle for advancing the implementation of standards at the local level.

Funds would be used to advance teacher understanding and use of best instructional practices in one or more of the core academic content areas"with a primary focus on math and science, encourage collaboration among groups of teachers and administrators, support districtwide professional development plans designed to raise student achievement on State academic standards, help teachers integrate educational technology into classroom practice, and provide additional intensive support for new teachers during their first three years in the classroom

Body Text#&J\ P6Q&P##XP\ P6QXP#
States would be required to design their grant competitions to target funds to high-poverty districts. Similarly, districts would be required to give priority to high-poverty and low-performing schools in distributing funds at the local level.

Body Text #^\
#XP\ P6QXP#□

Style0#XX2PQXP##XP\ P6QXP#The Administrations plans for reauthorizing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act have actually taken shape over the past few years in our annual budget requests. These proposals have been designed to strengthen the program by improving accountability and by targeting funds to local educational agencies with significant drug and violence prevention problems and high-quality, research-based programs to address those problems.

Style0#C\
P6QP##XP\ P6QXP#Our reauthorization proposal would build on earlier efforts by emphasizing a schoolwide approach to drug and violence prevention. All school districts receiving funds would be required to develop a comp

prehensive Safe and DrugFree Schools plan to ensure that they have a drugfree, safe, and disciplined learning environment. These plans would have to reflect the recently established principles of effectiveness, including the adoption of researchbased strategies and setting measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention.

Program funds would be distributed in larger, more effective grants by requiring States to award competitive grants to a limited number of highneed districts.

Program evaluations have consistently found that the current practice of allocating funds by formula to all districts spreads funds too thinly to have a significant impact in most districts.

Finally, we will propose a new provision authorizing the Department to provide emergency services"especially mental health and counseling services"to schools affected by the kind of violence or severe trauma we saw last year in Arkansas, Kentucky, and Oregon. This is the \$12million Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) initiative included in the Presidents 2000 budget request.

Our reauthorization plan also would set aside a small amount of funding at the State level to support similar emergency response activities.

7

□?GO!w7

□?GO!

endnote text#XP\ P6QXP#w7

□?GO!7

□?GO!#^\ P6QP#□EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY□

#XP\ P6QXP#

#endnote text#Style0#XX2PQXP##XP\ P6QXP#Since the creation of Title III in the last ESEA reauthorization, the Federal government has helped States and school districts make significant progress in bringing technology into the classroom and making sure that teachers are prepared to effectively integrate technology throughout the curriculum. With the support of Congress, the Department has delivered over \$1 billion to States through the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. This investment has helped increase classroom connections to the Internet from 3 percent to 27 percent, and has also helped decrease the studentcomputer ratio from 38 students per multimedia computer to 13 students per multimedia computer.

Style0

By early March, \$1.9 billion dollars in ERate discounts will be provided to the Nations schools and libraries. This means that over the summer, the number of poor schools that are connected to the Internet will rise dramatically. These discounts will also provide affordable access to advanced telecommunications and ensure that all of our schools are active participants in the technological revolution.

To reduce the "digital divide" that threatens to widen the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their wealthier peers, we propose to strengthen the targeting provisions of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. This is one more way to reduce the disparity between technologyproficient and technologydeficient districts and schools. We know that our Federal dollars are narrowing the digital divide"highpoverty schools received over twoandonehalf times more new computers than their lowpoverty counterparts.

Body Text##J\ P6Q&P##XP\ P6QXP# Helping teachers integrate technology into their daily lesson plans will be another special focus. Currently, only 20percent of our teachers feel qualified to integrate technology throughout the curriculum. The reauthorization proposal for Title III will focus on supporting State and local efforts to improve teacher quality, with a priority for developing partnerships between local school districts, institutes of higher education, and other entities.

Body Text

We want to strengthen our evaluation efforts to find proven and promising models of how technology is improving achievement that we can bring to scale.

As always, we will make a special effort to address the needs of rural America. Distance learning is one tool that we know can make difference for students in these areas.

endnote text#XP\ P6QXP##^\ P6QP#
SUPPORTING STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY
#XP\ P6QXP#

#endnote text#Students with limited English proficiency (LEP) are the fastest growing population served by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. According to State educational agency data, the number of LEP students grew 24 percent between 1992 and 1995.

Many of the fastest growing LEP student populations are in States and communities that have little prior experience in serving these students. For example, ten States (Alabama, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, Tennessee, and Virginia) reported increases in the numbers of LEP students greater than 46 percent between 1992 and 1995.

Our clear goal is that LEP students should be able to speak and read English after three consecutive years in our schools. We are equally committed to ensuring that LEP students reach challenging academic standards in all content areas.

Our reauthorization proposal for the Title VII bilingual education provisions seeks to achieve these two very important goals by emphasizing the same two key strategies we are pursuing throughout the ESEA: improving teacher quality and strengthening accountability.

To increase teacher quality, for example, all institutions of higher education applying for Title VII grants, would be required to show that their teacher education programs include preparation for all teachers serving LEP students.

endnote text#XP\ P6QXP#
#endnote text#Body Text#&J\ P6Q&P##XP\ P6QXP#To strengthen accountability ensure that LEP students reach our threeyear goal of learning English, both Title VII grantees and Title I schools would be required to annually assess LEP student progress in attaining English proficiency.

Body Text

LEP students who have been in a U.S. school for less than three years would continue to be included in the Title I assessment system, but after three years reading assessments would be conducted in English. Schools and districts will be held accountable, as part of the larger ESEA accountability provisions, for their progress in ensuring that LEP students reach the threeyear English language proficiency goal.

footnote ref#XP\ P6QXP#I also believe that Americas children need to become much more fluent in other languages. We are very far behind other nations when it comes to giving our students a mastery of other languages. There are teenagers in Europe who can easily speak three languages. I am certain we can do a much better job at giving our students at least a fluency in English and one foreign language. #footnote ref#There are currently over 200 twoway bilingual education programs that teach English and a foreign language and allow all students to truly develop proficiency in two languages.

#C\ P6QP#
#^\ P6QP#EXCELLENCE AND OPPORTUNITY IN PUBLIC EDUCATION
□

#XP\ P6QXP#As I travel around the country visiting schools I continue to see the spark of innovation and creativity in many public schools. Public education is changing quite rapidly at the ground level and offering parents many more options in the terms of the type of schools that children can attend.

This Administration is a strong advocate of public school choice as a way to encourage and stimulate the creative efforts of many schools districts to give parents the opportunity to find a school that best fits the needs of their children. Some public discussion about choice gets reduced to the idea that that there is only choice outside of public education. Well, that is an assumption that I want to challenge because it really has no basis in fact.

You can go to school district after school district and find schools within schools, school to work initiatives, high schools collaborating with local colleges, option and theme schools that focus in on specialized fields like the environment, the visual and performing arts, communications and technology, back to basics, classical studies, marine science, accelerated learning, the international baccalaureate, and career related areas like finance and medical sciences.

There is a great deal of variety in public education at the local level from alternative schools, to community based learning efforts, to schools without walls, to public schools that focus in on the core knowledge approach to education.

There are public school districts like Seattle that have a completely open choice model and many other school districts that offer intradistrict choice, interdistrict choice, and controlled choice. Critics of public education would do well to recognize that many public school districts are far more in touch with parents than they think and they are giving parents the choices they seek.

I want to stress that one of the most important choices that parents can make about a child's education is the choice of subjects and not schools. The best schools in America"whether they are public, private or parochial"all share something in common: they place a strong emphasis on a rigorous academic program. This is what makes these schools distinctive, and it is what makes them work. That is why President Clinton has spent six year years advocating the idea that by raising standards and putting quality teachers into every classroom we can raise achievement for many, many more of our students"indeed, all of our students"than any private school voucher program. Private school voucher programs affect only a small number of students and take scarce resources from the public schools that serve the vast majority of students.

While the Clinton Administration strongly opposes efforts to divert public funds to private schools through vouchers or similar proposals, we want to encourage the development of new choices within the public school system. This is why we worked very closely with Congress to reauthorize the Charter School legislation that fostered creativity and accountability. This year we are considering a new choice activity that would help us identify and support new approaches to public school choice and promote a new, broader version of choice that works within all public schools.

We are interested in promoting choice programs in which the schools and programs are public and accountable for results, are genuinely open and accessible to all students, and promote high standards for all students. There are many successful public schools that can provide models for improving lower performing schools, and one of our goals should be to find way to replicate these successful models.

#^\ P6QP#CONCLUSION

#XP\ P6QXP#

Style0#XX2PQXP##XP\ P6QXP#These are just the highlights of a reauthorization proposal that will span 14 titles affecting nearly every area of Federal support

for the Nations elementary and secondary schools. I encourage you to give careful consideration to our full proposal when it is completed next month, and I look forward to discussing the specific details of our plan as your work on your legislation.

Style0

I will be happy to take any questions you may have.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-1999 18:07:26.00

SUBJECT: Pay Equity Mtg

TO: Jennifer M. Luray (CN=Jennifer M. Luray/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn T. Wu (CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shannon Mason (CN=Shannon Mason/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Caroline R. Fredrickson (CN=Caroline R. Fredrickson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

John will have a meeting on pay equity with Sen. Harkin and Women's groups on Wednesday, January 10 at 11:30am in the Roosevelt Room. There will be a pre-brief Tuesday evening time tbd.

Pls call me at 6-4514 with any conflicts/questions. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dawn L. Smalls (CN=Dawn L. Smalls/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-1999 18:11:21.00

SUBJECT: Pay Equity Mtg.

TO: Jennifer M. Luray (CN=Jennifer M. Luray/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Carolyn T. Wu (CN=Carolyn T. Wu/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Shannon Mason (CN=Shannon Mason/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Karen Tramontano (CN=Karen Tramontano/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Mary L. Smith (CN=Mary L. Smith/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Caroline R. Fredrickson (CN=Caroline R. Fredrickson/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Kevin S. Moran (CN=Kevin S. Moran/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Sara M. Latham (CN=Sara M. Latham/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

John will have a meeting on pay equity with Sen. Harkin and women's groups on Wednesday, February 10 at 11:30am in the Roosevelt Room. There will be a pre-brief Tuesday evening time tbd.

Pls call me at 6-4514 with any conflicts/questions. Thanks.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Constance J. Bowers (CN=Constance J. Bowers/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 8-FEB-1999 18:17:53.00

SUBJECT: ESEA Testimony

TO: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Jonathan H. Schnur (CN=Jonathan H. Schnur/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Wayne Upshaw (CN=Wayne Upshaw/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Laura Emmett (CN=Laura Emmett/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Daniel I. Werfel (CN=Daniel I. Werfel/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/OU=OPD/O=EOP@EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TO: Leslie S. Mustain (CN=Leslie S. Mustain/OU=OMB/O=EOP@EOP [OMB])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Here is ED's final version. Please let me know ASAP what you think.
----- Forwarded by Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP on
02/08/99 06:16 PM -----

"Cordes, Bill"
02/08/99 06:12:04 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP
cc:
Subject: ESEA Testimony

Final version (we hope) is attached in Word 97 format.

<>

- eseafin.doc

===== ATTACHMENT 1 =====

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

DRAFT TESTIMONY ON ESEA REAUTHORIZATION

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to present the Administration's views on the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The Administration is working on a detailed reauthorization proposal that we plan to submit for your consideration next month. The Department will also soon submit to Congress several reports evaluating the implementation and impact of Title I, other ESEA programs, and Goals 2000. Today I will provide an overview of our reauthorization efforts, as well as some of our specific recommendations. If there is one overriding principle that defines what we hope to accomplish, it is to end the tyranny of low expectations and raise achievement levels for all of our young people.

Let me begin by urging the Committee to develop a single, comprehensive bill reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some have suggested a title-by-title approach that could lead to several separate bills. This concerns me, because we have worked very hard with the Congress in recent years to develop a comprehensive approach to Federal support for education reform. If our efforts are to be successful, it is very important for all the pieces to fit together, complementing and reinforcing each other to help States, school districts, and schools to make the changes needed to raise achievement for all students. This is why the Administration is developing a single, integrated reauthorization proposal, and I hope you will do the same.

I also want to point out that with the nearly simultaneous reauthorization of the Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement, we have a unique opportunity to develop a comprehensive agenda for independent research to support improved practices and instruction in elementary and secondary education. We should make every effort to develop research-based solutions to the many challenges we face in elementary and secondary education, and to get the best information on what works into the hands of parents, teachers, principals, and superintendents across the Nation.

BACKGROUND AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This is, of course, this Administration's second opportunity to work with Congress on improving the ESEA. The 1994 reauthorization—the Improving America's Schools Act—took direct aim at transforming a Federal role that for too long had condoned low expectations and low standards for poor children. Along with the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the 1994 reauthorization reflected a bipartisan effort to raise expectations for all children by helping States and school districts to set high standards and establish goals for improving student achievement. The 1994 Act included provisions to improve teaching and learning, increase flexibility and accountability for States and local school districts, strengthen parent and community involvement, and target resources to the highest poverty schools and communities.

There is strong evidence that these changes, particularly the emphasis on high standards, have helped States and school districts carry out the hard work of real education reform. States that led the way in adopting standards-based reforms—like Kentucky,

Maryland, North Carolina, Oregon, and Texas—found new support from Federal programs that helped them to raise reading and math achievement. In other States, the new ESEA and Goals 2000 encouraged and supported improvements in teaching and learning tied to high standards. For example, in a very positive report on Goals 2000 by the General Accounting Office (GAO), we were most pleased that State officials described Goals 2000 as “a significant factor in promoting their education reform efforts” and a “catalyst” for change.

Signs of Progress

Partly as a result of changes at the Federal level and our new partnerships with the States, 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have developed state-level standards and two States have pushed for standards at the local level. More importantly, there are promising signs of real progress toward meeting these higher standards in the classroom. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), for example, has shown significant increases in math scores at the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades (See Chart 1). The National Education Goals Panel reported that between 1990 and 1996, 27 States significantly increased the percentage of 8th graders scoring at either the proficient or the advanced level on the NAEP math test (See Chart 2).

Tomorrow the National Center for Education Statistics will release its national report card on reading, and I understand we will see some improvement. Making sure that every child can read well and independently by the end of the third grade is a key benchmark of whether or not American education is improving. This has been a very high priority for the Administration and over the past few years a strong, bipartisan consensus has emerged on the importance of helping all children master this key prerequisite for all further learning. Title I provides substantial resources to improve reading instruction, and last year, Congress on a bipartisan basis passed the Reading Excellence Act to strengthen State and local efforts to improve reading in the early grades. We also now have some 20,000 College Work-Study students serving as reading tutors.

“Leading-Edge” States

Turning from the national to the State level, individual States have made notable progress in a very short period of time (See Chart 3). North Carolina, for example, more than doubled the percentage of its 8th graders scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on the NAEP math test, from 9 percent in 1990 to 20 percent in 1996. In Texas, the percentage of 4th grade students reaching the NAEP proficient or advanced levels rose from 15 percent in 1992 to 25 percent in 1996.

The National Education Goals Panel issued a report authored by the Rand Corporation that examined experience of these two States. This report found that the “most plausible explanation” for the test-score gains was an “organizational environment and incentive structure” based on standards-based reform, defined as “an aligned system of standards, curriculum, and assessments; holding schools accountable for improvement by all students; and critical support from business.” This report also goes on to tell us that the willingness of political leaders to stay the course and continue the reform agenda, despite “changes of Governors and among legislators,” is another key element that has defined the success of these two leading States.

Many states are not yet implementing proven practices that are working in some of this Nation's "leading-edge" States. According to recent special report on accountability in *Education Week*, 36 states issue school report cards, 14 do not, and fewer than half of the parents in States that do issue report cards are aware of their existence. The report also tells us that only 19 States provide assistance to low performing schools, and only 16 States have the authority to reconstitute or close down failing schools. Only about half the States require students to demonstrate that they have met standards in order to graduate, and too many still promote students who are unprepared from grade to grade. So we have work to do.

New Flexibility at the Federal Level

The 1994 reauthorization also brought real change to the way we do business at the Department of Education. We made a very determined effort to give States and school districts greater flexibility to make innovations that help all students reach high standards. Our regulatory reform effort, for example, systematically examined every Department regulation and set very specific criteria for regulating only when absolutely necessary. The Office of Management and Budget and other Federal agencies have since adopted this approach as a model. Under our new regulatory criteria, we found that we needed to issue regulations for only five of the programs included in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization; thus we eliminated a full two-thirds of the regulations previously covering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Another major improvement was to give States the option of submitting a single, consolidated State application, instead of separate applications, for the majority of ESEA programs. Not surprisingly, every State but one has adopted this approach, which both reduces paperwork and encourages a comprehensive approach to planning for the use of Federal funds. Moreover, States now submit their single plan just once during the life of the authorization cycle, with brief yearly updates to ensure accountability. States reported in fiscal year 1996 that the consolidated application slashed paperwork requirements by 85 percent.

