

NLWJC - KAGAN

EMAILS RECEIVED

ARMS - BOX 044 - FOLDER -008

[02/09/1999]

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Nicole Rabner to Elena Kagan re: Thank you (1 page)	02/09/1999	Personal Misfile
002. email	Neera Tanden to Christopher Jennings et al. re: First Lady's office views on Medicare issue [partial] (1 page)	02/09/1999	P6/b(6)
003. email	Thomas Freedman to Elena Kagan and Bruce Reed re: opposition [partial] (1 page)	02/09/1999	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
 Automated Records Management System [Email]
 OPD ([Kagan])
 OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1999]

2009-1006-F
bm92

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

- C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
- PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
- RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

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 3rd 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.” The report also tells 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 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 create a strong teacher quality initiative in the Higher Education Act reauthorization 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 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. But 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, we give school districts greater flexibility if we see that they are making progress. But if a school or a school district simply isn’t making things happen, we want to work with State and local officials to find out why and shake things up. 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 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 reduce the number of 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, 7 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 improving teacher quality and increasing 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 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. In addition to these proposals, we are giving serious consideration to phasing in a set-aside within Title I for professional development aligned to standards.

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 develop better 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 3rd 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 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 passage 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 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 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, 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 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 inter-district 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 bonding authority to finance the construction or renovation of up to 6,000 schools. As part of the President's tax legislation, the Federal government will provide bondholders with tax credits in lieu of interest payments. State and local bond issuers will be responsible for repayment of principal. 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 <01J7J8UXY7GG00006E@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Tue, 9 Feb 1999 09:03:23 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTTP id <01J7J8QGWFCW00006U@PMDF.EOP.GOV>; Tue,

09 Feb 1999 09:03:04 -0500 (EST)

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

by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTTP id <01J7J7186F180002B5@EOP.GOV>;
Tue, 09 Feb 1999 08:11:05 -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 IAA01464; Tue,
09 Feb 1999 08:10:56 -0500 (EST)

Received: from ccMail by smtpgwyl.ed.gov

(IMA Internet Exchange 2.12 Enterprise) id 0033EFE2; Tue,
09 Feb 1999 08:11:03 -0500

A Blue Ribbon National Commission Improving K-12 Mathematics and Science Education

Background. The Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP), the National Science Foundation (NSF), and NASA believe the time is right to launch a Blue Ribbon National Commission to Improve K-12 Mathematics and Science Education. Senator John Glenn would like to devote some of his time to K-12 mathematics and science education and has expressed interest in serving as chair of this Commission.

The Problem. Far too many U.S. students finish high school without mastering the challenging mathematics and science necessary for success in higher education and in our competitive knowledge-based economy. The Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) results show that, while our 4th graders perform above the international average, performance begins to decline in the middle grades, and by the end of secondary school, U.S. students score significantly below the international average in both general and advanced mathematics and science. The TIMSS results also suggest possible avenues for change in its analysis of educational practices worldwide.

How a National Commission Can Help. A National Commission can review the current state of American K-12 math and science education and highlight important policy recommendations to improve U.S. student achievement in math and science. The TIMSS results have captured the attention of the public and the media, and the Administration has repeatedly cited math and science education as a priority. A high profile Commission can now convincingly articulate the steps needed to produce higher student achievement in math and science.

Possible Outcomes/Recommendations. The Commission will produce a report focused on specific action steps that federal, state, and local policymakers can take to address teacher supply and quality issues in K-12 math and science education. The report would highlight states and districts that have implemented some of these steps, resulting in higher student achievement in math and science. At the federal level, recommendations for legislation similar to the Reading Excellence Act, and building on current Congressional interest in math and science education, could emerge so that targeted resources become available to carry out the Commission's recommendations.

Possible Members. As mentioned above, Senator John Glenn has expressed interest in serving as chair of a Blue Ribbon Commission that will move policymakers forward. Among the remaining 12-15 participants would be key members of Congress, Governors, Mayors, Chief State School Officers, Nobel laureates, Business CEOs, University presidents, and so on.

Charge and Timing. Secretary Riley could foreshadow the announcement of the Commission in his State of American Education address by previewing a White House event and mentioning John Glenn as the chair. A White House event might include John Glenn, Neal Lane (OSTP), Rita Colwell (NSF), Daniel Goldin (NASA), Bruce Alberts (NAS), Secretary Richardson, Secretary Slater, and Secretary Riley, as well as a few of the Commission members. The Commission could begin meeting in April and meet once every other month for the next 12-16 months. The Commission will be charged to focus on teacher supply and quality in math and science, as described on the next page.

TEACHER SUPPLY AND QUALITY IN MATH AND SCIENCE

Critical to efforts to improve student achievement in math and science is the need for a cadre of highly-qualified teachers nationwide. Current realities intrude, however, with many math and science teachers teaching out of field. And, many others are underprepared in their disciplines, with few opportunities to upgrade their skills. Predictions of teacher shortages and student population growth combine to exacerbate the problem. A high profile Commission would command both respect and attention as it focused on the challenges of teacher recruitment, retention, and reinvigoration in teacher preparation and professional development programs.

Math and Science Teacher Recruitment

Issues: In some states, as many as half of those who complete teacher preparation programs do not become teachers. This is especially true of math and science teachers who are lured into industry by intriguing job opportunities and high salaries.

Potential Recommendations: Although a difficult issue without an easy answer, tax credits, loan forgiveness, or higher salaries for math and science teachers could attract more talented people to the profession. Moreover, alternative routes like the President's \$18M Troops to Teachers program would encourage more mid-career moves to teaching.

Math and Science Teacher Preparation

Issues: Many prospective elementary or middle school teachers take only 1 or 2 undergraduate math or science courses. In addition, many middle schools hire teachers with elementary certification (K-8) who therefore lack the content background needed to teach math or science well. Furthermore, few prospective K-12 math and science teachers receive adequate training in how to use technology to improve their classroom instruction.

Potential Recommendations: Colleges and universities must make the effective preparation of teachers a priority. College presidents' could be exhorted to use the Commission's recommendations to reform their preparation of teachers of math and science. The Commission could also recommend that more states implement content-specific middle school certification for teachers, so more middle school math and science teachers would have strong content backgrounds.

Supporting Current and New Math and Science Teachers

Issues: Slightly more than 25% of our current high school math and science teachers lack a major or minor in the subject area they teach. In high poverty schools, the percentage almost doubles, which means that 1 out of every 2 math and science teachers is unprepared to teach the discipline well. Moreover, many teachers do not have regular opportunities to improve their professional practice by upgrading their content or teaching skills.

Potential Recommendations: Strategies that districts can put in place to address these challenges include: (1) continuous, collaborative, content-based professional development experiences; (2) mentoring programs for new math and science teachers; (3) use of teacher leaders to provide peer support; and (4) incentives for math and science teachers to seek National Board certification.

