

**ESEA Reauthorization Q&As for Meeting with Hill Staff
(NOT FOR DISTRIBUTION)**

1) Will the Department consolidate existing ESEA programs or simplify programs?

- We are currently in the process of examining all ESEA programs to determine their effectiveness and their contribution to the mission of ESEA – helping all children reach high academic standards. Our proposal will eliminate many of the small programs and try to incorporate the goals of the small programs into other Titles, where appropriate. We will work to consolidate and/or simplify where it makes sense and fits with our vision – all children learning to high standards and closing the gap.

2) Can you give an example of some of the small programs you are eliminating?

- We have not received sign-off from the Secretary on eliminating any programs at this point.

2) We have heard the Secretary talk about “responsible block grants,” – do you plan to put forth any “responsible block grants”?

- When the Secretary talks about responsible block grants, he really is talking about simplifying programs where it makes good educational sense. And, by a “block grant,” he does not mean money out to states with no mission and no accountability. One example of a possibility that gives states flexibility and accountability, but continues to send a strong message about the need for work and reform in the area is Teacher Quality. Currently, many of our ESEA Titles include professional development as either an allowable activity or a requirement – Title I, Title II, Title III, Title VII – we are examining what it might look like to provide funding for professional development that would be available across Titles and programs.
- So again – the Secretary is interested in pushing us to think about how to get States, school districts, and schools to think about our various programs in ways that support comprehensive reform. If consolidating some of our programs or set-asides within Titles will help move forward an agenda of comprehensive reform than we will support it.

3) Are you going to reauthorize Goals 2000 as a stand-alone, roll it into ESEA, or no longer support it?

- The President and the Secretary are committed to supporting States as they complete their work on the development of content and performance standards. And, more importantly, we want to make sure that we support States and Districts in their work of getting standards into the classroom – making sure that teachers have the training and tools they need to teach children to high standards and ensuring that schools

receive on-going support to reform and revise their curriculum to align with State Standards.

- We are exploring several options for continuing standards work – keeping a state-based grant for standards – the follow-up grant to Goals 2000 – or doing this work through a larger grant focused on teacher quality. Either way – the Administration will push for supporting States and Districts in the development of Standards and in the hard work of getting standards into the classroom. Work on Standards will continue to be central to our ESEA mission.
- 2) **You stated that your four main themes are Equity, Teacher Quality, School Environments Conducive to Learning, and Choice & Innovation? How does this look in legislation? Will there be major new programs or will you highlight these themes within the existing framework?**
- There will be both – we are working on improving our existing programs, understanding where there are gaps and putting forward new ideas to support our ongoing effort. Under each theme, there will be provisions to support that theme. For example, Equity encompasses Title I, Migrant Education, Indian Education, Homeless, etc.
 - Major new pieces will include a much greater emphasis on Teacher Quality, more opportunities for Public School Choice, and Early Childhood.
- 3) **How would you respond to the fact that “staying the course” may be seen as keeping with the status quo?**
- The changes that were made in 1994 were viewed by the field as the largest changes in ESEA since its inception in 1965. At the time, we wanted to put forth a ten-year authorization because we knew that major change and reform takes time. This reauthorization is not staying with the “status quo,” instead it is continuing and building on the hard-work and major changes that the Administration and the Democrats put forth in 1994.
- 2) **One of the messages that we are certainly getting from the White House is a real hard-lined message of accountability – cutting off funding after a certain period of time if schools do not show results? Will you be proposing this type of hard-lined accountability? And, how does it fit with the accountability provisions already in Title I?**
- Accountability is a critical component of standards-based reform, but it cannot come without support for States, Districts, and schools to meet challenging standards.
 - We are working on improving the accountability system in Title I to meet the following objectives:

Objectives of an accountability system under Title I:

The system includes ALL students and holds them all to the same set of challenging standards.

Title I schools are held accountable through the same system as other schools.

The system provides meaningful information to schools, parents and students about student achievement.

The information generated by the system is used to improve teaching and learning.

The system promotes continuous improvement.

The system promotes a sense of responsibility among State staff, district personnel, principals, teachers, and students.

The system includes rewards and interventions for schools based on student performance.

3) It sounds as though you still have quite a bit of work to do to finalize your proposal. What type of assurances can you give us that this bill will get up to the Hill in early 1999?

- We know and respect that we have a tight timeline and do not want to lose the opportunity to work with you to set the agenda. While we have much to do, we have also accomplished much and we are already in the process of writing specs on many of our programs. We will continue to push and see early 1999 as a real deadline.

Reauthorization Briefing of Senate Staffers
Monday, January 25, 1999

Questions

- What is the Department's schedule for presenting its proposal? Is the Department meeting with groups before receiving feedback from the Senate representatives?
- How, if at all, would the Department encourage and support efforts under the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards at the local and state levels?
- What is the Department's plan for addressing out of field teachers? How will the Department's initiative work? More importantly, how will the effort to remove out of field teachers affect rural schools (given that the staffer believed most out of field teacher placements are in rural schools)?
- What kind of assistance would the Department provide to school districts in providing interim placements and other services to accommodate special needs student populations? How will the Department respond to the needs that a district may identify itself as having (i.e. transportation needs)? What is the Department's overall message to school districts regarding how to deal with the costs associated with providing services such as interim placements?
- Does any part of the legislation address ways to ensure that schools have access to funds for school libraries, since Title VI, which is being considered for consolidation, is currently the only place where school libraries are mentioned?
- What are the criteria for need that the Department is planning to use for awarding funds under the Safe and Drug Free Schools program?
- How will teacher recruitment be addressed? Is it restricted or limited to Title II?
- What has the Department heard from the different groups regarding Ed-Flex and initiatives, such as ending social promotion, that may be construed as the federal government telling the locals what to do?

Comments

- Regarding the consolidation of the Goals 2000 program, a staffer expressed that it would be good for the Department to consider two key issues: (1) the political and policy contexts of the consolidation strategy (using "*such sums as necessary*" language needs to reflect that the initiative represents an improved effort and increased commitment) and (2) the Department's reasoning behind the three programs it has chosen to focus on (and why initiatives such as Class Size Reduction are not among these programs)
- Regarding the Choice initiative, a staffer explained that it is not true that magnet schools guide growth in school districts. Rather, if the Department is talking about "good public schools" then it should not necessarily be promoting charters since there is evidence that some charters are really bad. Charter schools, therefore, may not be the best model for choice. Additionally, by promoting charter schools, the Department makes it difficult for Senate supporters. The Ed Flex program also makes it difficult to ensure accountability, particularly among charter schools.
- The Department should not feel as though it is defending a federal role since federal programs continue to do more to ensure equity than either state or localities, especially in view of evidence which indicates that states and locals are not distributing the funds they receive equally.
- Regarding the coordination of services (in the context of Safe and Drug Free Schools), a staffer expressed concern that the presentation did not make any reference to the Title I team. The staffer urged the Department to give extensive consideration to how services will be coordinated and what would be the role of HHS and mental health agencies in linking services for students.
- The Department was advised to consider interfacing with OSERS in focusing on students with disability and those in high-risk areas, especially in the how charter and magnet schools are working to accommodate students with special needs. Additionally, teacher professional development programs need to include ways to address accommodations for the needs of these students. Discipline matters raise additional concerns for special needs students that must be addressed. Finally, any aspect of the legislation that focus on special needs populations must also include LEP and Bilingual children.
- The Department was encouraged to carefully consider which programs would use competitive versus formula grants. A concern was expressed that competitive grants tend to place school districts with limited or poor grant writing ability at a grave disadvantage, such that certain districts (i.e., Hartford Connecticut in partnership with Harvard University) are always successful in getting funds. Although it was believed that a combination of targeted and formula grants would be most helpful for school districts.
- A staffer indicated that in view of efforts to consolidate federal programs, the Department

needs to be clear on what is the focus and vision of the legislation, how the legislation preserves existing programs, and what the program would look like in the future.

- One staffer expressed that the Department needs to give careful consideration to how it will address the accountability issue. The accountability bottom line could be viewed as how the Department be able to ask the locals "Did you do your job?"
- The Department needs to always focus its programs on targeting for the neediest and poorest children.
- Staffer expressed that the consolidation of Title VI did not appear to pose a problem since the issues addressed by this program appeared elsewhere in the legislation.
- The suggestion was made that the Department uses the principals of Goals 2000 and a focus on continuous improvement as the key elements of its legislative language. Additionally, the Department should consider addressing how services will provided to secondary schools and ways to bring the high schools onboard.

Reauthorization Briefing of House Staffers
Tuesday, January 26, 1999

Questions

- What is the Department planning as part of its current initiative to set aside funds for administrators and principals for leadership training? What is the difference between the Department's proposal and what states and local school districts are currently doing under the LEAD program? Is the proposed initiative something new, separate or different from existing programs?
- What is the bottom line of the Department's investment of \$2 million for corrective actions/interventions under its accountability proposal? Is the Department considering options such as closing non-performing schools as part of the proposed corrective actions?
- Is the Department considering adjusting any language in the current authority regarding corrective action for accountability? Since the legislation currently reserves harsher corrective actions for use with final assessments, the Department may not want to change these provisions.
- Would the Department provide the names of the GAO report(s) cited in the overview and other segments of the presentation?
- Does the Department have a list of the schools and/or districts that have been identified as needing correction? If so, the Department has been asked to provide this information to the staffers.
- Is anyone giving thought to how the Supreme Court decision regarding population sampling for the upcoming census going to be addressed under the Title I formula? How does sampling factor into the Department's allocation for Title I?
- Recognizing that teacher quality was emphasized in both Goals 2000 and the IASA, what can we/the Department do to put teeth into/strengthen the teacher quality initiative?

Comments from Staffers

There were two polar positions regarding how the Department is presenting the choice initiative.

Position (1)

- One staffer raised strong opposition to the Department's presentation, insisting that the Department has stated and continues to assert that choice is a major theme of the reauthorization. In the context of the President's State of the Union speech, Democratic support, and public sentiment, the staffer urged that the Department is presenting a very defensive message for the House. He acknowledged that while the SOTU addressed charters and magnets in the SOTU, they were framed as innovative models; to do otherwise supports the Republican's ideal/position. Moreover, the Department's presentation of choice pits schools against each other. The Democrats, and the public, support good schools, teacher quality, etc. The issue of choice is critical and the reason the Department is getting strong reactions when presenting its choice proposal is because the Department's position is not aligned with the Democratic concept.
- Another staffer agreed that the Department does appear to be promoting choice as a major theme of the reauthorization and, as such, would encounter strong Democratic opposition.

Position (2)

- One staffer disagreed with the aforementioned comments, stating that the emphasis on choice is not coming strictly from the Department, but rather the Democrats also have identified choice as one of their strategies and the Department is only trying to put substance into the proposal. The staffer also opined that if the Democrats had advanced the choice issue more openly, the public would have supported it.
- Another staffer asserted that not addressing choice would erode support among minority voters and inner city residents, adding that the two ideas are not mutually exclusive. Many Democrats will support the administration's position of keeping the issue at the forefront of the reauthorization discussions.
- One staffer expressed concern that the Department's presentation did not mention how initiatives address students with disabilities and urged that the Department work with OSERS to address how reauthorization would meet the needs of this student population.
- Regarding Ed-Flex and waivers, the Department was asked to work closely with the House on these matters, especially in the context of Title I. The staffer noted that a key issue with the Ed-Flex and waiver program is that it appears, and reports may corroborate, that the Department is granting waivers in a manner that allows schools that were previously ineligible to be eligible for and participate in Title I. If true, this would be a course of action that would set a dangerous precedent.

