

Questions + Answers to
questions from MJD Long
in ESEA 99.

TITLE I ACCOUNTABILITY

Question: How do the accountability provisions in your Title I proposal differ from current law? What difference would they make?

Answer:

- For the most part, the Administration's proposal would strengthen the existing but not yet fully implemented approach to accountability in Title I, which rests on standards-based assessments of student performance.
- New measures would give parents, districts, and States the information and resources to ensure that no Title I school languishes in failure.
- Our proposal would encourage States to develop one rigorous, statewide accountability system for all schools, including Title I schools, to eliminate the multiple and often confusing Title I and State accountability systems currently operating in more than half the States. The bill would give States flexibility to use either of two accountability models: the one outlined in the statute, which would require schools to make substantial gains in overall student performance and in the performance of the lowest-performing students, or an alternative that is at least as rigorous and effective.
- We would strengthen State and local capacity to improve low-performing schools by requiring States to reserve 2.5 percent (increasing to 3.5 percent by 2003) of their Title I allocations for this purpose. At least 70 percent of these funds would go to districts to turn around low-performing schools, with a priority on districts with chronically failing schools that need the strongest interventions. Fewer than half of the schools identified for improvement in 1997-98 received additional professional development or assistance.
- If schools fail to improve within three years of being identified as in need of improvement, our proposal would require districts to take corrective action, including one or more of the following: (1) implementing a new, research-based curriculum, (2) redesigning or reconstituting the school, including re-opening it as a charter school, (3) closing the school; and (4) in conjunction with any other above actions, allow students in schools that are subject to corrective action to transfer to other public schools.
- Title I accountability would be enhanced by the school, district, and State report cards required under the Education Accountability Act in Title XI. The report cards would give all parents the information they need to evaluate the quality of the schools their children attend, including data on student achievement broken out by ethnic and racial subgroups, limited English proficiency students, and students with disabilities.
- We would strengthen accountability for the progress of limited English proficient students in learning English by requiring schools to test LEP students who have attended schools in the U.S. for three consecutive years in English on the State's reading or language arts assessment. In addition, States would still be required to assess students in the content areas in the language and form most likely to yield accurate information.

TITLE I PARAPROFESSIONALS

Question: What changes are you proposing with regard to the use of paraprofessionals in the Title I program? What is your rationale for those changes? What effects will they have? Would requirements to eliminate the use of paraprofessionals in providing instruction mean that programs like Success for All, which use paraprofessionals, could no longer be supported by Title I?

Answer:

- Paraprofessionals continue to be widely used in Title I schools to provide instruction, despite the fact that very few paraprofessionals have the educational background necessary to teach students.
- In the 1997-98 school year, 84 percent of principals in high-poverty schools reported using aides, and almost all of those aides (98 percent) were either teaching or helping teach students. Three-fourths of paraprofessionals (76 percent) spent at least some time teaching without a teacher present.
- Since we know that teacher quality is critical to determining student success, we must greatly reduce or eliminate the use of paraprofessionals in instructional roles.
- The Administration's bill would require all paraprofessionals to hold at least a high school diploma or equivalent.
- In addition, only paraprofessionals with at least two years of college could assist teachers by providing instructional help such as tutoring, assisting with classroom management, or providing guidance in a computer laboratory. Aides with less than two years of college would be limited to parent liaison or other non-instructional roles.
- At the same time, we would encourage paraprofessionals to become certified teachers by supporting State and local efforts to build career ladders leading to certification.
- Success for All and other instructional strategies supported by Title I could continue to rely on paraprofessionals for tutoring and other activities, so long as those paraprofessionals have completed at least two years of college.

TITLE I "FOLLOW-THE-CHILD" PROPOSALS

Question: Would your proposal require Title I funding to "follow-the-child?" If not, why not?

Answer:

- No, the Administration's proposal does not include a "follow-the-child" provision in Title I.
- In the face of a limited number of high-quality public and private schools, voucher proposals like "follow-the-child" can do no more than promise success for a few students at the expense of failure for entire schools.
- Like all voucher proposals, Title I vouchers would siphon money away from public schools that face the enormous financial burdens of educating concentrations of severely disadvantaged students. Vouchers also would likely dilute the impact of Title I funding, reversing recent gains in targeting funds to the highest poverty schools with the greatest needs.
- In response to research showing a strong link between concentration of poverty and academic failure, Title I was restructured in 1994 to emphasize the need to improve the entire program of schools enrolling large numbers of poor students, rather than serving individual poor kids apart from their peers. With its focus on individuals, follow-the-child is diametrically opposed to this research-based approach, which concentrates Federal funds to transform entire schools.
- Title I vouchers would create instability and disruption in Title I schools at just the time thousands of Title I schools are undertaking the comprehensive, research-based, schoolwide reforms that show the greatest promise of narrowing the achievement gap between disadvantaged kids and their more advantaged peers. The uncertainty of annual school funding levels under a voucher program could make the long-term planning and hiring needed for effective comprehensive reforms all but impossible.
- Vouchers undermine efforts, greatly strengthened in the Administration's reauthorization bill, to ensure accountability for the effective use of Federal education funds to improve student achievement.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Question: How many separate professional development programs or set-asides are included in your bill? If there are more than a couple, what is your rationale for including that many, and how do they all fit together?

Answer:

- Although the Administration is proposing several professional development programs under the Educational Excellence for All Children Act, the major professional development program that we are proposing is Teaching to High Standards (Title II), which would provide funds to States and school districts for professional development for teachers of children in grades K through 12. This initiative would replace State reform programs under Title III of Goals 2000, ESEA Title II (Eisenhower Professional Development), and ESEA Title VI (Innovative Education Program Strategies).
- Teaching to High Standards would provide professional development to educators to help them bring high standards to the classroom for all students. The program would provide teachers with sustained and intensive high-quality professional development in the core academic content areas, including a \$300 million annual set-aside for professional development in mathematics and science. This professional development would be aligned with State and local content and student performance standards.
- Teaching to High Standards would focus federal funding more tightly on the type of professional development that researchers demonstrate and teachers report is most beneficial. The proposal would direct funds, for example, toward efforts to strengthen instruction in core academic content areas rather than toward general strategies for improving classroom practice. The proposal would also promote the use of professional development activities that are sustained over time, rather than those that are condensed into a single workshop, and activities that incorporate active collaboration among teachers, rather than passive lectures and disconnected practice in isolated classrooms.
- Teachers of younger children also need high-quality professional development to improve classroom instruction. To meet this need, the Administration is proposing the Early Childhood Professional Development Initiative (also in Title II) to enhance the future academic success of young children, especially those living in poverty. Currently, there are no concentrated Federal funds to meet this need.
- To provide additional support for children in high-poverty schools, the Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards (Title I) proposal would support high-quality instruction by requiring Title I districts to: (1) set aside 5 percent of program funds in fiscal years 2001 and 2002 and 10 percent of funds in subsequent years for professional development, (2) ensure that new Title I teachers are certified in the field in which they are teaching, and (3) raise the minimum qualifications for paraprofessionals working in Title I programs. This would allow Title I schools to tailor professional development to meet the unique needs and instructional approaches of each school.
- Teachers of limited English proficient students need special skills and knowledge to provide high-quality instruction for this student population. School districts nationally have had a

great deal of trouble finding qualified bilingual education and ESL teachers. Therefore, our bill would continue the current Title VII professional development program.

- The Elementary School Foreign Language Program would provide funds to help more elementary school teachers become qualified to teach a foreign language. Research indicates that the optimum time to begin learning a second language is in elementary school; however, fewer than one-third of elementary schools in the United States offer foreign language instruction.

TEACHER QUALITY AND RECRUITMENT

Question: What, if anything, would your bill do to help school districts recruit the 2 million new teachers they will need to hire over the next decade?

Answer:

- Despite the fact that every year the Nation's colleges and universities produce many more teachers than are hired and that over 2 million individuals who possess education degrees are currently engaged in activities other than teaching, many school districts experience difficulty recruiting and hiring enough fully-qualified teachers. The reasons include --
 - Cumbersome and poorly coordinated State licensing procedures and local hiring practices;
 - Bureaucratic personnel practices that result in hiring decisions being delayed until as late as the start of the school year;
 - Salaries and working conditions that discourage many individuals from entering teaching and cause experienced teachers to leave the profession;
 - A lack of support for new teachers that could help reduce the attrition rate and the number of new teachers that school districts must hire every year; and
 - Compensation systems that do not reward teachers for improving their knowledge and skills.
- To help address these problems, the Administration is proposing several programs in the Educational Excellence for All Children Act that would provide funds to improve teacher recruitment practices. Title II programs that would support these efforts include the following:
 - The Teaching to High Standards program would provide States with additional resources to support the development, at the school district and school-building level, of improved systems for recruiting, selecting, and hiring new teachers, as well as to create a statewide network to provide potential teachers with access to information on job openings, required qualifications, and on-line applications.
 - The Teaching to High Standards program would also support the efforts of school districts to develop incentives to encourage teachers and other qualified individuals to obtain proficiency in content knowledge in core academic subject areas identified by the school district as having a shortage of qualified teachers. Because research shows that many schools have difficulty retaining teachers during their first three years on the job, part of the program also focuses on induction programs for new teachers that provide them with the support and mentoring they need to succeed in the classroom.
 - The Transition to Teaching program would build on the highly successful work of the Department of Defense's Troops to Teachers program. This program would broaden the

focus of Troops to Teachers to recruit, place, and support a wide range of talented career-changing professionals as teachers, especially in high-poverty school districts and high-need subject areas.

- Title II would also authorize the creation of a nationwide job bank for teaching positions; support efforts to increase the portability of teacher credentials, pensions, and credited years of experience among States and school districts; and support the development and implementation of national or regional programs to recruit highly-qualified individuals to become teachers, through alternative routes to certification, in high-poverty school districts.
- Title VI of the ESEA, the Class-Size Reduction initiative, would allow school districts to use program funds to recruit, hire, and train certified regular and special education teachers to reduce class size.
- The teacher quality and recruitment proposals included in our ESEA proposal compliment and build upon the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants program authorized under the Higher Education Act of 1965, enacted last year. The State grant program is designed to help States improve the quality of their teaching force through promoting reform activities such as teacher licensing and certification, teacher preparation and professional development, and recruiting teachers for high-need schools. The Recruitment grant program supports efforts to reduce shortages of qualified teachers in high-need school districts. This program supports high-quality teacher preparation programs that work to meet locally identified needs, identify pools of potential teachers who address the shortages, and recruit individuals from these pools.

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

Question: Evaluations seem to indicate that the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program has been ineffective. How does your bill address this problem?

Answer: Our reauthorization proposal for Safe and Drug-Free Schools would improve the program by:

- Emphasizing the importance of high-quality, research-based programs. Under our proposal, States would award subgrants competitively to school districts and other applicants, based in significant part on the quality of their plan. Programs would need to be based on research, address locally identified needs and goals, and be assessed regularly for progress. We would also increase support for State activities to help applicants create and implement effective, accountable programs.
- Concentrating funds on areas of high need. In contrast to the current law, under which SDFSC funds are allocated by formula to all school districts in amounts too small to have a significant impact in most districts, our proposal would require States to focus program funds on districts that have significant drug and crime problems and comprehensive, research-based plans to solve them.
- Strengthening program accountability. State and local recipients of SDFS funds would be required to adopt outcome-based performance indicators and report regularly on their progress. Continuation of local grants would depend on achievement of satisfactory progress toward meeting performance targets. In addition, school districts would be required to create and disseminate to the public an annual "report card" on school crime and disorder.
- Emphasize school-wide solutions that focus on building safe, disciplined, and drug-free learning environments. We would require school districts to develop a comprehensive "Safe Schools Plan" to ensure that essential program components are in place and that school efforts are coordinated with related community-based activities. The plans would include fair and effective discipline policies, safe passage to schools, research-based drug and violence prevention policies, and after-school programs.
- Improving coordination between State educational agencies and Governors' programs. State and local educational agency programs and activities funded by the SDFS Governors' program would be more closely coordinated and focus all resources on the creation of safe, orderly, and drug-free learning environments that support student achievement.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

Question: The Secretary has said that the Administration's goal is to have all limited English proficient children become proficient in English within three years. Would your bill hold schools to that standard?

Answer:

- The bill includes strong measures to ensure that schools are held accountable for limited English proficient (LEP) students gaining proficiency in English in three years.
- Our Title I proposal would require that, after LEP students have been enrolled in school for three consecutive years, school districts measure their progress in reading and or language arts using State assessments written in English. School districts will use the results of this English language testing to hold schools accountable for the achievement of LEP students.
- School districts receiving Title VII Bilingual Education grants would annually assess the English language proficiency of participating LEP students. If a program, after three years, is not making continuous and substantial progress in enabling children to learn English and achieve to challenging standards, the school district operating the program would submit an improvement plan to the Secretary. If the Secretary later determines that the district is not making substantial progress in implementing the plan, he would terminate the grant.

HIGH SCHOOL REFORM

Question: Why is the Administration proposing a new high school reform program? How will the program operate?

Answer: We are proposing this initiative for several reasons, including the following:

- High schools are extremely important because of their role in preparing an educated citizenry and a skilled and adaptable workforce.
- The dropout rate, NAEP and TIMSS results, and other data indicate that many high schools are failing to meet the challenges they face.
- As the violence at Columbine High School demonstrated, many high school students feel disconnected from school and from adults. These students can be prone to emotional distress, use drugs and alcohol, and may engage in violence. These phenomena may be particularly present in the very large high schools that many students attend.
- The school reform movement has largely focused on elementary schools. For instance, most of the projects carried out under the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations program have been at the elementary level.
- High schools do receive some ESEA funds, particularly under Title I, but it doesn't seem to be enough. We would like to provide some funding for schools to bring together all their other resources – Federal, State, and local – in pursuit of serious, standards-based educational reforms.

The initiative would work in the following manner:

- Local educational agencies would compete for three-year grants.
- The Department would award grants on the basis of application quality and need. To the extent possible, at least half of grants would assist high schools that participate in Title I.
- High schools participating in the program would implement reforms aligned with their own needs. Reforms would be designed to provide all students in the school with challenging coursework, to motivate all students to learn, to help them achieve their educational and career goals, and make school a place where students receive individual attention and support.
- The Secretary would be authorized to make incentive awards to participating schools that, after three years in the program, demonstrate higher student achievement gains than comparable schools.
- The Department would carefully evaluate the reforms carried out under the program, and recognize and disseminate information on high schools that demonstrate outstanding results.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Question: A number of education groups have been highly critical of the technical assistance activities funded under the ESEA. How does your bill address those criticisms, and what changes are you proposing?