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 <01J7ID4K41600087GE@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for schnur_j@a1.eop.gov; Mon,
8 Feb 1999 17:54:47 EST

Received: from storm.eop.gov by PMDF.EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.1-9 #29131)
with ESMTTP id <01J7ID4GQNZ40055NX@PMDF.EOP.GOV> for schnur_j@a1.eop.gov; Mon,

08 Feb 1999 17:54:39 -0500 (EST)

Received: from vader.ed.gov ([165.224.216.253])
by EOP.GOV (PMDF V5.2-29 #34437) with ESMTTP id <01J7ID3RY3N00000M7@EOP.GOV>
for schnur_j@a1.eop.gov; Mon, 08 Feb 1999 17:54:05 -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 RAA00015; Mon,
08 Feb 1999 17:54:01 -0500 (EST)

Received: from ccMail by smtpgwyl.ed.gov
(IMA Internet Exchange 2.12 Enterprise) id 0033EEC6; Mon,
08 Feb 1999 17:54:48 -0500

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. email	Nicole Rabner to Elena Kagan re: Thank you (1 page)	02/09/1999	Personal Misfile

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Kagan])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1999]

2009-1006-F
bm92

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 11:19:48.00

SUBJECT: Equal pay memo update

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Caroline Fredrickson just called saying she was on her way back from the Hill and would send her/Larry's paragraphs for the memo as soon as she got back.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 11:26:13.00

SUBJECT: Pay Equity Pre-Brief

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: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/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:

The pre-brief for the pay equity meeting will be held directly before the meeting at 11:15am. The meeting time has been moved to 11:45 am. Both will take place in John's office. Pls call me at 6-4514 with any questions. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Dawn L. Smalls/WHO/EOP on 02/09/99
10:22 AM -----

Dawn L. Smalls
02/08/99 06:10:59 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP, Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Subject: Pay Equity Mtg.

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.

Message Sent

To:

Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Sally Katzen/OPD/EOP
Shannon Mason/OPD/EOP
Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP
Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP
Jennifer M. Luray/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lynn G. Cutler (CN=Lynn G. Cutler/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 11:39:05.00

SUBJECT: idea for POTUS

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

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

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

TEXT:

Had an idea--I was listening to Mandy Patinkin, who is in town and just had corneal transplants. He has become a major spokesperson for organ transplants, and listening to the terrible statistics on need and availability, it seems to me that this is a good project for the President to push. We could do a really wonderful event, with recipients and with Mandy, and announce some kind of new initiative where people who interface somehow with the federal govt., i.e., Social Security, could sign up to be a donor. Mail cards with the checks for two months--something. Let me know.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 12:53:02.00

SUBJECT: Senior Staff Coverage for Monday, February 15

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

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

CC: Teresa M. Jones (CN=Teresa M. Jones/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Cathy R. Mays (CN=Cathy R. Mays/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

please send me any vacation numbers if you are going to be away.
----- Forwarded by Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP on 02/09/99 12:51
PM -----

Antoinette D. Marchette
02/09/99 12:44:51 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: Senior Staff Coverage for Monday, February 15

Please have the information to me by Thursday, 2/11/99 at 5pm, thank you.
----- Forwarded by Antoinette D. Marchette/WHO/EOP on
02/09/99 12:37 PM -----

Antoinette D. Marchette
02/08/99 10:44:50 AM
Record Type: Record

To: Anne Whitworth/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Senior Staff Coverage for Monday, February 15

----- Forwarded by Antoinette D. Marchette/WHO/EOP on
02/08/99 10:41 AM -----

Antoinette D. Marchette
02/08/99 10:42:04 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Ilia V. Velez/WHO/EOP
cc:
Subject: Senior Staff Coverage for Monday, February 15

----- Forwarded by Antoinette D. Marchette/WHO/EOP on
02/08/99 10:38 AM -----

Antoinette D. Marchette
02/08/99 10:38:31 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc:
Subject: Senior Staff Coverage for Monday, February 15

I will be collecting the information on the Senior Staff Coverage for the upcoming federal holiday. Please forward the following information to me by Thursday, February 11, 1999 by 5pm:
Senior Staff in office coverage and on-call coverage for Monday, February 15.

Please remember to leave contact numbers with the White House Operators and Signal Operators. Also, please remind staff that they must take leave for any other days off other than the federal holiday.

Thank you for your attention to this matter.

Message Sent

To: _____
Brian A. Alcorn/WHO/EOP
Maya Seiden/WHO/EOP
Leslie Bernstein/WHO/EOP
Dawn L. Smalls/WHO/EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP
Edward F. Hughes/WHO/EOP
Ora Theard/WHO/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP
Maria E. Soto/WHO/EOP
Mindy E. Myers/WHO/EOP
Virginia L. Cearley/WHO/EOP
Gay L. Joshlyn/OPD/EOP
Betty W. Currie/WHO/EOP
Mary Morrison/WHO/EOP
Cynthia M. Jasso-Rotunno/WHO/EOP
Bethany T. Przeworski/WHO/EOP
Heather M. Riley/WHO/EOP
Victoria A. Lynch/WHO/EOP
Charles J. Payson/WHO/EOP
Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP
Carolyn E. Cleveland/WHO/EOP
Scott R. Hynes/OVP @ OVP

Message Sent

To:

Brian A. Alcorn/WHO/EOP
Maya Seiden/WHO/EOP
Jonathan E. Smith/WHO/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Katharine Button/WHO/EOP
Maria E. Soto/WHO/EOP
Virginia L. Cearley/WHO/EOP
Betty W. Currie/WHO/EOP
Mary Morrison/WHO/EOP
Bethany T. Przeworski/WHO/EOP
Anne Whitworth/WHO/EOP
Karin Kullman/OPD/EOP
Scott R. Hynes/OVP @ OVP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: David R Thomas (CN=David R Thomas/O=OVP [UNKNOWN])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 13:26:18.00

SUBJECT: Note to Congressman Rangel

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

I am going to forward a copy of the Vice President's remarks at the National Drug Control Strategy event to Congressman Rangel. Please review the cover note below and let me know if it is OK with you.

February 9, 1999

The Honorable Charles Rangel
United States House of Representatives
2354 Rayburn House Office Building
Washington, DC 20501

Dear Charlie:

I have enclosed a copy of my remarks from yesterday's Nation Drug Control Strategy event at the White House. Many thanks for all of your assistance with the event, and for your continued commitment to fighting our Nation's drug problems. I look forward to working with you on this (and many other) issues this year.

Sincerely,

Al Gore

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 13:27:59.00

SUBJECT: Pay Equity Pre-Brief

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

do you want to handle this exclusively or do you want to talk to me
beforehand????

----- Forwarded by Sally Katzen/OPD/EOP on 02/09/99 01:28
PM -----

Dawn L. Smalls

02/09/99 11:25:49 AM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP, Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP

Subject: Pay Equity Pre-Brief

The pre-brief for the pay equity meeting will be held directly before the
meeting at 11:15am. The meeting time has been moved to 11:45 am. Both
will take place in John's office. Pls call me at 6-4514 with any
questions. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Dawn L. Smalls/WHO/EOP on 02/09/99
10:22 AM -----

Dawn L. Smalls

02/08/99 06:10:59 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP, Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP

Subject: Pay Equity Mtg.

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.

Message Sent

To:

Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP

Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP

Sally Katzen/OPD/EOP

Shannon Mason/OPD/EOP

Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP

Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP
Jennifer M. Luray/WHO/EOP

Message Sent

To:

Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Sally Katzen/OPD/EOP
Shannon Mason/OPD/EOP
Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP
Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP
Jennifer M. Luray/WHO/EOP
Ruby Shamir/WHO/EOP

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 13:48:34.00

SUBJECT: response to HHS's argument about Medicaid

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

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Devorah R. Adler (CN=Devorah R. Adler/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

CC: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

From Chris as well:

HHS argues that a decision about state action in Medicare is not applicable to Medicaid because Medicare beneficiaries can always return to fee-for-service, while Medicaid beneficiaries cannot. (Note: Under the BBA, by 2001, beneficiaries will be locked into managed care plans for nine months from when they join the plan).

Medicaid is not that different from Medicare -- millions of Medicaid beneficiaries have a choice of managed care or fee-for-service.