Department Responses

Regarding public school choice

- Judith emphasized that the Department is currently examining the choice proposal and interpretations of the Department's position and would like to meet with the House at a later time to discuss the subject in greater detail to gain the full benefit of their input and address and resolve their concerns. In addition, she asserted that, in response to feedback from the House and after careful review, the Department decided to frame choice as a strategy -- not a theme for reauthorization. Ann O'Leary stressed that the choice proposal reflects only one of the Department's strategies among a myriad of options.

Regarding the teacher quality and professional development initiatives

- Judith pointed out that the Department's current focus is on principals and teachers in high poverty schools who may lack the knowledge and skills necessary to move the reform agenda forward. She asserted that the Department has not as of yet convinced the country that professional development is ongoing and continuous and needs to help the teaching community to articulate this. The issue is one of both policy and implementation.

Regarding the waiver for Title I

- Mary Jean assured the staffers that reports of the Department's granting waivers to ineligible school districts to receive funds under Title I is not accurate and she would provide information on the waivers that have been granted.

Regarding issues not addressed

- The Department would be available to meet with staffers at a later time to address other reauthorization initiatives and any additional details that were not covered in today's presentations.

M&B/CFO BRIEFING FOR SECRETARY RILEY

I Immediate Priorities

- Developing the Department's FY 1994 budget proposal.

II Major Pending Activities

- Reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs: Authorization for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as well as other elementary and secondary education statutes, expire at the end of FY 1993. While Congress may not complete reauthorization until next year, the House wants to complete its bill by May or June, so we need to move quickly if we want to have substantive input into the process. The Department has developed a set of proposals that largely reflect the judgment of its senior career staff, and M&B staff have made substantial progress in preparing legislative specifications. To move forward, we need to establish the objectives of the new Secretary, and to work with OMB on a fast-track clearance process.
- Reauthorizing the Office of Educational Research and Improvement: Authority for OERI's research activities expired at the end of FY 1992, and authority for its statistics and assessment activities will expire at the end of FY 1993. Research activities continue because Congress appropriated funds for that purpose, and statistics and assessment can be extended through FY 1994 under GEPA. Congress refused to consider an earlier Department reauthorization bill, and the Department strongly opposed a House bill that would have limited Secretarial authority over OERI's activities. The new Administration must decide when to resubmit a reauthorization proposal, and whether to combine an OERI proposal with the elementary and secondary reauthorization. NAEP legislation must be enacted by mid-February if State-level assessments are to be conducted in 1994.
- HEA Technical Amendments: The higher education community is encouraging Congress to enact technical amendments to last year's reauthorization of the HEA, and the Department needs to develop its own package of amendments as soon as possible.
- HEA Regulatory Negotiation: The Higher Education Amendments of 1992 require "negotiated rulemaking" prior to publication of proposed regulations for GSL, most student aid programs, and the institutional eligibility process. In deference to the incoming Administration, ED negotiators avoided making policy commitments at the initial public negotiating sessions held January 4-8. Concluding sessions are scheduled for February 1-5. There are number of major issues that require the Secretary's guidance regarding the Department's position, and delaying the final sessions would allow adequate time for the Secretary to consider these issues.

III Upcoming Congressional Hearings

- January 26: The House Appropriations Subcommittee for Interior and Related Agencies will hold a hearing on the FY 1994 budget for Indian Education. The hearing will address the Bush current services budget as well as various issues related to Indian Education programs. The Acting Assistant Secretaries for OESE and M&B/CFO will testify.
- February 16: The House Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations Subcommittee has scheduled an ED overview briefing that will include a statistical overview of education, Inspector General issues, and an historical review of education program funding. The purpose is to provide new Members with background information on education issues and Department activities.
- March 23-25 (approximately): The House Appropriations Subcommittee will conduct hearings on the Department's FY 1994 budget request. These dates assume the Clinton budget will be transmitted to Congress in mid-March, and depend on the availability of the Secretary. The first witness will be the Secretary, followed by the assistant secretaries for each program area.
- No Scheduled Date: The Senate Labor-HHS-ED Appropriations Subcommittee has yet to schedule a hearing on the Department's 1994 budget. In the past, the Secretary has been the only witness requested for this hearing.
- No Scheduled Date: Both House and Senate budget and authorizing committees may hold hearings on the Department's 1994 budget, but none are currently scheduled. These hearings usually involve only the Secretary.

IV Administrative Issues

- Pell Grant Payment Schedule: The Pell Grant payment schedule for academic year 1993-94 is required by law to be distributed to postsecondary institutions by February 1, 1993. OPE has prepared the schedule, but is delaying distribution to allow time for incoming Clinton officials to review the situation. This review should take place in time to meet the February 1 deadline.

V Status of FY 1993 Budget

- Status of Salaries and Expenses (S&E) budget: Last October each office received a 1993 S&E allocation to cover full-time equivalent (FTE) employment and operating expenses. The Department's S&E appropriations for FY 1993 were considerably less than the levels requested by President Bush.
- Hiring Waiver Process: ED has used a hiring waiver process to ensure that offices live within their FTE ceilings. Approval from both M&B/CFO and OHRA is required to authorize hiring. Continuing this process is probably the most practical way to preserve the Secretary's options for future hiring and use of limited S&E funds.
- Discretionary funds available for Secretarial priorities: A separate analysis is being prepared on this.

VI Financial Management Issues

- Performance Measures: A Department-wide Monitoring and Performance Measures Team is working to develop outcome measures for a pilot project involving five programs. The goal is to expand performance measurement activities to all programs.

Summary of Program Terminations

Question: Can you tell me how many programs the Department currently manages and how many programs the Department has terminated in the past several years?

Answer: The Department currently manages 171 programs in FY 1999. The FY 2000 budget includes 10 new initiatives, offset by the termination of seven programs for a net increase of 3, or a total of 174.

From FY 1994 through FY 1999, the Department has terminated 68 programs totaling \$642 million. In the FY 2000 budget, the Administration proposes to terminate an additional seven programs totaling \$503 million.

	<u>Total Number of Terminations</u> ^{/1}	<u>Prior Year's Appropriation</u>
Program Terminations in 1994 Appropriations	4	\$10,693
Program Terminations in 1995 Appropriations	14	81,925
Program Terminations in 1995 Rescissions	25	358,506
Program Terminations in 1996 Omnibus Appropriations	21	173,291
Program Terminations in 1997 Omnibus Appropriations	0	0
Program Terminations in 1998 Appropriations	0	0
Program Terminations in 1999 Appropriations	4	17,155
Total	<u>68</u>	<u>641,570</u>
Program Terminations in 2000 President's Budget	7	\$503,587

/1 Reflects Conference action on appropriations bills.

Wish List: What If There Were No Caps

Question: What would you request for education if there were no discretionary caps?

Answer:

- The President insists on fixing Social Security before we use the surplus for anything else.
- However, if we fixed Social Security and Medicare, and the caps were eliminated, we could effectively use additional resources for education.
- If not for the caps, I would consider increases in:
 - Class size to expedite hiring of the 100,000 additional teachers;
 - Special Education services to students, as long as there is accountability, but not just revenue sharing.
 - Pell Grants for low-income students
 - Investments in teacher quality and development

Response to Domenici

Question: What do you think of Senator Domenici's proposal to increase spending on elementary and secondary education by 40% or \$40 billion over 5 years?

Answer:

- I'm for anything that would add education resources to serve a national education purpose as long as there is accountability for results.
- I would prefer that the funds be targeted on those most in need, including economically disadvantaged, disabled, and limited English speaking students.
- I would welcome the Senator's support for education funding, but I haven't heard all the details of his plan or how the increase would be funded within the caps.
- In 1999, the Department will spend \$21.4 billion on elementary and secondary education. If continued for 5 years, that would be \$107 billion. A 40% increase spread out over 5 years would be about \$40 billion.
- Throwing money at the problem is not the solution. I'd like to have billions to throw, but I'd like to do it in a way that would achieve results.
- Five years is a long time. Five budgets ago:
 - Our discretionary budget for 2000 is 50 percent larger than the 1996 appropriation (\$23.0 billion vs \$34.7 billion).
 - In 1996, elementary/secondary funding was \$14.7 billion. We are proposing about 52% more in FY 2000 (\$22.3 billion).

Class Size Matching Requirement

Question: Why are you proposing that local districts provide a match for their FY 2000 Class Size Reduction funds (particularly when that was not a part of the FY 1999 budget agreement)?

Answer:

- We are not attaching any new conditions to the amount of Class Size funds districts will receive in FY 1999. A match would be required only on funds a district received in excess of its FY 1999 allocation.
- We know that poorer districts lack the resources to provide a match. That is why we are not asking districts with the highest concentrations of poor children to provide a match.
- Research has shown that reducing class size, particularly in the early elementary grades, can have a significant impact on student achievement, but the Federal government cannot bear the entire burden of reducing class sizes nationally. Requiring a match from local districts would ensure that class-size reduction is a joint Federal, State, and local initiative.
- The President has set as a goal the hiring of 100,000 additional teachers over 7 years to reduce class size so that all children can achieve to high standards. The match would allow for the hiring of 1,900 of the 8,000 additional teachers that we estimate districts would hire with these funds.

ED REFORM

	<u>Page</u>
21 st Century Community Learning Centers.....	2
Educational Technology	3
Recognition and Reward	4
Small, Safe and Successful High Schools	5
Increase for Community Technology Centers.....	6
No-Request for Goals 2000 and School-To-Work	7

21st Century Community Learning Centers

Question: Why are you proposing a significant expansion of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program? Will the program work any differently in 2001?

Answer:

- Our request of \$1 billion for 21st Century Learning Centers includes a \$547 million increase that more than doubles the 2000 appropriation. The request would support about 10,000 centers serving 2.5 million students.
- Under the proposal, The Department schools identified for "corrective action" or "improvement" under Title I would receive priority for grants, but they would still have to compete for funds and demonstrate that they have well thought out plans to provide their students with high-quality extended learning opportunities.
- The amount requested is sufficient funding to provide every student in a failing school the opportunity to receive extended learning services, while also allowing the program to continue to serve a wide range of students.
- Research has found that effective schools use extended learning time in reading and mathematics to improve student achievement. While the amount of extended learning time provided in Title I schools has increased since the 1994 ESEA reauthorization, still only 11 percent of students in Title I schools were served by extended learning time programs during the school year. Summer programs served only 19 percent of Title I students.
- During the reauthorization process, the Department intends to work with Congress to obtain enactment of a bill that makes changes along the following lines:
 - converting the authority to a formula grant program once it reaches an appropriate funding level (except that the Department would continue to administer the direct grants made prior to the conversion);
 - requiring States to distribute funds within the State through competitive subgrants, giving priority to applications from LEAs that are in Title I "corrective action" or "school improvement" status; and
 - requiring grantees to pay 50 percent of the cost of any project.

Educational Technology

Question: What is the Department's budget policy for technology programs?

Answer: The Department's technology programs are supporting the integration of technology into elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education, as well as inservice and preservice teacher professional development.

- The Technology Literacy Challenge Fund (+\$25 million to \$450 million) provides States with funding to make grants to districts to help them implement local technology plans. The Department's ESEA reauthorization proposal would more explicitly target funds to high-poverty districts to increase the capacity of teachers in those districts to use technology effectively in their classrooms.
- The new Next Generation Technology Innovation program (-\$26.8 million to \$170 million) will develop new applications of educational technologies and telecommunications for teaching and learning. The amount requested will fund all existing grants under the two antecedent programs, Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and Star Schools. Under the new program, funds will be used for competitions in three areas: Advanced Technology Application awards, research and development initiatives that advance state-of-the-art educational technology applications; the Mississippi Delta Initiative, a targeted demonstration project to provide training to middle school teachers; and Challenging Coursework On-Line awards, which will support the development of high quality, web-based courses.
- Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology (+\$75 million to +150 million) will award grants to consortia of States, colleges of education, LEAs, and other entities to prepare all teachers to use technology effectively in the classroom.
- Community-Based Technology Centers (+\$67.5 million to \$100 million) will support 400 model technology centers, including 280 new centers, in low-income urban and rural communities.
- Learning Anytime anywhere Partnerships (+\$23.3 million to \$30 million) supports distance learning projects using technology and other innovations to expand postsecondary education and lifelong learning opportunities.
- The Telecommunications Demonstration program (-\$3.5 million to \$5 million) provides support for mathematics professional development activities. The Department believes that \$5 million – the same level as in 1999 – will be sufficient to provide continued support for on-going mathematics activities and to begin planning for activities in other subject areas.
- Other programs: Regional Technology in Education Consortia (level funding, 10 million); Ready to Learn Digital Television (level funding, \$16 million); Technology Leadership Activities (level funding, \$2 million).