Answer: Our bill addresses criticisms, such as the following, about the technical assistance activities currently funded under the ESEA:

- Current ESEA technical assistance and dissemination efforts are insufficiently responsive to the needs of States, local educational agencies, and Indian tribes for help in identifying their particular needs for technical assistance and developing and implementing their own integrated systems for using the various sources of funding for technical assistance activities under the ESEA (as well as other State and local resources) to improve teaching and learning and to implement more effectively the programs authorized by the ESEA.
- State and district staff often turn to other, more accessible, sources for help in implementing programs.
- The Internet and other forms of advanced telecommunications technology are an important, but as yet underused, means of providing information and assistance in a cost-effective way.

Our bill addresses these criticisms by:

- Creating an integrated system of high-quality technical assistance providers to support school improvement and give States and school districts flexibility to determine and meet their technical assistance needs.
- Empowering customers by redirecting resources from the Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers to States and high-need districts to allow them to identify their needs, select technical assistance services, and build their capacity for school improvement.
- Retaining technical assistance centers in three key areas (math and science, technology, and parental involvement), and creating two new centers to address the special needs of limited English proficient, migratory, Indian, and Alaska Native students.
- Supporting local decision-making by providing information to States and districts to improve their own technical assistance systems and select high-quality technical assistance services and providers.
- Expanding the use of technology and electronic networks to disseminate information, assistance, and promising instructional strategies. In addition, all of the Department's technical assistance providers would be required to use electronic dissemination networks and World Wide Web-based resources, as well as other technologies, to expand their reach and improve service delivery.

GOALS 2000

Question: Why isn't the Administration proposing to reauthorize the Goals 2000 program? Has the program been a failure?

Answer:

- Goals 2000 has not been a failure; rather, it has been an important factor in promoting State and local reform efforts.
- In its 1998 report on Goals 2000, GAO found that "Goals 2000 appears to be accomplishing what the Congress intended – providing an additional flexible source to promote coordinated improvements to State and local education systems."
- With the support of Federal programs such as Goals 2000, all 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have made great progress in establishing high academic standards in the core academic subjects.
- The States that have demonstrated the most recent success in improving student achievement are those States that have developed challenging content and student performance standards, and aligned curricula and assessments with those standards.
- The Teaching to High Standards proposal included in the Administration's reauthorization proposal would build on and expand these efforts and support States and local districts as they strive to implement standards-based reform in every classroom. The Department's proposal to consolidate the Goals 2000, Eisenhower State Grants, and Title VI programs would strengthen the focus of States and local districts on providing the types of professional development activities that have been proven effective in providing teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary to prepare all students to achieve to challenging standards.
- The Administration's reauthorization proposal would also assist States and local districts in continuing to advance the implementation of standards-based reform by supporting the continued development of challenging content and student performance standards and the alignment of curricula and assessments with those standards.

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION INITIATIVE

Question: Why is the Administration continuing to push a one-size-fits-all class-size reduction proposal, when research shows that the pupil-teacher ratio doesn't make a difference in educational outcomes?

Answer:

- Class size does make a difference. Rigorous research has demonstrated the importance of reduced class size, particularly in the early elementary grades, and shown that students who receive instruction in small classes make more rapid educational progress than their counterparts in larger classes.
- The achievement gains documented in the research have been particularly significant for lower-achieving, minority, poor, and inner-city children.
- Our bill is flexible, not "one size fits all." School districts can use a portion of their funds for professional development and other capacity-building activities. Local districts that have met the target level of 18 students per class in grades 1 through 3 can use their funds to further reduce class size in those grades, to reduce class size in additional grades, or to improve teacher quality.
- The Department believes that districts welcome Federal support to help them reduce class size in the early elementary grades.

TARGETING

Question: In what ways, if any, would your bill improve the targeting of resources under ESEA? Would that targeting push most of the money to the big cities and other poor communities, leaving little for working class and middle class communities?

Answer: Across most major formula programs, the bill would provide for better targeting of resources on communities that face the greatest challenges in educating children to high standards and have the fewest local resources for meeting their needs. For instance:

- Under Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, while the bill would not change the current formulas, it would require that at least 20 percent of the funding go out under the "Targeted Grants" formula. This allocation mechanism, which Congress has not funded in the past, would do a better job than the current formulas at directing a major portion of the funding to the neediest school districts.
- Under the new Teaching to High Standards program, half of the money available for local educational agencies would go out by formula on the basis of counts of children living in poverty. The other half would be competitive, with States making competitive grants primarily to LEAs with the greatest needs. These targeting provisions are much stronger than the provisions in the three programs that this new initiative would replace.
- Currently, the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund includes very weak targeting provisions. (States are required to target technical assistance on high-poverty LEAs, but there is no requirement that they target grant funds on those LEAs.) Our bill would permit States to make competitive grants only to LEAs that have high poverty rates or low-performing schools or to partnerships that include at least one high-need LEA.
- Under current law, State educational agencies must provide 30 percent of their Safe and Drug-Free Schools allocations to LEAs that have the greatest need for funds; the remaining 70 percent goes out under an enrollment-based formula. Our reauthorization proposal would target all the LEA funds on school districts with a need for assistance, as documented by high rates of drug use or violence, or other factors.

Communities that do not have the highest rates of poverty (or, otherwise, do not demonstrate the highest levels of need for funding) would also continue to participate in ESEA programs. In some programs they might continue to receive the majority of funds. But the Administration, in general, believes that the current programs are not sufficiently targeted and that the reauthorization should do a better job in this area.

ACCOUNTABILITY

Question: Would the "Education Accountability Act" be an unfunded mandate? Even if it doesn't meet the technical definition of an unfunded mandate, wouldn't compliance be very costly for States and localities? In general, what is your response to the criticism that the proposal would result in a significant increase in Federal intrusion into policies that should best be left to States and local school boards?

Answer:

- The Education Accountability Act would require States, as a condition of receiving ESEA funds, to have in effect several basic policies that are central to the notion of educational accountability and to helping all students achieve to high standards: school report cards, qualified teachers, ending social promotion and retention, and sound discipline policies.
- Because compliance would be tied to the receipt of Federal funds, the Act would not be an unfunded mandate.
- We are proposing the Act because we know that certain policies must be in place if the educational improvements that everyone wants to see are to be attained. Children will not learn to high standards unless they are taught by well qualified teachers. Educational reforms will not succeed unless schools are safe and orderly. Coming up with a plan for ensuring that these policies are in place seems something reasonable to request in exchange for significant Federal aid.
- Some people are concerned that urban districts and other LEAs that have high concentrations of at-risk students will have the greatest difficulty meeting the new requirements. But these are also the districts that stand to benefit the most from the requirements because they are most likely to employ uncertified teachers and they have the greatest numbers of students who need additional support in order to reach high standards. The Accountability Act should spur States and others to provide these high-need districts the additional resources and supports they need to enable all children to achieve to challenging standards.
- We agree that these requirements may seem ambitious, but to those who say they're too ambitious, we ask: what is the alternative? If the alternative is to continue holding some students to low expectations and placing them in classes with unqualified teachers, we don't think that is acceptable.

COMPLIANCE WITH ACCOUNTABILITY REQUIREMENTS

Question: According to some reports, the Department has done a poor job of enforcing the requirements already on the books (for instance in Title I). With this in mind, how will you ensure compliance with the new accountability requirements? What will happen to States that do not comply, or do the most minimum extent possible?

Answer:

- The U.S. Department of Education has strongly supported the standards, assessment, and accountability provisions that were built into Title I in 1994. These requirements are fundamental for achievement of the reforms necessary to raise the performance of all students, especially students in high-poverty schools that are the focus of Title I services. Department activities – including providing technical assistance, developing new materials and products, and monitoring State compliance with the law – have focused on translating these requirements into meaningful changes in schools.
- The requirements in current law do not go into full effect until the 2000-01 school year. Criticisms of the Department's implementation of these provisions ignore the fact that the statute give States several years to phase in the requirements.
- The Department took tough stands even on transitional accountability systems by holding up approval of consolidated applications for Federal funds in about half of the States until accountability measures were strengthened. These States received a conditional approval and had to address key accountability issues.
- Our proposal builds on current work and does not recommend a brand new approach. It strengthens current accountability by making corrective actions stronger and adding funds to help States and districts turn around low-performing schools.
- The Department has taken a collaborative approach to working with States to improve their systems. We respect the fact that States are governed by a variety of State-specific education laws and systems. Also, knowledge continues to emerge from the field regarding standards, assessments, and accountability. The Department's monitoring of Title I implementation has focused on providing tailored technical assistance and guidance to States that are not fully meeting the requirements, and working with States to use Federal resources as support for their State-specific approaches to closing the achievement gap. Title I has been a "model and an instigator" for standards-based reform and efforts to track student progress and improve schools in high poverty districts. (McKenzie Group, 1999)
- Our proposal sets out several steps to ensure that accountability requirements are fully implemented. Accountability systems would be subject to peer review, and the Department would work with States to improve their systems. If a State still does not comply with the requirements after one year, it would be subject to the loss of Federal administrative funds. We expect that public pressure would also mount to implement these systems.

SOCIAL PROMOTION

Question: What would the Education Accountability Act require in the area of social promotion? Will adoption of a "No social promotion" policy result in an increase in the number of children being retained in grade? If you answer that it won't, because schools will respond by providing more summer programs and other supports, how will your bill ensure that this happens?

Answer:

- As a condition of receiving ESEA funds, each State would be required to have in effect a plan for: (1) ensuring that students progress through school on a timely basis, having mastered the challenging material needed for them to reach high standards of performance; and (2) ending the practices of social promotion and retention. The policies called for in this plan would be required to take effect within four years.
- These plans would include, among other provisions, policies for providing students who do not demonstrate mastery of challenging State academic standards with continuing, intensive, and age-appropriate interventions, including extended instruction and learning time. Other provisions would ensure that the assessments States and LEAs use to identify students who are not making progress are valid, reliable, and accurate, and include multiple measures, no one of which is assigned determinative weight.
- Because the State plans would deal with both ending social promotion and ending retention (defined in the bill as "the unsound educational practice of requiring students who have not demonstrated mastery of challenging State academic standards to remain in the same grade), we do not believe the policy would lead to increased student retention. To the contrary, our proposal should result in less retention.
- The Administration has proposed major funding initiatives – such as the Reading Excellence Act, Class Size Reduction, and 21st Century Community Learning Centers – that will help schools teach all children to high standards and provide extra help to those who don't initially meet the standards. But we don't look at ending social promotion and retention as entirely a Federal responsibility. The Education Accountability Act will spur States and school districts to do their part in ending damaging educational practices.

FLEXIBILITY

Question: In what ways, if any, would your bill increase State and local flexibility and reduce administrative burden, compared with current law?

Answer:

- The current ESEA is already quite flexible. Changes proposed by the Administration and adopted by Congress in 1994 – such as lowering the poverty threshold for schoolwide programs, allowing waivers, and authorizing consolidated applications and consolidation of administrative funds – have greatly increased State and local flexibility in administering ESEA programs. In fact, the programs are sufficiently flexible that a large number of school districts have applied for waivers only to learn that the flexibility in the law made their waiver requests unnecessary.
- The new Ed-Flex expansion will permit even greater flexibility. All States will now be able to apply to grant waivers of Federal requirements, so long as they are on track in the development of Title I standards and assessments, have the authority to waive their own (State) requirements, and agree to be held accountable for raising student achievement.
- Our ESEA bill would add some additional flexibility mechanisms. For one thing, it would authorize the Secretary to provide a State with added flexibility if the State can demonstrate that it has achieved significant, Statewide achievement gains on the National Assessment of Educational progress and that it is closing the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students. Second, the bill would authorize waivers of additional ESEA programs. In addition, it would make it easier for school districts to combine funds, from various ESEA programs, in order to carry out coordinated services activities.

"SUPERFLEX"

Question: Does your bill include the "Superflex" concept that a number of groups and experts are promoting? If not, what is your position on this concept?

Answer:

- The Heritage Foundation's "Superflex" proposal would give States broad eligibility to waive Federal requirements, in exchange for a commitment to achieving better results. It goes beyond ED-Flex in that it would permit waivers that allow funds to be used for activities that do not reflect the underlying purposes of the Federal programs; in other words, States and LEAs could commingle program funds and use them as general aid. A State that did not, in return, achieve better student outcomes would lose its Superflex status or receive some other penalty.
- While the Administration's bill does not include Superflex provisions, we too are interested in giving States and LEAs additional flexibility coupled with strong accountability for results. For instance, the Administration endorsed expansion of ED-Flex to all 50 States. And the President's Education Accountability Act (incorporated in Title XI of our ESEA bill) would authorize the Secretary to reward States that have demonstrated achievement gains and are narrowing the gap between high- and low-performing students. One of the authorized rewards would be additional flexibility in administering ESEA programs, and this flexibility could extend beyond what is permitted under ED-Flex.
- The principal differences between Superflex and our approach to flexibility are:
 - The Administration's bill would permit States to receive greater flexibility in reward for significant Statewide gains in student achievement. By comparison, Superflex would provide the flexibility up front, in hopes that achievement gains occur later. This is an important distinction because, under Superflex, the Federal program requirements -- with their focus on national priorities and the needs of special populations -- could be set aside for several years even if the State is not making progress on student achievement. During that time, all the benefits of the programs would be lost.
 - The Administration's bill, unlike Superflex, would give States added flexibility only if they are both demonstrating Statewide achievement gains and narrowing the achievement gap. This is also important because, if the only criterion were overall gains, a State could receive flexibility even if it were failing to make progress in raising the achievement of disadvantaged children. Because the focus of Title I and other ESEA programs is on those children, it would make little sense to reward States that are not doing a good job at educating them.

DOLLARS TO THE CLASSROOM

Question: Researchers have found that a significant proportion of ESEA funds never reach the classroom. Do you agree with this charge, and how does your bill address the issue?

Answer:

- Under ESEA programs, a very small percentage of funding goes for Federal and State administrative costs. The Federal cost of administering the programs is equivalent to less than 1/2 of one percent of the appropriation (and none of this money comes from program funds – it is provided through a separate appropriation). Only about 2 percent of the funds are retained at the State level, for administration or other purposes. The charge that most money never gets out of Washington, or never reaches the classroom, is simply not true.
- Local-level data are more limited, but they also show that administrative costs are low and that the great majority of funds reach “the classroom” or other intended purposes (such as teacher professional development). In Title I, for example, approximately 90 percent of the funding goes for instruction-related costs, such as teacher salaries, computers, instructional materials, and professional development.
- Reports by the Heritage Foundation and some other groups have purported to show that much higher percentages of funds do not reach school districts and schools. These studies counted funds that, by statute, are intended to go to colleges and universities, community organizations, or other non-LEA entities as not reaching “the classroom” – but those funds do reach their intended recipients and are not siphoned off for administration and overhead. Other studies have assumed that States reserve, from allocations to LEAs, the maximum amount permitted by law – but the actual data show that they reserve less.
- Our reauthorization bill would continue to drive the great majority of funds (generally, well over 90 percent) directly to LEAs and other local service providers, while permitting States to reserve a small portion of funds to carry out accountability requirements and implement Statewide reforms. Under Title I, the bill would continue to allow States to retain 1 percent for administration. In addition, they would reserve 2.5 percent (rising to 3.5 percent in FY 2003) for accountability activities such as turning around low-performing schools; however, State would allocate at least 70 percent of this reserve to LEAs that have schools undergoing corrective action or otherwise in need of improvement.