- Only 2 states have 100 percent of beneficiaries in managed care (Tennessee and Washington). States need 1115 waivers to require Medicare-Medicaid dual eligibles and children with special needs to join Medicaid managed care plans. In 10 states, less than 25 percent of beneficiaries are enrolled in managed care.

- Half (25) of states do not enroll any elderly or disabled Medicaid beneficiaries in managed care. This, plus the choice of fee-for-service for some adults and children account for the fact that 50 percent of Medicaid beneficiaries are not enrolled in managed care.

Absurd to make the case based on whether a beneficiary chooses managed care. In Medicaid, some children with special needs can choose but cannot be forced to enroll in managed care -- while healthy children may be required to enroll. Under HHS's logic, it would be alright to have no private right of action for the sick child whose parents chose managed care but not alright to take away the right of action from the healthy child.

Some Medicare-Medicaid dual eligibles are enrolled in managed care. For some elderly and people with disabilities, Medicare covers their basic health services and Medicaid pays for prescription drugs, Medicare cost sharing, etc. In this situation, the managed care plan could be sued as a state actor in Medicaid but not in Medicare.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 13:50:14.00

SUBJECT:

TO: ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN (ELENA (Pager) #KAGAN [UNKNOWN])

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

emailed you response to hhs's medicaid argument

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Sally Katzen (CN=Sally Katzen/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 14:07:58.00

SUBJECT: Re: Pay Equity Pre-Brief

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

thanks - i'd like to join for both.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Lisa M. Jones (CN=Lisa M. Jones/OU=OMB/O=EOP [OMB])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 14:09:48.00

SUBJECT: Headsup Memo

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

TO: Janet L. Yellen (CN=Janet L. Yellen/OU=CEA/O=EOP@EOP [CEA])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TO: Elena Kagan (CN=Elena Kagan/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: Mary E. Cahill (CN=Mary E. Cahill/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/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: Maria Echaveste (CN=Maria Echaveste/OU=WHO/O=EOP@EOP [WHO])

READ: UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The memo below was signed on February 9 by Sylvia Mathews and Don Arbuckle.

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN PODESTA

THROUGH: Sylvia Mathews

FROM: Don Arbuckle

SUBJECT: SSA Substantial Gainful Activity Proposed Regulation

Later this week (Thursday or Friday), the Vice President is planning to announce an increase in the Social Security Administration's Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) guidelines. SGA guidelines indicate the amount a disabled individual can earn and still be eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Disability Insurance (DI) benefits. SSA is planning to publish a proposed rule in time for the event, which would raise the SGA level from \$500 to \$700 per month.

The increased SGA level will be strongly favored by disability groups. We do not anticipate any opposition.

There are several good reasons to increase the SGA level at this time. The SGA level has not been updated since 1990. The proposed increase will roughly account for the increase in wage growth since 1990. The increase in SGA is a way to encourage work among people with disabilities.

SSA estimates that this change will affect 42,000 people and will cost \$1.2 billion over five years (SSI, DI, Medicaid, and Medicare). SSA is planning for the change to take effect June 1, 1999. The increase has been included in the President's Budget and will be paid for through increasing the number of eligibility redeterminations of recipients and through a change in the regulations.

OMB has been working with the DPC and NEC on this issue. Please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

cc: Maria Echaveste
Doug Sosnik
Larry Stein
Ron Klain
Thurgood Marshall, Jr.
Ann Lewis
Sally Katzen
Minyon Moore
Mary Beth Cahill
Bruce Reed
Gene Sperling
Paul Begala
Elena Kagan
Barry Toiv
Michael Waldman
Janet Yellen
Mickey Ibarra

February 9, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN PODESTA

THROUGH: Sylvia Mathews
FROM: Don Arbuckle
SUBJECT: SSA Substantial Gainful Activity Proposed Regulation

Later this week (Thursday or Friday), the Vice President is planning to announce an increase in the Social Security Administration's Substantial Gainful Activity (SGA) guidelines. SGA guidelines indicate the amount a disabled individual can earn and still be eligible for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) or Disability Insurance (DI) benefits. SSA is planning to publish a proposed rule in time for the event, which would raise the SGA level from \$500 to \$700 per month.

The increased SGA level will be strongly favored by disability groups. We do not anticipate any opposition.

There are several good reasons to increase the SGA level at this time. The SGA level has not been updated since 1990. The proposed increase will roughly account for the increase in wage growth since 1990. The increase in SGA is a way to encourage work among people with disabilities.

SSA estimates that this change will affect 42,000 people and will cost \$1.2 billion over five years (SSI, DI, Medicaid, and Medicare). SSA is planning for the change to take effect June 1, 1999. The increase has been included in the President's Budget and will be paid for through increasing the number of eligibility redeterminations of recipients and through a change in the regulations.

OMB has been working with the DPC and NEC on this issue. Please let us know if you have any questions or comments.

cc: Maria Echaveste
Doug Sosnik
Larry Stein
Ron Klain
Thurgood Marshall, Jr.
Ann Lewis

Sally Katzen
Minyon Moore

Automated Records Management System
Hex-Dump Conversion

Mary Beth Cahill
Bruce Reed
Gene Sperling
Paul Begala
Elena Kagan
Barry Toiv
Michael Waldman
Janet Yellen
Mickey Ibarra
Barbara Chow

**PRESIDENT CLINTON:
EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR NATIONAL SERVICE
2/9 DRAFT**

Today, at the University of Maryland, College Park, President Clinton called on Congress to expand the yearly participation level in AmeriCorps to 100,000 members by 2002. He also kicked-off AmeriCorps' largest national recruitment campaign to challenge young people to provide service to their communities.

AMERICORPS EXPANSION. When he came into office in 1993, President Clinton outlined a vision for a national service program that linked responsibility to opportunity by allowing young people to serve our nation while earning funds for a college education. The result of that vision is AmeriCorps, which is bringing people of different racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds together to solve community problems and improve the lives of Americans. AmeriCorps members give children the tools they need to succeed, including teaching them how to read, organizing quality after-school programs, mentoring students and they also strengthen communities by making schools and streets safer, building affordable housing, and mobilizing community volunteers.

The President seeks to build on this success by creating more opportunities for Americans to serve through AmeriCorps. President Clinton's budget proposes to expand AmeriCorps to nearly 70,000 members by the year 2000, with the goal of reaching 100,000 members serving each year by 2002. This expansion will also allow high school juniors and seniors to serve in AmeriCorps during the summers in exchange for college education awards. The FY 2000 budget request includes \$585 million for AmeriCorps, an increase of \$113 million over last year.

A CALL TO SERVICE CAMPAIGN. President Clinton announced the launch of the AmeriCorps Call To Service campaign, the largest-ever national recruitment drive for AmeriCorps. The President challenged all Americans, especially young people, to get involved in service. The Call to Service campaign will provide young people with information on how they can serve in AmeriCorps to help strengthen local communities. The campaign includes a new television public service announcement produced by MTV, print advertisements, campus visits and other local recruitment efforts.

A PROVEN RECORD OF SUCCESS. In just four years, over 100,000 young people have joined AmeriCorps to serve more than 4,000 communities. AmeriCorps provides needed human resources to schools churches, community groups and nonprofits, including Habitat for Humanity, Big Brother/Big Sister and the American Red Cross. A recent evaluation confirms that AmeriCorps strengthens communities in many ways: building leadership, citizenship, and other important skills; and making community organizations more effective. Since 1994, AmeriCorps members have served more than 32 million people, mobilized nearly 2 million volunteers, taught, tutored or mentored more than 2 million children, organized after-school programs for more than a half million at-risk youth, helped more than 200,000 senior citizens live independently and built or rehabilitated more than 25,000 homes. After a year of full-time service, AmeriCorps members receive education awards to help finance college or pay

back student loans.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Tanya E. Martin (CN=Tanya E. Martin/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 15:06:58.00

SUBJECT: AmeriCorps speech draft

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

----- Forwarded by Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP on 02/09/99
03:04 PM -----

June Shih

02/09/99 02:03:40 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Tanya E. Martin/OPD/EOP, Shirley S. Sagawa/WHO/EOP

cc:

Subject: comments?