Recognition and Reward

Question: What are you planning to do under the new Recognition and Reward program?

Answer:

- The Department is requesting \$50 million for the new Recognition and Reward program. The Department would use those funds to reward States that have made significant progress in increasing student achievement.
- A State would be eligible for an award if it can demonstrate that it made significant statewide achievement gains and narrowed the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students in mathematics between 1996 and 2000 as measured by NAEP.
- In 2001, the Department anticipates making awards to 10 States.
- The FY 2001 funds would be the first step toward implementing the vision, embedded in the Department's ESEA reauthorization proposal, of providing financial incentives to States to fully implement the types of standards-based accountability systems that have proven effective in improving student achievement.
- By requiring that States (1) demonstrate increases in student achievement in the core academic subjects over an extended period of time, and (2) simultaneously narrow the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students; the Administration's proposal deliberately sets a high standard for States to achieve to before receiving an award.

Small, Safe and Successful High Schools

Question: Why is the Department proposing such a large expansion of the Smaller Learning Communities program?

Answer:

- The Small, Safe and Successful High Schools program would continue and expand on the activities first funded under the Smaller Learning Communities program in FY 2000 to help high schools to create smaller learning environments.
- The \$120 million request would help approximately 700 high schools to create smaller, safer, and more intimate learning communities through such strategies as schools-within-schools or career academies.
- Research shows that students are best served when they attend high schools of between 600 and 900 students. Currently, 4,500 high schools, 40 percent of all high schools, have enrollments of more than 1,000 students. These schools serve more than 70 percent of the Nation's high school students.
- Also, when students are part of a smaller learning community they are more successful academically and socially. Smaller schools promote stronger bonds between teachers and students and a safer and improved school climate.

Increase for Community Technology Centers

Question: How will the Department use the \$67.5 million increase for the Community Technology Centers?

Answer:

- The requested increase would allow the Department to significantly expand this initiative, begun in 1999, to establish model community technology centers in low-income urban and rural communities. These centers provide access to technology, as well as other services, for disadvantaged students and adults who do not have access to computers at home.
- The requested increase would allow the Department to expand the program to an additional 280 low-income communities, and continue funding for 120 projects funded in previous years.
- Community-Based Technology Centers will enable residents of low-income communities to take courses on line, access on-line job data bases, take computer-based adult literacy classes, and, in general, enjoy the full benefits of educational and training technology.

No Request for Goals 2000 And School-To-Work

Question: No funds are included in the 2001 budget for the Goals 2000 and School-to-Work Opportunities programs. Why?

Answer:

- The Department's fiscal year 2000 appropriations act repealed the Goals 2000: Educate America Act effective September 30, 2000. States and school districts could continue Goals 2000 activities under the Administration's reauthorization proposal for Title II Teaching to High Standards State Grants. Goals 2000 has been important in promoting State and local reform efforts and helping all States establish high standards in the core academic subjects.
- The School-to-Work Opportunities Act "sunsets" on October 1, 2001. After Federal support winds down, States would be able to continue their school-to-work activities with funding from other Federal programs, such as Vocational Education and the Workforce Investment Act, and with State and local dollars.

FY 2000 Budget
Program Questions &
Answers
11/20

40 Percent Cost in IDEA

Question: How much would it cost to provide 40 percent of average per pupil expenditure for special education under the Grants to States program?

Answer:

- It would cost about \$15.3 billion in FY 2000 to provide 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure or \$11 billion more than the amount provided in 1999. This level would provide about 34 percent of the excess cost of providing special education to children with disabilities.
- 40 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure times the number of children served is the maximum amount that may be provided to States under the Grants to States program.
- States have primary responsibility for educating all children, including children with disabilities. IDEA authorizes payments to States to assist them in carrying out their responsibilities. The rights and protections provided by the IDEA are fundamental civil rights.
- Up to \$2.2 billion of the \$11 billion could be used to reduce local spending for special education. Under the 1997 amendments to the IDEA, once the appropriation for the program exceeds \$4.1 billion, school districts may use up to 20 percent of any increase in funding to offset local special education expenditures.
- The legislative history surrounding the enactment of Public Law 94-142 in 1975 indicates that members regarded the 40 percent as a goal, not a promise or commitment, and members acknowledged that the authorized amounts were not likely to be appropriated.
- Increases proposed by the Administration in the area of elementary and secondary education will increase and improve services for children, including children with disabilities. These include: the Class Size Reduction Initiative, School Construction, 21st Century Community Learning Centers, and Title I.
- Special Education increases include: \$50 million for the new Primary Education Intervention program to help address the needs of children with disabilities early in life when they can be most effective in improving results, \$10 million for State Improvement Grants to help States reform and improve their educational, early intervention, and transitional services systems, and \$4 million for Parent Information Centers to help parents understand what they can do to improve their children's education.

Why Nothing Has Happened in Education

Question: Some have argued that despite substantial investments in education, we seem to have little to show in the way of results. What is your opinion?

Answer:

I would disagree. We have a lot of specific data that shows measurable improvement by American students in recent years.

- Reading scores have improved significantly at all three grades tested in a recent national reading assessment. This is a "first" for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). According to the 1998 NAEP reading "report card," since 1994 average scores have increased for students in grades 4, 8, and 12 -- with lower performing 4th graders and most middle school students making the most significant progress.
- NAEP has also shown significant increases in the percentages of 4th grade math students scoring at both the basic and proficient achievement levels-- particularly among students in high-poverty schools. In addition, 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.

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

States like these that are most successful in improving student achievement have pursued education policies that aligned standards, curricula, and assessments, and that held schools accountable for student academic performance.

- The recent Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS) for 4th graders showed that America's 4th graders are performing above the national average in math and science. In fact, our 4th graders ranked second in the world in science in the TIMSS tests, just behind Korea.

We are making great strides, and we've built a solid foundation in our national effort to establish standards of excellence in education.

Test Score Progress

1998 NAEP

- Reading scores have improved significantly at all three grades (4/8/12)
- Significant increases in percentages of 4th grade math students scoring at basic and proficient achievement levels--particularly in high-poverty schools

SAT/ACT

- Average national SAT and ACT scores for 1998 are the highest in 20 years.
- SAT scores of black students have increased by the greatest percentage of any group--from 686 to 747--over the past twenty years
- SAT scores of Mexican-origin students went from 781 to 803 (same period)
- SAT scores of Puerto Rican students went from 765 to 790 (same period)
- Contrary to normal test patterns, improvement in the scores of these minority students has been accompanied by significant increases in the number of minority students who have taken the SAT.

INTERNATIONAL

- 4th graders are ranked second in the world in science (behind Korea)
- Nine year-olds scored second in the world in reading (behind Finland)

BLACK/WHITE

- The black/white test gap on the math NAEP test has shrunk from 40 points to 27 over a twenty year period (1973-1996)
- The black/white test gap on the reading NAEP test has shrunk from 52 points to 30 over a twenty year period (1971-1990)

Use of FIE Funds - Schools as Centers of Community

Question: Please tell me more about the \$10 million Schools as Centers of Community initiative.

Answer: Based on recommendations from the National Symposium on School Design held last October, the Department plans to make competitive grants to local school districts to assist them in the planning and design of new school buildings that would meet a number of objectives:

- 1) enhance teaching and learning and accommodate the needs of all learners;
 - 2) serve as the center of the community;
 - 3) involve all stakeholders;
 - 4) provide for health, safety, and security;
 - 5) make effective use of all available resources; and
 - 6) allow for flexibility and adaptability to changing needs.
- This project, which is to be part of the multi-billion dollar, government-wide Livable Communities initiative, seeks to encourage broader citizen engagement in developing a school system master plan or an individual school site space and design plan.
 - The competitive grants program would provide funds for up to one year and require a local community match.
 - Involving teachers, parents, students, museums, and other community groups in the process of planning and design of new schools brings a fresh wave of creativity to the planning process and often provides the impetus for cost sharing, savings, and maximum use of the school facility by the entire community.
 - The Department would make approximately 200 to 225 grants in the first year, with grants averaging \$50,000 - \$75,000.

Lack of Increase for IDEA Grants to States

Question: Why haven't you included an increase for Special Education Grants to States? Shouldn't we fund IDEA instead of lots of new programs? And, what about the Federal Government's commitment to pay for 40 percent of the costs?

Answer:

- Our request includes \$4.3 billion for IDEA Grants to States. Since FY 1996, funding for the program has increased by almost \$2 billion, or 85 percent.
- Our special education budget has a \$116 million increase for early intervention and parental involvement:
 - \$50 million for Primary Education Intervention (ages 5-9) for children with reading or behavioral problems.
 - \$20 million for Infants and Families (ages 0-2).
 - \$28 million for preschool (ages 3-5).
- Our request would maintain the Federal contribution at 10 percent of the excess costs of serving over 6.2 million children with disabilities.
- Providing 40 percent of the Average Per Pupil Expenditure, as authorized by IDEA, would require an \$11 billion increase (to a \$15.3 billion total).
- States have primary responsibility for the education of all children. The protections embedded in IDEA are fundamentally civil rights that guarantee children with disabilities access to equal educational opportunity. IDEA helps States carry out their responsibilities.
- Funding increases proposed in the area of elementary and secondary education will improve opportunities for children with disabilities, especially those in poor schools. These include:
 - +\$200 million (17 percent) for Class Size Reduction.
 - +\$26 million (10 percent) for America Reads.
 - +\$320 million (4 percent) for Title I of ESEA.
 - +\$25 billion in bonding authority for School Construction.
- More than 70 percent of all children with disabilities spend more than 40 percent of their time in the regular classroom.

95 Percent to the Classroom

Question: How much of the Federal funding for elementary and secondary programs is used for administration? What is your position on legislative proposals to require that 95 percent of funds flow to the classroom?

Answer:

- Overall, only a very small percentage of Federal education funding goes for Federal and State administrative costs. At the Federal level, we use, for administration, the equivalent of only about 1/2 of one percent of the appropriation for elementary and secondary programs. And only about 4 percent of funds from State formula programs (2 percent under ESEA programs) is retained at the State level, for administration or other purposes. Thus, more than 95 percent of the money flows to local educational agencies where it is used to serve students and teachers.
- We have more limited data on costs within school districts, but those data also suggest that administrative costs are very low. For Title I, the largest elementary and secondary program, approximately 90 percent of the funding goes for instruction-related costs such as teacher salaries, computers, instructional materials, and professional development.
- The Department has made legislative proposals to reduce the amount of funding that can be spent on administration, and will continue to do so. Our Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization bill will include measures for further reducing administrative costs and making more money available for services directly benefiting students and teachers.

School Construction

Question: What is the President's School Construction Initiative? Is it in the budget? How will it be funded?

Answer: The Administration is proposing to offer school construction funding by (1) expanding an existing bond program and (2) creating a new bond program.

- "Qualified Zone Academy Bonds" (QZABs) -- Under current law, through an authority created by the Taxpayer Relief Act of 1997, the Federal Government is subsidizing the issuance of \$800 million in no-interest bonds through the use of tax credits. Of the \$800 million, \$400 million is available in both calendar years 1998 and 1999. Funds raised from the issuance of these bonds may be used for school repairs, equipment, curriculum development, and professional development (but not new construction).