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS

Question: Some reports have found that the Federal Government operates more than 760 education programs. Would your bill eliminate any current programs? Are you proposing to create any new ones? If so, explain why, since there already seem to be so many?

Answer:

- The reports claiming the existence of more than 760 Federal education programs have been thoroughly discredited for nearly two years. The lists included unauthorized and unfunded programs as well as those that involve specialized training and do not provide a single dollar to our elementary and secondary schools.
- Some examples of "education programs" cited in the reports include research programs like University Coal Research and Cancer Biology Research, training programs like FBI Advanced Police Training and Hazardous Waste Worker Health and Safety Training, and programs of uncertain relation to education like National Guard Military Construction and the National Register of Historic Places.
- This Administration has taken the lead, going back to the original National Performance Review in 1993, in identifying unnecessary or duplicative programs and proposing their elimination. Each of our budget and reauthorization proposals has included significant program consolidations and eliminations. For example, the IDEA, Vocational Education, and Adult Education bills that passed in 1997 and 1998 consolidated a significant number of program authorities (reducing about 69 funded and unfunded programs, in selected areas, down to 12), as proposed by the Administration.
- From FY 1994 through FY 1999, Congress has agreed to the termination of nearly 70 Department of Education programs totaling some \$642 million. The 2000 budget request proposes to eliminate 5 additional programs totaling \$503 million.
- Our ESEA reauthorization proposal would eliminate 32 programs currently on the books (5 funded and 27 unfunded) while consolidating 17 others into just 5 authorities.
- While eliminating or consolidating 49 programs, we are proposing 7 new programs.
- In general, we propose new programs to address significant unmet needs in our education system. Recent examples of such needs include smaller class sizes; before- and after-school care, and school violence.

50 Percent of the Paperwork for 7 Percent of the Funds

Question: Proponents of expanding the ED-FLEX program often claim that the Federal government demands 50 percent of all the paperwork that teachers and principals have to file but provides only 7 percent of the funding for elementary and secondary education. Is this claim accurate?

Response:

- No, it is not. This claim is factually inaccurate and also ignores significant reductions in Federal paperwork burdens in recent years.
- The original 1990 Ohio study—on which the 50 percent claim is based—actually attributed only 20 percent of paperwork requirements to the Federal government, and that figure would be considerably lower today.
- The 1990 study by an agency of the Ohio Legislature identified a total of 330 forms that districts and schools might have to complete. The study attributed 173 of these forms to Federal programs—hence the 50 percent figure.
- However, only 41 percent of the 173—about 71 forms—were designated as mandatory, or required of all districts. The others were related to voluntary participation in programs like Safe and Drug-Free Schools or competitive grant programs.
- That means only about a fifth (71 of 330) of the forms identified in the Ohio study were actually required of all districts by the Federal government, not 50 percent.
- In a sample of 19 forms required for two programs (ESEA Chapter 2 and Adult Basic Education), 11 were related to performance measurement and financial accountability.
- The Ohio study also noted that the State department of education "sometimes requires more detail on Federal program reports than the Federal agency requires."
- ESEA paperwork requirements, which accounted for 68 of the 173 Federal forms identified in the Ohio study, were greatly reduced in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization. For example, States now submit a single, consolidated application for all ESEA programs just once during each authorization cycle, and many reports are required every other year instead of annually.
- We also should keep in mind that the national average of 7 percent masks far larger Federal contributions to specific districts and student populations. The Ohio study observed that programs like Title I and IDEA "provide services to relatively small groups of children who require relatively expensive services for which funding is not available from other sources."

State Burden in Administering Federal Programs

Question: According to the House Republicans' "Crossroads" report, the State of Florida needs 297 State employees to administer Federal education programs. What is your opinion on this issue, and do you believe that ESEA programs create an enormous administrative burden for States?

Answer:

- The impression we gain from talking to State officials is that the programs funded by the Department of Education, particularly those under ESEA, are not difficult or costly to administer. Therefore, it is hard to have much confidence in the numbers included in the Crossroads report for Florida.
- For example, we obtained data from the State educational agencies in New York and Texas, two States that are even bigger than Florida and have more Federal dollars to administer. New York informed us that they employ about 122 full-time equivalent (FTE) staff to administer Federal programs, including not just ED authorities but also the USDA child nutrition programs. Texas gave us a very similar number: their State educational agency employs 139 FTEs to work on Federal programs – and for Texas this is not the number "needed to administer" the programs, it's the total number employed (including staff hired with funds that Texas reserves, at its discretion, to provide services to school districts but not really to administer programs).

If New York needs 122 staff to run Federal programs and if Texas employs 139, why would Florida require 297? The Texas and New York figures clearly raise questions about the Florida number, and we wonder how it was calculated. For instance, it may represent the total number of staff who spend even 1 percent of their time dealing with Federal programs (instead of an FTE count); if so, this would present a very misleading picture of the Federal burden.

- The staff assigned to administering ESEA and Goals 2000 programs represents a small portion of the total number of staff that States employ for all Federal programs. For instance, New York assigns 44 FTEs to administer ESEA and Goals, and Texas employs 68 to work on those programs. As we get further into the reauthorization, it is important to remember that States reserve only a little more than 1 percent of their ESEA funds for administration, and hire a small number of staff with those funds.
- Having said all that, I should also reiterate that the Administration has taken many steps to help reduce the administrative burden on States and provide them with greater flexibility in implementing our programs. We have proposed legislative amendments to reduce administrative requirements, granted States waivers and Ed-Flex status, permitted consolidations of

funding streams, and reduced our elementary and secondary education regulations by two-thirds. Our ESEA reauthorization bill would allow States that are making real educational progress to obtain additional flexibility.

6/8/99

Judith--

Attached are the materials prepared in response to your request for additional Qs and As and other information on key ESEA reauthorization issues. They are on comparability (prepared by Kay Rigling), competitive vs. formula grants (Pat Gore and Val Plisko), accountability vs. flexibility (Susan Wilhelm), treatment of rural LEAs (Susan, again), and public school choice programs that work (Sylvia Wright).

Not all of the pieces are in the regular Q and A format; some are more narrative in style and, thus, provide more detail on the issues. I thought that this was appropriate, given your desire for a deeper understanding on some of the issue areas. But if you would like any reformatting or further work, please let me know.

Tom

Tom

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Authorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

AGENCY: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of request for public comment on the reauthorization of elementary and secondary education programs.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Education invites written comments regarding the reauthorization of programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and Subtitle B of Title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Education for Homeless Children and Youth).

DATES: Comments must be received by the Department on or before July 17, 1998. Comments may also be submitted at regional meetings to be held on July 8-15, 1998 (See dates, times and locations of regional meetings under the SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION section of this notice.)

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Judith Johnson, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW. (Portals Building, Room 4000), Washington, DC 20202-6132. E-mail responses may be sent to: Frances_Shadburn@ed.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frances Shadburn, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW. (Portals Building, Room 4000) Washington, DC 20202-6100. Telephone: (202) 401-0113. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1-800-877-8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g. Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

Electronic Access to This Document

Anyone may view this document, as well as other Department of Education documents published in the Federal Register, in text or portable document format (pdf) on the World Wide Web at either of the following sites:

<http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm>
<http://www.ed.gov/news.html>

To use the pdf, you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with

Search, which is available free at the previous sites. If you have questions about using the pdf, call the U.S. Government Printing Office toll free at 1-888-293-6498.

Anyone also may view these documents in text copy only on an electronic bulletin board of the Department. Telephone: (202) 219-1511 or, toll free, 1-800-222-4922. The documents are located under Option G-Files/Announcements, Bulletins and Press Releases.

Additionally, in the future, this document, as well as other documents concerning the reauthorization of the ESEA, will be available on the World Wide Web at the following site: <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea.html>.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the Federal Register.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Secretary is seeking public comment on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles III and IV of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and Subtitle B of Title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. A complete list of the programs currently authorized under these statutes is provided at the end of this notice. Most of these programs were last reauthorized in 1994. At that time ESEA programs were fundamentally restructured to support, in partnership with Goals 2000, comprehensive State and local efforts to improve teaching and learning and raise academic standards. The authorization for most of these programs expires September 30, 1999.

Need for Reauthorization

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the cornerstone of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, embodies the Federal Government's commitment to providing funds for the education of children living in high-poverty communities. Collectively, its programs provide funds to States, districts, and schools to improve teaching and learning to help all children, especially at-risk children, meet challenging State standards. Funding for ESEA and related programs currently represents an annual \$12 billion investment in our Nation's future. The support these programs provide for State and local school improvement efforts makes them key vehicles for carrying out the Department's mission: "To Ensure Equal Access to Education and Promote Educational Excellence Throughout the Nation."

Title I, the largest of the ESEA programs, is the primary vehicle for providing assistance to schools to raise the academic performance of poor and low-achieving students, especially in schools serving areas with high concentrated poverty.

The 1994 reauthorization responded to data from the Department's "Prospects" longitudinal study which concluded that the former Chapter I (now Title I) was not structured to close the achievement gap between students attending high- and low-poverty schools. To address this need, the 1994 reauthorization restructured the program to, among other things, encourage high-poverty schools to move away from "pullout" programs to "schoolwide" approaches for improving entire schools. To facilitate this change, the 1994 reauthorization linked Title I to other ESEA programs and State and local school reform efforts in partnership with Goals 2000 so that Federal and State programs could work together to provide all children, whatever their backgrounds and whatever schools they attend, with the opportunity to achieve the same high standards expected of all children. The 1994 reauthorization also revised the other ESEA programs so that they too support State and local school reform. For example, the Eisenhower Professional Development program was changed to support improved instructional practices in other core subjects in addition to math and science. A key component of the entire revised ESEA provides States and local schools with greatly increased flexibility in return for being held accountable for improving student achievement.

The President's fiscal year 1999 budget expands on Goals 2000 and the ESEA by requesting funds to help build the capacity of school districts and schools to: (1) deliver high-quality instruction by reducing class size in the early grades; (2) expand the pace and scope of reform in 35 high-poverty urban and rural school districts with significant barriers to high achievement that have already begun to show progress in implementing standards-based reform; (3) increase the number of school-based before- and after-school extended-day programs; (4) build and renovate public schools through the provision of tax credits to pay interest on nearly \$22 billion in bonds; and (5) provide support for schools, communities, and families to work together in improving and expanding opportunities for children to develop strong literacy skills.

When Goals 2000 was established and the ESEA was last reauthorized, the

Congress recognized that States required time to implement thoughtfully high standards aligned with challenging assessments as part of their ongoing school reforms. As a result, Title I requires States to develop or adopt challenging content standards and student performance standards, at least in mathematics, and reading and language arts, by Fall, 1997, and assessments aligned with standards by the school year 2000-2001. States, districts, and schools are steadily making progress toward implementing standards-based reform. However, there are still provisions of the law that have not yet been fully implemented—for example, aligned assessments that are part of accountability systems do not have to be in place until school year 2000-2001. Similarly, many States have requested and received waivers as they continue to develop their student performance standards. Reauthorization provides the opportunity to consider what changes, if any, are necessary to strengthen the effectiveness of Federal elementary and secondary education programs to improve teaching and learning for all students, especially those students most at risk of failing to meet State standards.

The Secretary intends to submit the Department's reauthorization proposal for Goals 2000 and ESEA and related programs to the Congress early in 1998, in conjunction with the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request. Proposed performance indicators also will be developed to provide feedback on program progress in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). GPRA requires all agencies to develop agency-wide strategic plans, and to identify and collect information on performance indicators for all programs. The Department's strategic plan organizes performance measurement around key policy objectives and the programs that advance these objectives: standards development (through Goals 2000); helping at-risk populations to achieve to challenging standards (Title I and other programs that serve at-risk populations); supporting local capacity-building (professional development and technology) to enhance instruction aligned with standards and improve the climate for learning (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities); and stimulating flexibility, performance accountability, and innovation (charter schools, Ed-Flex). The U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1995-2002, including current performance indicators, is available on the Department's Web site at <http://www.ed.gov/pubs/StratPlan/> or can be requested by calling 1-800-USA-LEARN. The Secretary invites public comments on the issues identified in this notice and recommendations for performance indicators.

Issues for Public Comment

The Secretary seeks comments and suggestions regarding reauthorization of Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs. The Secretary is interested both in comments regarding changes that may be needed, as well as comments on aspects of the programs that are working well and should be maintained. As noted above, the last ESEA reauthorization fundamentally restructured all ESEA programs so that they, together with Goals 2000, would support State and local efforts to improve our Nation's schools through comprehensive, standards-based reform of teaching and learning. The programs authorized by these statutes support State efforts to develop standards describing what students should know and be able to do at key points in their schooling; and district and school efforts to put in place educational programs that provide each student with the opportunity to meet those standards.

Since the 1995-96 school year, when the last reauthorization took effect, States have made progress in implementing standards-based reform. Currently, forty-seven States including Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico, report that they have adopted challenging content standards in at least reading and mathematics as required by ESEA Title I. All the remaining States—except one—also have State content standards that they are either revising or are in the process of formally adopting.

Although the development of content standards is the first step, there is still a long way to go to incorporate State standards fully into daily classroom activities. States and districts generally are now moving to the next phases of standards-based reform—developing student performance standards and assessments that measure student progress toward meeting the standards, and increasing the capacity of teachers, schools, and districts to implement changes to help all students meet challenging State standards. Capacities needed for effective teaching and learning include many factors, such as teacher knowledge and skills, student motivation and readiness to learn, and quality curriculum materials for teachers and students.

One aspect of capacity building is how school reform efforts at the State, district, and school levels can best be informed by high-quality research and

dissemination. In addition to technical assistance provided through the ESEA, the Department of Education funds regional educational laboratories to carry out applied research, development, dissemination, and other technical assistance activities by working with States, districts, and schools in their regions. The Department also is required to establish expert panels to review educational programs and to recommend to the Secretary those programs that should be designated as exemplary or promising for dissemination.

Clearly, more time will be needed for States and districts to implement fully a coherent set of reforms reflecting an aligned system of standards, assessment, instruction, professional development, and accountability, and for principals and teachers to fully implement reforms in the classroom. Nevertheless, there is already some evidence of the impact of State and local efforts, supported by Federal education programs, to help all elementary and secondary students attain high standards. States that have had assessments linked to standards for more than two years are showing progress in the achievement of all of their students, including those in high-poverty schools. For example, Texas reports that the percentage of Title I students passing all parts of the Texas Assessment of Student Achievement has increased from 37.6 percent in the 1994-95 school year to 62.1 percent in the 1996-97 school year. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores in math, the first subject area to implement standards-based, comprehensive reforms, are improving generally for the Nation and appreciably in some States. For example, data from the 1996 NAEP long-term trend assessment show math scores for 9 year-olds rising steadily since 1992, particularly in high-poverty schools (schools with at least 75 percent of the students on a subsidized lunch). The percentage of 4th-grade students in high-poverty schools who are achieving at or above the basic level in math on NAEP has increased in almost every State since 1992. In some States, achievement in high-poverty schools meets or exceeds the national average of 64 percent of students scoring at or above the basic level.