2/9/99

Shih

PRESIDENT WILLIAM J. CLINTON

REMARKS FOR AMERICORPS, CALL TO SERVICE

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND

COLLEGE PARK, MD

FEBRUARY 10, 1999

Acknowledge:

For the past six years, I have said that AmeriCorps is one of my proudest achievements as President. Derek, T.J., Leslie, Justin, Pepe, you,ve just shown us all why. You make America proud. You and your fellow AmeriCorps members here and across the country -- are the reasons why America is stronger than ever.

Today I want to talk to everyone here, those who are in AmeriCorps and those who are still thinking about it -- about why it is important to give more Americans the chance to serve through AmeriCorps.

I want you to remember what it was like when I first proposed AmeriCorps more than seven years ago. Many of you were still in high school -- or even elementary school. Back then, if you watched the news, or read the paper, or listened closely to the talk at the dinner table, you could tell that it was a time of doubt for America. Our economy was troubled, our deficit high, our people divided. Too many neighborhoods were falling prey to drugs and crime. Too many children were growing up without parents, without hope. Some wondered whether America,s best days were already behind us. A book called America, What Went Wrong? was at the top of the bestseller lists.

But I was confident that the heart and spirit of America were still strong. Today, we,ve earned the right to write a new bestseller,

□&America, What Went Right!□8 We are living in the longest peacetime economic expansion in American history. We have nearly 18 million new jobs. We have the lowest peacetime unemployment remained since 1957 -- when your parents were kids or teenagers. Wages are rising at more than twice the rate of inflation. Crime has fallen six years in a row. Our welfare rolls are shrinking. More people live in homes they call their own. We have opened the doors of college to all Americans -- making student loans more affordable, expanding Pell Grants, creating new Hope Scholarships and other tax deductions.

On my first day in office -- on the steps of the United States Capitol -- I said that □&there is nothing wrong with America that cannot be cured with what is right with America.□8 And what was right with America then, what is right with America now, is this: Our ethic of citizen service. For more than 200 years, we the American people have always believed in every citizen□,s duty to give something back to our communities and to each other.

But over the past few decades, two competing visions of government stifled this ethic of service. On one side were those who believed that if there was problem, the best approach was to set up a bureaucracy to solve it. On the other side, there were people who said that government was the cause of all our problems -- and that the only way to solve them was by citizens acting independently, and only in their own interests.

I believed we needed to move beyond these two visions of □&something for nothing□8 and □&everyone for himself□8 to a new ethic of □&mutual obligation.□8 Everyone -- government, the private sector, and most importantly, every citizen, had to take responsibility and move America forward. We needed to restore the spirit of service to America, to make citizen service once again the experience and expectation of every American.

And I believed that if we were going to rekindle the spirit of service, we had to start with you, our young people. Throughout this century, America has always found a way to bring the energy and idealism of young people to the task of meeting each generation□,s greatest challenges. During the Great Depression, President Roosevelt started the Civilian Conservation Corps, and gave young people the chance to work together and earn money clearing trails, fighting fires, planting trees in our forests and range lands. They left behind a legacy of national and state parks that we all enjoy to this day -- Appalachian Trail, Skyline Drive in Virginia.

In the □+60s, President Kennedy asked young people to serve America by serving in the Peace Corps -- teaching English, providing health care, bringing running water and electricity to some of the most remote villages of Africa, Asia and South America. Many of my generation who served in the Peace Corps came home with a greater sense of their duty to their communities. Like Harris Wofford, like my HHS Sec. Donna Shalala, they went on to become today□,s leaders.

I fought to create AmeriCorps in the same spirit of the Peace Corps and the CCC -- to give your generation a new chance to serve America and tackle the challenges of our time, to earn money for college, and even, to gain the skills and inspiration to become the new leaders of the 21st Century.

Now six years later, AmeriCorps is thriving. I travel around the

country often --- and everywhere I go, AmeriCorps members are hard at work. Just last month, I met dozens of AmeriCorps members who were working with the Red Cross and other organizations to help the families of my home state of Arkansas rebuild in the wake of tornadoes.

I ask the people who are not in AmeriCorps to seek out the AmeriCorps members and ask them share their experiences. Like Justin, T.J., Derek, Leslie, and Pepe, they've got powerful stories to tell: What it's like to hear the pride in a student's voice when after months of tutoring she can finally point to a book and say "I can read it myself" ... or to see the delight in a child's eyes as he climbs around on a playground AmeriCorps helped reclaim from drug dealers.

As a boy, I went to an all-white school. I did not get to know many children of different races. That was the law back then. But even now, too often, we still don't get to know people who are different. AmeriCorps can help us knock down the walls that still divide us. By working side-by-side with fellow AmeriCorps members from all walks of life, you learn that we all have much more in common than we thought; that what matters most is not the color of your skin, but your ability to get things done -- to hammer a nail, to teach a child to spell, to extend a helping hand.

Now, we must give more of our young people the same opportunity -- to serve and learn about America through AmeriCorps. That is why I challenge you -- today's generation of young people -- to answer a new Call to Service. Throughout this year, I will be working with Harris, the First Lady, and my entire administration to recruit more and more young people to make a difference through AmeriCorps. This fall, we can boost the number of AmeriCorps members by one quarter to 50,000 members. And in my new balanced budget, I plan to keep expanding AmeriCorps every year so that by the year 2003, 100,000 young people will be serving at any given time.

So I challenge all of you young people sign up for AmeriCorps. I challenge you to see for yourselves what America's real problems are: what keeps a child from learning to read or growing healthy or staying on the right side of the law. Find out for yourselves what works and doesn't work in solving these problems. And share them with your fellow Americans.

I challenge the high schoolers in this audience to begin serving their communities now. Service can be lifelong habit. In my balanced budget, I am propose to allow high schoolers to join AmeriCorps -- by serving part time during the school year and full time in the summers.

I challenge you to dedicate a year or two of your lives to a cause that's larger than yourselves. You may be tired of old people like me reminding you that you are living the most exciting times of your lives. With more tomorrows ahead of you than behind you, so many of you have the time, the freedom, the energy to tackle the work of AmeriCorps -- packing your bag at a moment's notice to go fight a forest fire, or moving into some of our most remote towns and Indian Reservations to teach children.

I challenge you to prove that your generation has not become a generation of cynics and slackers, but a generation of patriots and doers.

Have faith in your own power to change the world. When I was a student in college, Robert F. Kennedy inspired so many of my generation to

follow our highest ideals. He told us that "each time a man stands up for an ideal, or acts to improve the lot of others, or strikes out against injustice, he sends forth a tiny ripple of hope, and crossing each other from a million different centers of energy and daring, those ripples build a current that can sweep down the mightiest walls of oppression and resistance."

His words are still true today. Whether or not you work through AmeriCorps, I ask you to send forth those ripples of hope. Together we can build a mighty current that will carry us past our challenges into the brighter future we all hope to live in.