We are proposing to subsidize the issuance of new QZABs in 2000 and 2001. We propose to subsidize \$1 billion in bonds in 2000 and \$1.4 billion in 2001. We are also proposing to expand the use of these funds to include new construction.

- School Construction Bonds -- Our similar new proposal would subsidize the issuance of \$22 billion in 2000 and 2001 available entirely for the purposes of school construction and repairs. As under the QZABs program, bond holders would receive a tax credit in lieu of interest. States and school districts would only need to pay the principal on the loan, because the bond holders would factor in the substantial tax credit they would receive from the Federal Government when purchasing the bond. In addition to the \$22 billion, the Federal Government would subsidize \$400 million in bonds for Bureau of Indian Affairs schools.
- Budget Impact -- Taken together, the two bond programs would cost the Federal Government \$146 million in FY 2000 and \$3.7 billion over 5 years (with more after that, as the bonds continue to be repaid). These tax expenditures would not be part of the Department of Education's budget.
- Need -- Funds are needed for both new construction and to repair existing school buildings.

New construction. Many schools are already overcrowded and the National Center for Education Statistics projects that elementary and secondary enrollment will swell from 52.2 million in 1997 to 54.4 million by the year 2006.

Repairing existing schools. In 1996, GAO estimated it would cost \$112 billion to bring existing schools into good overall condition. NCES estimates that schools are 42 years old on average.

GEAR UP

Question: You are requesting a 100 percent increase for Gaining Early Awareness and Readiness for Undergraduates Programs (GEAR UP). Why are you proposing such a large increase?

Answer: GEAR UP is a national effort to give more low-income students in elementary and secondary schools the skills, encouragement, and academic preparation needed to successfully pursue postsecondary education.

- Our \$240 million request for GEAR UP, an increase of \$120 million over 1999, would create a strong impact at the national level by providing funds to all of the 53 eligible States and to almost 1,000 of the 6,000 middle grade schools that have half of their students living in poverty.
- \$80 million for State grants would support 28 continuation awards and fund approximately 25 new awards to States, serving a total of almost 160,000 disadvantaged students.
- \$158.3 million for Partnership grants would allow some of the continuation partnerships to expand services to an additional grade level of students in high-poverty schools and would fund approximately 270 new Partnership grants, serving a total of almost 221,000 disadvantaged students.
- Discretionary grants are awarded competitively to States or Partnerships comprised of colleges, high-poverty elementary and secondary schools, and community-based organizations.
- Both Partnership grants and State grants are required to provide comprehensive mentoring, tutoring, counseling, outreach, and supportive services, including information to students and their families about the benefits of postsecondary education and the availability of Federal financial assistance to attend college.
- State grants are required to award college scholarships to participating students. Partnership grants are encouraged to provide scholarships but are not required to do so.

Class Size Reduction Initiative: FY 2000 Request

Question: What is the Department's request for Class Size Reduction in FY 2000? Are you proposing any changes to the program?

Answer:

- The Department is requesting \$1.4 billion for the Class Size Reduction initiative in FY 2000, a \$200 million increase.
- For FY 2000, the Department is proposing that local districts provide a 35 percent match on any funds they receive above their FY 1999 allocations. Districts with at least 50 percent of their students from low-income homes would be exempt from the match. Otherwise, the program would continue under the same terms and conditions set forth in the 1999 appropriations bill.
- The amount requested and the matching funds would allow districts to hire over 38,000 highly-qualified teachers, or approximately 8,000 more than in FY 1999.

760 Federal Education Programs

Question: Over two years ago, Rep. Hoekstra's subcommittee found that there are 760 Federal programs dealing with education. Despite this large number of Federal education programs, we all know that educational achievement has stagnated over the past 20 years. And now President Clinton wants to create even more education programs. How can you justify this?

Answer: Despite all the talk about the 760 Federal education programs, this number has little merit, in my view, in any discussion about the effectiveness of the Federal role in education.

- The vast majority of the 760 figure are research, training, or other service programs created for specific purposes such as boating safety, health manpower, or narcotics and dangerous drug training that have nothing to do with improving our Nation's overall education system. Examples include:

- Colorado River Basin Salinity Control Program (Agriculture)
- Appalachian Loan Access Roads (ARC)
- Aquaculture Program (Commerce)
- University Coal Research (Energy)
- Cancer Biology Research (HHS)
- Cell Biology and Biophysics Research (HHS)
- Donations/Loans of Obsolete DOD Property (DOD)
- Military Construction, National Guard (DOD)
- Government Publication Sales and Distribution (GPO)
- NIEHS Hazardous Waste Worker Health and Safety Training (HHS)
- National Register of Historic Places (Interior)
- Law Enforcement Assistance: FBI Advanced Police Training (Justice)
- Local Veterans Employment Representative Program (Labor)
- Books for the Blind and Physically Handicapped (Library of Congress)
- Financial Assistance for Nuclear Regulatory Commission Local Public Documents Rooms (NRC)

- Within the Department of Education, we now have about 175 programs, and I would be the first to admit that even that is probably too many.
- Virtually every budget submitted by President Clinton has included significant numbers of recommended program eliminations and consolidations, and we have succeeded in eliminating more than 60 programs over the past six years.
- The President's new initiatives respond to significant unmet needs within our education system in critical areas like literacy, accountability, school construction, and helping families pay college costs.

Class Size Reduction: California Waiver Request

Question: The Department has received a request from California to waive the requirement that all districts lower class size in grades 1-3 to 18. When will the Department have a definitive answer for the State?

Answer:

- We have received the waiver request from California; however, before we can reach any decision on the request, the State must provide local districts and the general public with the opportunity to comment on it.
- Once California has considered those comments, we look forward to working with the State to find a quick and satisfactory resolution.
- We expect to issue guidelines on Class Size this week.
- We will try for as much flexibility as possible.

Title I Funds to Wealthy Districts

Question: Changes in the 1994 reauthorization were supposed to significantly improve the targeting of Title I funds to the districts with high numbers of poor children. Even so, Title I funds still flow to many wealthy districts with relatively few poor children. Why?

Answer: The 1994 reauthorization improved targeting by eliminating Title I funds for districts with 2 percent or less poor children and basing allocations on poverty data that, beginning in 1997, are to be updated once every two years rather than once a decade.

- These changes have had some impact, but other Title I provisions delay their full effects. For example:
 - The 100 percent "hold harmless" in the 1998 and 1999 appropriations acts, which guaranteed that LEAs received not less than their previous year's Title I allocation, prevented the new poverty data from shifting funds to districts that experienced increases in poverty.
 - Most Title I funds continue to be allocated through the Title I Basic Grants formula, which spreads funds thinly across all districts with both high and low poverty schools. Weak targeting leaves the poorest districts with insufficient funds to serve all of their high-poverty schools and low-achieving children.
 - The President proposed spending \$756 million on targeted grants to focus funds on the poorest districts.

Follow the Child and Title I Funds

Question: Under Title I, needy students lose the benefit of Title I if they transfer to a school that is not eligible for Title I funds. Wouldn't it make more sense to have the Title I funds follow the child?

Answer:

- To effectively help millions of children, Title I focuses on the school as the unit of intervention, especially schools with high concentrations of low-income children. Title I is needed in high-poverty schools because the concentration of poor students in those schools brings down the achievement of all students.
- If a child leaves a high-poverty school to attend a low-poverty school, his chances of improved student achievement increase, even without Title I services.
- If Title I funds followed the child the program would be difficult to administer and services would be disrupted to millions of students to accommodate a few. Also, the stigma of being singled out for services in a new school might outweigh the benefit of those services.

NOTE: The poor student population in California has increased recently, but the California share of Title I funds has not grown as fast because of "hold harmless" provisions. The Administration opposed the use of such hold harmless provisions.

Applying the Title I Hold Harmless to Other Programs

Question: Should the Title I "hold harmless" also apply to other programs that base their allocations on Title I?

Answer:

- Because of language in the appropriations acts, the Title I formulas currently include hold harmless provisions to ensure that each LEA receives 100 percent of the amount it received in the prior year.
- Hold harmless provisions detract from targeting because, by guaranteeing each State and LEA an amount equal to its previous year's Title I allocation, the new poverty data are prevented from shifting funding to districts with recent increases in poverty.
- Because the Title I hold harmless amounts have been incorporated in Title I formulas in recent years, they already apply to other programs that base their allocations on Title I shares.
- Examples of other programs using Title I formula:
 - Class Size
 - Reading
 - Technology
 - Construction
 - Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
 - Eisenhower Professional Development
 - Education for Homeless Children and Youth
- If the hold harmless amounts did not apply to the other programs, targeting to poor children would improve slightly in those programs.
- The Administration opposes hold harmless provisions that prevent use of the most recent data.

Basing on Allocations on Academic Need Instead of Poverty

Question: Title I funds are allocated to LEAs and schools based on their number of poor children, but the purpose of Title I is to help children meet high standards. Wouldn't it make more sense to base allocations on children's academic need?

Answer:

- Until 1994, Title I used to base allocations on academic need.
- Within districts, schools now receive Title I allocations based on the number of poor children.
- Prior to 1994, LEAs distributed funds based on the number of children who were "educationally deprived" (i.e., scoring poorly on tests).
- Congress changed the law in 1994 after researchers pointed out that the old distribution acted as a disincentive to raising student achievement. (If a student's test scores went up, it might lose Title I funds.)
- Within schools, children are selected for Title I services based on their relative academic need, unless the school is operating a schoolwide program to serve all children in the school.

Bilingual Education: Effectiveness

Question: Are Federal Bilingual projects effective?

Answer:

- The projects we fund are effective in teaching English to limited English proficient students and in assisting them to make progress in other classes.
- According to a recent sample of 1998 biennial evaluation reports, 91 percent of projects showed that at least three-quarters of participating students made gains in oral English proficiency and 82 percent of projects showed that at least three-quarters of participating students made gains in written English proficiency.
- In language arts, reading and math, 61 percent of projects showed that at least three-quarters of students made gains in those subjects.

Question: How does the Department plan to fix them?

Answer: As part of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Department plans to propose amendments that will strengthen accountability requirements for Title VII projects and place additional emphasis on English language acquisition within three years.

Fifth-Year Pell Grant Eligibility

Question What is the implementation status of the HEA provision that expands Pell Grant eligibility for students enrolled in non-graduate degree, post-baccalaureate teacher certification programs?

Answer

- This new provision is included under Title IV of the reauthorized Higher Education Act and, as required by statute, is currently under discussion as part of ongoing negotiated rulemaking sessions with the Higher Education community. Final regulations are expected by November 1, 1999 to be effective for the 2000-2001 award year.
- We are working with the Higher Education community to see if this provision can be implemented on a case-by-case basis for the 1999-2000 award year or sooner.
- Pell Grants were only available to undergraduate students until the Higher Education Amendments of 1998.
- Individuals pursuing a post-baccalaureate teaching license or credential will now be eligible for Pell Grants.

Wicker Bill Allowing States to Provide for Uniform Treatment in Discipline

Question: I recently introduced a bill that would allow States to provide for uniform treatment of children with and without disabilities in the area of discipline. I am responding to complaints that many people have about the ability of schools to provide for safe and orderly classrooms under the current IDEA statute, including the harmful effects of differential treatment for students involved in the same incident of misconduct. Mr. Secretary, would you support equitable treatment of disabled and nondisabled students in the area of discipline?