The Secretary believes that the early evidence from States and districts that have made the most progress in implementing standards-based reform demonstrates that the focus in Goals 2000 and the ESEA on supporting State and local school reform efforts is sound and should be continued in the next reauthorization. The Secretary also

believes that the priorities governing the next reauthorization are also sound and should be continued. These priorities include: (1) high standards for all children and the elements of education aligned so that everything is working together to help all students reach those standards; (2) a focus on teaching and learning; (3) flexibility to stimulate local school-based and district initiatives, coupled with responsibility for student performance; (4) links among schools, parents, and communities; and (5) resources targeted to where needs are greatest and in amounts sufficient to make a difference.

The Secretary seeks comments on the effectiveness of current programs in supporting State and local efforts to improve teaching and learning to help all children, especially at-risk children, meet challenging State standards. The questions in this notice are organized under three cross-cutting categories. These categories are: (1) Federal support for State and local school reform including questions addressing implementing standards in the classroom through professional development, technology to support teaching and learning, and targeting resources; (2) strategies for addressing the needs of children most at risk of failing to meet State standards; and (3) school environments conducive for learning including questions addressing Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, parental involvement, extended learning opportunities before and after school, and school facilities. In addition to consideration of the cross-cutting issues, individual programs will also be reviewed as part of the reauthorization. Comments on issues other than those raised in this notice are welcome.

Within each of the following cross-cutting categories, the Secretary is especially interested in: (1) suggestions on ways to strengthen the ability of Goals 2000 and ESEA programs to help all children, including students with limited English proficiency, migrant children, economically disadvantaged children including economically disadvantaged minority students, children with disabilities, and other educationally disadvantaged children meet challenging State student performance standards; and (2) comments directed at how the activity being discussed can be carried out in the most flexible manner possible while improving accountability for results.

I. Support for State and Local School Reform

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act provides the framework for Federal

support of State and local efforts to reform public schools by supporting the development of challenging State standards and new assessments to measure whether children are achieving those standards. The 1994 ESEA reauthorization built on the Goals 2000 framework, fundamentally reshaping ESEA programs so they would better support comprehensive State and local efforts to improve teaching and learning, especially in schools serving economically disadvantaged communities. The changes made in 1994 included: (1) requiring the same challenging State content and student performance standards for all students; (2) linking Federal program accountability requirements to student's achievement of challenging State standards; (3) supporting professional development tied to those standards; (4) providing greater flexibility in exchange for greater accountability for student performance; (5) promoting school-level decision-making to bolster local initiative; (6) authorizing consolidated applications and plans to reduce paperwork burdens so that educators can focus more time, energy, and resources on better educating children; and (7) providing authority for the Secretary to waive Federal rules and regulations, as needed, to improve student achievement. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program was added in 1997, primarily as part of Title I of ESEA, to encourage more extensive implementation of research-based approaches to comprehensive school reform.

Support for State and Local School Reform: General Questions

1. Are there changes in Federal statutes that would make Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs more effective tools for supporting comprehensive State and school district school reform? For example, given the progress that States, districts, and schools have made in implementing standards-based reforms, are changes needed to Goals 2000 to make it better aligned with current implementation efforts? Are there changes that would enable Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs to support more effectively State and school district efforts to improve the capacity of teachers, schools, and districts to integrate standards into the classroom? Are there changes that would make it easier for States, districts, schools, and teachers to get information on new research, on research-based programs, and on promising practices for improving the

achievement of all students, especially educationally disadvantaged children?

2. In addition to funding technical assistance through a variety of ESEA and Goals 2000 authorities, the U.S. Department of Education also funds regional educational laboratories to assist in the implementation of education reform. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would enable federally supported technical assistance efforts to support State and district, and school reform more effectively?

3. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would encourage greater public school choice as part of State and local school reform? For example, the Department of Education encourages expansion of choice within the public school system with such alternatives as charter schools, magnet schools, and system-wide strategies that make every public school a school of choice. Are changes needed in the law to strengthen these alternatives? Are changes needed in the Federal law to incorporate the knowledge gained about school reform from the establishment and operation of charter and magnet schools?

4. The ESEA currently contains provisions addressing the participation of private school students and teachers that are applicable across many ESEA programs. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would improve the effectiveness of these provisions?

Support for State and Local School Reform: Implementing Standards in the Classroom

Improved teaching and learning is central to the effort to help each child achieve to high State standards. Because professional development helps all teachers, school leaders, and other personnel teach to and support high standards, professional development is an authorized activity in Goals 2000 and almost every ESEA program. The ESEA also authorizes a major program, the Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development program, specifically to support national and State professional development in the major content areas.

Research indicates that professional development must be sustained, intensive, and of high quality to have a lasting impact, and must address teacher preparation as well as ongoing training for teachers in the classroom. Research also indicates that professional development is most effective when it includes networks, study groups, teacher research, and other strategies that enable teachers to meet regularly to solve problems, consider new ideas, analyze student work, or reflect on specific subject matter issues. The U.S. Department of Education and the

National Science Foundation have launched a joint effort to develop a range of appropriate mechanisms to raise student achievement in mathematics and science. These mechanisms include support for networks among teachers, schools, parents, colleges, students, professional scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and others.

5. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would focus and coordinate professional development resources across Goals 2000 and ESEA programs to ensure that all teachers and educational personnel have sufficient knowledge and skills to teach all children, including children most at risk of failing, to challenging State standards?

6. A recent National Academy of Sciences study states that if all students are to become successful readers, children must be able to discover the nature of the alphabetic system, understand how sounds are represented alphabetically, gain meaning from print, and practice reading skills to achieve fluency. In order to gain these skills, exposure to language and literacy must begin in the pre-school years, primary grades must focus on reading instruction; teachers must participate in ongoing sustained professional development; elementary schools must have enriched reading programs; students who do not have proficiency in English should be exposed to reading in their native language while acquiring proficiency in spoken English; and early intervention is critical. How can the use of research-based knowledge and of research-based approaches to improving student achievement be encouraged through teacher preparation and ongoing training?

7. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would strengthen connections between institutions of higher education and schools for high-quality professional development to increase the capacity of teachers and principals to implement standards-based reform?

Support for State and Local School Reform: Using Technology To Support Teaching and Learning

Educators across the country have begun to use technology in their classrooms on a regular basis, and many are convinced that technology can be very effective in improving teaching and learning. There is strong evidence that, used properly, computers and related telecommunications technologies provide new opportunities to students that can improve their motivation and achievement. The best instructional

practices using technology are generally recognized as providing strong support for the kinds of improvements sought by education reformers through new approaches to teaching and learning. While teacher's level of knowledge about technology is rapidly expanding, technology also is changing rapidly. Questions about new technology and how best to use it in teaching and learning will create an ongoing need for updated information in schools across the Nation, and the quality and quantity of assistance made available to schools will be an important factor in how quickly and well the benefits of technology are realized. Furthermore, as opportunities for using technology at school and home increase, it is imperative that all schools and students—not just those that can afford it—have access to these new resources so that technology reduces rather than increases disparities in the education of poor children and their better-off peers. In addition, the expertise of the teacher and the integration of technology into the curriculum are essential to improving student performance. Under the current authorization, concentrated Federal support for technology is provided under five main programs that include a mix of State formula and discretionary grants. Authorization to use funds for technology also is embedded in other large programs, such as Title I and Goals 2000.

8. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would better support the use of technology to advance State and local school reform efforts designed to help all children acquire the knowledge contained in State content standards? For example, are there changes that would improve access for students in high-poverty schools to high-quality academic content through technology? Are there changes that would increase the ability of teachers to use technology as an instructional resource? Should the focus be on development and demonstration of high-quality instructional applications of technology for all schools, or should it continue to be development of the infrastructure for students and schools in high-poverty areas?

Support for State and Local School Reform: Targeting Resources/Equalization

Academic performance tends to be lower in schools serving the highest percentages of children who live in poverty, and the obstacles to raising academic performance are considerable. The current law contains multiple provisions to direct financial resources

to areas of greatest need. For example, Title I funds must be used first in all schools with poverty rates above 75 percent, and low-poverty schools may not receive higher per-pupil allocations than high-poverty schools.

In addition to the issue of how Federal funds are targeted, since 1971 State courts have found school funding systems to be inequitable and unconstitutional in 17 States, and a 1997 General Accounting Office (GAO) report found that "On average, wealthy districts had about 24 percent more total funding per weighted pupil than poor districts." Sizeable disparities also exist across States: with average per-pupil funding ranging from a high of \$9,700 to a low of \$3,856 in 1994-95. Because Federal funding is more targeted to at-risk students, both in terms of services and total dollars, than State funding, it is an important source of funding for closing the gap between high- and low-poverty schools.

9. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would improve the distribution of ESEA and related program funds to communities and schools where they are most needed?

10. Current distribution formulas for some ESEA programs may result in allocations so small that school districts may have difficulty mounting effective, comprehensive programs. Are changes in Federal statutes needed to address this situation?

11. Should the Federal Government play a role in promoting greater equity in the distribution of school funding across and within States. If so, what should that role be and are there changes to Federal statutes that would be necessary to carry out the role?

II. Strategies for Addressing the Needs of Children Most at Risk of Failing To Meet State Standards

Goals 2000 and the revised ESEA and related programs are designed to support State and local efforts to improve America's schools for all children, particularly schools serving disadvantaged children. The resources these statutes provide are supplemental to funds and services provided through State and local resources. While the Federal Government contributes only six percent of American elementary and secondary school dollars nationally, Federal funds are substantial in many States and school districts and represent a significant source of funding for services for at-risk children. According to a January 1998 GAO report, Federal funding is more targeted to at-risk students, both in terms of services and total dollars, than State funding. These additional funds are critical for high-

poverty schools. Generally, academic achievement tends to be low in schools serving many children who live in poverty, and the obstacles to raising performance in these schools are challenging.

Over the past 33 years the Congress has amended and expanded ESEA multiple times, creating programs to help children who speak little English, migrant children, neglected and delinquent children, Native American/Alaskan Native children, and other children most at-risk of failing to meet challenging State standards. The ESEA also supports programs that promote educational equity for women and girls.

Enabling all children, especially at-risk children, to meet challenging State standards requires that State and local school reform efforts take into account the needs of a diverse student population. As States, districts, and schools progress toward full implementation of educational reform, they need specific targeted strategies to provide all students with equal access to rigorous academic standards, instruction, and aligned assessments that measure higher-order thinking skills and understanding.

The Secretary seeks not only to maintain the connection begun in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization between Federal elementary and secondary programs with their focus on at-risk students, and State and local school reform efforts, but to strengthen it.

12. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would make Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs more effective tools for use by States, districts, and schools in closing the achievement gap between students most at risk of failing to meet challenging State standards and other students? Are there changes to the Federal statute that would improve the role of accountability measures in both raising student achievement and providing more State and local flexibility? For example, should Title I improvement provisions be changed or strengthened?

13. Students most at risk of failing to meet State standards need the highest quality instruction provided by the most knowledgeable teachers, yet half of the instructional staff in Title I are paraprofessionals, most of whom have only high school diplomas. Are there changes to Federal statute that would strengthen qualifications for Title I and Title VII (Bilingual Education) staff who instruct students most at-risk of failing to meet challenging State standards?

14. A growing body of research on the development of the brain and its implications for learning during certain critical periods of child development

supports the need for early intervention and the importance of pre-school and parent education. How can Federal programs encourage greater application of this knowledge?

III. School Environments Conducive to Learning

For students to learn and compete in the global economy, schools must be modern and well-equipped, and provide an environment conducive to learning. A school environment conducive to learning is safe and drug-free, encourages active parental and community involvement, and often includes extended learning opportunities during non-traditional school hours (before and after school, weekends and summer sessions).

Students cannot learn and teachers cannot teach if students are disruptive or are threatened with violence. At the same time, research indicates that students who report positive school experiences are significantly less likely to use drugs than their peers who have negative experiences in school.

Research also indicates that when schools make a concerted effort to enlist the help of mothers and fathers in fostering children's learning, student achievement rises. When families are involved in their children's education, children earn higher grades and receive higher scores on tests, attend school more regularly, complete more homework, demonstrate more positive attitudes and behaviors, graduate from high school at higher rates, and are more likely to enroll in higher education than are students with less family involvement in their schooling.

Recent survey data indicate that parents strongly support school-based after-school programs that include expanded learning opportunities and enrichment and recreational activities. After-school programs can also contribute to school safety by providing supervised programs for young people to attend after the regular school day.

Goals 2000 and the ESEA support a variety of approaches to helping families become active partners in their children's education, including Even Start family literacy programs, Goals 2000 parent centers, and school-parent compacts under Title I. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (ESEA, Title IV), first enacted in 1986, has been the Federal Government's major effort in the area of drug education and prevention. It promotes comprehensive drug and violence prevention strategies for making schools and neighborhoods safe and drug free. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program

funds community learning centers that include after-school programs.

Equally important to the activities going on in a school is the physical condition of the school building itself. A 1995 study by the GAO found serious and widespread problems in school facilities across the country. These problems ranged from overcrowding and structural failures to inadequate electrical and plumbing systems. Further, the GAO found that many States and local school districts were unable or unprepared to meet the costs of improving these facilities.

15. Are there changes to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act that would encourage the implementation of more effective, research-based drug and violence prevention programs?

16. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would strengthen the ability of Federal education programs to assist families in their efforts to be active partners in their children's education? For example, could the current Title I requirement for school-parent compacts (which describes the shared responsibility of schools, parents, and students for improved student achievement) be improved?

17. In addition to helping local communities finance the construction and renovation of school facilities, what additional barriers to the modernization of schools need to be addressed?

Regional Meetings

Participants are welcome to address these and other issues relating to the reauthorization of the ESEA, either by attending the regional meetings or submitting written comments. Individuals desiring to present comments at the meetings are encouraged to do so. It is likely that each participant choosing to make a statement will be limited to four minutes. Speakers may also submit written comments. Individuals interested in making oral statements will be able to sign up to make a statement beginning at twelve noon on the day of the meeting at the Department's regional meeting on-site registration table on a first-come, first-served basis. If no time slots remain, then the Department will reserve a limited amount of additional time at the end of each regional meeting to accommodate these individuals. The amount of time available will depend upon the number of individuals who request reservations. In addition, written comments will be accepted and must be received on or before July 17, 1998.

The dates and location of the four regional meetings appear below. The Department of Education has reserved a limited number of rooms at each of the following hotels at a special government per diem room rate (Boston's Park Plaza Hotel does not have a special government per diem room rate). To reserve these rates, be certain to inform the hotel that you are attending the reauthorization hearings with the Department of Education.