February 9, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE CHIEF OF STAFF

FROM: BRUCE REED
LARRY STEIN

SUBJECT: Meeting with Senator Harkin and Pay Equity Advocates

The President and Vice-President have spoken out in favor of equal pay and supported Senator Daschle's Paycheck Fairness Act which strengthens the remedies available to women under the Equal Pay Act. The Administration has not supported Senator Harkin's bill which provides for comparable worth, a more controversial method that requires companies to equalize wages between "equivalent" jobs. You will be meeting with Senator Harkin and representatives of groups who favor comparable worth and will likely encourage the Administration to endorse the concept of comparable worth. As a fall back, the groups will push for strengthening of the Daschle bill and may seek reinsertion of a provision on pay disclosure that was dropped out last year at the Administration's request. This memorandum provides background on the Administration's strategy on the equal pay issue, compares Daschle and Harkin's bills giving the legislative outlook for each bill, and offers some options and recommendations.

I. Background

The last major piece of equal pay legislation, the Equal Pay Act signed by President Kennedy, became law more than 35 years ago. Since that time, the debate over how to diminish the pay gap between men and women has frequently declined into disputes over how large the gap actually is, what its causes are, and whether comparable worth is a desirable policy. In the last few years, the Administration has gained strong public support by taking steps to further equal pay, while not endorsing comparable worth. Among the actions the Administration has announced in the last two years: endorsement of the Daschle bill (see below); a \$14 million equal pay initiative in the FY 2000 budget for the EEOC and the DOL's Office of Federal Contractor Compliance (OFCCP); publication of a CEA report that shows a significant wage gap between male and female workers; commitments by federal agencies to conduct self-audits; and the creation of an annual report on pay differences to be published by DOL. The President and Vice-President have held a variety of events to announce these steps and raise

public awareness of the issue, including mentioning equal pay in the State of the Union, conducting a radio address on the topic this year, and hosting two events last year.

II. The Daschle Bill

The Administration has endorsed “The Paycheck Fairness Act,” introduced by Senator Daschle and Congresswoman DeLauro, to strengthen laws prohibiting wage discrimination. The measure is included this year as a one of the Democratic Leadership Initiatives. Key aspects of the bill include:

- **Increased Penalties.** The legislation would provide full compensatory and punitive damages as remedies for equal pay violations, in addition to the liquidated damages and back pay awards currently available under the Equal Pay Act.
- **Non-retaliation provision.** The bill would prohibit employers from punishing employees for sharing salary information with their co-workers. Without the ability to learn about wage disparities, it is difficult for employees to evaluate whether there is wage discrimination.
- **Training, Research, and Pay Equity Award.** The bill would provide for increased training for EEOC staff; more research on discrimination in the payment of wages; and would establish an award to promote employers who have worked to eliminate pay disparities.

III. Harkin’s Bill

Last year, Senator Harkin introduced a comparable worth bill called the “Fair Pay Act of 1997.” (It doesn’t appear that he has reintroduced the bill this year.) The highlights of this legislation include:

- **Comparable Worth.** Harkin’s bill amends the Fair Labor Standards Act to prohibit the paying of unequal wages for work on “equivalent jobs” in occupations dominated by employees of different sex, race, or national origins. The legislation defines “equivalent jobs” as “jobs that may be dissimilar, but whose requirements are equivalent, when viewed as a composite of skills, effort, responsibility, and working conditions.” It exempts from this provision wage differences on the basis of seniority, a merit system, or a quality/quantity system.

- **Data Collection.** The bill requires employers to submit wage data to the EEOC. Employers must submit data not only with respect to job category but also with respect to sex, race, and national origin. Furthermore, the EEOC is authorized to publish this data and may provide specific employer's reports to the public. This provision also is very controversial. Senator Daschle's bill had originally contained a requirement for greater collection of wage data, but the Administration felt this would draw a great deal of fire from Republicans and the business community and it was replaced with Sense of the Senate language that the President should increase the amount of information available on wage disparities.
- **Non-Retaliation Provision.** Harkin's bill also contains a non-retaliation provision and a provision to permit the awarding of expert fees.
- **Education, Training, and Technical Assistance.** The bill also provides for research, education, and technical assistance.

IV. Legislative Outlook

Senator Daschle's bill has 20 cosponsors currently (Sen. Harkin has yet to cosponsor, although he has in the past). On the House side, Congresswoman DeLauro's bill, H. R. 541, has 34 cosponsors. Both of these bills are part of the "Democratic Leadership" package of bills. Senator Harkin's bill had 8 cosponsors in the last Congress, while the House version garnered 64 cosponsors. (By contrast, last Congress, Senator Daschle brought 23 Democrats on board, while Congresswoman DeLauro's bill had 95.) The Harkin-Norton bill is unlikely to attract more cosponsors because of lack of support from the leadership, lack of strong lobbying efforts by interest groups, and its controversial nature. The Daschle-DeLauro represents the bill with the greatest ability to move, to draw some bipartisan support, and to have some chance of passage.

As a political matter, the Daschle bill offers Democrats the ability to raise the issue on the floor, highlight our commitment to the issue, and spotlight differences between supporters and opponents. If the bill fails to pass, the vote would give members a record of fighting the wage gap and demonstrate that on a moderate bill where there is a national consensus, opponents of equal pay denied passage. Whether the bill passes or not, the attention such a fight would receive would focus attention on the problem and broaden the constituency for further measures, including, possibly, for Senator Harkin's bill. In contrast, endorsement of the Harkin bill at this time would likely drive members away from the issue altogether in fear that they will be tarred as supporting government wage-setting and radical interference in the labor market.

It is also clear that without a commitment from the interest groups,

members, and the Administration to work together on legislation, we will lose the opportunity to raise the profile of this issue in any fashion. It is worth remembering that, while many Democrats espoused the principle of fair pay for women and participated in numerous events, no one tried to raise the issue on the floor. Without consensus support for our legislative and outreach strategy, the issue will be a victim of in-fighting and fall off the political radar screen.

V. Options & Recommendation

By backing Senator Daschle's bill as a first step, the Administration has gained an excellent position from which to lead a national debate on the wage gap and advocate for policies that will lead to more fairness in the workplace. In contrast, endorsing comparable worth at this point would likely breakdown the chance to build momentum on the issue, and spark only a debate over big government interference with the market and wage-setting. Indeed, just last week a Wall Street Journal op-ed attempted to attack the Daschle bill on the grounds that it promoted comparable worth, while giving only partial attention to the existence of a wage gap -- a shift in focus that would be greatly accelerated by Administration support for Harkin's bill. We believe that the Administration should keep opponents of equal pay on the griddle by keeping the nation's attention focused on the existence of the wage gap and the common-sense first steps we all should be able to agree to in attacking it.

We suggest two other points that may be useful for the discussion. First, the Administration's approach has been successful in advancing the ball and keeping momentum in favor of the issue. For example, in addition to endorsing the Daschle bill, the Administration has:

- Supported a \$14 million equal pay initiative in the FY 2000 budget for the EEOC and the DOL's Office of Federal Contractor Compliance (OFCCP);
- Issued a CEA report that shows a significant wage gap between male and female workers;
- Committed federal agencies to conduct self-audits, and the creation of an annual report on pay differences to be published by DOL starting this year;
- Discussed equal pay in the State of the Union, conducted a presidential radio address on the topic this year, and hosted two events last year.

Second, to demonstrate that we remain committed to the fight to erase pay disparities, you may want to suggest some intermediary steps the Administration could consider, short of endorsing Harkin. While it would be a stretch to support

comparable worth, perhaps we could look more closely at increasing disclosure by employers; encouraging, through a voluntary program, employers' attempts to remedy pay disparities (this would be an expansion of a provision already in the Daschle bill); and, strengthening the Daschle bill. The last option is already being considered by Senator Daschle's office and the groups have submitted recommended changes to the bill. We should agree that we will continue working with the groups in finding ways to make the Daschle bill more attractive to them.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 15:28:40.00

SUBJECT: Americas Promise

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

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

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

TEXT:

FYI.