Answer:

- We absolutely agree that schools must provide for safe and orderly environments for all our students.
- However, your proposal would appear to jeopardize vital protections provided by IDEA to children with disabilities. It would allow schools to punish children with disabilities without conducting a manifestation determination to determine the relationship between the student's disability and the behavior--a violation of the child's civil rights.
- It would also permit the cessation of education services to children who have been suspended or expelled. We believe that continuing services to children who have been removed from school for discipline problems are essential to ensuring that these children complete school successfully.
- We believe that the recently amended IDEA, along with the regulations we are issuing, provide for environments conducive to learning, while protecting the rights of disabled children to a free appropriate public education.
- We believe that the IDEA, as amended, and implemented by the regulations we have issued, provides school officials with the tools they need:
 - Schools have the authority to do multiple suspensions of up to 10-10 days at a time and services need not be provided for the first 10 days.
 - Schools have the authority to remove a student for misconduct involving weapons or drugs for up to 45 days and to ask a hearing officer to extend the removal if the child's return would result in a substantial risk of injury to others.
 - Schools can ask a hearing officer to remove a child for up to 45 days (with extensions) if maintaining the child in the original classroom would result in a substantial risk of injury.
 - Schools can apply the same disciplinary actions applied to nondisabled children if the child's behavior is not caused by the child's disability.

IDEA -- Discipline

Question: One of the chief concerns about the new regulations you are putting out has to do with the issue of "discipline." Can you tell us your views on this important issue.

Answer: Let me start by giving you a "clear" picture about what we are talking about.

- We have close to 53 million children in our schools and about 5 ½ million are children with disabilities.
- 300,000 children with disabilities will be suspended at least once during the school year. That's a suspension rate that is similar to non-disabled children (3,078,604 - 1994 data) and just a fraction of the total number of young people in our schools.
- 45,000 of these young people will receive a suspension of more than 10 days.
- Only 15,000 will receive a suspension for a serious offense like violence. We take every suspension seriously and especially those that deal with a serious offense.

Let's remember, however, that 95% of the young people with disabilities are successfully going to school every day and almost 99% of these children are not involved in the most serious of discipline issues.

Sometimes when I hear people go on about special education they only see the few children who we really have to worry about and forget about all the other young people. We need to see the whole picture. Our efforts to give children with disabilities a quality education is one of the great success stories of American education.

Now a comment on the regs. They will, first of all, incorporate the 1997 amendment giving school personnel unilateral authority to remove a child who has brought a weapon to school for up to 45 days.

- You will also see that we made a concerted effort to find a solid middle ground between the concerns of educators regarding the ability to discipline a child and the concerns of parents who want their children to get an education.
- I suspect that neither side will be particularly happy with this middle ground which suggests to me that we are about where we need to be.
- We have listened to school administrators and given them more flexibility. At the same time, we seek to protect the rights of the students and we have put a strong focus on early identification of problem behavior.
- I believe that if we do a lot more early prevention work we will have fewer problems and that is why we are proposing \$116 million for additional prevention efforts.

Release of IDEA Regulations

Question: When are the regulations coming out for IDEA?

Answer:

- We intend to meet our deadline of getting these regulations out by March 5th.
- We will immediately put them up on the **Web** and then get them printed in the Federal Register. The latter may take a few more days.
- We plan an extensive outreach effort to make sure that everyone understands how to use these regulations wisely. Judy Heumann will start the process today when she holds the first of **two national teleconferences**.
- The Department will sponsor **6 regional workshops in April**.
- The Department has also recently funded **4 "IDEA Partnership Projects"** to give many more people the expertise they need to understand how to implement IDEA. These partnerships will make extensive outreach efforts to school administrators, service providers, parents and teachers and families and advocates.
- These 4 IDEA Partnership Projects will be year around efforts.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NEWS

FOR RELEASE:
December 21, 2000Contact: Roberta Heine or Alexander
Wohl
(202) 401-3026**CONGRESS PASSES RECORD \$42 BILLION EDUCATION BUDGET**
Secretary Riley calls 18 percent increase a "landmark"

U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley today hailed the record \$42.1 billion appropriations bill passed by Congress as "a landmark in the nation's commitment to the education of our children."

The package includes \$6.5 billion in new funding to reduce class size, provide emergency repairs for run-down schools, increase after-school opportunities, improve teacher quality, help turn around low-performing schools, strengthen support for children with disabilities, and expand access to and funding for college.

"The 18 percent increase over last year is the largest one-year increase in education funding in the Department's history," Riley said. "This increased investment in education is a tribute to the strong leadership of President Clinton and Vice President Gore, to the hard work of a bipartisan coalition in Congress who have produced this bold legislation, and to the desires and interests of the American people, who have made education a national priority."

The Secretary added, "This was a very good next step, but additional funds will still be needed over the next few years to achieve full implementation of legislation designed to strengthen student achievement, including smaller classes, teacher quality, school renovation, and after-school programs."

Riley said he was especially disappointed that the school renovation program was not funded to the Administration's request and suggested that passage of the Johnson-Rangel School Modernization Bond Bill, which had 230 bipartisan co-sponsors in the Congress that just adjourned, should be enacted early in the new Congress.

Among the highlights of the FY2001 Appropriations bill:

Reducing Class Size with the third installment toward training and hiring 100,000 new teachers over seven years to reduce class sizes in early grades to 18 students per class: \$1.6 billion - a 25 percent increase - which will mean approximately 8,000 new highly qualified teachers in the nation's schools.

Upgrade Teacher Skills and Quality with Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants with nearly 15,000 school districts receiving \$485 million - a 45 percent increase - to help reduce the number of uncertified teachers and teachers who are not trained in the subjects they are teaching.

Improve Reading and Math by increasing Title I Grants to local education agencies which help disadvantaged students learn the basics and achieve high standards: \$8.6 billion - an 8.3 percent

increase. The bill also includes the full Administration request - \$286 million - for the Reading Excellence Act.

Urgent School Renovation Grants would provide support for emergency repairs, such as repair of roofs, plumbing and electrical systems, and meeting fire and safety codes, and includes funding for special education services or technology-related construction activities and support for a new charter school facility financing pilot: this new program was funded for \$1.2 billion.

21st Century After-School Programs offer 650,000 additional school-age children in 3,100 new family centers a safe, drug-free environment to learn during after-school and summertime hours while helping strengthen academic achievement: \$845 million - an increase of 87 percent. These centers, approximately 6,700 centers in 2001, would also offer lifelong learning opportunities for adults.

Strengthen Accountability by accelerating state and local efforts to improve the lowest performing Title I schools with reforms ranging from intensive teacher training to required implementation of proven reforms to school takeovers: \$225 million.

Comprehensive School Reform helps schools develop or adapt comprehensive school reform models that are based on reliable research and effective practices: \$260 million - an 18 percent increase.

Special Education Grants to States to assist them in providing a free appropriate public education to more than 6.3 million children with disabilities nationally: \$6.3 billion - a 27 percent increase.

Pell Grants provide grant assistance to help low-income undergraduate students attend college: \$8.8 billion - an increase of 15 percent - coupled with a \$450 increase in the maximum Pell Grant to \$3,750. Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants provide grant assistance to low-income undergraduate students: \$691 million - a 9.5 percent increase.

Federal Work-Study helps undergraduate and graduate students pay for college through part-time work assistance: \$1 billion - an 8 percent increase.

GEAR UP and TRIO prepare low-income middle and high school students for college through a variety of approaches: \$295 million for GEAR UP and \$730 million for TRIO.

NOTE TO EDITORS: State-by-state and national budget tables can be found on the Education Department's Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/budget.html>.

###



DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Office, Account, Program and Activity	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Change from 2000 Appropriation
	REQUIREMENT	REQUIREMENT	ADDITIONAL	REQUIREMENT	ADDITIONAL	REQUIREMENT
1. 21st Century community learning centers (ESEA X-1)	453,377	1,000,000	608,000	845,514	392,237	86.53
2. Small learning communities (ESEA X-A, section 1105)	0	130,000	0	128,000	128,000	128,000
3. Educational technology (ESEA III)	428,000	517,000	423,000	430,000	25,000	5.93
(a) Technology literacy challenge fund (section 1121)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(b) Next-generation technology innovation:	170,000	0	0	0	0	0
(1) Next-generation technology innovation (proposed legislation)	0	0	0	0	0	0
(2) Technology innovation challenge grants (section 1116)	142,555	197,500	108,000	134,328	(9,927)	-5.81
(3) Star schools (part A)	50,250	85,000	43,000	59,318	4,768	17.34
Subtotal:	170,000	242,500	143,000	193,646	(1,859)	-0.88
(c) Regional technology in education consortia (section 3121)	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	0.01
(d) Technology leadership activities (section 1122)	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	0	0.01
(e) Ready to learn television (part C)	16,000	16,000	16,000	16,000	0	0.00
(f) Telecommunications program for professional development:	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
(1) Telecommunications program for professional development (proposed legislation)	0	5,000	0	0	0	0.00
(2) Telecommunications demonstration project for mathematics (part D)	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
(g) Community-based technology centers (section 1123)	32,500	108,500	65,000	64,850	32,650	99.81
(h) Teacher training in technology (ESEA III, section 1124)	70,000	130,000	125,000	124,920	50,000	66.74
Subtotal, educational technology	768,600	905,000	794,500	872,096	108,291	13.93
4. Recognition and reward (ESEA X-A)	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
5. Goals 2000 State and local education system improvement (Goals 2000 ESEA-III)	458,000	0	0	0	(458,000)	-100.01
6. Parental assistance (Goals 2000 ESEA-IV)	33,000	0	40,000	39,800	3,000	15.23
7. School-to-work opportunities (ESEA Opportunity Act, Title II, III and IV)	55,000	0	0	0	155,000	-100.01
Total	2,166,000	1,805,000	1,434,500	1,680,710	119,520	6.34
Outlays	1,424,548	1,468,033	1,468,500	1,472,854	447,965	39.81

A total of \$45,000 (shown) was provided for Small Learning Communities in the total for the Fund for the Improvement of Education under the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement account.

* Adjusted for comparability, reported in 2001 as Parental Information Resource Centers in the School Improvement Programs account.

† An identical amount is included in the budget for the Department of Labor.

NOTE: All activities in this account for which funds are proposed in fiscal year 2001, are requested under proposed legislation.

NOTE: Category Codes are as follows: D = discretionary program; M = mandatory program.

11/22/90

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

(in thousands of dollars)

Office, Account, Program and Activity

2000

2001

2001

2001

2001

2001

2001

2001

2001

President's Budget

Appropriation

Request

Request

Request

Request

Request

Request

Request

Request

Request

Appropriation

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION (OSEE)
 EDUCATION FOR THE DISABLED

1. Grants to local educational agencies (LEA I-4):
 (a) Basic grants (section 1121)
 (b) Concentration grants (section 1121)
 (c) Targeted grants (section 1125)

Subtotal
 Annual appropriation
 Advance for succeeding fiscal year

2. Capital expenses for private school children (LEA I-1
 section 1120(f))
 Even start (LEA I-8)

3. State agency programs:
 (a) Migrant (LEA I-C)
 (b) Registered and delinquent (LEA I-D)

Subtotal

4. Evaluation (LEA I-E section 1501)
 Demonstration of comprehensive school reform (LEA
 section 1502)

5. Migrant education (MIA I-A-B)
 (a) High school equivalency program
 (b) College assistance migrant program

Subtotal

Total Appropriation
 Total Budget Authority
 Current
 Prior year's advance

Enclaves, Total
 Outlays, Current
 Outlays, Advance

Includes funds for Title I Accountability Grants: \$34,000 thousand under the President's
 Request, and \$25,000 thousand in the 2001 appropriation.
 Excludes an advance appropriation of \$6,724,763 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal
 year.
 Excludes an advance appropriation of \$6,223,342 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of fiscal year 2002.

NOTE: All activities in this account authorized under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and for which funds
 are proposed in fiscal year 2001, are requested under proposed legislation.