In addition, the Department has vigorously implemented the waiver provisions included in the 1994 reauthorization, which permit States, school districts, and schools to request waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements that present an obstacle to innovative reform efforts if there are adequate accountability safeguards in place. Our efforts included a Waiver Hot Line as well as comprehensive waiver guidance at our site on the World Wide Web.

Since the reauthorization of ESEA in 1994, the Department has received 648 requests for waivers from States and local districts and granted a total of 357 waivers. Overall, the Department has approved 55 percent and disapproved 8 percent of all waivers requested. Of the remainder, 28 percent were withdrawn largely because districts learned that they had sufficient latitude or flexibility under existing law to proceed without a waiver, demonstrating that the ESEA is more flexible than many people thought even without the waiver authority.

ED-FLEX

Another approach to flexibility is the ED-FLEX demonstration program, which allows the Department to give States with strong accountability mechanisms the authority to approve waivers of certain Federal statutory and regulatory requirements that stand in the way of effective reform at the local level. Congress has authorized up to 12 States to participate in ED-FLEX.

We are proposing to expand ED-FLEX to allow all eligible States to participate. I believe such an expansion should be considered, not as a free-standing bill, but in the context of reauthorization, our emphasis on accountability for results, and other programmatic issues. ED-FLEX can be an important tool for accelerating the pace of real reform in our schools, but it must be done thoughtfully.

One final issue I want to touch on is the Department's performance in getting Federal education dollars to the local level, where they can do the most good. There have been a number of "dollars to the classroom" proposals over the past two years based on the assumption that the Department of Education retains a significant portion of Federal elementary and secondary appropriations to pay for administrative costs.

The truth is that over 95 percent of all the dollars appropriated by Congress for ESEA programs already go to local school districts. Almost all of the rest goes to States to provide technical assistance, to support the use of standards and assessments, and to provide oversight. If the "95 percent" figure sounds familiar, it is because some of those proposals I mentioned promise to send 95 percent of Federal dollars to the classroom.

I recognize that some may argue about whether the "local level" is the same as "the classroom." My view is that once the funds reach the local level, it is up to local elected school boards to decide how best to spend them to achieve the purposes of the programs enacted by the Congress. We in Washington should not attempt to bypass local school boards and deny them their lawful responsibility to determine how to meet the educational needs of their students.

I believe that these accomplishments—widespread adoption of challenging standards, promising achievement gains nationally and even more improvement in "leading-edge" States, and new flexibility for States and school districts—show that we were on the right track in 1994. The evidence demonstrates a clear connection between raising standards and raising student achievement. The record also shows, however, that many States and districts are still phasing in the 1994 reforms. Taken as a whole, this experience provides a compelling argument for the Administration and Congress to keep working together to help States and school districts get high standards into the classroom, and to push for improved incentives and strengthened accountability mechanisms to ensure that these reforms take hold.

THE NEXT STAGE: RAISING ACHIEVEMENT IN OUR SCHOOLS AND CLASSROOMS

Let me lay out for you the broader context for our ESEA reauthorization proposals. In 1994, we broke sharply with the past and made a significant policy shift in putting an end to the practice of giving students a watered-down curriculum. I strongly believe that the tyranny of low expectations—and it is tyranny—has been one of the great flaws of American education. We vigorously oppose the idea of “dumbing down” American education. Instead of “dumbing down,” we want to “achieve up.”

To support this effort we have developed a comprehensive, three-part strategy of (1) targeting investments to disadvantaged children, with particular attention to the early years of schooling; (2) improving teacher quality, and (3) real accountability. All these pieces need to fit together if we want to raise achievement levels.

First, our investments in the Title I, the Class-Size Reduction program, the Reading Excellence Act, education technology, and after-school programs—to name just a few—are all part of our effort to get communities and their teachers and principals the resources they need to raise achievement for all students. We have put a real emphasis on the early years of schooling because research and common sense tells you that if a young person can “master the basics” early, they get off to a much better start in their education.

We want to improve academic achievement for all students, with a special emphasis on closing the gap upward between poor and minority students and other students. This is why, for example, we are such strong supporters of reducing class size in the early grades. Research from the Tennessee STAR study demonstrated that reducing class sizes in the early grades led to higher achievement for all students, with poor and minority students showing the greatest gains.

Second, we think it is absolutely essential to put a highly qualified, dedicated teacher in every classroom in America. John Stanford, the inspiring former superintendent from Seattle who recently passed away, had this marvelous slogan that summed up his philosophy: “the victory is in the classroom.” If we are going to achieve many more victories in the classroom, we simply have to raise teacher quality and get many more certified teachers into our Title I schools. This is why we asked the Congress to fund a strong teacher quality initiative in reauthorizing the Higher Education Act last year. Our intent here is to make high standards part of every teacher’s daily lesson plans. I will discuss this part of our proposal in greater detail later on in my testimony.

Strengthening Accountability

Stronger accountability is the third part of our broad strategy of improvement. We believe that effective accountability measures—what business leaders call quality control measures—can make sure that our investments are used wisely and actually produce the desired results.

Much of our thinking about accountability has been informed by successful accountability initiatives at the local and State levels. The most thoughtful education leaders

at the State and local level are doing what we are proposing: they are ending social promotion, requiring school report cards, identifying low performing schools, improving discipline in schools and classrooms, and putting in place measurable ways to make change happen, such as basic skills exams at different grade levels. They are striking a careful balance between giving schools the increased support and flexibility they need to raise achievement levels and, at the same time, holding schools accountable when they do not measure up to clearly established goals. We are trying to strike that same balance in our reauthorization proposals.

Our emphasis on accountability in ESEA, and in particular in Title I, seeks to build on, support, and encourage these growing State and local efforts to pick up the pace of standards-based reform. Here it is important to recognize that we are not talking about more regulations. We want better results. There is both a moral and a fiscal dimension to being more accountable. We cannot afford to lose the talents of one child, and we cannot waste the substantial resources entrusted to us by American taxpayers.

The “either or” thinking that has dominated the public debate to date about our accountability proposals—more Federal control versus less local control—really misses the point entirely about what we seek to achieve. If a State is putting its own accountability measures into place, we are not demanding that they replace their measures with our measures. If a State does not have such requirements in place, then it makes a good deal of sense for them to adopt our proposals. We expect States to do this because it is good education policy and the right thing to do for the children.

Our approach to increased accountability is one of graduated response, a range of options—some positive and others more prescriptive—that can help break the mold and get low-performing schools moving in a more positive direction. On the positive side of the continuum, you give school districts the flexibility they need if you see that they are making progress. If a school or a school district simply isn’t making things happen, we want to shake things up and work with State and local officials to find out why. The local school district, for example, may not be giving teachers the real professional development time they need.

If a school district is refusing to change despite a continuing failure to raise achievement levels, we are prepared, for example, to be much more specific about how it uses Title I funding. We do not intend to be passive in the face of failure. We will help, nudge, prod, and demand action. And, if we have to, we are prepared to restrict or withhold ESEA funding.

We recognize that a complete accountability system should be multi-dimensional and include high expectations and accountability for everyone in the system. All of us are responsible for ensuring that all students reach high standards. The accountability measures in our reauthorization proposal will be designed to (1) help school districts and states provide students with a high-quality education, (2) focus on continuous improvement, and (3) hold students, teachers, principals, schools, and districts to high standards.

It is important to note that our proposed accountability measures reinforce and build on similar provisions approved in 1994. For example, the underlying structure of the Title I accountability provisions is sound, and a minority of States are hard at work emphasizing

continuous improvement and holding schools and principals accountable for results. Many States, however, have not fully implemented the Title I provisions and have moved only tentatively to make other changes based on high standards and accountability.

We seek to speed up and strengthen the process by requiring States to take immediate action to turn around low-performing schools, to give parents annual report cards, to end social promotion, to improve teacher quality, and to have well-thought-out discipline policies in place that make a difference.

Meeting State Standards

First, we would retain the current Title I requirement that States establish assessments aligned with State content and performance standards by the 2000-2001 school year. States must also define adequate yearly progress for Title I schools and local school districts in a manner that would result in continuous progress toward meeting State standards within a reasonable time frame.

Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools

Second, States should take immediate corrective action to turn around the lowest performing schools. Currently, there are over 6,500 schools and 1,300 school districts designated under Title I as needing improvement. These schools and districts were placed in school-improvement status after making little or no improvement over a period of two years. Many of these schools are still showing no improvement despite receiving additional support. We are saying our children have spent enough time in low-performing schools—it is time to take action now.

States should quickly identify the lowest performing schools that are failing to show improvement and provide additional support and assistance. If any school continues to show no improvement, States should take bold action such as reconstituting the school or closing the school down entirely and reopening it as a fresh new school. The Department's 2000 budget request includes a \$200 million set-aside in Title I to help jumpstart this process of State and district intervention in the lowest performing schools.

Annual Report Cards

Third, annual report cards at the State, district, and school levels should be a requirement for receiving ESEA funds. The report cards should provide invaluable information on improvement over time or the lack thereof. They should include information on student achievement, teacher quality, class size, school safety, attendance, and graduation requirements. Where appropriate, the student achievement data should be disaggregated by demographic subgroups to allow a greater focus on the gaps between disadvantaged students and other students.

For report cards to make sense they need to be easily understood by and widely distributed to parents and the public. As I indicated earlier, while 36 States already require report cards, many parents and teachers from these States say that they have never seen them. Our proposal is intended to give parents a tool they can use to join the debate over bringing

high standards into the classroom, to advocate on behalf of their children and their children's schools, and to work with teachers and principals to make improvements.

I assure you, if parents find out that their children are going to an unruly or unsafe school, there will be standing-room only at the next school board meeting and that can be a very good thing. If parents discover that test scores are down at their school but up at a nearby school, they will start asking questions and spark reform. In short, a good, honest report card gives parents a real accountability tool that allows them to make a difference in the education of their children.

Separately, we have proposed an additional test that can help parents determine if their children are measuring up: the voluntary national tests in 4th grade reading and 8th grade math. The independent, bipartisan National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) is developing a plan for this test, in accordance with language in the Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations Act. I ask the Committee to join me in looking carefully at this plan when NAGB announces it later in the spring.

Ending Social Promotion

Fourth, all States receiving ESEA funds should end the practice of social promotion. I want to be clear that we are against both a policy of social promotion and a policy of retaining students in grade. We are for a policy of preparing children to achieve to high standards. That is why we have pushed so hard for programs like Class Size Reduction, the Reading Excellence Act, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers after-school initiative, which invest in the early years and help to minimize the number of children at risk of retention in grade.

Research indicates that from 10 to 15 percent of young adults who graduate from high school and have not gone further—up to 340,000 students each year—cannot balance a checkbook or write a letter to a credit card company to explain an error on a bill. In addition, about 450,000 to 500,000 young people drop out of high school between the 10th and 12th grades. These are the young people who are hurt by both social promotion and retention. We need to make sure these students are given the support they need to succeed.

The President's call for an end to social promotion is designed to tell students that "performance counts," and to encourage districts and schools to take aggressive action to help all students meet promotion standards on time. States should target their efforts at key transition points, such as 4th, 8th, and 10th grades, and should use multiple measures, such as valid assessments and teacher evaluations, to determine if students have met the high standards required for promotion to the next grade. States would develop their own specific approaches to match their unique circumstances.

Strategies to end social promotion include early identification and intervention for students who need additional help—including appropriate accommodations and supports for students with disabilities. After-school and summer-school programs, for example, can provide extended learning time for students who need extra help to keep them from having to repeat an entire grade.

Ensuring Teacher Quality

Fifth, we would encourage States and school districts to do more to ensure teacher quality. Less than two weeks ago, we released our first biannual report on Teacher Quality. In developing this report, we are making a statement that we are going to keep coming back to the issue of teacher quality again and again. The first report told us that less than half of America's teachers feel very well-prepared to teach in the modern classroom. Teachers cited four areas of concern: using technology, teaching children from diverse cultures, teaching children with disabilities, and helping LEP students (See Chart 4). This study really is a cry for help and we need to respond.

I know the Members of this Committee share our concern about teacher quality, and we want to work with you to address that concern. Research shows that qualified teachers are the most important in-school factor in improving student achievement, yet more than 30 percent of newly hired teachers are entering the teaching profession without full certification, and over 11 percent enter the field with no license at all.

Our ability to raise academic standards also is hindered by teachers teaching "out of field." Overall, nearly 28 percent of teachers have neither an undergraduate major nor minor in their main assignment fields. Another significant concern is the practice of using teacher aides as substitutes for full-time instructors. All of these individuals are trying to do their best, but where they are being asked to take the place of a teacher we are shortchanging our students.

High-poverty urban schools are most likely to suffer from unqualified teachers. Even when urban districts succeed in hiring qualified teachers, attrition rates during the first five years often reach 50 percent. Partly as a result of difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers, Title I schools are hiring teacher aides at twice the rate of certified teachers, and an increasing number of aides are providing direct instruction without a teacher's supervision.

Our ESEA reauthorization proposal would begin to address these problems by asking States to adopt challenging competency examinations for all new teachers that would include assessments of subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills. We would also work to phase out the use of teacher aides as instructors in Title I schools, but at the same time encourage paraprofessionals to become certified teachers by supporting State and local efforts to build career ladders leading to certification. Our proposal will urge States to make significant progress in reducing both the number of teachers with emergency certificates and the number of teachers teaching subjects for which they lack adequate preparation.

The issue of improving teacher quality is also of great importance to all of us who want to improve the education of children with disabilities. The ESEA is meant to serve all children and there are growing numbers of children with disabilities who have been successfully mainstreamed into regular classrooms. The ESEA and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act can work together to make a real difference for many more of these children. The Teacher Quality report told us that the majority of our teachers do not feel as well-prepared as they should to teach children with disabilities. We want to work very hard to make sure that all teachers have the skills and the tools they need to teach these children to high standards.

We made a good start in improving teacher quality last year when Congress passed—with strong bipartisan support—the new teacher recruitment and training programs in Title II of the reauthorized Higher Education Act. Our ESEA reauthorization plan would build on this success by providing resources to help States strengthen teacher-certification standards. It also will include—in the new Teacher Quality and High Standards in Every Classroom initiative—increased investment in the high-quality professional development that teachers tell us they need to help all students meet challenging new State standards.

TITLE I

I have described some of the key, crosscutting measures for getting high standards into all classrooms. Now I would like to outline some program-specific issues and recommendations, beginning with Title I, which is the largest Federal investment in elementary and secondary education. This \$7.7 billion program reaches more than 45,000 schools in over 13,000 school districts. With the expansion of schoolwide projects following the last reauthorization, the program now serves over 11 million students. In the 1996-97 school year, 36 percent of the children served were white, 30 percent were Hispanic, and 28 percent were African-American. Seventeen percent of the children served were limited English proficient.

Historically, Title I has been the single largest source of federal funding targeted to raising the achievement levels of students in high-poverty schools and helping to close the achievement gap between these children and their more advantaged peers. The 1994 reauthorization focused on helping children in high poverty schools reach the same high standards expected of all students. In particular, States were required to develop content and performance standards in reading and math, with aligned assessments to measure student progress toward meeting the standards.

The 1994 Act also improved targeting of resources, expanded the schoolwide approach, and strengthened parental involvement. With regard to targeting, the GAO recently reported that Federal programs are much more targeted than State programs. On average, for every \$1 a State provided in education aid for each student in a district, the State provided an additional \$0.62 per poor student. In contrast, for every \$1 of Federal funding districts received for each student, they received an additional \$4.73 in Federal funding per poor student. We believe targeting works, and we recommend leaving in place the Title I allocation formula adopted by the Congress in 1994.

The 1994 Act expanded schoolwide programs by permitting schools with poor children making up at least 50 percent of their enrollment to use Title I funds in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds to upgrade the instructional program of the entire school. Since 1995, the number of schools implementing schoolwide programs has more than tripled, from about 5,000 to approximately 16,000. Our reauthorization proposal would maintain the 50-percent threshold for schoolwide programs.