----- Forwarded by Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP on 02/09/99
03:28 PM -----

Thurgood Marshall Jr

02/09/99 02:55:09 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP, Ann F. Lewis/WHO/EOP, Thomas L.
Freedman/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: Americas Promise

----- Forwarded by Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP on
02/09/99 02:55 PM -----

Jon P. Jennings

02/09/99 12:26:10 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Thurgood Marshall Jr/WHO/EOP, Anne E. McGuire/WHO/EOP

cc: Maya Seiden/WHO/EOP

Subject: Americas Promise

Paige Cassidy called me to request a meeting soon to discuss the two year anniversary of the Service Summit. She said General Powell is very anxious about this and would like to do the meeting soon. Please let me know when you are available for a meeting. Thanks

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Jeanne Lambrew (CN=Jeanne Lambrew/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 15:45:08.00

SUBJECT: Medicare fraud news

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

Chris may have already let you know about this, but just in case:

HHS Office of Inspector General press conference on Medicare fraud. On Tuesday, the independent, OIG held a press conference to announce its annual report on improper Medicare payments. (we just learned of it today). It found:

Error rate down by 35 percent from last year, 50 percent from 1996. In FY 1997, the OIG estimated that Medicare made \$20 billion on improper payments; in 1998, this amount was reduced to \$12.6 billion. This improvement was attributed to improved program oversight and enforcement and greater provider compliance.

"Examples of improper payments include a community mental health center that was paid \$21,421 for services later determined by medical reviewers to be medically unnecessary. In another case, a skilled nursing facility billed Medicare \$10,428 for a 51-day skilled-nursing stay by an elderly patient. Because medical records showed that the patient received only maintenance-level, nonskilled care, the payment was denied. In a third case, a physician billed Medicare \$871 for 40 hospital visits. The medical records, however, supported only 18 visits. In each of these instances, and in all other cases where improper payments were specifically identified, action was taken to deny the claim and to recover the overpayment."

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Dan Marcus (CN=Dan Marcus/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 15:36:50.00

SUBJECT: Grijalva -- stripped-down cert -petition

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

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TEXT:
draft is being brought around to you

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Anne Whitworth (CN=Anne Whitworth/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 15:43:33.00

SUBJECT: Message Meeting . . .

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

TO: Thurgood Marshall Jr (CN=Thurgood Marshall Jr/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

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

TO: Michael Waldman (CN=Michael Waldman/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: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Nancy V. Hernreich (CN=Nancy V. Hernreich/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

TO: Patricia Solis-Doyle (CN=Patricia Solis-Doyle/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

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

READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

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

TO: Douglas B. Sosnik (CN=Douglas B. Sosnik/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

There will be a Message Meeting tommorrow at 11:30 am. Location TBD.
Please let me know if you can attend. Thanks, annie in Stephanie Streett's
Office.

**PRESIDENT CLINTON:
EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR NATIONAL SERVICE
2/9 DRAFT**

Today, at the University of Maryland, College Park, President Clinton called on Congress to expand the yearly participation level in AmeriCorps to 100,000 members by 2002. He also kicked-off AmeriCorps' largest national recruitment campaign to challenge young people to provide service to their communities.

EXPANDING AMERICORPS TO GIVE MORE AMERICANS A CHANCE TO SERVE. When he came into office in 1993, President Clinton outlined a vision for a national service program that linked responsibility to opportunity by allowing young people to serve our nation while earning funds for a college education. The result of that vision is AmeriCorps, which is bringing people of different racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds together to solve community problems and improve the lives of Americans. In the four years since its launch, over 100,000 AmeriCorps members have served to give children the tools they need to succeed, including teaching them how to read, organizing quality after-school programs, mentoring students and to strengthen communities by making schools and streets safer, building affordable housing, and mobilizing community volunteers.

The President seeks to build on this success by creating more opportunities for Americans to serve through AmeriCorps. President Clinton's budget proposes to expand AmeriCorps to nearly 70,000 members by the year 2000, with the goal of reaching 100,000 members serving each year by 2002. This expansion will also allow high school students to join AmeriCorps-- by serving part-time during the school year and full-time during the summer. The FY 2000 budget request includes \$585 million for AmeriCorps, an increase of \$113 million over last year.

A CALL TO SERVICE CAMPAIGN. President Clinton announced the launch of the AmeriCorps Call To Service campaign, the largest-ever national recruitment drive for AmeriCorps. The President challenged all Americans, especially young people, to get involved in service. The Call to Service campaign will provide young people with information on how they can serve in AmeriCorps to help strengthen local communities. The campaign includes a new television public service announcement produced by MTV, print advertisements, campus visits and other local recruitment efforts.

A PROVEN RECORD OF SUCCESS. In just four years, over 100,000 young people have joined AmeriCorps to serve more than 4,000 communities. AmeriCorps provides needed human resources to schools churches, community groups and nonprofit organizations, including Habitat for Humanity, Big Brother/Big Sister and the American Red Cross. A recent evaluation confirms that AmeriCorps strengthens communities in many ways: building leadership, citizenship, and other important skills; and making community organizations more effective. Since 1994, AmeriCorps members have served more than 32 million people, mobilized nearly 2 million volunteers, taught, tutored or mentored more than 2 million children, organized after-school programs for more than a half million at-risk youth, helped more than 200,000 senior citizens live independently and built or rehabilitated more than 25,000 homes.

After a year of full-time service, AmeriCorps members receive education awards to help finance college or pay back student loans.

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
002. email	Neera Tanden to Christopher Jennings et al. re: First Lady's office views on Medicare issue [partial] (1 page)	02/09/1999	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Kagan])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1999]

2009-1006-F
bm92

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Neera Tanden (CN=Neera Tanden/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 16:11:18.00

SUBJECT: First Lady's office views on Medicare issue

TO: Christopher C. Jennings (CN=Christopher C. Jennings/OU=OPD/O=EOP @ EOP [OPD])
READ:UNKNOWN

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

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

TEXT:

I talked to Melanne and she said she is going to try to talk to the First Lady in the next few hours P6(b)(6) and if we do get an answer, it is not likely to be before 6pm. However, Melanne did want to convey her own view which is that she supports either option 2 or 3. If option 2 is not possible or not really workable, then she believes we should not file.

[002]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

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

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 16:44:03.00

SUBJECT: Pay Equity Mtg. CANCELLED

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: Ruby Shamir (CN=Ruby Shamir/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:

Sen. Harkin is unable to do the meeting because the Senate is starting deliberations at 10:00 on Wednesday. The Meeting will be rescheduled after the Senate recess.

----- Forwarded by Dawn L. Smalls/WHO/EOP on 02/09/99
03:40 PM -----

Dawn L. Smalls
02/09/99 11:25:49 AM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP, Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Subject: Pay Equity Pre-Brief

The pre-brief for the pay equity meeting will be held directly before the meeting at 11:15am. The meeting time has been moved to 11:45 am. Both will take place in John's office. Pls call me at 6-4514 with any questions. Thanks.

----- Forwarded by Dawn L. Smalls/WHO/EOP on 02/09/99
10:22 AM -----

Dawn L. Smalls
02/08/99 06:10:59 PM
Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message
cc: Sara M. Latham/WHO/EOP, Kevin S. Moran/WHO/EOP
Subject: Pay Equity Mtg.

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.