Office, Account, Program and Activity	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	2001	2001	2001
	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request	Request
1. Grants to local educational agencies (LEA I-4):								
(a) Basic grants (section 1121)	6,782,000	6,781,000	7,113,403	7,337,721	484,771	6.73		
(b) Concentration grants (section 1121)	1,158,392	1,158,392	1,022,193	1,164,000	204,603	17.71		
(c) Targeted grants (section 1125)	0	0	0	0	0			
Subtotal	7,940,392	7,941,392	8,135,596	8,501,721	689,374	8.51		
Annual appropriation	7,940,392	7,940,392	8,135,596	8,501,721	689,374	8.51		
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	0	0	0	0	0			
2. Capital expenses for private school children (LEA I-1 section 1120(f))	12,800	0	0	0	16,000	-52.01		
Even start (LEA I-8)	150,800	150,800	185,800	250,800	104,800	68.71		
3. State agency programs:								
(a) Migrant (LEA I-C)	354,888	354,888	380,800	380,800	25,911	7.31		
(b) Registered and delinquent (LEA I-D)	42,000	42,000	50,000	48,000	4,000	9.51		
Subtotal	396,888	396,888	430,800	428,800	29,911	7.64		
4. Evaluation (LEA I-E section 1501)	8,900	0	0	0	0	0.00		
Demonstration of comprehensive school reform (LEA section 1502)	170,000	170,000	190,000	250,000	80,000	23.53		
Subtotal, LEA I	178,900	178,900	190,800	250,800	80,000	23.53		
5. Migrant education (MIA I-A-B):								
(a) High school equivalency program	15,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	5,000	33.33		
(b) College assistance migrant program	7,000	20,000	30,000	30,000	3,000	42.86		
Subtotal	22,000	40,000	50,000	50,000	8,000	36.36		
Total Appropriation	8,700,980	8,700,980	9,136,396	9,532,621	813,635	9.31		
Total Budget Authority	8,700,980	8,700,980	8,966,800	9,312,621	611,641	6.91		
Current	2,486,333	2,484,333	2,781,458	2,774,331	278,025	11.21		
Prior year's advance	6,214,647	6,216,647	6,204,342	6,538,290	313,643	5.04		
Enclaves, Total	2,486,333	2,484,333	2,781,458	2,774,331	278,025	11.21		
Outlays, Current	2,486,333	2,484,333	2,781,458	2,774,331	278,025	11.21		
Outlays, Advance	5,214,647	6,216,647	6,109,607	6,538,290	313,643	5.04		

11/22/88

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Office, Account, Program and Activity	2000		2001		2001 APPROPRIATION	CHANGE FROM 2000 APPROPRIATION AMOUNT	PERCENT
	2000	2001	2001	2001			
	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT	AMOUNT			
1. Payments for Federally connected children (section 8003):							
(a) Basic support payments (section 8003(a))	111,260	758,000	853,000	853,000	853,000	144,600	13.6%
(b) Payments for children with disabilities (section 8003(b))	56,800	30,000	59,000	59,000	59,000	0	0.0%
(c) Payments for heavily impacted districts (section 8003(c))	72,200	0	0	0	0	(72,200)	-100.0%
Subtotal	240,260	788,000	912,000	912,000	912,000	171,540	71.4%
2. Facilities maintenance (section 8004)	5,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	3,000	60.0%
3. Construction (section 8007)	10,000	25,000	35,000	35,000	35,000	25,000	250.0%
4. Payments for Federal property (section 8023)	32,000	0	40,000	40,000	40,000	8,000	25.0%
Total	287,260	811,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	1,025,000	153,740	53.5%
Outlay	2,014,358	881,725	1,052,725	1,052,725	1,052,725	148,367	7.3%

NOTE: All activities in this account for which funds are proposed in fiscal year 2001 are requested under proposed legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

CLASSIFICATION	2000	2001	2002	CHANGE FROM 2000 APPROPRIATION	
				Amount	Percent
(a) High standards in the classroom:					
(1) Teaching to high standards:					
(i) Teaching to high standards State grants (proposed legislation):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	405,000	0	405,000	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	385,000	0	385,000	0
Subtotal.....	0	790,000	0	790,000	0
(ii) Teacher quality initiatives:					
Annual appropriation.....	315,000	0	435,000	120,000	38.4
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	135,000	0	435,000	300,000	222.2
Subtotal.....	450,000	0	870,000	420,000	93.3
(iii) Eisenhower professional development State grants (ESEA title II-B):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
(b) National programs:					
(1) School leadership initiative (proposed legislation):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
(2) National activities for the improvement of teaching and school leadership (prop. leg.):					
Annual appropriation.....	25,000	0	0	25,000	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	25,000	0	0	25,000	0
(3) Teacher quality initiatives:					
(i) Homestead teachers (proposed legislation):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	75,000	0	75,000	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	50,000	0	50,000	0
Subtotal.....	0	125,000	0	125,000	0
(ii) Higher standards, higher pay (prop. leg.):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
(iii) Teacher quality incentives (proposed legislation):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
(c) Transition to teaching: Troops to teachers (proposed legislation):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
(d) Early childhood educator professional development (proposed legislation):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
(e) Eisenhower professional development national activities (ESEA section 7102):					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	315,000	0	435,000	120,000	38.4
2. Innovative education program strategies State grants (ESEA title A):					
Annual appropriation.....	80,750	0	515,000	434,250	538.3
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	285,000	0	2,885,000	2,600,000	912.3
Subtotal, ESEA title A.....	365,750	0	3,399,999	3,034,250	830.0
3. Class size reduction (Department of Education's Appropriations Act, 2001, section 3661):					
Annual appropriation.....	400,000	0	433,000	33,000	8.3
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	900,000	0	1,150,000	250,000	27.8
Subtotal.....	1,300,000	0	1,583,000	283,000	21.7
4. Teacher Employment Act:					
Annual appropriation.....	0	0	0	0	0
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	0	0	0	0	0
Subtotal.....	315,000	0	435,000	120,000	38.4

A total of \$23,390 thousand was provided in the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement account for the antecedent program of Eisenhower Professional Development Federal Activities.

A total of \$19,000 thousand for Early Childhood Educator Professional Development was provided within the funds appropriated for Eisenhower Professional Development National Activities.

Excludes \$2,000 thousand to be transferred to the Department of Defense to administer the Troops-to-Teachers Program Act of 1999.

Adjusted for comparability. Excludes \$19,000 thousand for Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortium which was requested in 2001 in the School Improvement program account and is shown under the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement account where funds are appropriated.

Contingent appropriation subject to authorization.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

in thousands of dollars

Office, Account, Expense, and Activity

2001

2001

2001

2001

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

CHANGE FROM 2000 APPROPRIATION

REMAINING

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

46.81

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

0

26,000

91,000

91,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

192,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

26,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

285,000

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 COMPREHENSIVE ACTION

OFFICE OF SPECIAL EDUCATION AND REHABILITATIVE SERVICES (OSERS) SPECIAL EDUCATION/IDEAL	D (in thousands of dollars)	2000		2001		2001 ADMINISTRATIVE	Change from 2000 Appropriation Amount
		FEDERAL FUNDS	STATE FUNDS	FEDERAL FUNDS	STATE FUNDS		
1. State Grants:							
(a) Grants to States (Part B-611 and Part D-674):							
Armed Services (Part B-611)	D	1,557,685	1,742,685	1,659,685	1,267,685	20,000	1.66
Advance for succeeding fiscal year	D	3,242,000	3,242,000	4,564,000	5,072,000	3,130,000	15.54
Subtotal		4,822,685	5,489,685	6,279,685	6,379,685	1,352,000	27.58
(b) Preschool grants (Part B-612)	D	190,000	395,000	190,000	390,000	0	0.01
(c) Grants for infants and families (Part C)	D	315,000	375,000	363,567	303,567	8,567	2.31
Subtotal, State Grants		5,327,685	6,259,685	6,833,252	7,073,252	1,396,567	23.61
2. National activities (Part D):							
(a) State improvement (Subpart 1)	D	35,200	45,200	35,200	48,700	14,000	39.81
(b) Research and innovation (Section 672)	D	64,433	74,433	74,433	77,333	12,920	20.14
(c) Technical assistance and dissemination (Section 685)	D	45,481	45,481	45,481	53,481	8,000	17.61
(d) Personnel preparation (Section 673)	D	83,952	83,952	83,952	83,952	0	0.00
(e) Parent information centers (Sections 682-684)	D	18,538	22,000	26,000	26,000	7,463	40.31
(f) Technology and media services (Section 687)	D	35,810	34,522	36,813	38,210	2,800	7.81
Subtotal, National Activities		263,511	325,588	328,879	336,696	45,105	16.34
Total, Appropriation		5,591,196	6,585,273	7,162,161	7,410,381	3,463,702	61.31
Total, Budget Authority		2,294,196	6,368,841	6,471,141	6,109,848	3,015,752	47.33
Current		2,394,196	2,628,841	2,733,141	2,367,848	73,752	3.28
Fiscal year's advance		0	3,742,000	3,738,000	3,742,000	3,742,000	100.00
Outlays, Total		5,432,281	5,624,308	6,065,957	5,489,685	26,000	0.46
Outlays, current		5,432,281	3,196,482	3,345,857	3,028,799	(2,105,494)	-47.39
Outlays, advance		0	2,619,450	2,619,450	2,432,300	2,432,300	100.00

1 Excludes an advance appropriation of \$3,742,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.
 2 Excludes an advance appropriation of \$4,524,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of fiscal year 2002.
 3 Excludes an advance appropriation of \$3,072,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of fiscal year 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Office, Account, Program and Activity	2000		2001		2001		Change from 2000 Appropriation Estimate
	Appropriation	Funds*	Hours	Estimate	Appropriation	Estimate	
REHABILITATION SERVICES AND PLANNING SERVICES							
1. Vocational rehabilitation State grants (a) Grants to States for I-A and sections 110 and 111; (b) Grants to States for I-CI	2,315,487	2,374,792	2,374,792	2,374,792	2,375,792	46,205	7.83
2. Client assistance State grants (IRA section 112)	23,998	23,998	23,998	23,998	23,998	608	2.51
3. Training (IRA section 102)	2,538,377	2,399,790	2,399,790	2,399,790	2,399,790	60,823	2.38
4. Demonstration and training programs (IRA section 103)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
5. Pilot and national networks (IRA section 104)	2,338,377	2,399,790	2,399,790	2,399,790	2,399,790	60,823	2.58
6. Recreational programs (IRA section 105)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
7. Protection and advocacy of individuals rights (IRA section 106)	11,894	13,000	13,000	13,000	13,000	2,106	17.73
8. Projects with infirmity (IRA VI-A)	22,071	22,071	22,071	22,071	22,071	0	0.00
9. Supported employment State grants (IRA VI-B)	18,152	38,152	38,152	38,152	38,152	0	0.00
10. Independent living (IRA VII)	22,296	22,296	22,296	22,296	22,296	0	0.00
(a) State grants (Chapter V, Part #)	48,090	58,000	58,000	58,000	58,000	10,000	20.81
(b) Centers (Chapter 2, Part C)	14,050	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000	5,000	35.74
(c) Services for older blind individuals (Chapter 2B)	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	1,900	0	0.00
11. Program improvement (IRA section 118)	1,387	1,387	1,387	1,387	1,387	0	0.00
12. Evaluation (IRA section 119)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.00
13. Helen Keller National Center for the Deaf-Blind Youth and Adults (HKNCA)	8,438	8,438	8,438	8,438	8,438	167	2.01
14. National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (IRA III)	86,462	86,462	86,462	86,462	86,462	13,338	15.43
15. Assistive Technology (ATA)	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000	0	0.00
Subtotal	388,012	399,861	399,861	399,861	405,549	55,688	14.24
Total	2,706,989	2,798,651	2,798,651	2,798,651	2,801,339	2,652	0.10
Total, discretionary	368,012	368,012	368,012	368,012	368,012	0	0.00
Total, mandatory	2,338,977	2,430,639	2,430,639	2,430,639	2,433,327	2,652	0.11
Outlays, discretionary	368,012	368,012	368,012	368,012	368,012	0	0.00
Outlays, mandatory	2,370,965	2,462,627	2,462,627	2,462,627	2,465,315	2,652	0.11