Parents of Title I children are now more fully involved in their children's education through the use of parent compacts called for in the 1994 Act. I want to stress that getting parents involved in the process of school reform is often the spark that makes the difference.

I have been a strong advocate of increased parental involvement in education for many years and there is a good reason for it. Parents are children's first teachers and they set the expectations that tell children how hard they should strive to achieve. And teachers tell us again and again that parents are too often the missing part of the education success equation.

If you look at the attached chart entitled "Making the Grade," you will see why we are placing such a strong emphasis on developing compacts between parents and schools for our Title I children (See Chart 5). Four years ago, we created the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education with 40 organizations. This Partnership has since grown to 4,700 organizations and it continues to grow quite rapidly. To give you one example of its activities, last month the Partnership sent out a detailed guide of best practices on how teachers can work better with parents.

Progress Since the 1994 Reauthorization

Current information on Title I indicates progress on several fronts. Title I has contributed to the rapid development of challenging State standards that apply to all students in Title I schools. Teachers in Title I schools are increasingly reporting that standards are helping to guide instruction. Moreover, preliminary data gathered for this reauthorization from States that have implemented the Title I standards and assessment provisions generally show increased achievement levels in high-poverty schools. For the 1997-98 school year, seven of the 10 States with standards and aligned assessments in place for two years report increasing percentages of students meeting proficient and advanced performance standards in schools with poverty rates of at least 50 percent. These State-level data are particularly encouraging since final assessments are not required to be in place until school year 2000-2001. This and other information, including data indicating that Title I is driving higher standards to poor districts and schools, will be discussed in greater detail in the Congressionally mandated National Assessment of Title I scheduled for release in late February.

Despite these initial signs of progress, I would be the first to admit that we are not anywhere near where we need to be in turning around the thousands of low-performing high-poverty schools that are served by Title I. This is why the President is so strong for improved teacher quality and increased accountability. We know that many States, districts, and schools are not making as much progress as we had hoped. However, we did not expect to turn around the long, sorry history of setting low expectations for our Nation's poorest children in just four years. I believe we are now on the right course in aligning Title I with the best efforts of State and local school systems. We simply need to stay the course in fitting all the pieces together to raise achievement levels.

Finally, in looking at the impact of Title I, we should keep in mind that despite its size and prominence at the Federal level, it represents about three percent of national spending on elementary and secondary education. Title I is effective only when it works in partnership with much larger State and local resources. Nevertheless, Title I can and should do more to assist State and local efforts to raise the educational achievement level of poor and minority children, and this is what we are trying to achieve through our reauthorization proposals.

Proposed Changes to Title I

Building on what we have learned since 1994, our reauthorization proposal would continue to hold at-risk children in high-poverty schools to the same high standards expected of all children and link Title I to State and local reforms based on high standards. We also would continue targeting resources to areas of greatest need, supporting flexibility at the local level to determine instructional practices, and encouraging more effective implementation of schoolwide programs.

Title I schools would of course be subject to the accountability provisions that we would apply to all ESEA programs. Specific improvements to Title I would include targeting additional resources to help the lowest achieving schools, phasing in a set-aside for professional development aligned to standards, and phasing out the use of teacher aides as instructors in Title I schools. We also would strengthen the schoolwide authority by borrowing some of the successful features of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, such as basing reforms on solid research about what works. And in response to a key recommendation of the reading study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), we are proposing the use of diagnostic assessments in the first grade to ensure the early identification of children with reading difficulties.

Separately, we support the continuation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, which we believe is generating some good models for improving the effectiveness of the broader Title I program and for strengthening both Title I and non-Title I schools.

The Department also is considering proposals to promote high quality professional development for early childhood educators and others to help children better develop language and literacy skills in the early years. The NAS's reading study presented strong evidence that children who receive enrichment services focused on language and cognitive development in early childhood show significantly higher reading achievement in the later elementary and middle school years. We believe that professional development based on recent research on child language and literacy development—including strategies that could be shared with parents—could make a significant contribution toward the goal of ensuring that every child can read well by the end of the third grade. Our proposal would target those children most at risk of experiencing difficulty in learning to read by working with early childhood educators in Head Start and Title I pre-K programs.

QUALITY TEACHERS AND HIGH STANDARDS IN EVERY CLASSROOM

While every State has developed high standards, States and districts now need significant support to continue the hard work of turning these high expectations into classroom realities. This is why we are proposing a new initiative called Quality Teachers and High Standards in Every Classroom. This initiative would help States and school districts continue the work of aligning instruction with State standards and assessments, while focusing most resources on improving teacher quality through high-quality professional development. Our proposal would build on and succeed the current Goals 2000, Title II, and Title VI programs.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future found that the biggest impediment to improving teaching was the lack of access to the kinds of knowledge and skills teachers need to help students succeed. We know from the Commission's report that most school districts do not direct their professional development funds in a coherent way toward sustained, standards-based, practical, and useful learning opportunities for teachers. We need to provide teachers with opportunities to change instructional practices in order to ensure that all children are taught to high standards.

Just as we have real concerns about improving teacher quality, we need to recognize the growing shortage of qualified principals. I was struck by a statistic in a recent article in *The Washington Post*, which indicated that about 50 percent of all schools face a shortage of qualified principal candidates. That is a very heavy statistic.

Unfortunately, we have not done enough to support the professional growth of teachers and principals. Currently, most school districts spend less than three percent of their budgets on professional development, while our best private companies spend as much as 10 percent to ensure that their employees have quality training and keep current in their work. If we expect the best from our students, we need to ensure that we are giving our teachers the best support possible. And, we know it works. In New York City's District 2, former Superintendent Tony Alvarado made major investments in professional development—investments that paid off in marked improvement in student achievement.

The 1994 reauthorization included a greater focus on research-based principles of professional development in the Eisenhower Professional Development program. Despite this emphasis, recent evaluations of the Eisenhower professional development program found that most districts did not receive enough funding to support the kind of on-going, intensive professional development that works best to improve teaching skills.

As we move into the next phase of getting high standards into schools and classrooms, we must give States and districts the flexibility they need to strengthen their local efforts to implement standards and to improve teacher quality. States could use these funds to continue the development of standards and assessments and provide leadership to districts working to align instruction with these standards and assessments and to improve professional development for teachers. School districts would use their funds to implement standards in schools and to invest in professional development in core subject areas, with a priority on science and mathematics.

States and districts would also be able to use these funds to meet new ESEA teacher quality requirements related to the implementation and improvement of competency-based assessments for initial licensure, the reduction of the number of teachers on emergency credentials, and the reduction of the number of teachers teaching out of field.

Funds would be used to advance teacher understanding and use of best instructional practices in one or more of the core academic content areas, with a primary focus on math and science. The initiative also is designed to complement the strong emphasis on professional development throughout our ESEA reauthorization proposal, including Title I, the Reading Excellence Act, and Title VII.

We would support activities to assist new teachers during their first three years in classroom, including additional time for course preparation and lesson planning, mentoring and coaching by trained mentor teachers, observing and consulting with veteran teachers, and team-teaching with veteran teachers.

Veteran teachers would be encouraged to participate in collaborative professional development based on the standards developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The initiative also would support district-wide professional development plans designed to help students meet State academic standards, the integration of educational technology into classroom practice, and efforts to develop the next generation of principals.

SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

The Administration's plans for reauthorizing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act have actually taken shape over the past few years in our annual budget requests. These proposals have been designed to strengthen the program by improving accountability and by targeting funds to local educational agencies with (1) significant drug and violence prevention problems and (2) high-quality, research-based programs to address those problems.

Our reauthorization proposal would build on these earlier efforts by emphasizing a schoolwide approach to drug and violence prevention. All school districts receiving funds would be required to develop a comprehensive Safe and Drug-Free Schools plan to ensure that they have a drug-free, safe, and disciplined learning environment. These plans would have to reflect the "principles of effectiveness" that the Department recently established, which include the adoption of research-based strategies, setting measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention, and regular evaluation of progress toward these goals and objectives.

Program funds would be distributed in larger, more effective grants, because our proposal would require States to award competitive grants to a limited number of high-need districts. Program evaluations have consistently found that the current practice of allocating funds by formula to all districts spreads funds too thinly to have a significant impact in most districts. For example, about three-fifths of districts currently receive grants of less than \$10,000, with the average grant providing only about \$5 per student.

Our reauthorization plan also would continue the Safe Schools/Healthy Students program, an interagency initiative that provides competitive grants to help school districts and communities to develop and implement comprehensive, community-wide strategies for creating safe and drug-free schools and for promoting healthy childhood development. Similarly, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinator Initiative would be continued under our proposal.

We also will propose to authorize the Department to provide emergency services—especially mental health and counseling services—to schools affected by the kind of violence or severe trauma we saw last year in Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. This is the \$12 million Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) initiative included in the President's 2000 budget request. Our reauthorization plan also would set aside a small amount of funding at the State level to support similar emergency response activities.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Since the creation of Title III in the last ESEA reauthorization, the Federal government has helped States and school districts make significant progress in bringing technology into the classroom and making sure that teachers are prepared to effectively integrate technology throughout the curriculum.

With the support of Congress, the Department has delivered over \$1 billion to States through the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. This investment is helping to increase the number of classrooms connected to the Internet—just 27 percent in 1997—and has helped decrease the student-computer ratio from 38 students per multimedia computer to 13 students per multimedia computer.

By early March, \$1.9 billion dollars in E-Rate discounts will be provided to the Nation's schools and libraries. This means that over the summer, the number of poor schools that are connected to the Internet will rise dramatically. These discounts will also provide affordable access to advanced telecommunications and ensure that all of our schools are active participants in the technological revolution.

To reduce the "digital divide" that could widen the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their wealthier peers, we propose to strengthen the targeting provisions of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Just 63 percent of high-poverty schools had connections to the Internet in 1998, compared to 88 percent of low-poverty schools. The disparity is even greater at the classroom level, with only 14 percent of classrooms connected to the Internet in high-poverty schools, compared to 34 percent of classrooms in low-poverty schools.

Federal dollars are helping to narrow this digital divide. High-poverty schools received over two-and-one-half times more new computers than their low-poverty counterparts in recent years. We will make a special effort to address the needs of rural America, where technologies like distance learning can make a real difference, and to coordinate ESEA technology programs with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act

Technology Development Program, which expands access to innovations in technology to students with disabilities.

Helping teachers integrate technology into their daily lesson plans will be another special focus. Currently, only 20 percent of our teachers feel qualified to integrate technology throughout the curriculum. The reauthorization proposal for Title III will focus on supporting State and local efforts to improve teacher quality, with a priority for developing partnerships between local school districts, institutes of higher education, and other entities.

We also want to strengthen our evaluation efforts to find proven and promising models of how technology is improving achievement that we can bring to scale.

SUPPORTING STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

Students with limited English proficiency (LEP) are the fastest growing population served by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. According to State educational agency data, the number of LEP students grew 67 percent between the 1990-91 and 1996-97 academic years.

Growing numbers of LEP students are in States and communities that have little prior experience in serving them. For example, between the 1992-93 and 1996-97 school years, the LEP population more than doubled in Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The President's goal is to hold schools accountable for ensuring that LEP students can speak and read English after three consecutive years in our schools. We are equally committed to ensuring that LEP students reach challenging academic standards in all content areas. We also want to assure that States and school districts have the flexibility they need to provide the most appropriate instruction for each child.

I told you earlier that we cannot afford to waste the talents of one child. One of America's greatest strengths has always been her diversity of peoples. Today, immigrants and their children are revitalizing our cities, energizing our culture, and building up our economy. We have a responsibility to make them welcome here and to help them to enter the mainstream of American life.

Our reauthorization proposal for the Title VII bilingual education provisions seeks to achieve these goals by emphasizing the same two key strategies we are pursuing throughout the ESEA: improving teacher quality and strengthening accountability.

To increase teacher quality, for example, all institutions of higher education applying for Title VII grants would be required to show that their teacher education programs include preparation for all teachers serving LEP students.

To strengthen accountability, we would require both Title VII grantees and Title I schools to annually assess the progress of LEP students in attaining English proficiency. These assessments will be used to inform parents of their children's progress and to help schools improve instruction.

LEP students who have been in U.S. schools for less than three years would continue to be included in the Title I assessment system, but after three years reading assessments would be conducted in English. Schools and districts would be held responsible, as part of the larger ESEA accountability provisions, for ensuring that LEP students reach the three-year English language proficiency goal.

I also believe that America's children need to become much more fluent in other languages. We are very far behind other nations when it comes to giving our students a mastery of other languages. There are teenagers in Europe who can easily speak three languages. I am certain we can do a much better job at giving our students both a mastery of English and fluency in at least one foreign language. There are currently over 200 two-way bilingual education programs that teach English and a foreign language and allow all students to truly develop proficiency in both languages.

EXCELLENCE AND OPPORTUNITY IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

As I travel around the country visiting schools, I continue to see the spark of innovation and creativity in many public schools. Public education is changing quite rapidly at the ground level and offering parents many more options in the terms of the type of schools their children can attend and the courses they can take.

This Administration is a strong advocate of public school choice as a way to encourage and stimulate the creative efforts of school districts to give parents the opportunity to find a school that best fits the needs of their children. Some discussions about choice suggest that there is choice only outside of public education. Well, that is an assumption that I want to challenge because it really has no basis in fact.

You can go to school district after school district and find schools-within-schools, magnet schools, school-to-work initiatives, high schools collaborating with local colleges, and option and theme schools that focus in on specialized fields like the environment, the visual and performing arts, communications and technology, back-to-basics, classical studies, marine science, accelerated learning, the international baccalaureate, and career-related areas like finance and medical sciences.

There is a great deal of variety in public education at the local level, from alternative schools to community-based learning efforts, to schools-without-walls, to public schools that focus in on the core knowledge approach to education. There are public school districts like Seattle that have a completely open choice model and many other school districts that offer intra-district choice, inter-district choice, and controlled choice. Critics of public education would do well to recognize that many public school districts are far more in touch with parents than they think and are giving parents the choices they seek.

I want to stress that one of the most important choices that parents can make about a child's education is the choice of subjects and not schools. We have a growing body of research showing that courses students choose in middle and high school are powerful predictors of success—from mastery of high-level math to gaining entrance to top colleges and universities. The best schools in America—whether they are public, private or

parochial—all share something in common: they place a strong emphasis on a rigorous and engaging academic program. This is what makes these schools distinctive, and it is what makes them work.

That is why President Clinton has spent six years advocating the idea that by raising standards, exciting families about their children's education, and putting quality teachers into every classroom, we can raise achievement for many, many more of our students—and indeed, someday soon, hopefully all of our students. That is the best public policy for us to support. Private school voucher programs affect only a small number of students, divert us from our goal of high standards for all children, and take scarce resources from the public schools that serve around 90 percent of America's children.

While the Clinton Administration strongly opposes efforts to divert public funds to private schools through vouchers or similar proposals, we want to encourage the development of new choices within the public school system. This is why we worked very closely with Congress to reauthorize the Charter School legislation that fosters creativity with accountability. This year we are considering a new choice authority that would help us identify and support new approaches to public school choice and promote a new, broader version of choice that works within all public schools.

We are interested in promoting public school choice programs in which the schools and programs are public and accountable for results, are genuinely open and accessible to all students, and promote high standards for all students. There are many successful public schools that can provide models for improving low-performing schools, and one of our goals must be to find ways to help States and local school districts to replicate these successful models by leveraging “what works” for our children's education.

MODERNIZING SCHOOLS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

An additional priority for the Administration is to help communities build and renovate the school buildings they will need to help all students reach challenging standards. The General Accounting Office has reported that States and school districts face over \$112 billion in repairs to existing schools. In addition, many schools face severe overcrowding as a result of the “baby boom echo.”

The Administration is proposing \$25 billion in authority for interest-free bonds to finance the construction or renovation of up to 6,000 schools. This proposal will be included as part of the President's tax legislation. In addition, through the reauthorized ESEA, we would make grants to involve citizens in designing schools that reflect the needs of the entire community. The President's 2000 budget would provide \$10 million for these grants under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

CONCLUSION

These are just the highlights of a comprehensive reauthorization proposal that will span a dozen or so titles affecting nearly every area of Federal support for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. I encourage you to give careful consideration to our full proposal when it is completed next month, and I look forward to discussing the specific details of our plan as your work on your legislation.