The meeting sites are accessible to individuals with disabilities. An individual with a disability who will need an auxiliary aid or service to participate in the meeting (e.g., interpreting service, assistive listening device, or materials in an alternate format) should notify the contact person listed in this notice at least two weeks before the scheduled meeting date. Although the Department will attempt to meet a request received after that date, the requested auxiliary aid or service may not be available because of insufficient time to arrange it.

Dates, Times, and Locations of Regional Meetings

1. July 8, 1998, 1:30-5:30 p.m., Hotel Inter-Continental Los Angeles, 251 South Olive Street, Los Angeles, California; 1-213-617-3300 and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 17.

2. July 10, 1998, 1:30-5:30 p.m., Radisson Hotel & Suites, 160 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois; 1-312-787-2900, and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 19.

3. July 13, 1998, 1:30-5:30 p.m., Park Plaza Hotel, 64 Arlington Street, Boston, Massachusetts; 1-617-426-2000, and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 22.

4. July 15, 1998, 1:30-5:30 p.m., Terrace Garden Hotel, 3405 Lanox Road, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia; 1-404-261-8250, and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 24.

FORMAT FOR COMMENT: This request for comments is designed to elicit the views of interested parties on how the Department's elementary and secondary education programs can be structured to meet the objectives of the reauthorization as stated in this notice.

The Secretary requests that each respondent identify his or her role in education and the perspective from which he or she views the educational system—either as a representative of an association, agency, or school (public or private), or as an individual teacher, student, parent, or private citizen.

The Secretary urges each commenter to identify the specific question being responded to by number, to be specific

regarding his or her proposals, and to include, if possible, the data requirements, procedures, and actual legislative language that the commenter proposes for the improvement or redesign of programs.

Richard W. Riley,
Secretary of Education.

Existing Programs and Related Provisions Under the Scope of the ESEA/Goals 2000 Reauthorization

Goals 2000: Educate America Act

Title III—State and Local Education Systemic Improvement

Title IV—Parental Assistance

Title V—National Skill Standards Board

Title VI—International Education Program

Title VIII—Minority-Focused Civic Education

Title X—Miscellaneous

Section 1011—School Prayer

Section 1018—Contraceptive Devices

Section 1019—Assessment

Section 1020—Public Schools

Section 1022—Sense of the Congress

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Title I—Helping Disadvantaged

Children Meet High Standards

Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs

Part B—Even Start Family Literacy Programs

Part C—Education of Migratory Children

Part D—Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth

Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out

Part E—Federal Evaluations,

Demonstrations, and Transition Projects

Part F—General Provisions

Title II—Dwight D. Eisenhower

Professional Development Program

Part A—Federal Activities

Part B—State and Local Activities

Part C—Professional Development Demonstration Project

Title III—Technology for Education

Part A—Technology for Education of All Students

Subpart 1—National Programs for Technology in Education

Subpart 2—State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources

Subpart 3—Regional Technical Support and Professional Development

Subpart 4—Product Development

Part B—Star Schools Program

Part C—Ready-to-Learn Television

Part D—Telecommunications Demonstration Project for

Mathematics

Part E—Elementary Mathematics and Science Equipment Program

Title IV—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Part A—State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs

Subpart 1—State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs

Subpart 2—National Programs

Title V—Promoting Equity

Part A—Magnet Schools Assistance

Part B—Women's Educational Equity

Part C—Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems

Title VI—Innovative Education Program Strategies

Title VII—Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and

Language Acquisition Programs

Part A—Bilingual Education

Subpart 1—Bilingual Education

Capacity and Demonstration Grants

Subpart 2—Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination

Subpart 3—Professional Development

Part B—Foreign Language Assistance Program

Part C—Emergency Immigrant Education Program

Part D—Administration

Title VIII—Impact Aid

Title IX—Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Education

Part A—Indian Education

Subpart 1—Formula Grants to LEAs

Subpart 2—Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational

Opportunities for Indian Children

Subpart 3—Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians

Subpart 4—National Research

Activities

Subpart 5—Federal Administration

Subpart 6—Definitions

Part B—Native Hawaiians

Part C—Alaska Native Education

Title X—Programs of National

Significance

Part A—Fund for the Improvement of Education

Part B—Gifted and Talented Children

Part C—Public Charter Schools

Part D—Arts in Education

Subpart 1—Arts in Education

Subpart 2—Cultural Partnerships for At-Risk Children and Youth

Part E—Inexpensive Book

Distribution Program

Part F—Civic Education

Part G—Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program

Part H—DeLugo Territorial Education Improvement Program

Part I—21st Century Community Learning Centers

Part J—Urban and Rural Education Assistance

Part K—National Writing Project

Part L—The Extended Time for

Learning and Longer School Year
 Part M—Territorial Assistance
 Title XI—Coordinated Services
 Title XII—School Facilities
 Infrastructure Improvement Act
 Title XIII—Support and Assistance
 Programs to Improve Education
 Part A—Comprehensive Regional
 Assistance Centers
 Part B—National Diffusion Network
 Part C—Eisenhower Regional

Mathematics and Science Education
 Consortia
 Part D—Technology-Based Technical
 Assistance
 Title XIV—General Provisions
 Part A—Definitions
 Part B—Flexibility in the Use of
 Administrative and other Funds
 Part C—Coordination of Programs;
 Consolidated State and Local Plans

and Applications
 Part D—Waivers
 Part E—Uniform Provisions
 Part F—Gun Possession
 Part G—Evaluations
 Title VII, Subtitle B, Stewart B.
 McKinney Homeless Assistance Act
 (FR Doc. 98-14546 Filed 6-1-98; 8:45 am)
 BILLING CODE 4000-01-P

Notes from Reauthorization meeting on December 15

(Judith Johnson, Kristin Bunce, Tom Corwin, Sandra Cook, Bayla White, Laurence Peters)

Next Steps:

Finalize The Organizational Structure

- Set-up a reauthorization calendar
- Tom Corwin to send over the papers prepared by his office that compared administration proposals against House and Senate compromises
- Sandra agreed to send over the House and Senate reports that described their intent
- Compare each report to conference agreement
- PES will complete and send to us the timetable for completing evaluation studies
- Set-up meetings with
 - × Mike Smith - approval for the plan
 - × Mike Cohen - What role will the DPC play and when do they want to weigh in?
 - × Delia Pompa - Identify studies they have commissioned; define the partnerships.
 - × Kent McGuire, Pierce Hammond, and Ricky Takai - Identify their respective roles and the relationship of OERI authorization to Goals 2000 and ESEA.
- Invite IG (Tom Bloom) and OMB to the discussion sessions
- Reach agreement on the strategy for bringing Goals into the deliberation

(The text on the following pages represent a summary of the conversation that took place.)

Notes from Reauthorization meeting on December 15.

(Judith Johnson, Bayla White, Tom Corwin, Sandra Cook, Kristin Bunce, Laurence Peters)

CONVERSATION

Judith started the meeting by stating that the next steps in the reauthorization process are:

1. establish workgroups
2. identify outreach activities
3. identify experts/consultants
4. draft legislation specs

General comments made by Sandra and Tom:

Start with a vision, an overall set of principles that form the core (most important thing to do first). This is needed to set a context. Accomplish this by the end of January. (Bayla would be a good person for this project.) This should answer the question Mike Smith raised, "What are Headline?"

There are many people who have to have input into the process. OMB needs to be involved. This is a very long process. You have to go through OMB and the White House. OMB should be involved when we are writing policy papers along with the White House.

Specs may have to go through the same clearance process as the actual legislation.

Set really hard timeframes and figure that everything will take two times as long as you think.

We are still a few months away from creating working groups.

Need to think about technology and how we use it.

Mike Cohen should be involved. Ask him what the organizational principles should reflect.

At some point (not for quite a while) you do sit down with the key people, but we need to be much further along in our thinking.

Might want to look at the House and Senate(?) reports as the bills moved out to the authorizing committees.

How will Goals 2000 fit in? It will proceed as part of ESEA, but what it is, is unclear.

Need to weigh in with Mike Cohen and the chiefs.

One of David Hawkins' Ph.D. students was doing his/her dissertation on the history of Title I -- ask Mary Jean for this.

Get OBEMLA and OERI in now.

The data piece is really important.

Keep things going, set-up a calendar.

We should be pretty far along (ready to do specs) by Labor Day, have decisions. Then we can draft the legislation, Jack Kristy's staff.

IG must be involved by statute. Invite Tom Bloom to attend the meetings. We need to know what they will be producing and when.

Get budget document from Tom's office.

Vision Statement

What are we trying to say?

Look at the seven priorities paper.

At some point, we really need to have a serious talk about the 5 organizational principles and what they don't cover. Are there some other ones that we need to articulate?

Outreach Process:

Federal Register. Put vision statement in Federal Register (It helps us get our thoughts in order) Budget can help us the Federal Register Services. They can take the first cut on it and can pay to have the comments synthesized.

Regional Meetings: A huge commitment of time. You contract local people. You contact local people or you will not attract state leaders. The whole world should get their ten minutes (we want to minimize the people who say they weren't invited).

Website. Put the whole thing on the web site.

Civil Rights Organizations

What should we do with these? - about these?

Tom said they have to be part of the forum for groups. Send the Federal Register notice to these groups for comment in addition to any other groups, but you ask all groups the same questions.

Retreat (1/2 day in January)

How would we frame this conversation so it is constructive?
OBEMLA and OERI must be involved.

Next Steps:

(We need to fill these in.)

**MEETING WITH HOUSE DEMOCRATS
MAY 13, 1999**

It's good to be among friends. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss our proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We call it, the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999.

Many of you were here in 1994, when we controlled Congress and dramatically revamped how we thought about education. You should be proud of your work in passing the Improving America's Schools Act and Goals 2000, and the improvements in education that those laws spurred throughout the country.

The 1994 laws brought about two fundamental changes in education. First, it raised expectations for children from high-poverty areas, asking them to meet high standards like all other children.

Second, the laws created a new federal role in education. For the first time, federal, state, and local officials were all working off the same page. More importantly, the laws promoted partnerships with parents, teachers and students. We all worked together in agreement that we could no longer tolerate lower expectations and watered-down curriculum for poor and disadvantaged students.

Those laws were built on the premise that all children can learn. States and schools would set challenging standards for all students. These high academic standards would form the foundation of a set of coherent and aligned reforms of curricula, assessments, and teacher training to raise all students' achievement.

Our partners have risen to the challenge. Five years later, there is evidence that the new federal support for standards-based reform accelerated reforms already underway in many states, while helping spark reforms in others.

In a recent GAO report, state officials described Goals 2000 as "a significant factor in promoting their education reform efforts" and a "catalyst" for change. Another assessment found that Title I of the ESEA is "driving standards-based reform" in many districts.

Today, 48 states, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia have developed or state academic standards for all children. The other two states have promoted challenging standards at the local level. This is what we have accomplished together.

In 1999, we must build upon the accomplishments of 1994, including the progress we made through Goals 2000. We must take the next step by helping teachers and schools teach to high standards in every classroom.

This isn't easy. We're asking many teachers and schools to change the way they've been doing business for years. But using challenging standards to develop curricula, assessments, teacher professional development, and systems of accountability is a proven approach to increase learning.

High expectations coupled with standards-based reform works. North Carolina and Texas put high standards into place and held schools accountable for student achievement, and they showed greater gains than any other state on the National Assessment of Educational Progress between 1992 and 1996.

To take standards further, we must also strengthen accountability to ensure that everyone is doing their part to help all children learn.

That's why we strongly support an end to social promotion and traditional retention practices, even though some of our friends disagree with us. If we tolerate children slipping through the cracks — being passed from grade to grade without adequate preparation for life or simply retaining students in the same grade without extra help — we are not meeting our promise to all of our children to help them meet high expectations. *(Should this go here or under the Education Accountability Act?)*

The 1994 laws put educators nationwide on the right track. Now we must continue the momentum that we Democrats put in place.

To increase educational excellence and equity, the Educational Excellence Act would:

- Put high standards into every classroom;
- Provide small class sizes and help every child read well;

- Strengthen teacher and principal quality;
- Emphasize accountability for schools and student performance, including turning around failing schools, and toughen accountability in federal education programs;
- Support safe, healthy and disciplined learning environments that better connect students, teachers, families, and communities; and
- Modernize schools for the 21st Century by putting useful technology in the classrooms, making schools smaller and more personalized, and increasing opportunities to learn foreign languages.

I'd like to — briefly — highlight the most important provisions in the 11 Titles of our ESEA proposal. Much more detail will be available next week.

Title I is the primary source of aid to increase the achievement of our most disadvantaged students, providing over \$8 billion each year on behalf of over 11 million children.

Ninety-nine percent of Title I dollars go to the local level to support instruction.

The impact of standards-based reform is beginning to be seen in reading and math scores in Title I schools. However, there remains a significant and disturbing achievement gap between students in high- and low-poverty areas.

The Educational Excellence Act would, first, continue the commitment to standards-based reform through Title I.

Second, it would strengthen accountability by encouraging States to use one system to hold all schools accountable for student achievement and by helping low-performing schools and districts turn around.

Third, it would emphasize high-quality teaching by requiring new teachers to be certified and limiting the instructional duties of teachers' aides without at least two years of college.

Fourth, it would strengthen schoolwide efforts to improve schools where 50 percent of the students receive free or reduced-price lunch, and continue the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program.

Finally, our Title I proposal includes a continued commitment to the Even Start family literacy, Migrant Education, and Neglected and Delinquent children programs. It also adds the Reading Excellence Act as a new part of Title I, which helps improve the teaching and learning of reading to young children in high-poverty schools.

A recent Department survey found that 37 percent of teachers did not feel adequately prepared to teach to high standards in their classrooms. Our Teach to High Standards initiative — which will be Part A of Title II — represents the next generation of Goals 2000. It is our effort to ensure that every classroom in America has a quality teacher and every child is taught to high standards. This new initiative will take the place of Goals 2000, Eisenhower, and Title VI and will focus on giving teachers the preparation, instructional materials, and classroom tools they need to teach all students to high standards.

Teach to High Standards funds will be distributed by formula to the states. States will distribute half of their funds to school districts based upon their population and poverty levels. The other half will be distributed through competitive grants for high-quality, innovative programs of professional development and standards implementation.

States will be able to use 10 percent of the funds to continue work on developing and implementing standards, and providing technical assistance to districts in their efforts to align instruction, curriculum, and assessments to the State standards.

This initiative will support intensive, sustained, and collaborative professional development that research and teachers say improves teaching the most. It will also recognize the national importance of improving math and science instruction by allocating the first \$300 million of the appropriation to professional development in those areas.

The initiative will also address the urgent need to reduce teacher attrition by prioritizing professional development proposals that support new teachers during their first three years in the classroom;

Part B of Title II, Transition to Teaching: Troops to Teachers, will help recruit, prepare, and support mid-career professionals — including retiring members of the military service — become teachers in high-need areas.