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

(in thousands of dollars)	2001 B APPROPRIATION	2001 PRESIDENT'S REQUEST	2001 HOURS	2001 SENATE	2001 APPROPRIATION	CHANGE FROM 2000 APPROPRIATION AMOUNT PERCENT
Office Account, Printing and Activity	10,100	10,265	11,000	17,500	12,000	1,900 18.8%
American Printing House for the Blind	12,685	10,255	10,945	22,356	11,000	1795 -6.3%
Outlays	45,500	45,500	45,100	40,823	45,101	5,297 11.7%
National Technical Institute for the Deaf	45,500	45,500	45,000	47,100	45,000	2,500 5.5%
1. Operations	2,651	5,376	5,000	3,136	5,376	2,725 102.8%
2. Construction	48,351	51,726	50,000	54,366	51,376	5,205 10.2%
Total	45,500	47,600	45,100	40,823	45,101	5,297 11.7%
Outlays	83,480	83,650	83,400	87,650	85,400	5,250 7.1%
2. Construction	3,500	0	0	0	0	(2,500) -100.0%
Total	85,380	83,650	83,400	87,650	85,400	3,420 4.0%
Outlays	82,138	82,075	82,720	82,075	82,720	7,503 9.1%
TOTAL APPROPRIATION, OSERS	9,887,416	9,312,103	9,481,354	10,107,174	10,400,063	2,512,047 27.0%
Total, discretionary	4,546,434	5,312,403	7,001,574	7,507,386	8,000,273	1,451,834 22.2%
Total, mandatory	2,338,977	2,399,790	2,338,790	2,399,790	2,339,790	60,913 2.6%
TOTAL BUREAU AUTHORITY, OSERS	5,145,416	6,317,193	9,481,364	9,425,178	9,070,283	3,924,647 76.3%
Total, discretionary	2,806,437	6,912,403	7,001,574	7,025,386	6,570,273	3,883,834 132.2%
Total, mandatory	2,338,977	2,399,790	2,338,790	2,399,790	2,399,790	60,913 2.6%

Excludes an advance appropriation of \$1,722,882 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

Excludes an advance appropriation of \$4,514,600 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of fiscal year 2002.

Excludes an advance appropriation of \$5,072,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of fiscal year 2002.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

12/21/00
(in thousands of dollars)

Office Account, Program and Authority

1000 APPROPRIATION

1991 FUND

1991 President's Budget

1991 APPROPRIATION

1991 FUND

1991 APPROPRIATION

1991 FUND

Change from 1996 Appropriation

Balance

Office Account, Program and Authority	1000 APPROPRIATION	1991 FUND	1991 President's Budget	1991 APPROPRIATION	1991 FUND	1991 APPROPRIATION	Change from 1996 Appropriation	Balance
OFFICE OF VOCATIONAL AND ADULT EDUCATION (OVAE)								
Vocational and Adult Education								
2. Vocational education (Carl D. Perkins VAFEA):								
(a) Basic grants (VAFEA Title I and VII section 5031):								
Annual appropriations.....	266,650	309,075	266,650	285,680	309,000	44,350	18,81	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	791,000	791,000	791,000	791,000	791,000	0	0.01	
Subtotal, basic grants.....	1,055,450	1,100,000	1,055,650	1,071,000	1,100,000	44,350	4.21	
(b) National program (section 114):								
Annual appropriations.....	17,500	17,500	17,500	17,500	17,500	0	0.01	
(c) Occupational and employment information (section 119):								
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	
(d) Tribally controlled postsecondary vocational and technical institutions (section 117):								
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	4,600	0	21.71	
(e) Tech-prep education (Title II section 2041):								
Annual appropriations.....	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	0	0.01	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	
Subtotal, Tech-prep.....	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	106,000	0	0.01	
(f) Tech-prep demonstration (Title II section 107):								
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	
Subtotal, vocational education.....	1,192,750	1,228,100	1,183,750	1,211,100	1,228,100	44,350	6.21	
3. Adult education (adult education and family literacy):								
(a) State grants (Chapter 7 and MIA section 503):								
Annual appropriations.....	450,000	470,000	450,000	470,000	470,000	20,000	20.88	
(b) National Institute for Literacy (section 242):								
Annual appropriations.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	5,000	0	0.01	
(c) National Leadership Activities (section 343):								
Annual appropriations.....	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0.01	
Subtotal, adult education.....	470,000	490,000	470,000	490,000	490,000	20,000	21.13	
4. Literacy programs for prisoners (NLA, section 501):								
Annual appropriations.....	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0.01	
Subtotal, literacy programs.....	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	14,000	0	0.01	
TOTAL APPROPRIATION, OVAE:								
Annual appropriations.....	1,681,750	1,718,600	1,681,750	1,718,600	1,718,600	36,850	36.81	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	791,000	791,000	791,000	791,000	791,000	0	0.01	
Prior year's advance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	
Subtotal, OVAE.....	2,472,750	2,509,600	2,472,750	2,509,600	2,509,600	36,850	36.83	
TOTAL BUDGET AUTHORITY, OVAE:								
Annual appropriations.....	1,546,812	1,639,169	1,546,812	1,639,169	1,639,169	82,357	82.31	
Advance for succeeding fiscal year.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	
Prior year's advance.....	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.01	
Subtotal, OVAE.....	1,546,812	1,639,169	1,546,812	1,639,169	1,639,169	82,357	82.33	

A total of \$19,000 thousand in fiscal year 2000 was provided for State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders, which included funding for Literacy Programs for Prisoners. A total of \$22,000 thousand was provided for State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders, which included funding for Literacy Programs for Prisoners. Excludes an advance appropriation of \$191,000 thousand that becomes available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.

Authorization as in effect prior to enactment of the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, which repealed the National Literacy Act.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

OFFICE OF STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS (OSFAP) STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE	2000		2001		2001		CHANGE FROM 2000 ESTIMATION
	Y	B	PRELIMINARY ESTIMATE	REMARKS	RECOMMENDATION	DIFFERENCE	
1. Federal Pell grants (HEA IV-A-1)	9,639,717	9,358,000	9,639,717	9,358,000	8,692,000	8,756,000	1,116,783
Funding surplus used (non-add)	382,793	132,000	382,793	0	384,000	359,000	96,317
Funding shortfall (non-add)	0	0	0	30,000	0	0	0
Subtotal, program costs (non-add)	7,992,000	9,490,000	7,992,000	8,338,000	8,776,000	8,756,000	1,223,000
Maximum award (in whole dollars)	3,368	3,300	3,368	3,300	3,650	3,750	450
Subtotal, new appropriation	7,639,717	8,356,000	7,639,717	8,308,000	8,692,000	8,756,000	1,116,283
2. Campus-based programs:							
(a) Federal supplemental educational opportunity grants (HEA IV-A-7)	611,900	631,000	611,900	631,000	631,000	631,000	60,000
(b) Federal work-study (HEA IV-C)	934,000	1,011,000	934,000	1,011,000	1,011,000	1,011,000	77,000
(c) Federal Perkins loans (HEA IV-E):							
(1) Capital contributions	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	0
(2) Loan cancellations	30,000	40,000	30,000	40,000	75,000	60,000	30,000
Subtotal, Perkins loans	130,000	140,000	130,000	140,000	175,000	160,000	30,000
Subtotal, campus-based programs	1,675,000	1,822,000	1,675,000	1,842,000	1,877,000	1,882,000	157,000
3. Leveraging educational assistance partnership (HEA IV-A-1)	40,000	60,000	40,000	0	70,000	55,000	15,000
4. Loan forgiveness for child care providers (HEA section 428k)	0	0	0	0	10,000	1,000	1,000
TOTAL	9,714,717	10,228,000	9,714,717	10,150,000	10,649,000	10,674,000	1,299,283
Outlays	8,944,029	9,478,940	8,944,029	9,478,703	9,818,703	9,844,503	868,474

1. Reflects the Department's December 2000 estimate of Pell Grants program costs.

2. Reflects the Department's June 2000 estimate of PEW Grants program costs.

* Includes \$10,000 thousand in emergency funds for disaster relief.

* Includes \$10,000 thousand in fiscal year 2000, \$10,000 thousand under the President's request, \$10,000 thousand under the President's request, \$10,000 thousand under the Senate and 625,000 thousand under the fiscal year 2001 appropriation for Special LEAP, pursuant to HSA Section 428k(b)(2) which states that when the appropriation for LEAP exceeds \$30,000 thousand, the excess shall be reserved to carry out Special LEAP, authorized under Section 418.

* Funds for the Loan Forgiveness for Child Care Providers were provided in a General Provision under Title III of the Senate Bill.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

(in thousands of dollars)	2001 President's Request	2001 House	2001 Senate	2001 Administration	Change from 2000 Appropriation Request	PERCENT
Federal Family Education Loans (FISMA)						
1. Family education loans (FEL) (V-B)	12,357,000	12,357,000	12,357,000	12,357,000	3,714,000	-73.7%
Outlays	12,357,000	12,357,000	12,357,000	12,357,000	2,714,000	-73.4%
Funds returned to Treasury (non-add)					2,278,000	-73.4%
Federal Family Education Loan Program Account						
2. New loan subsidies (FEL IV-B)	4,215,584	4,215,584	4,215,584	4,215,584	140,378	3.3%
3. Reestimates of existing loans	776,881	0	0	0	(776,881)	-100.0%
Subtotal, loan subsidies	4,992,465	4,215,584	4,215,584	4,215,584	(805,223)	-12.7%
4. Federal administration (FELA section 9514e)	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000	0	0.0%
Total, FELA Program	5,040,584	4,263,584	4,263,584	4,263,584	(805,223)	-12.7%
Total, discretionary	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000	0	0.0%
Total, mandatory	4,992,584	4,215,584	4,215,584	4,215,584	(805,223)	-12.7%
Outlays, Total	4,992,584	4,263,584	4,263,584	4,263,584	(805,223)	-12.7%
Outlays, discretionary	48,000	48,000	48,000	48,000	0	0.0%
Outlays, mandatory	4,944,584	4,215,584	4,215,584	4,215,584	(805,223)	-12.7%

* Reflects a program-side negative subsidy; no new budget authority is required.
 † Proposed legislation containing cost-savings measures was not enacted by the Congress; therefore, the 2001 conference amount reflects the current services measure prepared for mid-session review of the budget.

NOTE: Mandatory amounts for 2000 and 2001 reflect policy estimates prepared for mid-session review of the budget (June 2000).

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

Office, Account, Program and Activity	2000		2001		2001		CHANGE FROM 2000 APPROPRIATION
	AMOUNT	PERCENT	AMOUNT	PERCENT	ADMINISTRATION	PERCENT	
Federal Student Loan Program Account							
1. New loan subsidies (HEA IV-B)	11,069,249	1646.1981	1546,1991		(646,199)	423,067	-39.51
2. Reestimate of existing loans	(2,442,285)	0	0		0	2,442,285	100.00
Subtotal, loan subsidies	(3,513,551)	1646.1981	1546,1991		(646,199)	2,865,352	-61.69
3. Federal administration (HEA IV-D section 498)							
(a) Federal administration	735,000	770,000	770,000		770,000	15,000	4.81
(b) Payments for services to quasi-state agencies (non-add)	180,000	170,000	170,000		170,000	10,000	-5.43
Subtotal, Federal administration	735,000	770,000	770,000		770,000	35,000	4.83
Total	(2,778,551)	123.602	123,602		123,602	2,908,352	-104.51
Outlays, Total	(2,830,198)	75.748	75,748		75,748	2,905,944	-102.71
Outlays, Federal administration	521,353	721,844	721,844		721,844	40,591	6.82
Outlays, loan subsidies - mandatory	(3,513,551)	1646.1981	1646,1981		1646,1981	2,865,352	-61.69
Funds returned to Treasury (non-add)	(2,812,353)	1646.1981	1646,1981		1646,1981	2,865,352	-61.69
TOTAL OBPAP	9,285,750	12,816,104	12,816,104		12,816,104	6,298,033	57.11
Total, discretionary	9,422,717	10,138,000	10,138,000		10,138,000	1,297,283	13.88
Total, mandatory	(1,136,967)	2,678,104	2,678,104		2,678,104	3,999,750	-2913.53

Reflects a program-wide negative subsidy; no new budget authority is required.