The framework for all of our thinking is the clear recognition that the days of "dumbing down" American education are over. We want to "achieve up" and raise expectations for all of our young people. As I have said so many times before, our children are smarter than we think. We can and surely will debate the merits of the policy ideas that we are putting forward today and that is healthy. Let us find common ground, however, around the idea that we have both a moral and social obligation to give the poorest of our young people the help they need to get a leg-up in life and be part of the American success story.

As I travel around the country visiting schools, I really do get a sense that things are happening, that a very strong consensus has developed about what needs to be done to improve our schools. All the elements are coming together: a new emphasis on early childhood, better reading skills, high expectations for all of our young people, and accountability for results. We are moving in the right direction and we need to stay the course to get results and always remember that "the victory is in the classroom."

In conclusion, I want assure you that the Administration is prepared to work with the Congress to help and support local and State educators and leaders who are striving to raise achievement levels. I hope that in the process, a new bipartisan spirit can evolve around education issues. The last few years have been somewhat contentious here in Washington, and we need to give a better account of ourselves to the American people.

I will be happy to take any questions you may have.

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to present the Administration's views on the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The Administration is working on a detailed reauthorization proposal that we plan to submit for your consideration next month. The Department will also soon submit to Congress several reports evaluating the implementation and impact of Title I, other ESEA programs, and Goals 2000. Today I will provide an overview of our reauthorization efforts, as well as some of our specific recommendations. If there is one overriding principle that defines what we hope to accomplish, it is to end the tyranny of low expectations and raise achievement levels for all of our young people.

Let me begin by urging the Committee to develop a single, comprehensive bill reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some have suggested a title-by-title approach that could lead to several separate bills. This concerns me, because we have worked very hard with the Congress in recent years to develop a comprehensive approach to Federal support for education reform. If our efforts are to be successful, it is very important for all the pieces to fit together, complementing and reinforcing each other to help States, school districts, and schools to make the changes needed to raise achievement for all students. This is why the Administration is developing a single, integrated reauthorization proposal, and I hope you will do the same.

I also want to point out that with the nearly simultaneous reauthorization of the Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement, we have a unique opportunity to develop a comprehensive agenda for independent research to support improved practices and instruction in elementary and secondary education. We should make every effort to develop research-based solutions to the many challenges we face in elementary and secondary education, and to get the best information on what works into the hands of parents, teachers, principals, and superintendents across the Nation.

BACKGROUND AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This is, of course, this Administration's second opportunity to work with Congress on improving the ESEA. The 1994 reauthorization—the Improving America's Schools Act—took direct aim at transforming a Federal role that for too long had condoned low expectations and low standards for poor children. Along with the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the 1994 reauthorization reflected a bipartisan effort to raise expectations for all children by helping States and school districts to set high standards and establish goals for improving student achievement. The 1994 Act included provisions to improve teaching and learning, increase flexibility and accountability for States and local school districts, strengthen parent and community involvement, and target resources to the highest poverty schools and communities.

There is strong evidence that these changes, particularly the emphasis on high standards, have helped States and school districts carry out the hard work of real education reform. States that led the way in adopting standards-based reforms—like Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Oregon—found new support from Federal programs that helped them to raise reading and math achievement. In other States, the new ESEA and Goals

2000 encouraged and supported improvements in teaching and learning tied to high standards. For example, in a very positive report on Goals 2000 by the General Accounting Office (GAO), we were most pleased that State officials described Goals 2000 as “a significant factor in promoting their education reform efforts” and a “catalyst” for change.

Signs of Progress

Partly as a result of changes at the Federal level and our new partnerships with the States, 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have developed state-level standards and two States have pushed for standards at the local level. More importantly, there are promising signs of real progress toward meeting these higher standards in the classroom. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), for example, has shown significant increases in math scores at the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades (See Chart 1). The National Education Goals Panel reported that between 1990 and 1996, 27 States significantly increased the percentage of 8th graders scoring at either the proficient or the advanced level on the NAEP math test (See Chart 2).

Tomorrow the National Center for Education Statistics will release its national report card on reading, and I understand we will see some improvement. Making sure that every child can read well and independently by the end of the third grade is a key benchmark of whether or not American education is improving. This has been a very high priority for the Administration and over the past few years a strong, bipartisan consensus has emerged on the importance of helping all children master this key prerequisite for all further learning. Title I provides substantial resources to improve reading instruction, and last year, Congress on a bipartisan basis passed the Reading Excellence Act to strengthen State and local efforts to improve reading in the early grades. We also now have some 20,000 College Work-Study students serving as reading tutors.

“Leading-Edge” States

Turning from the national to the State level, individual States have made notable progress in a very short period of time (See Chart 3). North Carolina, for example, more than doubled the percentage of its 8th graders scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on the NAEP math test, from 9 percent in 1990 to 20 percent in 1996. In Texas, the percentage of 4th grade students reaching the NAEP proficient or advanced levels rose from 15 percent in 1992 to 25 percent in 1996.

The National Education Goals Panel issued a report authored by the RAND Corporation that examined experience of these two States. This report found that the “most plausible explanation” for the test-score gains was an “organizational environment and incentive structure” based on standards-based reform, defined as “an aligned system of standards, curriculum, and assessments; holding schools accountable for improvement by all students; and critical support from business.” This report also goes on to tell us that the willingness of political leaders to stay the course and continue the reform agenda, despite “changes of Governors and among legislators,” is another key element that has defined the success of these two leading States.

Many states are not yet implementing proven practices that are working in some of this Nation's "leading-edge" States. According to recent special report on accountability in *Education Week*, 36 states issue school report cards, 14 do not, and fewer than half of the parents in States that do issue report cards are aware of their existence. The report also tells us that only 19 States provide assistance to low performing schools, and only 16 States have the authority to reconstitute or close down failing schools. Only about half the States require students to demonstrate that they have met standards in order to graduate, and too many still promote students who are unprepared from grade to grade. So we have work to do.

New Flexibility at the Federal Level

The 1994 reauthorization also brought real change to the way we do business at the Department of Education. We made a very determined effort to give States and school districts greater flexibility to make innovations that help all students reach high standards. Our regulatory reform effort, for example, systematically examined every Department regulation and set very specific criteria for regulating only when absolutely necessary. The Office of Management and Budget has supported this approach, and other Federal agencies have since adopted it as a model. Under our new regulatory criteria, we found that we needed to issue regulations for only five of the programs included in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization; thus we eliminated a full two-thirds of the regulations previously covering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Another major improvement was to give States the option of submitting a single, consolidated State application, instead of separate applications, for the majority of ESEA programs. Not surprisingly, every State but one has adopted this approach, which both reduces paperwork and encourages a comprehensive approach to planning for the use of Federal funds. Moreover, States now submit their single plan just once during the life of the authorization cycle, with brief yearly updates to ensure accountability. States reported in fiscal year 1996 that the consolidated application slashed paperwork requirements by 85 percent.

In addition, the Department has vigorously implemented the waiver provisions included in the 1994 reauthorization, which permit States, school districts, and schools to request waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements that present an obstacle to innovative reform efforts if there are adequate accountability safeguards in place. Our efforts included a Waiver Hot Line as well as comprehensive waiver guidance at our site on the World Wide Web.

Since the reauthorization of ESEA in 1994, the Department has received 648 requests for waivers from States and local districts and granted a total of 357 waivers. Overall, the Department has approved 55 percent and disapproved 8 percent of all waivers requested. Of the remainder, 28 percent were withdrawn largely because districts learned that they had sufficient latitude or flexibility under existing law to proceed without a waiver, demonstrating that the ESEA is more flexible than many people thought even without the waiver authority.

ED-Flex

Another approach to flexibility is the ED-Flex demonstration program, which allows the Department to give States with strong accountability mechanisms the authority to approve waivers of certain Federal statutory and regulatory requirements that stand in the way of effective reform at the local level. Congress has authorized up to 12 States to participate in ED-Flex.

We are proposing to expand ED-Flex to allow all eligible States to participate. I believe such an expansion should be considered, not as a free-standing bill, but in the context of reauthorization, our emphasis on accountability for results, and other programmatic issues. ED-Flex can be an important tool for accelerating the pace of real reform in our schools, but it must be done thoughtfully. ED-Flex cannot be used to get around established civil-rights protections.

Federal Education Dollars to the Local Level

One final issue I want to touch on is the Department's performance in getting Federal education dollars to the local level, where they can do the most good. There have been a number of "dollars to the classroom" proposals over the past two years based on the assumption that the Department of Education retains a significant portion of Federal elementary and secondary appropriations to pay for administrative costs.

The truth is that over 95 percent of all the dollars appropriated by Congress for ESEA programs already go to local school districts. Almost all of the rest goes to States to provide technical assistance, to support the use of standards and assessments, and to provide oversight. If the "95 percent" figure sounds familiar, it is because some of those proposals I mentioned promise to send 95 percent of Federal dollars to the classroom.

I recognize that some may argue about whether the "local level" is the same as "the classroom." My view is that once the funds reach the local level, it is up to local elected school boards to decide how best to spend them to achieve the purposes of the programs enacted by the Congress. We in Washington should not attempt to bypass local school boards and deny them their lawful responsibility to determine how to meet the educational needs of their students.

I believe that these accomplishments—widespread adoption of challenging standards, promising achievement gains nationally and even more improvement in "leading-edge" States, and new flexibility for States and school districts—show that we were on the right track in 1994. The evidence demonstrates a clear connection between raising standards and raising student achievement. The record also shows, however, that many States and districts are still phasing in the 1994 reforms. Taken as a whole, this experience provides a compelling argument for the Administration and Congress to keep working together to help States and school districts get high standards into the classroom, and to push for improved incentives and strengthened accountability mechanisms to ensure that these reforms take hold.

THE NEXT STAGE: RAISING ACHIEVEMENT IN OUR SCHOOLS AND CLASSROOMS

Let me lay out for you the broader context for our ESEA reauthorization proposals. In 1994, we broke sharply with the past and made a significant policy shift in putting an end to the practice of giving students a watered-down curriculum. I strongly believe that the tyranny of low expectations—and it is tyranny—has been one of the great flaws of American education. We vigorously oppose the idea of “dumbing down” American education. Instead of “dumbing down,” we want to “achieve up.”

To support this effort we have developed a comprehensive, three-part strategy of (1) targeting investments to disadvantaged children, with particular attention to the early years of schooling; (2) improving teacher quality, and (3) real accountability. All these pieces need to fit together if we want to raise achievement levels.

First, our investments in the Title I, the Class-Size Reduction program, the Reading Excellence Act, education technology, and after-school programs—to name just a few—are all part of our effort to get communities and their teachers and principals the resources they need to raise achievement for all students. We have put a real emphasis on the early years of schooling because research and common sense tells you that if a young person can “master the basics” early, they get off to a much better start in their education.

We want to improve academic achievement for all students, with a special emphasis on closing the gap upward between poor and minority students and other students. This is why, for example, we are such strong supporters of reducing class size in the early grades. Research from the Tennessee STAR study demonstrated that reducing class sizes in the early grades led to higher achievement for all students, with poor and minority students showing the greatest gains.

Second, we think it is absolutely essential to put a highly qualified, dedicated teacher in every classroom in America. John Stanford, the inspiring former superintendent from Seattle who recently passed away, had this marvelous slogan that summed up his philosophy: “the victory is in the classroom.” If we are going to achieve many more victories in the classroom, we simply have to raise teacher quality and get many more certified teachers into our Title I schools. This is why we asked the Congress to fund a strong teacher quality initiative in reauthorizing the Higher Education Act last year. Our intent here is to make high standards part of every teacher’s daily lesson plans. I will discuss this part of our proposal in greater detail later on in my testimony.

Strengthening Accountability

Stronger accountability is the third part of our broad strategy of improvement. We believe that effective accountability measures—what business leaders call quality control measures—can make sure that our investments are used wisely and actually produce the desired results.

Much of our thinking about accountability has been informed by successful accountability initiatives at the local and State levels. The most thoughtful education leaders

at the State and local level are doing what we are proposing: they are ending social promotion, requiring school report cards, identifying low performing schools, improving discipline in schools and classrooms, and putting in place measurable ways to make change happen, such as basic skills exams at different grade levels. They are striking a careful balance between giving schools the increased support and flexibility they need to raise achievement levels and, at the same time, holding schools accountable when they do not measure up to clearly established goals. We are trying to strike that same balance in our reauthorization proposals.

Our emphasis on accountability in ESEA, and in particular in Title I, seeks to build on, support, and encourage these growing State and local efforts to pick up the pace of standards-based reform. Here it is important to recognize that we are not talking about more regulations. We want better results. There is both a moral and a fiscal dimension to being more accountable. We cannot afford to lose the talents of one child, and we cannot waste the substantial resources entrusted to us by American taxpayers.

The “either or” thinking that has dominated the public debate to date about our accountability proposals—more Federal control versus less local control—really misses the point entirely about what we seek to achieve. If a State is putting its own accountability measures into place, we are not demanding that they replace their measures with our measures. If a State does not have such requirements in place, then it makes a good deal of sense for them to adopt our proposals. We expect States to do this because it is good education policy and the right thing to do for the children.

Our approach to increased accountability is one of graduated response, a range of options—some positive and others more prescriptive—that can help break the mold and get low-performing schools moving in a more positive direction. On the positive side of the continuum, you give school districts the flexibility they need if you see that they are making progress. If a school or a school district simply isn’t making things happen, we want to shake things up and work with State and local officials to find out why. The local school district, for example, may not be giving teachers the real professional development time they need.

If a school district is refusing to change, we are prepared, for example, to be much more specific about how it uses ESEA funding. We do not intend to be passive in the face of failure. We will help, nudge, prod, and demand action. And, if we have to, we are prepared to restrict or withhold ESEA funding.

We recognize that a complete accountability system should be multi-dimensional and include high expectations and accountability for everyone in the system. All of us are responsible for ensuring that all students reach high standards. The accountability measures in our reauthorization proposal will be designed to (1) help school districts and states provide students with a high-quality education, (2) focus on continuous improvement, and (3) hold students, teachers, principals, schools, and districts to high standards.

It is important to note that our proposed accountability measures reinforce and build on similar provisions enacted in 1994. For example, the underlying structure of the Title I accountability provisions is sound, and a minority of States are hard at work emphasizing continuous improvement and holding schools and principals accountable for results. Many

States, however, have not fully implemented the Title I provisions and have moved only tentatively to make other changes based on high standards and accountability.

We seek to speed up and strengthen the process by requiring States to take immediate action to turn around low-performing schools, to give parents annual report cards, to end social promotion, to improve teacher quality, and to have well-thought-out discipline policies in place that make a difference.

Meeting State Standards

First, we would retain the current Title I requirement that States establish assessments aligned with State content and performance standards by the 2000-2001 school year. States must also define adequate yearly progress for Title I schools and local school districts in a manner that would result in continuous progress toward meeting State standards within a reasonable time frame.

Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools

Second, States should take immediate corrective action to turn around the lowest performing schools. Currently, there are over 6,500 schools and 1,300 school districts designated under Title I as needing improvement. These schools and districts were placed in school-improvement status after making little or no improvement over a period of two years. Many of these schools are still showing no improvement despite receiving additional support. We are saying our children have spent enough time in low-performing schools—it is time to take action now.

States should quickly identify the lowest performing schools that are failing to show improvement and provide additional support and assistance. If any school continues to show no improvement, States should take bold action such as reconstituting the school or closing the school down entirely and reopening it as a fresh new school. The Department's 2000 budget request includes a \$200 million set-aside in Title I to help jumpstart this process of State and district intervention in the lowest performing schools.

Annual Report Cards

Third, annual report cards at the State, district, and school levels should be a requirement for receiving ESEA funds. The report cards should provide invaluable information on improvement over time or the lack thereof. They should include information on student achievement, teacher quality, class size, school safety, attendance, and graduation requirements. Where appropriate, the student achievement data should be disaggregated by demographic subgroups to allow a greater focus on the gaps between disadvantaged students and other students.

For report cards to make sense they need to be easily understood by and widely distributed to parents and the public. As I indicated earlier, while 36 States already require report cards, many parents and teachers from these States say that they have never seen them. Our proposal is intended to give parents a tool they can use to join the debate over bringing

high standards into the classroom, to advocate on behalf of their children and their children's schools, and to work with teachers and principals to make improvements.

I assure you, if parents find out that their children are going to an unruly or unsafe school, there will be standing-room only at the next school board meeting and that can be a very good thing. If parents discover that test scores are down at their school but up at a nearby school, they will start asking questions and spark reform. In short, a good, honest report card gives parents a real accountability tool that allows them to make a difference in the education of their children.