Title II will also help children enter school ready to learn by increasing and improving training of early childhood educators to help them build key language and cognitive skills.

Finally, Title II, Part D, will re-vamp our technical assistance by providing our customers with resources to identify their needs, select technical assistance services, and build their capacity for school improvement. We will not re-authorize the comprehensive technical assistance centers, but will instead focus our efforts on providing States and districts with the ability to purchase the technical assistance they need.

The effective use of education technology can help all students develop higher-order thinking skills, technological literacy, and achieve to high standards. Title III of our proposal will narrow the “digital divide” by targeting funds to high-need school districts and, through the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, improve teacher professional development in using technology well.

It would also consolidate the resources of the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and the Star Schools program to develop innovative technology models.

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act is a very important program, although we wish it wasn't necessary. Current law spreads Safe and Drug-Free funds too thin to have much impact in high-need communities, we would distribute the funds through competitive grants to concentrate our resources where they will do the most good.

Our Safe Schools proposal would also authorize Project SERV — School Emergency Response to Violence — to help communities respond to crises such as the terrible tragedy in Littleton, Colorado, only three weeks ago.

The Educational Excellence Act promotes equity, excellence, and public school choice. It includes magnet schools and charter schools and promotes new school-choice options — such as work-site schools and partnerships between secondary schools and colleges — through the new OPTIONS authority.

We've included our Class-Size Reduction Initiative in Title VI of our proposal. Smaller class sizes in early grades help students learn to read, the foundation of all learning, and promote continued academic success.

Title VII, Bilingual Education, emphasizes the importance of helping students with limited English proficiency learn English and meet the same challenging academic standards. Our proposal would also improve teacher training programs to help teachers teach these students.

Our proposal continues and simplifies our Impact Aid program and our education programs for American Indians, Native Hawaiians, and Alaska Natives.

Title X includes a number of programs of national significance. I'd like to mention three in particular.

- **21st Century Community Learning Centers offer extended learning opportunities for students and adults. Our proposal would emphasize after-school and summer programming, create a local match to build capacity, and target funds on high-need areas.**
- **Title X would also increase the number of — and improve the quality of — elementary school foreign language programs, by building links with middle and high schools and focusing them on developing fluency, rather than familiarity.**
- **Finally, Title X would establish a national grant competition to help 5,000 high schools implement research-based reforms. The Secondary School Reform initiative would help transform high schools into places where all students are known by one adult, feel motivated to learn, and are challenged academically.**

Our last Title, Title XI, includes the President's Education Accountability Act. The Act would emphasize the shared responsibility we all have to ensure that all children learn by:

- Improving teacher quality by ending the practices of emergency certification and out-of-field teaching.
- Ending social promotion to help all students achieve high standards;
- Increasing the use of school report cards to increase public accountability; and,
- Requiring schools to implement sound discipline policies.

That was a quick summary of our ESEA proposal. I'd be interested to hear your comments and answer your questions.

6/2/99

COMPARABILITY

What is the background of the Title I comparability requirement?

The Title I comparability of services provision was enacted in 1970 to ensure that Title I schools received their fair share of non-Federal resources. It required an LEA to use State and local funds to provide services in Title I schools that, taken as a whole, were at least comparable to services being provided in non-Title I schools. The basic statutory requirement remains essentially the same today. However, examining the history of the comparability provision reveals a gradual reduction in prescriptiveness. For example, regulations implementing the 1970 statute required an LEA to meet five tests of comparability within 5% tolerance: pupils/certified teacher; pupils/certified instructional staff (other than teachers); pupils per noncertified instructional staff; instructional salaries/pupil; and other instructional costs/pupil. Subsequent regulations reduced these tests to three, and then two: pupils/instructional staff; and instructional salaries/pupil. In 1981, Congress added a statutory provision that deemed an LEA to be comparable if it filed an assurance that it had: a districtwide salary schedule; a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in teachers, administrators, and other staff; and a policy to ensure equivalence among schools in the provision of materials and instructional supplies. Nonregulatory guidance indicated that an LEA could also meet the comparability requirement if it met *either* of the two prior regulatory tests. Moreover, the guidance suggested that a 10% tolerance was acceptable. Regulations implementing the 1988 statutory amendments codified this nonregulatory guidance. Currently, the statute specifically precludes an LEA from including staff salary differentials in calculating comparability; there are no regulations.

Documenting compliance with the comparability requirement has also relaxed over the years. Initially, an LEA had to submit data demonstrating comparability to its SEA before it could receive Title I funds. Later regulations also required each SEA to file a comparability report with the Department. In 1981, all comparability reports were eliminated. Although not requiring reports, the 1988 amendments made clear that an LEA had to maintain annual records demonstrating its compliance with comparability. Since 1994, comparability records must only be maintained biennially.

Is the Department aware of compliance problems with the current comparability requirements?

Currently, most districts comply with the comparability requirement by ensuring equivalence in pupil/teacher ratios or in instructional staff salaries/pupil. To the best of our knowledge, compliance with these measures is not a problem. A recent IRT to California, in reviewing comparability in four LEAs, did discover one LEA that had a noncomparable school and three LEAs in which there was no evidence that comparability had been calculated. Most IRTs, however, have not found comparability problems.

Two 1993 studies also did not find significant problems with comparability. To inform the last reauthorization, the General Accounting Office (GAO) examined comparability in eight LEAs (including Detroit and Dade County) in four states and found all districts were in compliance on the measure the districts chose: students/instructional staff. GAO also examined available data on 17 other measures that fell into three categories: (1) ratios of students to specific types of staff; (2) proxies for teacher quality; and (3) supplies, equipment, and other expenditures. These data indicated in many cases that Title I schools had lower student/teacher ratios than non-Title I schools but were often worse off on other measures such as teacher salaries and experience. (However, the lowest average teacher experience in Title I schools was 10 years.)

A study by the Department's Planning and Evaluation Service (PES) concluded that the sample LEAs had, for the most part, achieved within-district comparability on most measurable aspects of their educational programs: i.e., cost per student; number of staff; average class size; teaching experience and degree level of teachers; and availability of instructional materials and equipment. (The study examined 95 elementary schools and 25 high schools in 30 districts during 1991-92.) Where differences in these measures existed, they generally favored the high-poverty schools.

Preliminary results from PES' current Study of Education Resources and Federal Funding also found that staff/student ratios actually favor high-poverty schools slightly.

If compliance with the current Title I comparability requirements is not a problem, why is the Department proposing changes in reauthorization?

The current measures of comparability generally address *quantity*: quantity of staff per students or amount of funds spent on staff per student. Although these measures are important, they may not be sufficient to ensure that resources are comparable in terms of *quality* between Title I and non-Title I schools.

The Department's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has been examining intradistrict resource comparability in reviews under Title VI of the Civil Rights Act and has raised qualitative concerns. For example, OCR cited references indicating that, in New York City—

- Provisional certification rates are higher on average in high-poverty schools
- Districts with very high percentages of low-income black and latino children have almost no courses that would prepare students for specialized high school entrance exams
- In the 25 high schools with the lowest graduation rates, fewer than 4% of their students take and pass Regents level exams.

Accordingly, OCR has been developing investigative guidance for conducting intradistrict resource comparability reviews. That guidance looks at a number of factors within four general dimensions: staff resources, educational programming, technology, and facilities. OCR's work formed the basis for the Administration's proposed changes.

How would the Administration's proposal strengthen Title I comparability?

The Administration's proposal would strengthen comparability by requiring districts receiving Title I funds to establish policies, no later than July 1, 2002, to ensure that Title I schools are comparable to non-Title I schools on various qualitative factors. For example, Title I schools would be expected to have teachers who are as well qualified, in terms of experience and education, as teachers in non-Title I schools. Similarly, students in Title I schools would be expected to have equal access to a high-quality curriculum, including gifted and talented classes, Advanced Placement courses, and courses that address the State's content standards, as students in non-Title I schools. Title I schools would also be expected to be in comparable condition, in terms of safety, repair, and accessibility to technology. While providing districts considerable flexibility in devising their comparability policies, the Administration's proposal would go far toward ensuring that the comparability provision results in comparable quality as well as quantity of resources.

COMPETITIVE GRANT STRUCTURE

Question: The Administration is proposing that certain programs move from a formula to a competitive grant structure. What is the rationale for this proposal?

Answer:

There are three main advantages to moving to a competitive grant structure: (1) to provide funds to districts (or other grantees) that can demonstrate a need for services; (2) to support high quality activities; and (3) to provide grants that are of adequate size to address identified needs and support high quality activities.

Formula grants, on the other hand, spread funds out in order to provide at least a small amount of funding to the largest possible number of grantees. Unfortunately, this amount may be far too small to support effective programs—particularly in small districts—and the amount provided is determined without regard to whether the grantees' needs are large or small.

- The proposed Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) competitive grant structure will enable states to target funds to districts with a demonstrated need for assistance and based on the highest quality of proposed programming. By moving primarily to competitive grants, States can award funds to districts based on objective criteria such as high rates of substance use by youth or high rates of victimization of youth by violence and crime. States could fund high-quality, research-based approaches that address the identified needs. Currently 70% of the SDFSCA funds designated for districts are distributed on a formula basis, while the remaining 30% are targeted to relatively few districts in a state which have the greatest need for program funds. Because of the formula distribution and funding level of the program, presently 59% of districts receive grants of less than \$10,000. The average grant for districts receiving formula funds is approximately \$6 per student, except in the 10% of targeted districts with the greatest need.
- Currently, Title VI funds are distributed by formula to states and districts across the nation and closely resembles general aid for schools. Title VI gives states and local districts extensive flexibility to fund a broad range of initiatives that support school improvement and education reform. A recent Study of Educational Resources and Federal Funding (SERFF) conducted for the Department found that Title VI funds are most often distributed to all schools in a district with little targeting of funds to schools based on need (e.g., high-poverty or low-performance). The study also found that decisions about the uses of funds are most likely to be influenced by short-term local priorities, rather than by long-term district plans, state priorities, or data on student performance. This use of Title VI funds—which differs greatly from the use of Goals 2000 funds—may be attributable both to the extremely flexible nature of the program as well as to its formula funding structure.
- States like the current Goals 2000 competitive grant structure and both state and local officials reported that it allows them to flexibly focus federal funds on supporting education reform plans. In a 1998 GAO report of the Goals 2000 program, State officials reported that the program's funding structure allows states to use their state-retained funding according to

self-determined priorities as well as structure their subgrant programs to mesh with their states' education reform plans. Several state officials stated that they do not want more program flexibility, such as block grants that could be used for many purposes in addition to education reform. ("Goals 2000: Flexible Funding Supports State and Local Education Reform," GAO, November 1998, pp. 14-15).

- The Eisenhower Program, which funds both formula and competitive grants, has seen different results with these two funding strategies. The professional development provided through competitive grants to institutions of higher education may be of higher caliber and more useful to teachers than that provided through formula grants to school districts according to a recent evaluation of the program. The competitive grants exhibit outcomes comparable to those shown by exemplary professional development programs. They are more likely to be intensive and employ practices associated with successful professional development than those funded through formula grants.
- The competitive grant structure requires specific targeting provisions to assure that high-need districts access available funds. High poverty and rural, isolated school districts often have limited resources and expertise to develop highly competitive proposals. Yet these are the districts that generally have a great need for the programs. For these reasons, safeguards such as funding priorities and technical assistance should be built into the competitive grant structure to assure that these programs reach the intended target groups and provide high quality programs.

ACCOUNTABILITY VS. FLEXIBILITY

Question: A key principle of the 1994 ESEA reauthorization was flexibility in exchange for accountability for student achievement. Doesn't this proposal tilt the balance away from flexibility with the new set-asides that are being proposed and the emphasis on accountability?

Answer:

- The Administration's proposal continues the principle of greater flexibility in exchange for greater accountability begun in 1994.

It retains the flexibility in current law, such as the provisions lowering the poverty threshold for schoolwide programs and the authorization for consolidated applications.

It adds greater flexibility by incorporating the new Ed-Flex expansion, adding to the list of programs under which provisions can be waived; and authorizing the Secretary to grant additional flexibility to States that achieve higher student outcomes along with a reduction in the achievement gap between high- and low-achieving students.

At the same time, the bill would strengthen the focus on accountability for ensuring that all children achieve to high standards.

- The accountability provisions combined with the set-asides strengthen the capacity of schools to help all children achieve to high standards. States and districts have flexibility on how they spend funds within the set asides as well as in developing and implementing their accountability policies.

RURAL SCHOOL DISTRICTS

Question: How will rural areas fare under the Department's reauthorization proposal?

Answer:

- Rural areas should do well under the Education Excellence for All Children Act
- The Title I allocation formula would continue to take into account districts with large percentages of poor children. These districts are most frequently rural.
-
- Under Teach to High Standards (Title II), rural areas could benefit from requirements that States have strategies for ensuring that school districts with the greatest need have a reasonable opportunity to compete. Similar provisions in other titles, including Title III (Technology) and Title IV (Safe and Drug-Free Schools) will also give priority to rural districts that have high poverty rates and are facing the greatest challenges in teaching all students to high standards.
- Rural areas compete successfully in competitions. More than half of the centers funded under 21st Century Community Learning Centers program are located in rural areas.

MEMORANDUM

April 13, 1998

TO: ESEA Reauthorization CORE Group

FROM: Judith Johnson *JJ*

RE: The Status of Standards-Based Reform and
Summary of State Status Re: Standards

Attached are the materials that were discussed in our meeting on April 6 that we said would be forthcoming for your information.

Should you have additional requests or questions, please let us know.

JJ:fds

The Status of Standards-Based Reform

Once the President and nation's governors agreed to set specific results oriented goals at the Education Summit in 1989, the logic of standards-based reform was inescapable. How, after all, could the nation ensure that all students would demonstrate competency in challenging subject matter without specifying in some fashion what was to be learned? It seemed equally obvious that assessments aligned with the standards would be needed to determine whether and how well students had learned the challenging subject matter. And, schools needed to develop the capacities to help students attain these standards. Three basic understandings supported standards-based reform:

- All students can learn.
- The achievement gap between groups of students could only be closed by raising the bar for all students.
- The old model of looking at school performance by measuring inputs must be replaced with a results orientation.

The same concerns for educational equity and quality that had launched standards-based reform at the national level was already at work in many States. In 1987, California incorporated its standards into the State's comprehensive "curriculum frameworks." Maryland, Wisconsin, and South Carolina, among others also developed content standards. Overall between 1989 and 1992, over 40 States began to set standards and revise their curricula in the core academic subjects. The reauthorization of Title I naturally flowed from growing understanding of standards-based reform at both the national and State level.

While many believed that setting standards was going to be the most difficult aspect, implementing standards-based reform at the school level has proven to be a far more intensive process. Standards-based reform requires the implementation of three parallel sets of strategies:

- Setting content and performance standards and measuring results through aligned assessments.
- Developing a results orientation that is focused on accountability and closing the achievement gap.
- Building the capacity of schools to ensure that students reach high standards.