Message Sent

To: _____
Elena Kagan/OPD/EOP
Laura Emmett/WHO/EOP
Sally Katzen/OPD/EOP
Shannon Mason/OPD/EOP
Caroline R. Fredrickson/WHO/EOP
Thomas L. Freedman/OPD/EOP
Mary L. Smith/OPD/EOP
Carolyn T. Wu/WHO/EOP
Karen Tramontano/WHO/EOP
Jennifer M. Luray/WHO/EOP

Withdrawal/Redaction Marker

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
003. email	Thomas Freedman to Elena Kagan and Bruce Reed re: opposition [partial] (1 page)	02/09/1999	P6/b(6)

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Automated Records Management System [Email]
OPD ([Kagan])
OA/Box Number: 250000

FOLDER TITLE:

[02/09/1999]

2009-1006-F
bm92

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.
PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).
RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 17:11:09.00

SUBJECT: P6/(b)(6)

[003]

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

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

TEXT:

My opposition to endorsing Harkin's bill has now evidently earned me a new title.

**PRESIDENT CLINTON:
EXPANDING OPPORTUNITIES FOR NATIONAL SERVICE
2/9 DRAFT**

Today, at the University of Maryland, College Park, President Clinton called on Congress to expand the yearly participation level in AmeriCorps to 100,000 members by 2002. He also kicked-off AmeriCorps' largest national recruitment campaign to challenge young people to provide service to their communities.

EXPANDING AMERICORPS TO GIVE MORE AMERICANS A CHANCE TO SERVE. When he came into office in 1993, President Clinton outlined a vision for a national service program that linked responsibility to opportunity by allowing young people to serve our nation while earning funds for a college education: The result of that vision is AmeriCorps, which is bringing people of different racial, ethnic and economic backgrounds together to solve community problems and improve the lives of Americans. In the four years since its launch, over 100,000 AmeriCorps members have risen to the challenge. They have tutored children in school and after school, organized block watches and book drives, renovated housing for low-income families, and recruited people in the neighborhood to volunteer alongside them.

The President seeks to build on this success by creating more opportunities for Americans to serve through AmeriCorps. President Clinton's budget proposes to expand AmeriCorps to nearly 70,000 members by the year 2000, with the goal of reaching 100,000 members serving each year by 2002. This expansion will also allow high school students to join AmeriCorps-- by serving part-time during the school year and full-time during the summer. The FY 2000 budget request includes \$585 million for AmeriCorps, an increase of \$113 million over last year.

A CALL TO SERVICE CAMPAIGN. President Clinton announced the launch of the AmeriCorps Call To Service campaign, the largest-ever national recruitment drive for AmeriCorps. The President challenged all Americans, especially young people, to get involved in service. The Call to Service campaign will provide young people with information on how they can serve in AmeriCorps to help strengthen local communities. The campaign includes a new television public service announcement produced by MTV, print advertisements, campus visits and other local recruitment efforts.

A PROVEN RECORD OF SUCCESS. In just four years, over 100,000 young people have joined AmeriCorps to serve more than 4,000 communities. AmeriCorps provides needed human resources to schools churches, community groups and nonprofit organizations, including Habitat for Humanity, Big Brother/Big Sister and the American Red Cross. A recent evaluation confirms that AmeriCorps strengthens communities in many ways: building leadership, citizenship, and other important skills; and making community organizations more effective. Since 1994, AmeriCorps members have served more than 32 million people, mobilized nearly 2 million volunteers, taught, tutored or mentored more than 2 million children, organized after-school programs for more than a half million at-risk youth, helped more than 200,000 senior citizens live independently and built or rehabilitated more than 25,000 homes.

After a year of full-time service, AmeriCorps members receive education awards to help finance college or pay back student loans.

AmeriCorps' Call To Service Campaign Event
Q&A -- Internal Use Only
2/10/98

AmeriCorps Expansion

What is the President proposing in his budget for the expansion of AmeriCorps?

President Clinton has called for a major expansion of AmeriCorps in his FY 2000 budget, giving thousands more Americans the chance to serve their country and help meet pressing social needs.

The budget proposes \$585 million for AmeriCorps, an increase of \$113 million over last year. This level would support 69,000 AmeriCorps members next year, growing to reach 100,000 members per year by 2002. This expansion would include participation in AmeriCorps by high school students serving full-time in the summer and part-time during the school year. The proposal builds on growing bipartisan support for AmeriCorps: Congress has increased AmeriCorps funding two years in a row, by \$49 million in fiscal 1998 and \$18 million last year.

AmeriCorps and Military Recruitment

The New York Times reports that the military is having significant problems meeting its recruiting requirement. Will the AmeriCorps' recruitment effort worsen this problem?

The President is committed to strengthening opportunities for young people to engage in service to this country -- be it through the military, AmeriCorps, the Peace Corps or any of the other national service programs. The Department of Defense examined this question and concluded in its 1998 Annual Defense Report: "The Department has looked at the potential impact of National Service on military recruiting, and believes that both programs can coexist successfully."

Do the military and AmeriCorps coordinate their respective recruiting efforts?

The Corporation for National Service and the Defense Department share information and coordinate efforts where it makes sense to do so. For example, the Defense Department shares information about AmeriCorps with applicants who may not meet the unique physical requirements for military service. In addition, the Corporation provides the military with access to its career nights and outreach events so that AmeriCorps members have a full appreciation of the military career choices available to them.

How do AmeriCorps' financial benefits compare with the military's financial benefits?

Because each organization has particular needs, the benefits are different and they are generally set by law or regulations. During a term of service, military pay is generally higher than the average living allowance afforded to national service participants. Moreover, most national service programs are not residential so members are responsible for their own food and housing. The post-service educational benefit for a national service participant is set by law at \$4,725 for a full year of service, with a maximum of two awards. The Department of the Army recently

announced an increase in its maximum college tuition benefit to \$50,000.

AmeriCorps Program

What do AmeriCorps members do?

AmeriCorps, the domestic Peace Corps, gives citizens the opportunity to engage in full-time service to their community. Working through a grassroots network of more than 1,000 national and local non-profit and faith-based organizations, AmeriCorps members help build stronger communities. In four years, AmeriCorps members have taught, tutored or mentored more than 2 million youth; organized after-school programs for more than 500,000 at-risk youth; established 4,000 safety patrols; built or rehabilitated more than 25,000 homes; planted more than 52 million trees; arranged immunizations for nearly half-million people; and recruited, trained or supervised nearly 2 million volunteers.

Where do AmeriCorps members serve?

Since it was established, AmeriCorps members have served in more than 4,000 communities. AmeriCorps members work with national nonprofits like the American Red Cross, Boys and Girls Club, the YMCA, Teach for America, Habitat for Humanity, and faith-based organizations like Lutheran Social Services, the Catholic Network of Volunteer-Services and the National Council of Churches and with hundreds of smaller community-based organizations.

How many people are part of AmeriCorps?

Since it was launched four years ago, more than 100,000 men and women have served in AmeriCorps. This year alone, more than 40,000 AmeriCorps members are working with more than 600 organizations to serve more than 2,500 communities.

What is the average cost per AmeriCorps member?

The average cost per member is \$16,000. This includes a living allowance, an education award and costs associated with program administration. As part of a bipartisan agreement reached in March 1996, with Senator Grassley, AmeriCorps is cutting costs significantly. The cost of AmeriCorps has been cut by \$1000 per member each year. The Corporation for National Service has already successfully lowered the costs per member to \$16,000 in the current grant year and is on track to cut the cost per member to \$15,000 next year.