Separately, we have proposed an additional test that can help parents determine if their children are measuring up: the voluntary national tests in 4th grade reading and 8th grade math. The independent, bipartisan National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) is developing a plan for this test, in accordance with language in the Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations Act. I ask the Committee to join me in looking carefully at this plan when NAGB announces it later in the spring.

Ending Social Promotion

Fourth, all States receiving ESEA funds should end the practice of social promotion. I want to be clear that in calling for an end to social promotion we are not encouraging school districts to retain students in grade, instead we are asking school districts to prepare children to high standards. That is why we have pushed so hard for programs like Class Size Reduction, the Reading Excellence Act, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers after-school initiative, which invest in the early years and help to minimize the number of children at risk of retention in grade.

Research indicates that from 10 to 15 percent of young adults who graduate from high school and have not gone further—up to 340,000 students each year—cannot balance a checkbook or write a letter to a credit card company to explain an error on a bill. In addition, about 450,000 to 500,000 young people drop out of high school between the 10th and 12th grades. These are the young people who are hurt by current practices. We need to make sure these students are given the support they need to succeed.

The President's call for an end to social promotion is designed to tell students that "performance counts," and to encourage districts and schools to take aggressive action to help all students meet promotion standards on time. States should target their efforts at key transition points, such as 4th, 8th, and 10th grades, and should use multiple measures, such as valid assessments and teacher evaluations, to determine if students have met the high standards required for promotion to the next grade. States would develop their own specific approaches to match their unique circumstances.

Strategies to end social promotion include early identification and intervention for students who need additional help—including appropriate accommodations and supports for students with disabilities. After-school and summer-school programs, for example, can provide extended learning time for students who need extra help to keep them from having to repeat an entire grade.

Ensuring Teacher Quality

Fifth, States must do more to ensure teacher quality. States receiving ESEA funds should adopt challenging competency tests for new teachers, phase out the use of uncertified teachers, and teachers who are teaching out-of-field. Less than two weeks ago, we released our first biannual report on Teacher Quality. In developing this report, we are making a statement that we are going to keep coming back to the issue of teacher quality again and again. The report told us that less than half of America's teachers feel very well-prepared to teach in the modern classroom. Teachers cited four areas of concern: using technology, teaching children from diverse cultures, teaching children with disabilities, and helping limited English proficient (LEP) students (See Chart 4). This study really is a cry for help and we need to respond.

I know the Members of this Committee share our concern about teacher quality, and we want to work with you to address that concern. Research shows that qualified teachers are the most important in-school factor in improving student achievement, yet more than 30 percent of newly hired teachers are entering the teaching profession without full certification, and over 11 percent enter the field with no license at all.

Our ability to raise academic standards also is hindered by teachers teaching "out of field." Overall, nearly 28 percent of teachers have neither an undergraduate major nor minor in their main assignment fields. Another significant concern is the practice of using teacher aides as substitutes for full-time instructors. All of these individuals are trying to do their best, but where they are being asked to take the place of a teacher we are shortchanging our students.

High-poverty urban schools are most likely to suffer from unqualified teachers. Even when urban districts succeed in hiring qualified teachers, attrition rates during the first five years often reach 50 percent. Partly as a result of difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers, Title I schools are hiring teacher aides at twice the rate of certified teachers, and an increasing number of aides are providing direct instruction without a teacher's supervision.

Our ESEA reauthorization proposal would begin to address these problems by ensuring that States adopt challenging competency examinations for all new teachers that would include assessments of subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills. We would also work to phase out the use of teacher aides as instructors in Title I schools, but at the same time encourage paraprofessionals to become certified teachers by supporting State and local efforts to build career ladders leading to certification. Our proposal will ensure that States make significant progress in reducing both the number of teachers with emergency certificates and the number of teachers teaching subjects for which they lack adequate preparation.

The issue of improving teacher quality is also of great importance to all of us who want to improve the education of children with disabilities. The ESEA is meant to serve all children and there are growing numbers of children with disabilities who have been successfully mainstreamed into regular classrooms. The ESEA and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act can work together to make a real difference for many more of these children. The Teacher Quality report told us that the majority of our teachers do not feel as well-prepared as they should to teach children with disabilities. We want to work very hard to

make sure that all teachers have the skills and the tools they need to teach these children to high standards.

We made a good start in improving teacher quality last year when Congress passed—with strong bipartisan support—the new teacher recruitment and training programs in Title II of the reauthorized Higher Education Act. Our ESEA reauthorization plan would build on this success by providing resources to help States strengthen teacher-certification standards. It also will include—in the new Teacher Quality and High Standards in Every Classroom initiative—increased investment in the high-quality professional development that teachers tell us they need to help all students meet challenging new State standards.

TITLE I

I have described some of the key, crosscutting measures for getting high standards into all classrooms. Now I would like to outline some program-specific issues and recommendations, beginning with Title I, which is the largest Federal investment in elementary and secondary education. This \$7.7 billion program reaches more than 45,000 schools in over 13,000 school districts. With the expansion of schoolwide projects following the last reauthorization, the program now serves over 11 million students. In the 1996-97 school year, 36 percent of the children served were white, 30 percent were Hispanic, and 28 percent were African-American. Seventeen percent of the children served were limited English proficient.

Historically, Title I has been the single largest source of Federal funding targeted to raising the achievement levels of students in high-poverty schools and helping to close the achievement gap between these children and their more advantaged peers. The 1994 reauthorization focused on helping children in high poverty schools reach the same high standards expected of all students. In particular, States were required to develop content and performance standards in reading and math, with aligned assessments to measure student progress toward meeting the standards.

The 1994 Act also improved targeting of resources, expanded the schoolwide approach, and strengthened parental involvement. With regard to targeting, the GAO recently reported that Federal programs are much more targeted than State programs. On average, for every \$1 a State provided in education aid for each student in a district, the State provided an additional \$0.62 per poor student. In contrast, for every \$1 of Federal funding districts received for each student, they received an additional \$4.73 in Federal funding per poor student. We believe targeting works, and we recommend leaving in place the Title I allocation formula adopted by the Congress in 1994.

The 1994 Act expanded schoolwide programs by permitting schools with poor children making up at least 50 percent of their enrollment to use Title I funds in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds to upgrade the instructional program of the entire school. Since 1995, the number of schools implementing schoolwide programs has more than tripled, from about 5,000 to approximately 16,000. Our reauthorization proposal would maintain the 50-percent threshold for schoolwide programs.

Parents of Title I children are now more fully involved in their children's education through the use of parent compacts called for in the 1994 Act. I want to stress that getting parents involved in the process of school reform is often the spark that makes the difference. I have been a strong advocate of increased parental involvement in education for many years and there is a good reason for it. Parents are children's first teachers and they set the expectations that tell children how hard they should strive to achieve. Teachers tell us again and again that parents are too often the missing part of the education success equation.

If you look at the chart entitled "Making the Grade," you will see why we are placing such a strong emphasis on developing compacts between parents and schools for our Title I children (See Chart 5). Four years ago, we created the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education with 40 organizations. This Partnership has since grown to 4,700 organizations and it continues to grow quite rapidly. To give you one example of its activities, last month the Partnership sent out a detailed guide of best practices on how teachers can work better with parents.

Progress Since the 1994 Reauthorization

Current information on Title I indicates progress on several fronts. Title I has contributed to the rapid development of challenging State standards that apply to all students in Title I schools. Teachers in Title I schools are increasingly reporting that standards are helping to guide instruction. Moreover, preliminary data gathered for this reauthorization from States that have implemented the Title I standards and assessment provisions generally show increased achievement levels in high-poverty schools. For the 1997-98 school year, seven of the 10 States with standards and aligned assessments in place for two years report increasing percentages of students meeting proficient and advanced performance standards in schools with poverty rates of at least 50 percent. These State-level data are particularly encouraging since final assessments are not required to be in place until school year 2000-2001. This and other information, including data indicating that Title I is driving higher standards to poor districts and schools, will be discussed in greater detail in the Congressionally mandated National Assessment of Title I scheduled for release in late February.

Despite these initial signs of progress, I would be the first to admit that we are not anywhere near where we need to be in turning around the thousands of low-performing high-poverty schools that are served by Title I. This is why the President is so strong for improved teacher quality and increased accountability. We know that many States, districts, and schools are not making as much progress as we had hoped. However, we did not expect to turn around the long, sorry history of setting low expectations for our Nation's poorest children in just four years. I believe we are now on the right course in aligning Title I with the best efforts of State and local school systems. We simply need to stay the course in fitting all the pieces together to raise achievement levels.

Finally, in looking at the impact of Title I, we should keep in mind that despite its size and prominence at the Federal level, it represents about three percent of national spending on elementary and secondary education. Title I is effective only when it works in partnership with much larger State and local resources. Nevertheless, Title I can and should do more to

assist State and local efforts to raise the educational achievement level of poor and minority children, and this is what we are trying to achieve through our reauthorization proposals.

Proposed Changes to Title I

Building on what we have learned since 1994, our reauthorization proposal would continue to hold at-risk children in high-poverty schools to the same high standards expected of all children and to link Title I to State and local reforms based on high standards. We also would continue targeting resources to areas of greatest need, supporting flexibility at the local level to determine instructional practices, and encouraging more effective implementation of schoolwide programs.

Title I schools would, of course, be subject to the accountability provisions that we would apply to all ESEA programs. Specific improvements to Title I would include targeting additional resources to help the lowest achieving schools, phasing in a set-aside for professional development aligned to standards, and phasing out the use of teacher aides as instructors in Title I schools. We also would strengthen the schoolwide authority by borrowing some of the successful features of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, such as basing reforms on solid research about what works. And in response to a key recommendation of the reading study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), we are proposing the use of diagnostic assessments in the first grade to ensure the early identification of children with reading difficulties.

Separately, we support the continuation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, which we believe is generating some good models for improving the effectiveness of the broader Title I program and for strengthening both Title I and non-Title I schools.

The Department also is considering proposals to promote high quality professional development for early childhood educators and others to help children better develop language and literacy skills in the early years. The NAS's reading study presented strong evidence that children who receive enrichment services focused on language and cognitive development in early childhood show significantly higher reading achievement in the later elementary and middle school years. We believe that professional development based on recent research on child language and literacy development—including strategies that could be shared with parents—could make a significant contribution toward the goal of ensuring that every child can read well by the end of the third grade. Our proposal would target those children most at risk of experiencing difficulty in learning to read by working with early childhood educators in Head Start and Title I pre-K programs.

QUALITY TEACHERS AND HIGH STANDARDS IN EVERY CLASSROOM

While every State has developed high standards, States and districts now need significant support to continue the hard work of turning these high expectations into classroom realities. This is why we are proposing a new initiative called Quality Teachers and High Standards in Every Classroom. This initiative would help States and school districts continue the work of aligning instruction with State standards and assessments, while

focusing most resources on improving teacher quality through high-quality professional development. Our proposal would build on and succeed the current Goals 2000, Title II, and Title VI programs.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future found that the biggest impediment to improving teaching was the lack of access to the kinds of knowledge and skills teachers need to help students succeed. We know from the Commission's report that most school districts do not direct their professional development funds in a coherent way toward sustained, standards-based, practical, and useful learning opportunities for teachers. We need to provide teachers with opportunities to change instructional practices in order to ensure that all children are taught to high standards.

Just as we have real concerns about improving teacher quality, we need to recognize the growing shortage of qualified principals. I was struck by a statistic in a recent article in *The Washington Post*, which indicated that about 50 percent of all schools face a shortage of qualified principal candidates. That is a very heavy statistic.

Unfortunately, we have not done enough to support the professional growth of teachers and principals. Currently, most school districts spend less than three percent of their budgets on professional development, while our best private companies spend as much as 10 percent to ensure that their employees have quality training and keep current in their work. If we expect the best from our students, we need to ensure that we are giving our teachers the best support possible. And, we know it works. In New York City's District 2, former Superintendent Tony Alvarado made major investments in professional development—investments that paid off in marked improvement in student achievement.

The 1994 reauthorization included a greater focus on research-based principles of professional development in the Eisenhower Professional Development program. Despite this emphasis, recent evaluations of the Eisenhower professional development program found that most districts did not receive enough funding to support the kind of on-going, intensive professional development that works best to improve teaching skills.

As we move into the next phase of getting high standards into schools and classrooms, we must give States and districts the flexibility they need to strengthen their local efforts to implement standards and to improve teacher quality. States could use these funds to continue the development of standards and assessments and provide leadership to districts working to align instruction with these standards and assessments and to improve professional development for teachers. School districts would use their funds to implement standards in schools and to invest in professional development in core subject areas, with a priority on science and mathematics.

States and districts would also be able to use these funds to meet new ESEA teacher quality requirements related to the implementation and improvement of competency-based assessments for initial licensure, the reduction of the number of teachers on emergency credentials, and the reduction of the number of teachers teaching out of field.

Funds would be used to advance teacher understanding and use of best instructional practices in one or more of the core academic content areas, with a primary focus on math and

science. The initiative also is designed to complement the strong emphasis on professional development throughout our ESEA reauthorization proposal, including Title I, the Reading Excellence Act, and Title VII.

We would support activities to assist new teachers during their first three years in classroom, including additional time for course preparation and lesson planning, mentoring and coaching by trained mentor teachers, observing and consulting with veteran teachers, and team-teaching with veteran teachers.

Veteran teachers would be encouraged to participate in collaborative professional development based on the standards developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The initiative also would support district-wide professional development plans designed to help students meet State academic standards, the integration of educational technology into classroom practice, and efforts to develop the next generation of principals.

SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

The Administration's plans for reauthorizing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act have actually taken shape over the past few years in our annual budget requests. These proposals have been designed to strengthen the program by improving accountability and by targeting funds to local educational agencies with (1) significant drug and violence prevention problems and (2) high-quality, research-based programs to address those problems.

Our reauthorization proposal would build on these earlier efforts by emphasizing a schoolwide approach to drug and violence prevention. All school districts receiving funds would be required to develop a comprehensive Safe and Drug-Free Schools plan to ensure that they have a drug-free, safe, and disciplined learning environment. These plans would include fair and effective discipline policies, safe passages to and from schools, effective research-based drug and violence prevention policies, and links to after-school programs. These plans would also have to reflect the "principles of effectiveness" that the Department recently established, which include the adoption of research-based strategies, setting measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention, and regular evaluation of progress toward these goals and objectives.

Program funds would be distributed in larger, more effective grants, because our proposal would require States to award competitive grants to a limited number of high-need districts. Program evaluations have consistently found that the current practice of allocating funds by formula to all districts spreads funds too thinly to have a significant impact in most districts. For example, about three-fifths of districts currently receive grants of less than \$10,000, with the average grant providing only about \$5 per student.

Our reauthorization plan also would continue the Safe Schools/Healthy Students program, an interagency initiative that provides competitive grants to help school districts and communities to develop and implement comprehensive, community-wide strategies for creating safe and drug-free schools and for promoting healthy childhood development. Similarly, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinator Initiative would be continued under our proposal.

We also will propose to authorize the Department to provide emergency services—especially mental health and counseling services—to schools affected by the kind of violence or severe trauma we saw last year in Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. This is the \$12 million Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) initiative included in the President's 2000 budget request. Our reauthorization plan also would set aside a small amount of funding at the State level to support similar emergency response activities.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Since the creation of Title III in the last ESEA reauthorization, the Federal government has helped States and school districts make significant progress in bringing technology into the classroom and making sure that teachers are prepared to effectively integrate technology throughout the curriculum.

With the support of Congress, the Department has delivered over \$1 billion to States through the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. This investment is helping to increase the number of classrooms connected to the Internet—just 27 percent in 1997—and has helped decrease the student-computer ratio from 38 students per multimedia computer to 13 students per multimedia computer.

By early March, \$1.9 billion dollars in E-Rate discounts will be provided to the Nation's schools and libraries. This means that over the summer, the number of poor schools that are connected to the Internet will rise dramatically. These discounts will also provide affordable access to advanced telecommunications and ensure that all of our schools are active participants in the technological revolution.

To reduce the "digital divide" that could widen the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their wealthier peers, we propose to strengthen the targeting provisions of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Just 63 percent of high-poverty schools had connections to the Internet in 1998, compared to 88 percent of low-poverty schools. The disparity is even greater at the classroom level, with only 14 percent of classrooms connected to the Internet in high-poverty schools, compared to 34 percent of classrooms in low-poverty schools.