Setting Challenging content and performance standards and measuring results through aligned assessments

The foundation of standards-based reform is the development and implementation of content and performance standards and aligned assessments to measure student results. Once communities establish what it is that students must know and be able to do they can align the rest of their education supports to ensure that all students can reach challenging standards.

Therefore, the Improving America's Schools Act included specific requirements for the

development of standards and aligned assessments. Under Title I, States must have had challenging content and student performance standards, with three levels of proficiency, in reading and math in place for all students by the beginning of the 1997-98 school year. Aligned assessments that have multiple measures and accommodations for special needs students must be in place by the 2000-2001 school year.

The nation has made tremendous progress toward building the foundation for standards-based reforms, but it still has a long way to go both in terms of building the foundation and in terms of making standards meaningful in classroom activities. Ten years ago, few States had clear, explicit standards for student performance. Today all States are actively engaged in discussions of what it is they want all students to know and be able to do. Standards have become a focal point for education reform efforts across the Nation and they have received increasing attention from teachers and parents. In a 1997 Public Agenda survey, 98% of k-12 teachers and 82% of parents reported that their States or school districts have set guidelines for what students are expected to know and be able to do. (*Quality Counts*, 1998, p. 72)

Most States have now adopted challenging content standards. Forty four States plus DC and Puerto Rico have reported that they have adopted challenging content standards in reading in math as required by Title I. All of the remaining States -- except for Iowa -- have State standards, but are either revising them or in the process of formally adopting them. The CCSSO reported that 26 States had adopted standards in four academic areas by 1996, up from 16 in 1994. (*State Baselines for Goals 2000 Implementation*, April 1994 and *States' Status on Standards*, June 1996). Standards are part of a process of continuous improvement which States seem to be taking seriously based on AFT reports that 39 States developed or revised their standards in the last year. (*Making Standards Matter*, 1997, p. 13). Outside groups are now evaluating the quality of these standards in terms of their rigor, clarity, and specificity. They have found mixed results to date, but the majority of the States received A and B grades for rigor by the Council for Basic Education (*Quality Counts*, 1998, p. 80), and the AFT reported that 14 States improved their standards in 1997 over 1996 (AFT, *What Matters Most*, 1997).

Content standards are important, but they are not sufficient for education reform. Student performance standards operationalize standards for use in classrooms and assessments by articulating how good is good enough to demonstrate mastery of content standards. Progress on the development of State performance standards has been slower. We have learned that the development of performance standards is an integral part of developing assessments, so many State efforts have taken more time than originally envisioned. To date, only 18 States have reported that they have challenging performance standards with three levels of proficiency in place. The other States are making progress, but probably will not have performance standards for another year while their assessments are under development. Many more States have general descriptors that will guide assessments and proficiency levels, but the actual levels of proficiency will not be specified until assessments are pilot tested in 1998-99.

Aligned assessments remain one of the most challenging areas of State activity. The development of valid, reliable assessments aligned to standards requires rethinking the way that we design tests and use them to inform instruction. No State has yet announced that it has a final assessment in place that satisfies all of the Title I requirements. Twenty States, however, have indicated that their current assessments are aligned to their standards and will become final. (Allen Shenck's analysis, March 1998). States are still struggling with issues such as disaggregating student data, including all students in assessments to the extent practicable, and designing multiple measures to assess student progress.

Developing a results orientation that is focused on accountability and closing the achievement gap.

As States and districts struggle with the development of their assessments aligned with standards, they are also now confronting the challenge of both defining and developing systems of accountability for student learning results. Meant as a response to a public desire to both know how well their schools are achieving and have leverages for supporting their improvement, approaches to accountability are many and varied.

Accountability is predicated on existence of accurate portrayals of performance, and is traditionally tied to single point in time achievement data. (Forty-five States have statewide assessments, about half are aligned to their standards.)

However, for accountability to effectively serve the multiple needs of standards-based school reform—to support improved curriculum and instruction, inform the public, and influence policy—it will need to be conceived as “a systematic method to assure to those inside and outside of the educational system that schools are moving to desired directions—commonly included elements are goals; indicators of progress toward meeting those goals, analysis of data; reporting procedures, and consequences or sanctions” (NCES, July 1997, 97). However, while States have been increasingly attentive to accountability, few have implemented it from the broader position. There is little evidence of data use at the State level (*Living in Interesting Times*, 49), and though

29 States authorize the use of sanctions against under-performing schools (*The Progress of Education Reform: 1996*, 12) and 23 have academic bankruptcy or intervention policies ranging from citations and audits to the transferring of students, public notification, and dissolution of districts or schools (ECS, *Policy Brief*, Anderson and Lewis, “Academic Bankruptcy” March, 1997), few have defined plans of support.

In addition, while there is some trend toward States providing financial rewards for improved student achievement, there is little evidence of their ability to motivate teachers and administrators toward change.

Building the capacity of schools to ensure that students reach high standards

The best systems of standards, assessments, and accountability will mean little if high teachers are not in schools helping children meet challenging standards. Early studies of standards-based reform noted that developing the organizational capacity of schools—and the individual capacity of teachers—to carry out new, challenging kinds of instruction was the most significant issue confronting reform; but was being given the least attention. The significance of this finding is intensified when it is coupled with an assessment of the status of our current teaching force. The National Commission on Teaching and America's Future reports that more than 12% of all new "teachers" enter the workforce without any training at all, and another 15% enter teaching positions without meeting State standards. In addition, many current teachers are under-qualified. Fewer than 75% of all teachers have studied child development, learning, and teaching methods, have degrees in their subject area, and have passed State licensing requirements. Nearly one-fourth (23%) of all secondary teachers do not have even a college minor in their main teaching field. This is true for more than 30% of mathematics teachers. The National Education Goals Panel noted that the trend in hiring under qualified teachers and/or misassigning qualified teachers appears to be worsening. The U.S. has experienced a decline in the percentage of secondary school teachers who hold an undergraduate or graduate degree in their main teaching assignment (from 66% in 1991 to 63% in 1994).

Efforts to improve instruction tend to involve two approaches:

- Alignment of standards for K-12 students; standards for accrediting teacher preparation programs, standards for initial licensure; standards for professional development, and standards for advanced certification of master teachers.
- High quality professional development for educators that begins in pre-service programs, supports beginning teachers in challenging conditions, is continuous and embedded in the daily life of schools, and is driven by a coherent long-term plan related to standards. (National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, 1996; and "Policies and Programs for Professional Development of Teachers: A 50 State Profile," 1996.)

Policymakers have begun to address these capacity issues and tie licensure and professional development activities to reform. (Cite stats) While these actions, if sustained, will enhance our future teaching force, more attention must be given to short-term strategies to improve our existing workforce.

Conclusion

Clearly standards-based reform is taking hold across the nation. However, since many elements of the reform are still under development, student results are difficult to demonstrate. But progress is evident on all accounts. Several questions should be considered in future actions.

QUESTIONS

Standards and Assessments:

- What are the implications for actually implementing standards if they are constantly under revision?
- Will performance standards that are cut scores, rather than descriptions of student work, be useful for guiding classrooms?
- What assistance can be provided for the development of assessments?
- What are the most effective ways for ensuring that standards get into classrooms?

Accountability

- How is performance measured? At what levels (classroom, district, State, etc.)?
 - Which students are included?
 - How is data used? Does it inform curriculum and instruction?
 - How are teachers and administrators prepared to use performance data?
- What/who are the foci of accountability measures; who is being held accountable and for what?
 - Are students accountable for meeting the standards—via promotion or graduation requirements? What measures are used (multiple measures—classroom or large-scale assessment, based on what criteria)? Are all students included?
 - Are teachers accountable for the performance of their students? If so, what measures should be used?
 - Are administrators accountable for school improvement? What measures are used to assess their success (student scores, school improvement plan benchmarks, etc.)?
- What are the consequences of performance?
 - Are sanctions, rewards, and/or supports applied based on performance?
 - Are they student, school, or district focused?
- How are performance results shared? What results are shared? How are they disaggregated? To whom are results disseminated?

Professional Development:

- Should development of leadership skills—for principals and teachers—be given priority in the effort to improve the capacity of schools?
- What should be the role of technology in supplementing teacher knowledge and motivating students?

SUMMARY OF STATE STATUS RE: STANDARDS

April 13, 1998

States were supposed to have content and performance standards in reading and math in place by the beginning of the 1997-98 school year. Only 18 states fully met the Title I requirement for content and performance standards this Fall. We gave states that had not completed this process the option of a temporary waiver until the end of May 1998.

Content Standards:

Our current estimates indicate that the states without content standards will have them by May, except Iowa.

Performance Standards:

Our estimates of state progress in developing performance standards in compliance with Title I are (note: DC and Puerto Rico were considered states for this purpose):

- 18 states have approved performance standards.
- 13 states have indicated that they need waivers well into 1998-99 because their performance standards are being defined as assessments are developed.
- 5 states need a waiver extension well into 1998-99 because they are at beginning stages of development.
- 8 states should be able to complete their standards by this Fall. (AK, AL, DC, FL, NJ, NV, UT, WV)
- 7 states may be ready for peer review by the end of May. (MI, MN, MS, MT, ND, PA, WI)
- Iowa does not intend to establish state standards or a state assessment.

Performance standards

Status Table

March 23, 1998

	has content standards	has perf. stds w/ levels	expect perf. stds 5/98	expect perf. stds. Fall 98	beginning stage - 1999	devpg w/ assmts - 1999
AL	X			X		
AK	X			X		
AZ	X					X
AR	X					X
CA					X	
CO	X	X				
CT	X	X				
DE	X					X
DC	X			X		
FL	X			X		
GA						X
HI	X				X	
ID					X	
IL	X	X				
IN	X	X				
IA						
KS	X	X				
KY	X	X				
LA	X					X
ME	X	X				
MD	X	X				
MA	X					X
MI	X		X			
MN	X		X			
MS	X		X			
MO	X					X
MT	X		X			
NE					X	
NV	X			X		
NH	X	X				
NJ	X			X		
NM	X					X
NY	X					X
NC	X	X				
ND	X		X			
OH	X	X				
OK	X	X				
OR	X	X				
PA	X		X			
PR	X	X				
RI	X					X
SC	X	X				
SD	X	X				
TN	X					X
TX	X	X				
UT	X			X		
VT	X	X				
VA	X					X
WA	X					X
WV	X			X		
WI			X			
WY					X	

MEMORANDUM

January 6, 1998

TO: Mike Smith

FROM: Gerald Tirozzi
Judith Johnson

Subject: The ESEA Reauthorization

Copy -
Attachment B

Need to respond to -

In conjunction with the senior leadership of OESE, we have begun the process of mapping out in general terms the strategies for the reauthorization of ESEA and Goals 2000. This memo outlines our early thinking concerning the critical steps that should guide our planning.

The process we propose to follow this year is largely based on the approach followed during the last reauthorization. Attached please find a *Proposed Calendar for ESEA Reauthorization* (Attachment A), a memo and chart on the *ESEA Reauthorization Work Groups* (Attachment B), our *Responses to Questions From November 21 Meeting* (Attachment C), and a set of *Guiding Questions and Group Specific Questions* we have begun circulating in draft form to OESE staff to initiate the work of the groups (Attachment D).

We started from a set of assumptions about the current legislation that are worth making explicit. Our view is that with the legislation only two and a half years old, and with early indicators showing some positive results, it would be unwise to propose major changes in the underlying philosophy and approach. However, we do believe that there maybe provisions in the legislation that need to be rethought as well as provisions that could be strengthened or better targeted. For example, we need to vastly improve access to technical assistance and professional development. — ?

As you are aware the proposal to consider the *Goals 2000: Educate America Act* legislation and the ESEA together has significant implications for OERI and NCES and we would want to start discussions with Assistant Secretary designee, Kent McGuire, at the earliest possible opportunity.

With guidance provided by the program directors, we have identified the following eight key questions that should frame our initial conversations. It is our belief that answers to these key questions will guide our responses to other issues. We would like to know

how closely these questions mirror your own thinking and concerns.

(For discussion-Core Groups and Work Groups)

1. The 1994 reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act identified five major guiding principles for our work. 1 Do we have convincing evidence that these principles are now affecting the type of change we want to see in Title 1 schools and classrooms? What have we learned that might inform any aspect of ESEA?

and next?

2. Assuming that the five principles of ESEA are the correct ones, are we satisfied that the programs we have in place are all necessary or can some programs be consolidated, terminated or otherwise modified to better achieve results?

3. How will the ESEA reauthorization relate to the administration's (and Congress's) other education initiatives--specifically, America Reads, the Urban-Rural Initiative, and the Obey-Porter provisions? To what extent can we package these initiatives into a coherent message about the federal role in school reform and improvement?

4. What should be our strategy with the Safe and Drug Free Schools program given recent evaluations and the efforts to move some of the funding for the program into HHS?

5. Clearly professional development and the provision of technical assistance to high-poverty schools will be of key concern in this reauthorization. The reauthorization of ESEA together with Goals 2000 provides us with a new opportunity to think through a more coherent approach to this question. Do you have suggestions for strategies that are more crosscutting and more likely to produce sustainable results?

6. Given the fact that few program evaluations will be ready by the time we will develop our legislative proposals, what options do we have to strengthen the justifications for our legislative proposals?

7. How can we address the issues of providing increased flexibility without unintentionally perhaps turning the program into a virtual block grant? What is the impact on the students with the greatest need? Have we, for example, under-emphasized the need for accountability for results while over-emphasizing flexibility and freedom from regulation? If so, how can the balance be shifted back towards greater accountability?

8. How do we begin to apply the new research on the brain so that we can better apply this knowledge to ESEA programs and in so doing also make better connections with Head Start, and other federally sponsored early interventions strategies?

We feel helpful input on these questions, in addition to others you may pose, can be provided through the forums we have scheduled, specifically, with the experts sponsored by the PEW foundation, an OESE retreat, and perhaps a Senior Leadership meeting or retreat. We anticipate that this early thinking will assist the way we draft the Federal Register notice at the end of this month that formally announces that the reauthorization process has begun.

1Five Directions for ESEA, (from the Department of Education's Improving America's Schools Act publication of 1993).

1. High standards for all children--with the elements of education aligned, so that everything is working together to help all students reach those standards.
2. A focus on teaching and learning.
3. Flexibility to stimulate local school-based and district initiative, coupled with responsibility for student performance.
4. Links among schools, parents, and communities.
5. Resources targeted to where needs are greatest and in amounts sufficient to make a difference.