February 9, 1999

DATE: February 10, 1999
LOCATION: University of Maryland
Ritchie Coliseum
TIME: 1:50 p.m.
FROM: Thurgood Marshall, Jr.
Bruce Reed
Anne McGuire
Tanya Martin

I. PURPOSE

To kick-off AmeriCorps' first national recruitment campaign and challenge young people to provide service to their communities. You will also call on Congress to expand the yearly participation level in AmeriCorps to 100,000 members by 2002.

II. BACKGROUND

In the four years since AmeriCorps launch, over 100,000 young people have joined to provide mentoring, tutoring, disaster relief, public safety and assistance to senior citizens and the homeless in their communities. Today you will announce that your budget proposes to expand AmeriCorps to nearly 70,000 members by the year 2000, with the goal of to expand the yearly participation level in AmeriCorps to 100,000 members by 2002. The FY 2000 budget request includes \$585 million for AmeriCorps, an increase of \$113 million over last year.

You will also announce the launch of the AmeriCorps Call To Service campaign -- the first-ever national recruitment drive for AmeriCorps. You will challenge all Americans, especially young people, to get involved in service. The Call to Service campaign will provide young people with information on how they can serve in AmeriCorps to help strengthen local communities by tackling the nation's most serious problems, including illiteracy, poverty, health care, and crime. The campaign includes new television public service announcements, print advertisements, campus visits and other local recruitment efforts.

As you already know, in just four years, more than 100,000 AmeriCorps members have served more than 4,000 communities through local and nation programs, including Habitat for Humanity, Big Brother/Big Sister and the American Red Cross. Since 1994, AmeriCorps members have served more than 32 million people, mobilized nearly 2 million volunteers, taught, tutored or mentored more than 2 million children, organized after-school programs for more than a half million at-risk youth, helped more than 200,000 senior citizens live independently and built or rehabilitated more than 25,000 homes.

You will hear from five Americorps members before you speak:

Tara (T.J.) Trimmer is an AmeriCorps member serving with Public Allies, D.C. and Mentors Inc. After a rough childhood that included running with gangs, and doing time in juvenile detention by age 15, T.J. graduated from Eagle Rock, an alternative school for at-risk youth founded by American Honda in Estes Park, Colorado. Last year, T.J. joined AmeriCorps and now serves with Public Allies, D.C., where she recruits adults to serve as mentors to at-risk youth and coordinates activities, providing support for the mentors and their proteges.

Justin Ward joined AmeriCorps in the summer of 1998 after graduating from University of Maryland at College Park. He serves as Volunteer Coordinator for Harford County Habitat for Humanity in Aberdeen. In just five months, Justin has revived the chapter and dramatically increased its productivity, recruiting more than 100 new volunteers who have finished one home and started another.

Leslie Mayo, a second year AmeriCorps member with Montgomery County Police Department's AmeriCorps program, touches the lives of more than 300 persons with mental illness or developmental disabilities everyday. A single mother with twins, Leslie says "My AmeriCorps service has taught me that change begins within and that we all have something to share. AmeriCorps has allowed me to see the difference that I can make."

Susan Carrasco (Pepe) graduated from Creighton University with a degree in chemistry. After working as a chemist with a branch of the Army Corps of Engineers, Susan joined AmeriCorps*NCCC and moved to Washington, DC. Susan now specializes in disaster relief. Last spring she fought forest fires in Florida -- and this fall she led a team of members to Puerto Rico to help relief efforts following Hurricane Georges. Currently Susan's team is serving with the DC Housing Authority to improve public housing.

Stephen Hellinger who will introduce you, serves at Edgecombe Circle Elementary School in Baltimore, where he teaches art and pairs inner-city youth with elderly residents. A refugee from South Vietnam, he was raised in Lancaster, Pa. While in Vietnam, he contracted polio and was told that he would be confined to a wheelchair. He proved the doctors wrong and went on to complete though, and has made service to others a mainstay in his life. Just last week, for example, he assisted a victim of a drive-by shooting outside the elementary school where he serves.

III. PARTICIPANTS

Pre-brief Participants:

Harris Wofford
Thurgood Marshall, Jr.
Anne McGuire
Karen Tramontano
Ann Lewis
Bruce Reed
Tanya Martin
Shirley Sagawa
June Shih

Event Participants:

YOU

Harris Wofford

President U of MD

Governor Glendening

Lt. Governor Kennedy Townsend

Wayne Curry, PG County Executive

Stephen D. Hellinger, AmeriCorps member

Tara (T.J.) Trimmer, AmeriCorps member

Justin Ward, AmeriCorps member

Leslie Mayo, AmeriCorps member

Susan Carrasco (Pepe), AmeriCorps member

IV. PRESS PLAN

Open Press

V. SEQUENCE OF EVENTS

- **YOU** are announced off-stage accompanied by Harris Wofford, Stephen Hellinger, Tara (T.J.) Trimmer, Justin Ward, Leslie Mayo and Susan Carrasco (Pepe).
- Dr. Daniel Mote, President, University of Maryland, makes welcoming remarks and introduces Lieutenant Governor Kathleen Kennedy-Townsend.
- Kathleen Kennedy-Townsend makes brief remarks and introduces Governor Parris Glendening.
- Governor Glendening makes brief remarks.
- Harris Wofford, CEO, AmeriCorps, introduces AmeriCorps Public Service Announcement.
- Harris Wofford makes brief remarks.
- AmeriCorps members Tara (T.J.) Trimmer, Justin Ward, Leslie Mayo, and Susan Carrasco(Pep) each make 30-second remarks.
- Stephen Dellinger, AmeriCorps member makes brief remarks and introduces **YOU**.
- **YOU** make remarks.
- **YOU** work ropeline and depart.

VI. REMARKS

Provided by speech writers.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 17:27:51.00

SUBJECT: Child safety seat news

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

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

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

TEXT:

NHTSA says this Thursday a group is releasing a study showing the high level of incompatibility in child seat hook ups. The group is calling it a national landmark study and says it will get the Today show live. They invited Dr. Martinez, NHTSA head, who is declining. He points out we could get hit for holding this, or at least miss a good opportunity to piggy back the story.

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Barry J. Toiv (CN=Barry J. Toiv/OU=WHO/O=EOP [WHO])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 17:28:00.00

SUBJECT: education

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

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

CC: Nanda Chitre (CN=Nanda Chitre/OU=WHO/O=EOP @ EOP [WHO])
READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:
What are we saying about Republican education plan?

RECORD TYPE: PRESIDENTIAL (NOTES MAIL)

CREATOR: Thomas L. Freedman (CN=Thomas L. Freedman/OU=OPD/O=EOP [OPD])

CREATION DATE/TIME: 9-FEB-1999 18:23:31.00

SUBJECT: Re: sexist pig

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

READ:UNKNOWN

TEXT:

The woman's office wanted us to be more encouraging on the possibility of doing comparable worth. While I don't see the need to needlessly alienate the pay equity groups, I also don't think we do any ourselves any favors by setting up expectations that we are about to do comparable worth. As I've mentioned, I'm concerned that we will get into a debate on whether to do comparable worth with that endorsement being the benchmark of the Administration's commitment. I'm also concerned that some in the Administration will send signals that instead of taking credit for what we've done, now is the time to push DPC (NEC) to do Comp. Worth. Politically, I think now is the time to hold the high ground, push the popular Daschle bill until the other side concedes, and then move to the next thing we want to do on fair pay. As an aside, it seems that Shirley W. at OFCCP wanted to collect wage data, the DOL solicitors office said no, Shirley appealed to OMB and told the groups about her problem. I thought that was bad form. DOL has now asked OMB to hold off reviewing for three months.