NOTE: Mandatory amounts for 2000 and 2001 reflect policy estimates prepared for Mid-session Review of the Budget (June 2000).

(in thousands of dollars)	D	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	CHANGES FROM 2000 APPROPRIATION
Office, Account, Program and Activity		Request	Actual	Actual	Appropriation	Change	Annual
Higher Education (continued)							
3. Assistance for students:							
(a) Federal TRIO programs (HEA IV-A-2, Chapter 31)	D	545,000	325,500	760,000	716,500	716,500	85,000
(b) Training early entrants and students for undergraduate programs (HEA IV-A-2, Chapter 31)	D	200,000	125,000	780,000	225,000	225,000	95,000
(c) Scholarships and fellowships:							
(1) BY2D honors scholarships (HEA IV-A-2)	D	32,850	41,001	19,450	41,001	41,001	1,142
(2) Javits fellowships (HEA IV-A-2)	D	20,000	19,000	19,000	11,500	10,000	(10,000)
(3) Graduate assistance in areas of national need (HEA VII-A-2)	D	31,000	31,000	31,000	31,000	0	0
(4) Truogood Marshall legal educational opportunity program (HEA IV-A-2)	D	0	0	0	0	0	0
(5) B.A. Stupak Olympic scholarships (Higher Education Amendments of 1982, Section 1543)	D	0	0	0	0	0	0
(d) Child care access needs parents in school (HEA IV-A-2)	D	5,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	20,000
(e) Learning anytime anywhere partnerships (HEA IV-A-2)	D	22,250	10,000	10,000	30,000	30,000	6,750
4. Teacher quality enhancement (HEA II)	D	98,000	98,000	98,000	98,000	0	0
5. Undergraduate retained program (NE Amendments of 1998, VIII-2)	D	1,750	1,750	1,750	1,750	0	0
6. Web-based Education Commission (NE Amendments of 1998, VIII-3)	D	450	0	0	0	0	(450)
7. SPED data/USEN program evaluation (Department of Education Appropriations Act, 2000)	D	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	0	0
8. Community scholarship mobilization (NE Amendments of 1998, VIII-2)	D	1,000	0	0	0	0	(1,000)
Total		1,530,750	1,799,073	3,468,081	3,468,520	3,468,520	340,771
Outlays		2,468,824	1,509,486	1,497,023	1,497,023	1,497,023	(78,802)

A total of \$51,000 thousand in fiscal year 2000 was provided under Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need, which included funding for Javits fellowships.

A total of \$10,000 thousand that remain available through fiscal year 2001 for academic year 2001-2002.

Funds would remain available through fiscal year 2002 for academic year 2002-2003.

Reflects a reappropriation that extended the availability of funds appropriated in fiscal year 1999. The reappropriation is scored as new budget authority in fiscal year 2000.

A total of \$10 thousand was provided for the Web-based Education Commission in the funds for the improvement of Education under the Education Research, Statistics, and Improvement Account.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 1961 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

12/22/60

(in thousands of dollars)
 Office Account, Program and Activity

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
Howard University (20 U.S.C. 121 et seq.)									
1. Howard University Hospital (20 U.S.C. 124)	0			30,374	30,374		30,374	40,174	0.0%
2. General support (20 U.S.C. 123 and 130a)	0			189,879	196,100		202,100	13,030	6.8%
Total				219,444	226,474		232,474	53,204	5.9%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
Higher Education Facilities Loans (liquidity) (HEA section 1211, Outlays)				(5,878)	(6,878)		(6,878)	(1,043)	17.2%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
College Moving and Academic Facilities Loans (liquidity) (HEA section 1211, Outlays)				(6,789)	(5,233)		(5,233)	(444)	9.2%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans Program (HEA section 1211)				737	737		737	762	3.1%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
1. Federal administration (PCA section 501e)				737	737		737	762	3.1%
Outlays, Total				737	737		737	762	3.1%
Outlays, Federal administration				1,282	1,282		1,282	469	56.8%
Outlays, loan subsidies				792	792		792	33	4.3%
				495	495		495	435	87.4%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
College Housing Loans (liquidity) (HEA section 1211, Outlays)				(26,722)	(23,124)		(23,124)	3,599	13.5%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
Historically Black College and University Capital Financing Program Account (HEA 1211)				307	308		308	3	0.5%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
2. Federal administration (PCA section 501e)				307	308		308	3	0.5%
Outlays				307	308		308	3	0.5%

	D	V	M	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Charge from 1960 Appropriation
				Administration	House	Senate	Administration	Amount	Percent
TOTAL, DWR				1,751,167	1,815,489		1,815,489	393,897	22.8%

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

(in thousands of dollars)	D	V	N	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Change from 2000 Appropriation
				RECORDED	RECORD	RECORD	RECORD	RECORD	AMOUNT
OFFICE OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH AND IMPROVEMENT (OERI)									
ADMINISTRATIVE, SALARIAL, AND FUNDING									
1. Research, development and dissemination for research, development and administration (proposed legislation)	D			0	0	0	0	0	0
(a) Research and dissemination (EDDIA Part C, Part D section 411)(g) and Part E)	D			103,567	103,567	112,567	120,567	17,000	17,000
(c) Regional educational laboratories (EDDIA section 411)(h))	D			85,000	85,000	85,000	85,000	0	0
Subtotal				188,567	188,567	197,567	205,567	17,000	17,000
2. Statistics (NSA)	D			68,000	68,000	68,000	68,000	0	0
3. Assessment:									
(a) National Assessment (NSA section 411)	D			36,000	36,000	36,000	36,000	0	0
(b) National Assessment Governing Board (NSA section 412)	D			4,000	4,000	4,000	4,000	0	0
Subtotal				40,000	40,000	40,000	40,000	0	0
4. America's Levers (proposed legislation)	D			0	0	0	0	0	0
5. Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIEA X-2)	D			144,232	144,232	142,187	139,154	95,122	35,031
6. Davis Gifted and talented education (EDDIA X-3)	D			8,500	7,500	7,500	7,500	1,000	15,031
7. National writing project (NSW X-4)	D			8,000	8,000	8,000	8,000	1,000	11,111
8. Career education (NSW section 10601)	D			9,850	8,850	8,850	12,800	2,150	21,811
9. International education exchange (EDDIA 2000 EAA title VI)	D			7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	3,000	42,031
10. Eisenhower regional mathematics and science education consortia (NSW XIII-C)	D			15,000	15,000	15,000	15,000	0	0
11. Eisenhower professional development Federal activities (NSW II-A)	D			23,300	23,300	23,300	23,300	0	0
Total				591,449	494,367	506,319	722,723	131,272	22,281
Outlays				650,812	588,693	597,231	624,468	66,367	9,641
TOTAL, OERI				517,567	494,367	506,319	722,723	191,152	22,281

* Excludes \$10,000 thousand transferred to the Secretary of the Interior for an award to the National Constitution Center for construction activities.
 * Adjusted for comparability. Requested in fiscal year 2001 under High Standards in the Classroom in the School Improvement Programs Account.
 * A total of \$25,000 thousand was requested under proposed legislation in the School Improvement Programs account for a comparable program of National Activities for the Improvement of Teaching and School Leadership.
 NOTE: All activities in this account for which funds are proposed in fiscal year 2001 are requested under proposed legislation.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION FISCAL YEAR 2001 CONGRESSIONAL ACTION

(in thousands of dollars)	D	2000	2001	2001	2001	2001	Change from 2000 Appropriation
Office, Account, Program and Activity		Reimbursable	Hours	Salaries	ADDITIONAL	AMOUNT	PERCENT
DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT							
Program Administration (DEA, section 203) Outlays	D	397,841	413,184	382,936	413,184	16,343	7.94
		421,237	388,428	384,908	399,428	(1,664)	-0.51
Office for Civil Rights (OHR), section 203 Outlays	D	71,200	76,000	71,200	76,000	4,800	6.74
		76,832	74,134	72,781	74,134	(2,697)	-3.56
Office of the Inspector General (OIG), section 212 Outlays	D	34,400	36,500	34,400	36,500	2,100	7.41
		35,837	35,838	34,288	35,838	(94)	-0.31
Departmental Renovation (DEA, section 203) Outlays	D	2,732	0	0	0	(2,732)	-100.00
Total, Departmental Management		488,641	525,684	488,134	525,684	37,550	7.71
CONTRIBUTIONS							
Outlays	M	0	0	0	0	0	---
Total		782	0	0	0	(782)	-100.00
REIMBURSEMENT							
1. Perkins loan repayments	M	(30,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	(50,000)	0	0.00
2. FFEI guaranty agency reserve recoveries	M	0	(1,309,000)	(1,309,000)	(1,309,000)	(1,309,000)	-100.00
3. HEAF Funds	D	(27,000)	0	0	0	27,000	100.00
Total		(57,000)	(1,359,000)	(1,359,000)	(1,359,000)	(1,359,000)	-100.00
CHANGING LEGISLATION, ESTABLISHED FUNDS							
Outlays	D	2,761	2,761	2,761	2,761	0	0.00
APPROPRIATION TOTAL, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT		37,732,877	43,751,750	40,801,193	46,881,202	9,079,109	34.59
Discretionary Funds	D	35,578,067	40,094,856	37,152,359	42,078,469	6,499,282	29.13
Mandatory Funds	M	2,154,810	3,656,894	3,648,834	4,802,733	2,750,343	127.81
BUDGET AUTHORITY TOTAL, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT		31,488,077	43,751,750	40,801,193	46,881,202	9,079,109	34.59
Budget Authority, Discretionary Funds	D	29,218,067	40,094,856	37,152,359	42,078,469	6,499,282	29.13
Budget Authority, Mandatory Funds	M	2,269,910	3,656,894	3,648,834	4,802,733	2,750,343	127.81
OUTLAYS TOTAL, EDUCATION DEPARTMENT		34,651,552	46,471,477	44,450,186	51,644,165	7,000,000	25.81
Outlays, Discretionary Funds	D	33,253,223	42,344,261	40,321,193	46,881,202	6,499,282	29.13
Outlays, Mandatory Funds	M	1,398,329	3,127,126	3,127,126	4,802,733	2,750,343	127.81

* Excludes \$91 thousand transferred to the Department of Agriculture and General Services Administration to support fiscal year 2000 emergency activities associated with the Chief Information Officers and Chief Financial Officers Councils.
 † Excludes \$19,427,763 thousand in advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of the following fiscal year.
 ‡ Excludes \$14,748,312 thousand in advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of fiscal year 2002.
 † Excludes \$14,569,300 thousand in advance appropriations that become available on October 1 of fiscal year 2002.

NOTE: Appropriation totals displayed above reflect the total funds provided in the year of appropriation, including advance appropriation amounts that do not become available until the succeeding fiscal year. The total budget authority reflects funds that become available in the fiscal year shown, which include new amounts provided for that fiscal year and amounts advanced from the prior year's appropriation.

NOTE: The Senate bill includes a total of \$31.8 million in reductions for salaries and expenses to be allocated among the Departments of Labor, HHS, and Education. The final conference includes a similar reduction of \$25 million. The Department of Education's share of which has not been determined.