Federal dollars are helping to narrow this digital divide. High-poverty schools received over two-and-one-half times more new computers than their low-poverty counterparts in recent years. We will make a special effort to address the needs of rural America, where technologies like distance learning can make a real difference, and to coordinate ESEA technology programs with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Technology Development Program, which expands access to innovations in technology to students with disabilities.

Helping teachers integrate technology into their daily lesson plans will be another special focus. Currently, only 20 percent of our teachers feel qualified to integrate technology throughout the curriculum. The reauthorization proposal for Title III will focus on supporting

State and local efforts to improve teacher quality, with a priority for developing partnerships between local school districts, institutes of higher education, and other entities.

We also want to strengthen our evaluation efforts to find proven and promising models of how technology is improving achievement that we can bring to scale.

SUPPORTING STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

Students with limited English proficiency (LEP) are the fastest growing population served by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. According to State educational agency data, the number of LEP students grew 67 percent between the 1990-91 and 1996-97 academic years.

Growing numbers of LEP students are in States and communities that have little prior experience in serving them. For example, between the 1992-93 and 1996-97 school years, the LEP population more than doubled in Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The President's goal is to hold schools accountable for ensuring that LEP students can speak and read English after three consecutive years in our schools. We are equally committed to ensuring that LEP students reach challenging academic standards in all content areas. We also want to assure that States and school districts have the flexibility they need to provide the most appropriate instruction for each child.

I told you earlier that we cannot afford to waste the talents of one child. One of America's greatest strengths has always been her diversity of peoples. Today, immigrants and their children are revitalizing our cities, energizing our culture, and building up our economy. We have a responsibility to make them welcome here and to help them to enter the mainstream of American life.

Our reauthorization proposal for the Title VII bilingual education provisions seeks to achieve these goals by emphasizing the same two key strategies we are pursuing throughout the ESEA: improving teacher quality and strengthening accountability.

To increase teacher quality, for example, all institutions of higher education applying for Title VII grants would be required to show that their teacher education programs include preparation for all teachers serving LEP students.

To strengthen accountability, we would require both Title VII grantees and Title I schools to annually assess the progress of LEP students in attaining English proficiency. These assessments will be used to inform parents of their children's progress and to help schools improve instruction.

LEP students who have been in U.S. schools for less than three years would continue to be included in the Title I assessment system, but after three years reading assessments would be conducted in English. Schools and districts would be held responsible, as part of the larger ESEA accountability provisions, for ensuring that LEP students reach the three-year English language proficiency goal.

I also believe that America's children need to become much more fluent in other languages. We are very far behind other nations when it comes to giving our students a mastery of other languages. There are teenagers in Europe who can easily speak three languages. I am certain we can do a much better job at giving our students both a mastery of English and fluency in at least one foreign language. There are currently over 200 two-way bilingual education programs that teach English and a foreign language and allow all students to truly develop proficiency in both languages.

EXCELLENCE AND OPPORTUNITY IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

As I travel around the country visiting schools, I continue to see the spark of innovation and creativity in many public schools. Public education is changing quite rapidly at the ground level and offering parents many more options in the terms of the type of schools their children can attend and the courses they can take.

This Administration is a strong advocate of public school choice as a way to encourage and stimulate the creative efforts of school districts to give parents the opportunity to find a school that best fits the needs of their children. Some discussions about choice suggest that there is choice only outside of public education. Well, that is an assumption that I want to challenge because it really has no basis in fact.

You can go to school district after school district and find schools-within-schools, magnet schools, school-to-work initiatives, high schools collaborating with local colleges, and option and theme schools that focus in on specialized fields like the environment, the visual and performing arts, communications and technology, back-to-basics, classical studies, marine science, accelerated learning, the international baccalaureate, and career-related areas like finance and medical sciences.

There is a great deal of variety in public education at the local level, from alternative schools to community-based learning efforts, to schools-without-walls, to public schools that focus in on the core knowledge approach to education. There are public school districts like Seattle that have a completely open choice model and many other school districts that offer intra-district choice, inter-district choice, and controlled choice. Critics of public education would do well to recognize that many public school districts are far more in touch with parents than they think and are giving parents the choices they seek.

I want to stress that one of the most important choices that parents can make about a child's education is the choice of subjects and not schools. We have a growing body of research showing that courses students choose in middle and high school are powerful predictors of success—from mastery of high-level math to gaining entrance to top colleges and universities. The best schools in America—whether they are public, private or parochial—all share something in common: they place a strong emphasis on a rigorous and engaging academic program. This is what makes these schools distinctive, and it is what makes them work.

That is why President Clinton has spent six years advocating the idea that by raising standards, exciting families about their children's education, and putting quality teachers into

every classroom, we can raise achievement for many, many more of our students—and indeed, someday soon, hopefully all of our students. That is the best public policy for us to support. Private school voucher programs affect only a small number of students, divert us from our goal of high standards for all children, and take scarce resources from the public schools that serve around 90 percent of America's children.

While the Clinton Administration strongly opposes efforts to divert public funds to private schools through vouchers or similar proposals, we want to encourage the development of new choices within the public school system. This is why we worked very closely with Congress to reauthorize the Charter School legislation that fosters creativity with accountability.

This year we are proposing a new choice authority that would help us identify and support new approaches to public school choice, such as interdistrict magnet schools and worksite schools, and promote a new, broader version of choice that works within all public schools.

We are interested in promoting public school choice programs in which the schools and programs are public and accountable for results, are genuinely open and accessible to all students, and promote high standards for all students. There are many successful public schools that can provide models for improving low-performing schools, and one of our goals must be to find ways to help States and local school districts to replicate these successful models by leveraging "what works" for our children's education.

MODERNIZING SCHOOLS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

An additional priority for the Administration is to help communities build and renovate the school buildings they will need to help all students reach challenging standards. The General Accounting Office has reported that States and school districts face over \$112 billion in repairs to existing schools. In addition, many schools face severe overcrowding as a result of the "baby boom echo."

The Administration is proposing \$25 billion in authority for interest-free bonds to finance the construction or renovation of up to 6,000 schools. This proposal will be included as part of the President's tax legislation. In addition, through the reauthorized ESEA, we would make grants to involve citizens in designing schools that reflect the needs of the entire community. The President's 2000 budget would provide \$10 million for these grants under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

CONCLUSION

These are just the highlights of a comprehensive reauthorization proposal that will span a dozen or so titles affecting nearly every area of Federal support for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. I encourage you to give careful consideration to our full proposal when it is completed next month, and I look forward to discussing the specific details of our plan as your work on your legislation.

The framework for all of our thinking is the clear recognition that the days of “dumbing down” American education are over. We want to “achieve up” and raise expectations for all of our young people. As I have said so many times before, our children are smarter than we think. We can and surely will debate the merits of the policy ideas that we are putting forward today and that is healthy. Let us find common ground, however, around the idea that we have both a moral and social obligation to give the poorest of our young people the help they need to get a leg-up in life and be part of the American success story.

As I travel around the country visiting schools, I really do get a sense that things are happening, that a very strong consensus has developed about what needs to be done to improve our schools. All the elements are coming together: a new emphasis on early childhood, better reading skills, high expectations for all of our young people, and accountability for results. We are moving in the right direction and we need to stay the course to get results and always remember that “the victory is in the classroom.”

In conclusion, I want assure you that the Administration is prepared to work with the Congress to help and support local and State educators and leaders who are striving to raise achievement levels. I hope that in the process, a new bipartisan spirit can evolve around education issues. The last few years have been somewhat contentious here in Washington, and we need to give a better account of ourselves to the American people.

I will be happy to take any questions you may have.

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J7IK4MWEQ800A0DL@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 21:14:54 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTTP id <01J7IK4FHALS00B9IF@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Mon,

08 Feb 1999 21:14:44 -0500 (EST)

Received: from vader.ed.gov ([165.224.216.253])

by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTTP id <01J7IK3ON2Z20000Z9@EOP.GOV>;
Mon, 08 Feb 1999 21:14:05 -0500 (EST)

Received: from smtpgwyl.ed.gov (smtpgwyl.ed.gov [165.224.16.166])

by vader.ed.gov (8.9.1a/8.8.4) with SMTP id VAA00495; Mon,
08 Feb 1999 21:14:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: from ccMail by smtpgwyl.ed.gov

(IMA Internet Exchange 2.12 Enterprise) id 0033EF2E; Mon,
08 Feb 1999 21:14:48 -0500

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

I appreciate this opportunity to present the Administration's views on the upcoming reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965. The Administration is working on a detailed reauthorization proposal that we plan to submit for your consideration next month. The Department will also soon submit to Congress several reports evaluating the implementation and impact of Title I, other ESEA programs, and Goals 2000. Today I will provide an overview of our reauthorization efforts, as well as some of our specific recommendations. If there is one overriding principle that defines what we hope to accomplish, it is to end the tyranny of low expectations and raise achievement levels for all of our young people.

Let me begin by urging the Committee to develop a single, comprehensive bill reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Some have suggested a title-by-title approach that could lead to several separate bills. This concerns me, because we have worked very hard with the Congress in recent years to develop a comprehensive approach to Federal support for education reform. If our efforts are to be successful, it is very important for all the pieces to fit together, complementing and reinforcing each other to help States, school districts, and schools to make the changes needed to raise achievement for all students. This is why the Administration is developing a single, integrated reauthorization proposal, and I hope you will do the same.

I also want to point out that with the nearly simultaneous reauthorization of the Department's Office of Educational Research and Improvement, we have a unique opportunity to develop a comprehensive agenda for independent research to support improved practices and instruction in elementary and secondary education. We should make every effort to develop research-based solutions to the many challenges we face in elementary and secondary education, and to get the best information on what works into the hands of parents, teachers, principals, and superintendents across the Nation.

BACKGROUND AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

This is, of course, this Administration's second opportunity to work with Congress on improving the ESEA. The 1994 reauthorization—the Improving America's Schools Act—took direct aim at transforming a Federal role that for too long had condoned low expectations and low standards for poor children. Along with the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the 1994 reauthorization reflected a bipartisan effort to raise expectations for all children by helping States and school districts to set high standards and establish goals for improving student achievement. The 1994 Act included provisions to improve teaching and learning, increase flexibility and accountability for States and local school districts, strengthen parent and community involvement, and target resources to the highest poverty schools and communities.

There is strong evidence that these changes, particularly the emphasis on high standards, have helped States and school districts carry out the hard work of real education reform. States that led the way in adopting standards-based reforms—like Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, and Oregon—found new support from Federal programs that helped them to raise reading and math achievement. In other States, the new ESEA and Goals

2000 encouraged and supported improvements in teaching and learning tied to high standards. For example, in a very positive report on Goals 2000 by the General Accounting Office (GAO), we were most pleased that State officials described Goals 2000 as “a significant factor in promoting their education reform efforts” and a “catalyst” for change.

Signs of Progress

Partly as a result of changes at the Federal level and our new partnerships with the States, 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have developed state-level standards and two States have pushed for standards at the local level. More importantly, there are promising signs of real progress toward meeting these higher standards in the classroom. The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), for example, has shown significant increases in math scores at the 4th, 8th, and 12th grades (See Chart 1). The National Education Goals Panel reported that between 1990 and 1996, 27 States significantly increased the percentage of 8th graders scoring at either the proficient or the advanced level on the NAEP math test (See Chart 2).

Tomorrow the National Center for Education Statistics will release its national report card on reading, and I understand we will see some improvement. Making sure that every child can read well and independently by the end of the third grade is a key benchmark of whether or not American education is improving. This has been a very high priority for the Administration and over the past few years a strong, bipartisan consensus has emerged on the importance of helping all children master this key prerequisite for all further learning. Title I provides substantial resources to improve reading instruction, and last year, Congress on a bipartisan basis passed the Reading Excellence Act to strengthen State and local efforts to improve reading in the early grades. We also now have some 20,000 College Work-Study students serving as reading tutors.

“Leading-Edge” States

Turning from the national to the State level, individual States have made notable progress in a very short period of time (See Chart 3). North Carolina, for example, more than doubled the percentage of its 8th graders scoring at the proficient or advanced levels on the NAEP math test, from 9 percent in 1990 to 20 percent in 1996. In Texas, the percentage of 4th grade students reaching the NAEP proficient or advanced levels rose from 15 percent in 1992 to 25 percent in 1996.

The National Education Goals Panel issued a report authored by the RAND Corporation that examined experience of these two States. This report found that the “most plausible explanation” for the test-score gains was an “organizational environment and incentive structure” based on standards-based reform, defined as “an aligned system of standards, curriculum, and assessments; holding schools accountable for improvement by all students; and critical support from business.” This report also goes on to tell us that the willingness of political leaders to stay the course and continue the reform agenda, despite “changes of Governors and among legislators,” is another key element that has defined the success of these two leading States.

Many states are not yet implementing proven practices that are working in some of this Nation's "leading-edge" States. According to recent special report on accountability in *Education Week*, 36 states issue school report cards, 14 do not, and fewer than half of the parents in States that do issue report cards are aware of their existence. The report also tells us that only 19 States provide assistance to low performing schools, and only 16 States have the authority to reconstitute or close down failing schools. Only about half the States require students to demonstrate that they have met standards in order to graduate, and too many still promote students who are unprepared from grade to grade. So we have work to do.

New Flexibility at the Federal Level

The 1994 reauthorization also brought real change to the way we do business at the Department of Education. We made a very determined effort to give States and school districts greater flexibility to make innovations that help all students reach high standards. Our regulatory reform effort, for example, systematically examined every Department regulation and set very specific criteria for regulating only when absolutely necessary. The Office of Management and Budget has supported this approach, and other Federal agencies have since adopted it as a model. Under our new regulatory criteria, we found that we needed to issue regulations for only five of the programs included in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization; thus we eliminated a full two-thirds of the regulations previously covering the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Another major improvement was to give States the option of submitting a single, consolidated State application, instead of separate applications, for the majority of ESEA programs. Not surprisingly, every State but one has adopted this approach, which both reduces paperwork and encourages a comprehensive approach to planning for the use of Federal funds. Moreover, States now submit their single plan just once during the life of the authorization cycle, with brief yearly updates to ensure accountability. States reported in fiscal year 1996 that the consolidated application slashed paperwork requirements by 85 percent.

In addition, the Department has vigorously implemented the waiver provisions included in the 1994 reauthorization, which permit States, school districts, and schools to request waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements that present an obstacle to innovative reform efforts if there are adequate accountability safeguards in place. Our efforts included a Waiver Hot Line as well as comprehensive waiver guidance at our site on the World Wide Web.

Since the reauthorization of ESEA in 1994, the Department has received 648 requests for waivers from States and local districts and granted a total of 357 waivers. Overall, the Department has approved 55 percent and disapproved 8 percent of all waivers requested. Of the remainder, 28 percent were withdrawn largely because districts learned that they had sufficient latitude or flexibility under existing law to proceed without a waiver, demonstrating that the ESEA is more flexible than many people thought even without the waiver authority.

ED-Flex

Another approach to flexibility is the ED-Flex demonstration program, which allows the Department to give States with strong accountability mechanisms the authority to approve waivers of certain Federal statutory and regulatory requirements that stand in the way of effective reform at the local level. Congress has authorized up to 12 States to participate in ED-Flex.

We are proposing to expand ED-Flex to allow all eligible States to participate. I believe such an expansion should be considered, not as a free-standing bill, but in the context of reauthorization, our emphasis on accountability for results, and other programmatic issues. ED-Flex can be an important tool for accelerating the pace of real reform in our schools, but it must be done thoughtfully. ED-Flex cannot be used to get around established civil-rights protections.

Federal Education Dollars to the Local Level

One final issue I want to touch on is the Department's performance in getting Federal education dollars to the local level, where they can do the most good. There have been a number of "dollars to the classroom" proposals over the past two years based on the assumption that the Department of Education retains a significant portion of Federal elementary and secondary appropriations to pay for administrative costs.

The truth is that over 95 percent of all the dollars appropriated by Congress for ESEA programs already go to local school districts. Almost all of the rest goes to States to provide technical assistance, to support the use of standards and assessments, and to provide oversight. If the "95 percent" figure sounds familiar, it is because some of those proposals I mentioned promise to send 95 percent of Federal dollars to the classroom.

I recognize that some may argue about whether the "local level" is the same as "the classroom." My view is that once the funds reach the local level, it is up to local elected school boards to decide how best to spend them to achieve the purposes of the programs enacted by the Congress. We in Washington should not attempt to bypass local school boards and deny them their lawful responsibility to determine how to meet the educational needs of their students.

I believe that these accomplishments—widespread adoption of challenging standards, promising achievement gains nationally and even more improvement in "leading-edge" States, and new flexibility for States and school districts—show that we were on the right track in 1994. The evidence demonstrates a clear connection between raising standards and raising student achievement. The record also shows, however, that many States and districts are still phasing in the 1994 reforms. Taken as a whole, this experience provides a compelling argument for the Administration and Congress to keep working together to help States and school districts get high standards into the classroom, and to push for improved incentives and strengthened accountability mechanisms to ensure that these reforms take hold.

THE NEXT STAGE: RAISING ACHIEVEMENT IN OUR SCHOOLS AND CLASSROOMS

Let me lay out for you the broader context for our ESEA reauthorization proposals. In 1994, we broke sharply with the past and made a significant policy shift in putting an end to the practice of giving students a watered-down curriculum. I strongly believe that the tyranny of low expectations—and it is tyranny—has been one of the great flaws of American education. We vigorously oppose the idea of “dumbing down” American education. Instead of “dumbing down,” we want to “achieve up.”

To support this effort we have developed a comprehensive, three-part strategy of (1) targeting investments to disadvantaged children, with particular attention to the early years of schooling; (2) improving teacher quality, and (3) real accountability. All these pieces need to fit together if we want to raise achievement levels.

First, our investments in the Title I, the Class-Size Reduction program, the Reading Excellence Act, education technology, and after-school programs—to name just a few—are all part of our effort to get communities and their teachers and principals the resources they need to raise achievement for all students. We have put a real emphasis on the early years of schooling because research and common sense tells you that if a young person can “master the basics” early, they get off to a much better start in their education.

We want to improve academic achievement for all students, with a special emphasis on closing the gap upward between poor and minority students and other students. This is why, for example, we are such strong supporters of reducing class size in the early grades. Research from the Tennessee STAR study demonstrated that reducing class sizes in the early grades led to higher achievement for all students, with poor and minority students showing the greatest gains.

Second, we think it is absolutely essential to put a highly qualified, dedicated teacher in every classroom in America. John Stanford, the inspiring former superintendent from Seattle who recently passed away, had this marvelous slogan that summed up his philosophy: “the victory is in the classroom.” If we are going to achieve many more victories in the classroom, we simply have to raise teacher quality and get many more certified teachers into our Title I schools. This is why we asked the Congress to fund a strong teacher quality initiative in reauthorizing the Higher Education Act last year. Our intent here is to make high standards part of every teacher’s daily lesson plans. I will discuss this part of our proposal in greater detail later on in my testimony.

Strengthening Accountability

Stronger accountability is the third part of our broad strategy of improvement. We believe that effective accountability measures—what business leaders call quality control measures—can make sure that our investments are used wisely and actually produce the desired results.

Much of our thinking about accountability has been informed by successful accountability initiatives at the local and State levels. The most thoughtful education leaders

at the State and local level are doing what we are proposing: they are ending social promotion, requiring school report cards, identifying low performing schools, improving discipline in schools and classrooms, and putting in place measurable ways to make change happen, such as basic skills exams at different grade levels. They are striking a careful balance between giving schools the increased support and flexibility they need to raise achievement levels and, at the same time, holding schools accountable when they do not measure up to clearly established goals. We are trying to strike that same balance in our reauthorization proposals.

Our emphasis on accountability in ESEA, and in particular in Title I, seeks to build on, support, and encourage these growing State and local efforts to pick up the pace of standards-based reform. Here it is important to recognize that we are not talking about more regulations. We want better results. There is both a moral and a fiscal dimension to being more accountable. We cannot afford to lose the talents of one child, and we cannot waste the substantial resources entrusted to us by American taxpayers.

The “either or” thinking that has dominated the public debate to date about our accountability proposals—more Federal control versus less local control—really misses the point entirely about what we seek to achieve. If a State is putting its own accountability measures into place, we are not demanding that they replace their measures with our measures. If a State does not have such requirements in place, then it makes a good deal of sense for them to adopt our proposals. We expect States to do this because it is good education policy and the right thing to do for the children.

Our approach to increased accountability is one of graduated response, a range of options—some positive and others more prescriptive—that can help break the mold and get low-performing schools moving in a more positive direction. On the positive side of the continuum, you give school districts the flexibility they need if you see that they are making progress. If a school or a school district simply isn’t making things happen, we want to shake things up and work with State and local officials to find out why. The local school district, for example, may not be giving teachers the real professional development time they need.

If a school district is refusing to change, we are prepared, for example, to be much more specific about how it uses ESEA funding. We do not intend to be passive in the face of failure. We will help, nudge, prod, and demand action. And, if we have to, we are prepared to restrict or withhold ESEA funding.

We recognize that a complete accountability system should be multi-dimensional and include high expectations and accountability for everyone in the system. All of us are responsible for ensuring that all students reach high standards. The accountability measures in our reauthorization proposal will be designed to (1) help school districts and states provide students with a high-quality education, (2) focus on continuous improvement, and (3) hold students, teachers, principals, schools, and districts to high standards.

It is important to note that our proposed accountability measures reinforce and build on similar provisions enacted in 1994. For example, the underlying structure of the Title I accountability provisions is sound, and a minority of States are hard at work emphasizing continuous improvement and holding schools and principals accountable for results. Many

States, however, have not fully implemented the Title I provisions and have moved only tentatively to make other changes based on high standards and accountability.

We seek to speed up and strengthen the process by requiring States to take immediate action to turn around low-performing schools, to give parents annual report cards, to end social promotion, to improve teacher quality, and to have well-thought-out discipline policies in place that make a difference.

Meeting State Standards

First, we would retain the current Title I requirement that States establish assessments aligned with State content and performance standards by the 2000-2001 school year. States must also define adequate yearly progress for Title I schools and local school districts in a manner that would result in continuous progress toward meeting State standards within a reasonable time frame.

Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools

Second, States should take immediate corrective action to turn around the lowest performing schools. Currently, there are over 6,500 schools and 1,300 school districts designated under Title I as needing improvement. These schools and districts were placed in school-improvement status after making little or no improvement over a period of two years. Many of these schools are still showing no improvement despite receiving additional support. We are saying our children have spent enough time in low-performing schools—it is time to take action now.

States should quickly identify the lowest performing schools that are failing to show improvement and provide additional support and assistance. If any school continues to show no improvement, States should take bold action such as reconstituting the school or closing the school down entirely and reopening it as a fresh new school. The Department's 2000 budget request includes a \$200 million set-aside in Title I to help jumpstart this process of State and district intervention in the lowest performing schools.

Annual Report Cards

Third, annual report cards at the State, district, and school levels should be a requirement for receiving ESEA funds. The report cards should provide invaluable information on improvement over time or the lack thereof. They should include information on student achievement, teacher quality, class size, school safety, attendance, and graduation requirements. Where appropriate, the student achievement data should be disaggregated by demographic subgroups to allow a greater focus on the gaps between disadvantaged students and other students.

For report cards to make sense they need to be easily understood by and widely distributed to parents and the public. As I indicated earlier, while 36 States already require report cards, many parents and teachers from these States say that they have never seen them. Our proposal is intended to give parents a tool they can use to join the debate over bringing

high standards into the classroom, to advocate on behalf of their children and their children's schools, and to work with teachers and principals to make improvements.

I assure you, if parents find out that their children are going to an unruly or unsafe school, there will be standing-room only at the next school board meeting and that can be a very good thing. If parents discover that test scores are down at their school but up at a nearby school, they will start asking questions and spark reform. In short, a good, honest report card gives parents a real accountability tool that allows them to make a difference in the education of their children.

Separately, we have proposed an additional test that can help parents determine if their children are measuring up: the voluntary national tests in 4th grade reading and 8th grade math. The independent, bipartisan National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) is developing a plan for this test, in accordance with language in the Fiscal Year 1999 Appropriations Act. I ask the Committee to join me in looking carefully at this plan when NAGB announces it later in the spring.

Ending Social Promotion

Fourth, all States receiving ESEA funds should end the practice of social promotion. I want to be clear that in calling for an end to social promotion we are not encouraging school districts to retain students in grade, instead we are asking school districts to prepare children to high standards. That is why we have pushed so hard for programs like Class Size Reduction, the Reading Excellence Act, and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers after-school initiative, which invest in the early years and help to minimize the number of children at risk of retention in grade.

Research indicates that from 10 to 15 percent of young adults who graduate from high school and have not gone further—up to 340,000 students each year—cannot balance a checkbook or write a letter to a credit card company to explain an error on a bill. In addition, about 450,000 to 500,000 young people drop out of high school between the 10th and 12th grades. These are the young people who are hurt by current practices. We need to make sure these students are given the support they need to succeed.

The President's call for an end to social promotion is designed to tell students that "performance counts," and to encourage districts and schools to take aggressive action to help all students meet promotion standards on time. States should target their efforts at key transition points, such as 4th, 8th, and 10th grades, and should use multiple measures, such as valid assessments and teacher evaluations, to determine if students have met the high standards required for promotion to the next grade. States would develop their own specific approaches to match their unique circumstances.

Strategies to end social promotion include early identification and intervention for students who need additional help—including appropriate accommodations and supports for students with disabilities. After-school and summer-school programs, for example, can provide extended learning time for students who need extra help to keep them from having to repeat an entire grade.

Ensuring Teacher Quality

Fifth, States must do more to ensure teacher quality. States receiving ESEA funds should adopt challenging competency tests for new teachers, phase out the use of uncertified teachers, and teachers who are teaching out-of-field. Less than two weeks ago, we released our first biannual report on Teacher Quality. In developing this report, we are making a statement that we are going to keep coming back to the issue of teacher quality again and again. The report told us that less than half of America's teachers feel very well-prepared to teach in the modern classroom. Teachers cited four areas of concern: using technology, teaching children from diverse cultures, teaching children with disabilities, and helping limited English proficient (LEP) students (See Chart 4). This study really is a cry for help and we need to respond.

I know the Members of this Committee share our concern about teacher quality, and we want to work with you to address that concern. Research shows that qualified teachers are the most important in-school factor in improving student achievement, yet more than 30 percent of newly hired teachers are entering the teaching profession without full certification, and over 11 percent enter the field with no license at all.

Our ability to raise academic standards also is hindered by teachers teaching "out of field." Overall, nearly 28 percent of teachers have neither an undergraduate major nor minor in their main assignment fields. Another significant concern is the practice of using teacher aides as substitutes for full-time instructors. All of these individuals are trying to do their best, but where they are being asked to take the place of a teacher we are shortchanging our students.

High-poverty urban schools are most likely to suffer from unqualified teachers. Even when urban districts succeed in hiring qualified teachers, attrition rates during the first five years often reach 50 percent. Partly as a result of difficulties in recruiting and retaining teachers, Title I schools are hiring teacher aides at twice the rate of certified teachers, and an increasing number of aides are providing direct instruction without a teacher's supervision.

Our ESEA reauthorization proposal would begin to address these problems by ensuring that States adopt challenging competency examinations for all new teachers that would include assessments of subject-matter knowledge and teaching skills. We would also work to phase out the use of teacher aides as instructors in Title I schools, but at the same time encourage paraprofessionals to become certified teachers by supporting State and local efforts to build career ladders leading to certification. Our proposal will ensure that States make significant progress in reducing both the number of teachers with emergency certificates and the number of teachers teaching subjects for which they lack adequate preparation.

The issue of improving teacher quality is also of great importance to all of us who want to improve the education of children with disabilities. The ESEA is meant to serve all children and there are growing numbers of children with disabilities who have been successfully mainstreamed into regular classrooms. The ESEA and the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act can work together to make a real difference for many more of these children. The Teacher Quality report told us that the majority of our teachers do not feel as well-prepared as they should to teach children with disabilities. We want to work very hard to

make sure that all teachers have the skills and the tools they need to teach these children to high standards.

We made a good start in improving teacher quality last year when Congress passed—with strong bipartisan support—the new teacher recruitment and training programs in Title II of the reauthorized Higher Education Act. Our ESEA reauthorization plan would build on this success by providing resources to help States strengthen teacher-certification standards. It also will include—in the new Teacher Quality and High Standards in Every Classroom initiative—increased investment in the high-quality professional development that teachers tell us they need to help all students meet challenging new State standards.

TITLE I

I have described some of the key, crosscutting measures for getting high standards into all classrooms. Now I would like to outline some program-specific issues and recommendations, beginning with Title I, which is the largest Federal investment in elementary and secondary education. This \$7.7 billion program reaches more than 45,000 schools in over 13,000 school districts. With the expansion of schoolwide projects following the last reauthorization, the program now serves over 11 million students. In the 1996-97 school year, 36 percent of the children served were white, 30 percent were Hispanic, and 28 percent were African-American. Seventeen percent of the children served were limited English proficient.

Historically, Title I has been the single largest source of Federal funding targeted to raising the achievement levels of students in high-poverty schools and helping to close the achievement gap between these children and their more advantaged peers. The 1994 reauthorization focused on helping children in high poverty schools reach the same high standards expected of all students. In particular, States were required to develop content and performance standards in reading and math, with aligned assessments to measure student progress toward meeting the standards.

The 1994 Act also improved targeting of resources, expanded the schoolwide approach, and strengthened parental involvement. With regard to targeting, the GAO recently reported that Federal programs are much more targeted than State programs. On average, for every \$1 a State provided in education aid for each student in a district, the State provided an additional \$0.62 per poor student. In contrast, for every \$1 of Federal funding districts received for each student, they received an additional \$4.73 in Federal funding per poor student. We believe targeting works, and we recommend leaving in place the Title I allocation formula adopted by the Congress in 1994.

The 1994 Act expanded schoolwide programs by permitting schools with poor children making up at least 50 percent of their enrollment to use Title I funds in combination with other Federal, State, and local funds to upgrade the instructional program of the entire school. Since 1995, the number of schools implementing schoolwide programs has more than tripled, from about 5,000 to approximately 16,000. Our reauthorization proposal would maintain the 50-percent threshold for schoolwide programs.

Parents of Title I children are now more fully involved in their children's education through the use of parent compacts called for in the 1994 Act. I want to stress that getting parents involved in the process of school reform is often the spark that makes the difference. I have been a strong advocate of increased parental involvement in education for many years and there is a good reason for it. Parents are children's first teachers and they set the expectations that tell children how hard they should strive to achieve. Teachers tell us again and again that parents are too often the missing part of the education success equation.

If you look at the chart entitled "Making the Grade," you will see why we are placing such a strong emphasis on developing compacts between parents and schools for our Title I children (See Chart 5). Four years ago, we created the Partnership for Family Involvement in Education with 40 organizations. This Partnership has since grown to 4,700 organizations and it continues to grow quite rapidly. To give you one example of its activities, last month the Partnership sent out a detailed guide of best practices on how teachers can work better with parents.

Progress Since the 1994 Reauthorization

Current information on Title I indicates progress on several fronts. Title I has contributed to the rapid development of challenging State standards that apply to all students in Title I schools. Teachers in Title I schools are increasingly reporting that standards are helping to guide instruction. Moreover, preliminary data gathered for this reauthorization from States that have implemented the Title I standards and assessment provisions generally show increased achievement levels in high-poverty schools. For the 1997-98 school year, seven of the 10 States with standards and aligned assessments in place for two years report increasing percentages of students meeting proficient and advanced performance standards in schools with poverty rates of at least 50 percent. These State-level data are particularly encouraging since final assessments are not required to be in place until school year 2000-2001. This and other information, including data indicating that Title I is driving higher standards to poor districts and schools, will be discussed in greater detail in the Congressionally mandated National Assessment of Title I scheduled for release in late February.

Despite these initial signs of progress, I would be the first to admit that we are not anywhere near where we need to be in turning around the thousands of low-performing high-poverty schools that are served by Title I. This is why the President is so strong for improved teacher quality and increased accountability. We know that many States, districts, and schools are not making as much progress as we had hoped. However, we did not expect to turn around the long, sorry history of setting low expectations for our Nation's poorest children in just four years. I believe we are now on the right course in aligning Title I with the best efforts of State and local school systems. We simply need to stay the course in fitting all the pieces together to raise achievement levels.

Finally, in looking at the impact of Title I, we should keep in mind that despite its size and prominence at the Federal level, it represents about three percent of national spending on elementary and secondary education. Title I is effective only when it works in partnership with much larger State and local resources. Nevertheless, Title I can and should do more to

assist State and local efforts to raise the educational achievement level of poor and minority children, and this is what we are trying to achieve through our reauthorization proposals.

Proposed Changes to Title I

Building on what we have learned since 1994, our reauthorization proposal would continue to hold at-risk children in high-poverty schools to the same high standards expected of all children and to link Title I to State and local reforms based on high standards. We also would continue targeting resources to areas of greatest need, supporting flexibility at the local level to determine instructional practices, and encouraging more effective implementation of schoolwide programs.

Title I schools would, of course, be subject to the accountability provisions that we would apply to all ESEA programs. Specific improvements to Title I would include targeting additional resources to help the lowest achieving schools, phasing in a set-aside for professional development aligned to standards, and phasing out the use of teacher aides as instructors in Title I schools. We also would strengthen the schoolwide authority by borrowing some of the successful features of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, such as basing reforms on solid research about what works. And in response to a key recommendation of the reading study conducted by the National Academy of Sciences (NAS), we are proposing the use of diagnostic assessments in the first grade to ensure the early identification of children with reading difficulties.

Separately, we support the continuation of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program, which we believe is generating some good models for improving the effectiveness of the broader Title I program and for strengthening both Title I and non-Title I schools.

The Department also is considering proposals to promote high quality professional development for early childhood educators and others to help children better develop language and literacy skills in the early years. The NAS's reading study presented strong evidence that children who receive enrichment services focused on language and cognitive development in early childhood show significantly higher reading achievement in the later elementary and middle school years. We believe that professional development based on recent research on child language and literacy development—including strategies that could be shared with parents—could make a significant contribution toward the goal of ensuring that every child can read well by the end of the third grade. Our proposal would target those children most at risk of experiencing difficulty in learning to read by working with early childhood educators in Head Start and Title I pre-K programs.

QUALITY TEACHERS AND HIGH STANDARDS IN EVERY CLASSROOM

While every State has developed high standards, States and districts now need significant support to continue the hard work of turning these high expectations into classroom realities. This is why we are proposing a new initiative called Quality Teachers and High Standards in Every Classroom. This initiative would help States and school districts continue the work of aligning instruction with State standards and assessments, while

focusing most resources on improving teacher quality through high-quality professional development. Our proposal would build on and succeed the current Goals 2000, Title II, and Title VI programs.

The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future found that the biggest impediment to improving teaching was the lack of access to the kinds of knowledge and skills teachers need to help students succeed. We know from the Commission's report that most school districts do not direct their professional development funds in a coherent way toward sustained, standards-based, practical, and useful learning opportunities for teachers. We need to provide teachers with opportunities to change instructional practices in order to ensure that all children are taught to high standards.

Just as we have real concerns about improving teacher quality, we need to recognize the growing shortage of qualified principals. I was struck by a statistic in a recent article in *The Washington Post*, which indicated that about 50 percent of all schools face a shortage of qualified principal candidates. That is a very heavy statistic.

Unfortunately, we have not done enough to support the professional growth of teachers and principals. Currently, most school districts spend less than three percent of their budgets on professional development, while our best private companies spend as much as 10 percent to ensure that their employees have quality training and keep current in their work. If we expect the best from our students, we need to ensure that we are giving our teachers the best support possible. And, we know it works. In New York City's District 2, former Superintendent Tony Alvarado made major investments in professional development—investments that paid off in marked improvement in student achievement.

The 1994 reauthorization included a greater focus on research-based principles of professional development in the Eisenhower Professional Development program. Despite this emphasis, recent evaluations of the Eisenhower professional development program found that most districts did not receive enough funding to support the kind of on-going, intensive professional development that works best to improve teaching skills.

As we move into the next phase of getting high standards into schools and classrooms, we must give States and districts the flexibility they need to strengthen their local efforts to implement standards and to improve teacher quality. States could use these funds to continue the development of standards and assessments and provide leadership to districts working to align instruction with these standards and assessments and to improve professional development for teachers. School districts would use their funds to implement standards in schools and to invest in professional development in core subject areas, with a priority on science and mathematics.

States and districts would also be able to use these funds to meet new ESEA teacher quality requirements related to the implementation and improvement of competency-based assessments for initial licensure, the reduction of the number of teachers on emergency credentials, and the reduction of the number of teachers teaching out of field.

Funds would be used to advance teacher understanding and use of best instructional practices in one or more of the core academic content areas, with a primary focus on math and

science. The initiative also is designed to complement the strong emphasis on professional development throughout our ESEA reauthorization proposal, including Title I, the Reading Excellence Act, and Title VII.

We would support activities to assist new teachers during their first three years in classroom, including additional time for course preparation and lesson planning, mentoring and coaching by trained mentor teachers, observing and consulting with veteran teachers, and team-teaching with veteran teachers.

Veteran teachers would be encouraged to participate in collaborative professional development based on the standards developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. The initiative also would support district-wide professional development plans designed to help students meet State academic standards, the integration of educational technology into classroom practice, and efforts to develop the next generation of principals.

SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

The Administration's plans for reauthorizing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act have actually taken shape over the past few years in our annual budget requests. These proposals have been designed to strengthen the program by improving accountability and by targeting funds to local educational agencies with (1) significant drug and violence prevention problems and (2) high-quality, research-based programs to address those problems.

Our reauthorization proposal would build on these earlier efforts by emphasizing a schoolwide approach to drug and violence prevention. All school districts receiving funds would be required to develop a comprehensive Safe and Drug-Free Schools plan to ensure that they have a drug-free, safe, and disciplined learning environment. These plans would include fair and effective discipline policies, safe passages to and from schools, effective research-based drug and violence prevention policies, and links to after-school programs. These plans would also have to reflect the "principles of effectiveness" that the Department recently established, which include the adoption of research-based strategies, setting measurable goals and objectives for drug and violence prevention, and regular evaluation of progress toward these goals and objectives.

Program funds would be distributed in larger, more effective grants, because our proposal would require States to award competitive grants to a limited number of high-need districts. Program evaluations have consistently found that the current practice of allocating funds by formula to all districts spreads funds too thinly to have a significant impact in most districts. For example, about three-fifths of districts currently receive grants of less than \$10,000, with the average grant providing only about \$5 per student.

Our reauthorization plan also would continue the Safe Schools/Healthy Students program, an interagency initiative that provides competitive grants to help school districts and communities to develop and implement comprehensive, community-wide strategies for creating safe and drug-free schools and for promoting healthy childhood development. Similarly, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Coordinator Initiative would be continued under our proposal.

We also will propose to authorize the Department to provide emergency services—especially mental health and counseling services—to schools affected by the kind of violence or severe trauma we saw last year in Arkansas, Kentucky, Mississippi, Oregon, and Pennsylvania. This is the \$12 million Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) initiative included in the President's 2000 budget request. Our reauthorization plan also would set aside a small amount of funding at the State level to support similar emergency response activities.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Since the creation of Title III in the last ESEA reauthorization, the Federal government has helped States and school districts make significant progress in bringing technology into the classroom and making sure that teachers are prepared to effectively integrate technology throughout the curriculum.

With the support of Congress, the Department has delivered over \$1 billion to States through the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. This investment is helping to increase the number of classrooms connected to the Internet—just 27 percent in 1997—and has helped decrease the student-computer ratio from 38 students per multimedia computer to 13 students per multimedia computer.

By early March, \$1.9 billion dollars in E-Rate discounts will be provided to the Nation's schools and libraries. This means that over the summer, the number of poor schools that are connected to the Internet will rise dramatically. These discounts will also provide affordable access to advanced telecommunications and ensure that all of our schools are active participants in the technological revolution.

To reduce the "digital divide" that could widen the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their wealthier peers, we propose to strengthen the targeting provisions of the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Just 63 percent of high-poverty schools had connections to the Internet in 1998, compared to 88 percent of low-poverty schools. The disparity is even greater at the classroom level, with only 14 percent of classrooms connected to the Internet in high-poverty schools, compared to 34 percent of classrooms in low-poverty schools.

Federal dollars are helping to narrow this digital divide. High-poverty schools received over two-and-one-half times more new computers than their low-poverty counterparts in recent years. We will make a special effort to address the needs of rural America, where technologies like distance learning can make a real difference, and to coordinate ESEA technology programs with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Technology Development Program, which expands access to innovations in technology to students with disabilities.

Helping teachers integrate technology into their daily lesson plans will be another special focus. Currently, only 20 percent of our teachers feel qualified to integrate technology throughout the curriculum. The reauthorization proposal for Title III will focus on supporting

State and local efforts to improve teacher quality, with a priority for developing partnerships between local school districts, institutes of higher education, and other entities.

We also want to strengthen our evaluation efforts to find proven and promising models of how technology is improving achievement that we can bring to scale.

SUPPORTING STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

Students with limited English proficiency (LEP) are the fastest growing population served by the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. According to State educational agency data, the number of LEP students grew 67 percent between the 1990-91 and 1996-97 academic years.

Growing numbers of LEP students are in States and communities that have little prior experience in serving them. For example, between the 1992-93 and 1996-97 school years, the LEP population more than doubled in Alabama, Alaska, Florida, Idaho, Nebraska, Nevada, North Carolina, Oregon, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The President's goal is to hold schools accountable for ensuring that LEP students can speak and read English after three consecutive years in our schools. We are equally committed to ensuring that LEP students reach challenging academic standards in all content areas. We also want to assure that States and school districts have the flexibility they need to provide the most appropriate instruction for each child.

I told you earlier that we cannot afford to waste the talents of one child. One of America's greatest strengths has always been her diversity of peoples. Today, immigrants and their children are revitalizing our cities, energizing our culture, and building up our economy. We have a responsibility to make them welcome here and to help them to enter the mainstream of American life.

Our reauthorization proposal for the Title VII bilingual education provisions seeks to achieve these goals by emphasizing the same two key strategies we are pursuing throughout the ESEA: improving teacher quality and strengthening accountability.

To increase teacher quality, for example, all institutions of higher education applying for Title VII grants would be required to show that their teacher education programs include preparation for all teachers serving LEP students.

To strengthen accountability, we would require both Title VII grantees and Title I schools to annually assess the progress of LEP students in attaining English proficiency. These assessments will be used to inform parents of their children's progress and to help schools improve instruction.

LEP students who have been in U.S. schools for less than three years would continue to be included in the Title I assessment system, but after three years reading assessments would be conducted in English. Schools and districts would be held responsible, as part of the larger ESEA accountability provisions, for ensuring that LEP students reach the three-year English language proficiency goal.

I also believe that America's children need to become much more fluent in other languages. We are very far behind other nations when it comes to giving our students a mastery of other languages. There are teenagers in Europe who can easily speak three languages. I am certain we can do a much better job at giving our students both a mastery of English and fluency in at least one foreign language. There are currently over 200 two-way bilingual education programs that teach English and a foreign language and allow all students to truly develop proficiency in both languages.

EXCELLENCE AND OPPORTUNITY IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

As I travel around the country visiting schools, I continue to see the spark of innovation and creativity in many public schools. Public education is changing quite rapidly at the ground level and offering parents many more options in the terms of the type of schools their children can attend and the courses they can take.

This Administration is a strong advocate of public school choice as a way to encourage and stimulate the creative efforts of school districts to give parents the opportunity to find a school that best fits the needs of their children. Some discussions about choice suggest that there is choice only outside of public education. Well, that is an assumption that I want to challenge because it really has no basis in fact.

You can go to school district after school district and find schools-within-schools, magnet schools, school-to-work initiatives, high schools collaborating with local colleges, and option and theme schools that focus in on specialized fields like the environment, the visual and performing arts, communications and technology, back-to-basics, classical studies, marine science, accelerated learning, the international baccalaureate, and career-related areas like finance and medical sciences.

There is a great deal of variety in public education at the local level, from alternative schools to community-based learning efforts, to schools-without-walls, to public schools that focus in on the core knowledge approach to education. There are public school districts like Seattle that have a completely open choice model and many other school districts that offer intra-district choice, inter-district choice, and controlled choice. Critics of public education would do well to recognize that many public school districts are far more in touch with parents than they think and are giving parents the choices they seek.

I want to stress that one of the most important choices that parents can make about a child's education is the choice of subjects and not schools. We have a growing body of research showing that courses students choose in middle and high school are powerful predictors of success—from mastery of high-level math to gaining entrance to top colleges and universities. The best schools in America—whether they are public, private or parochial—all share something in common: they place a strong emphasis on a rigorous and engaging academic program. This is what makes these schools distinctive, and it is what makes them work.

That is why President Clinton has spent six years advocating the idea that by raising standards, exciting families about their children's education, and putting quality teachers into

every classroom, we can raise achievement for many, many more of our students—and indeed, someday soon, hopefully all of our students. That is the best public policy for us to support. Private school voucher programs affect only a small number of students, divert us from our goal of high standards for all children, and take scarce resources from the public schools that serve around 90 percent of America's children.

While the Clinton Administration strongly opposes efforts to divert public funds to private schools through vouchers or similar proposals, we want to encourage the development of new choices within the public school system. This is why we worked very closely with Congress to reauthorize the Charter School legislation that fosters creativity with accountability.

This year we are proposing a new choice authority that would help us identify and support new approaches to public school choice, such as interdistrict magnet schools and worksite schools, and promote a new, broader version of choice that works within all public schools.

We are interested in promoting public school choice programs in which the schools and programs are public and accountable for results, are genuinely open and accessible to all students, and promote high standards for all students. There are many successful public schools that can provide models for improving low-performing schools, and one of our goals must be to find ways to help States and local school districts to replicate these successful models by leveraging “what works” for our children's education.

MODERNIZING SCHOOLS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

An additional priority for the Administration is to help communities build and renovate the school buildings they will need to help all students reach challenging standards. The General Accounting Office has reported that States and school districts face over \$112 billion in repairs to existing schools. In addition, many schools face severe overcrowding as a result of the “baby boom echo.”

The Administration is proposing \$25 billion in authority for interest-free bonds to finance the construction or renovation of up to 6,000 schools. This proposal will be included as part of the President's tax legislation. In addition, through the reauthorized ESEA, we would make grants to involve citizens in designing schools that reflect the needs of the entire community. The President's 2000 budget would provide \$10 million for these grants under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

CONCLUSION

These are just the highlights of a comprehensive reauthorization proposal that will span a dozen or so titles affecting nearly every area of Federal support for the Nation's elementary and secondary schools. I encourage you to give careful consideration to our full proposal when it is completed next month, and I look forward to discussing the specific details of our plan as your work on your legislation.

The framework for all of our thinking is the clear recognition that the days of “dumbing down” American education are over. We want to “achieve up” and raise expectations for all of our young people. As I have said so many times before, our children are smarter than we think. We can and surely will debate the merits of the policy ideas that we are putting forward today and that is healthy. Let us find common ground, however, around the idea that we have both a moral and social obligation to give the poorest of our young people the help they need to get a leg-up in life and be part of the American success story.

As I travel around the country visiting schools, I really do get a sense that things are happening, that a very strong consensus has developed about what needs to be done to improve our schools. All the elements are coming together: a new emphasis on early childhood, better reading skills, high expectations for all of our young people, and accountability for results. We are moving in the right direction and we need to stay the course to get results and always remember that “the victory is in the classroom.”

In conclusion, I want assure you that the Administration is prepared to work with the Congress to help and support local and State educators and leaders who are striving to raise achievement levels. I hope that in the process, a new bipartisan spirit can evolve around education issues. The last few years have been somewhat contentious here in Washington, and we need to give a better account of ourselves to the American people.

I will be happy to take any questions you may have.

ATT CREATION TIME/DATE: 0 00:00:00.00

TEXT:

RFC-822-headers:

Received: from conversion.pmdf.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
id <01J7IK4MWEQ800A0DL@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Mon, 8 Feb 1999 21:14:54 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTTP id <01J7IK4FHALS00B9IF@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Mon,

08 Feb 1999 21:14:44 -0500 (EST)

Received: from vader.ed.gov ([165.224.216.253])

by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTTP id <01J7IK3ON2Z20000Z9@EOP.GOV>;
Mon, 08 Feb 1999 21:14:05 -0500 (EST)

Received: from smtpgwyl.ed.gov (smtpgwyl.ed.gov [165.224.16.166])

by vader.ed.gov (8.9.1a/8.8.4) with SMTP id VAA00495; Mon,
08 Feb 1999 21:14:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: from ccMail by smtpgwyl.ed.gov

(IMA Internet Exchange 2.12 Enterprise) id 0033EF2E; Mon,
08 Feb 1999 21:14:48 -0500