Attachment A**PROPOSED CALENDAR FOR THE REAUTHORIZATION OF ESEA**

ACTION	LEAD OFFICE	DEADLINE
Meeting with experts (Sponsored by PEW)	ODS/OESE	January 1998 (?)
OESE Retreat	OESE/G2K M'ngt. Team	January 1998
First meeting of ESEA Work Group to begin to draft vision statement and key questions for Federal Register announcement	OESE	January 1998
Draft of Vision Statement/Federal Register Announcement Circulated for Comment	OESE/ODS 10/5?	January 29, 1998
First Meeting of Core Group--to approve draft vision statement/ Federal Register announcement		
Federal Register Statement announced. Significant pre-publication mailing to education groups nationwide/ Launch of Reauthorization Website.	OESE/ODS	February 1998
Analysis of demographic and trend summaries	Data and Evaluation Subgroup	TBA
Summary of Education Groups comment	OESE	April 1998
Summary of public comment	OESE	April 1998
Major Concept Papers recommended and approved by Work and Core Group commissioned.	ESEA Work Group/Core Group	April-June 1998

Regional Meetings/Focus Groups	OIIA	April-June 1998
Development of Options	ESEA Workgroup	June-August 1998
Decision Memoranda to Secretary	Core Group/ ESEA work group	July-August 1998
* Draft Specifications (7)	OGC/Budget	August 1998
* Final Specifications for OMB	OESE/OGC	August 1998
FY 2000 budget submission reflecting Department's proposals	OESE/Budget	September 1998
Bill language drafted	OGC/ODS	October 1998
Final negotiations with OMB	OESE/ODS	October-November 1998
Hill and Group Briefings/Outreach	OESE/OCLA/ODS	August-November 1998
Fine Tuning	OESE/OCLA/OGC	November-January 1999
Transmittal to Congress	OGC/OLCA/ODS	January 1999

THE: ROLE AND FUNCTIONING OF ESEA WORKGROUPS

We envision two major groups who will be responsible for driving the work. The first is a **Work Group** that will be formed from OESE staff, the other relevant program offices, including OERI and OBEMLA, as well as support offices such as PES, OGC, Budget, and OIG's office. The second group will be drawn from principals from those offices as well as the Deputy Secretary and will be referred to as the **Core Group**. The Secretary's seven priority teams, referred to as **Initiative Groups** will be called upon to assist in helping us to think across program boundaries. The Work Group will also charter a number of **special issue subgroups** that can help us think through some specific cross cutting issues such as technology and professional development.

For organizational purposes, we have outlined the work in terms of three roughly chronological phases.

Phase One: Preparing for Public Outreach and Engagement

We are ready to circulate a set of draft questions for the Policy Work Group and the Initiative Teams (see Attachment D). Responses to these questions will help inform a Vision Statement (a broad statement of beliefs and principles) which will become the basis for the Federal Register announcement. The vision statement and Federal Register announcement will be similar in style and scope to the one that initiated the last Reauthorization.

The ESEA workgroup will draft the vision statement and key questions/federal register announcement in January and will be seeking CORE GROUP approval in late January. They will be assisted in their work by a meeting of educational experts brought together by PEW as well as an OESE retreat to which the core group will be invited.

Once the vision statement/federal register announcement is approved in January, we will solicit comment from major education groups, POC heads and Initiative teams.

Phase Two: Data Assessment and Identification of Issues

Following the development of the Vision Statement and the Federal Register announcement, the ESEA Work Group will meet in February to develop responses to some of the key questions raised. At this time the group will also identify subject areas for concept papers. To the extent possible their further work will be based upon:

- ◆ IRT team reviews and other data reported from the field;
- ◆ Reports and analyses that PES has already completed or on which draft reports are available;

- ◆ Comments from the letters received as a result of the Federal Register announcement;
- ◆ Issues raised by members of the Core Team; and
- ◆ Issues raised by Program Offices.

The **Workgroup** will also charge a **Data and Evaluation Subgroup** of evaluation and data experts (drawn from OERI, NCES and PES) to continue to develop a list of issues and concerns that will inform Reauthorization planning and identify useful new studies (for example demographic analyses), reports and syntheses. An **Outreach Support Subgroup** will also be chartered during this period. The responsibilities of this group will be to:

- ◆ Establish a "Reauthorization Web Site" which will accommodate key documents and accommodate email correspondence;
- ◆ Organize Regional Meetings and Focus Groups utilizing the Comprehensive Centers as a major vehicle for accomplishing this work; and
- ◆ Summarize public comment received from the website, the Federal Register and internal sources.

The Work Group will determine its own schedule of option papers to the Core Group, with the goal of completing work on major issues by July. Option papers will typically identify program components, a background statement concerning what we know about the issue, the feedback we have received about the topic, and some potential options concerning the issue's resolution. These concept papers will provide background and rationale for recommendations emerging from the policy work group and will be given wide circulation. The Core Group will review these papers and suggest their own thoughts and ideas concerning the recommendation proposed and any new work that needs to be done.

Phase Three: Development of Options and Legislative Specifications

When a consensus is reached among the Core Group concerning the identification of specific legislative issues, formal option memos will be developed by the Policy Work Group for the Core Team. A certain number of these options will be pretested among a number of focus groups. These focus groups will allow us to get another informed view of the consequences of certain decisions--for teachers, principals, school administrators and policy makers. These groups will allow us to develop sharper rationales for our final legislative recommendation.

During this period we will attempt to engage Congress in our legislative proposals as well as some of the key groups. The precise details as to how we engage them and what level of understanding and support we want to seek from them, will be determined through discussion with OLCA, Susan Frost, and others.

Accordingly, we will draft the FY 2000 OMB Submission reflecting the Department's proposals and be ready to transmit the legislation to Congress in January, 1999.

Attachment C

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS RAISED FROM 11/21 MEETING

1. *What is our overall strategy for the reauthorization of ESEA and related statutes (e.g., the McKinney Act)?*

We will begin a year long set of internal and external activities in January 1998, (based on the last reauthorization) culminating in the production of a bill to Congress in January or March 1999 (See Schedule -Attachment A). We will need as part of that process to identify smaller related statutes that either need to be reauthorized at the same time as ESEA or where it makes sense to ask for related amendments. In addition we need to identify those statutes within ESEA that are not forward funded and may otherwise expire if the reauthorization takes two years to complete. Additionally we need to identify what other legislation the administration wants the Congress to consider during the course of the next year to see to what extent there are themes and issues that may relate to our legislative proposals. With the cooperation of OCLA, OGC and OUS staff we hope to complete this work by the end of February.

2. *What is our strategy for reauthorization of Goals 2000 (which expires a year earlier than ESEA)?*

We plan to request a one year extension for Goals 2000 and reauthorize the program at the same time as ESEA. However, we need to think carefully about our Congressional strategy as we do so since the Congress may not want to grant that one year extension or in the alternative seek to terminate the program, despite our seeking funding for it in this year's (FY99) budget. We plan to work with Tom Corwin and OCLA to address these issues and present our recommendations to you at the end of this month.

3. *When do we want to submit a bill to Congress?*

We have an option to submit a bill in March 1999 or January 1999. There are some clear advantages and disadvantages to taking either course of action. By waiting to March we buy more time for ourselves and can extend the time we afford for digesting expert opinion and public comment. Critical policy decisions can also be delayed until after we know the results of the November midterm elections and the leadership of the new Congress. However, sending up a budget in February without a bill sends confusing signals. We think it is preferable to have the bill ready for introduction in January so it can be given a low number and be awarded priority.

4. *In order to meet that deadline, what intermediate deadlines should we meet—e.g., presentation of an outline or options memo to the Secretary, development of specifications, submission of a bill for OMB clearance?*

These intermediate deadlines are set out on the Proposed Reauthorization Calendar (Attachment A).

5. How should we organize ourselves to produce a reauthorization bill? What are OESE's current plans for reauthorization?

A basic organizational matrix is set out on the attached chart (see Attachment B). Similar to the last reauthorization we see the need for two main groups--a WORK GROUP--composed of OESE program offices and other key POCs which administer, evaluate or support OESE programs, such as OERI, PES, OUS, OGC in addition to the OIG's office.

This WORK GROUP will identify several subgroups that will represent the major program units within ESEA--Title 1, Even Start, Professional Development etc.

A CORE GROUP with principals of the key program and support units represented on the WORK GROUP will meet to discuss option memos and make recommendations to the Secretary.

The seven priority or initiative teams will serve as resources groups to the WORK GROUP. Their main task will be to help provoke discussion concerning cross cutting issues.

Other external groups will be brought in from time to time to brief either the WORK GROUP or the CORE GROUP. These external groups could be representatives of advocacy based organizations, academic researchers, practitioners etc.

Our current plans (as reflected in OESE's Strategic Plan) are consistent with the proposed timetable and activities. For example, we have already identified the members of the above groups and will be assembling a detailed OESE calendar that will reflect the way we will be using OESE meetings, IRT forums and conferences to gain additional input and analysis.

We plan to complete the detailed calendar by February.

6. What public outreach activities should we undertake?

--Should we issue a Federal Register notice requesting comments on the major issues?

Yes. We believe a Federal Register announcement modeled on the one produced in February of 1992 represents a good way to begin our public engagement.

--Should we hold regional meetings to take public comment? If so, when?

We plan a full schedule of regional meetings to gain public comment. We plan also to hold some other smaller focus group meetings in which key groups can explore some critical questions in more depth than is usually afforded in more open public meetings. We will use the services of OIA and the SRR's to plan these activities.

—Other outreach activities, such as requesting suggestions from Congress?

We plan to develop a ESEA Reauthorization WEBPAGE, linked to the Department's home page. On the page will be included key reauthorization documents, including, the Federal Register Notice, the legislation, key studies, notice of public hearings etc. We will also offer a capacity for the public to send us emailed comments.

Attachment D

GUIDING QUESTIONS FOR ALL INITIATIVE GROUPS

1. The 1994 reauthorized Elementary and Secondary Education Act identified five guiding principles for our work. 1 As you think about the relationship between (your) programs and the purposes/principles set out in the legislation, is there still a good fit? Are there some new or continuing issues you feel need to be included? If so, what are they?
2. Identify the current problems that can, should, or must be fixed before the reauthorization conversations begin?
3. Can you identify what promising program practices or accomplishments have emerged since 1994?
4. Of the work underway in your priority area, what work (e.g studies, reports, protocols) will be completed this Spring (1998) or this summer that can inform our reauthorization effort?

Priority Teams

Math

1. What have we learned from *TIMMS* that might inform any aspect of ESEA?
2. What have we learned about best practices in states and districts that have raised their math achievement levels? How might these insights translate into policy recommendations concerning ESEA?
3. In what ways has the broader focus of the Eisenhower program affected either the quality or the amount of the professional development offered to math teachers? What is the evidence?

Teaching

1. What is the potential impact of OERI's new Center on Teaching (*Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching*) on the way we approach professional development issues in Title I?
2. Have we maximized the potential value of telecommunications technology in the continuing professional development of teachers in ESEA programs? If not what legislative recommendations can we make?
3. What have been the strengths and weaknesses of the new Eisenhower program?
4. How can we tie the programs in ESEA to the principles of professional development articulated by Terry Dozier's work?
5. What recommendations can you offer with respect to connecting the professional development activities described under Title V of the Higher Education Act with the provisions of ESEA?

Strong Schools

1. What are the potential policy implications of the President's recent request to collect more complete data on school violence? How might we use this data to further program goals?
2. What can we do to close the gap between what we know works and continuing high levels of violence and drug use? What are the policy implications for Reauthorization?

3. How might we address the problems of school violence and drugs within a broader context of school restructuring that includes curricular and organizational changes?
4. Are charter schools meeting the needs of all students? What has been their impact on the way we deliver services under ESEA?
5. What can we do to strengthen charter schools and support the President's goal of 3,000 charter schools by 2002?

Standards

1. In light of the information collected from the survey work (conducted by various organizations) what are we learning concerning the impact of ESEA programs in those states and districts that have made the most progress on standards-based reform as opposed to those that have made the least? What are the implications for Reauthorization of this data?
2. We are hearing that states and districts will require a considerable amount of support to develop their new assessment systems required by IASA. What are the challenges we can expect to address prior to the Reauthorization? What legislative changes might be necessary particularly since some of the assessments are not due to be in place until after the current Reauthorization has technically expired?
3. What support can we provide to help translate standards into changes in classroom practice?

Reading

1. How will the new *America Reads* program affect the way we address reading in ESEA?
2. What have we learned about the teaching of reading since the 1994 Reauthorization that needs to be applied now or as a policy recommendation in the upcoming Reauthorization?
3. What evidence do we have that 1994 legislation is achieving results for Title 1 students?
4. What might be the potential impact of Obey/Porter ?

Technology

1. What key changes will we need to take into account between 1994 and 1999 in terms of the quality and availability of technology?

2. How might we build a more integrated approach to the infusion of technology into all aspects of ESEA?

3. Are funds going to the targeted poverty populations?

Issue Groups (We plan to give these questions to specially commissioned groups)

1. Why is the perception in Congress that your program is "not working"--what are your recommendations as to how we might change those perceptions?
2. Why have some school districts failed to heed the message regarding flexibility of funds or continue to view those provisions negatively (i.e., schoolwides dilute the focus on needy students)?
3. What have been the key demographic change between 1994 and 1999 that we should take into consideration in the upcoming reauthorization?
4. What can we infer from the experiences of some of the states and districts that are showing improved results as opposed to results from those states and districts that have been flat or worse? What are the implications of this analysis for the reauthorization?

Summary of the First Retreat on the Reauthorization of ESEA
January 27, 1998

At the OESE Senior Leadership retreat we discussed an organizational structure for raising and resolving issues related to the reauthorization of ESEA. A Core Group made up of Assistant Secretaries and other senior leadership in the Department will make decisions related to reauthorization and provide general guidance to a staff-level Work Group. The Work Group, chaired by Susan Wilhelm and made up of staff from all involved offices, will frame policy issues and options for reauthorization. Program specific issues and options will be mainly generated at the Program Office level, but will be brought to the Work Group to ensure that policies are consistent and cross-cutting issues are addressed.

At the retreat, senior leadership raised many issues that the Work Group for reauthorization should address. After much discussion, we reached consensus on the initial questions that the Work Group should address, keeping in mind that many additional questions, from a variety of sources, will surface and be considered. The initial charge to Work Group is to draft a *Federal Register* notice. Issues for the Work Group to consider are outlined below.

Issues To Be Considered By The Work Group

Three overarching questions should be considered throughout all deliberations:

- a) How do we close the current achievement gap?
- b) How do we encourage policies that foster comprehensive reforms that cut across program practices and policies?
- c) How do we ensure that our programs improve classroom practices?

Some other key considerations follow:

1. What do we know so far about the effectiveness of the implementation of the 1994 reauthorization of ESEA? What evidence do we have that each of the five guiding principles of the Act is being implemented? What results can we show regarding the impact of each principle?

As a result of this work, we should ultimately be able to tell a story about the LASA implementation. Ideally, we will be able to show that education looks different today as a result of each principle. Any data on results in terms of student achievement would be especially useful.

2. Should we add any principles to guide the next reauthorization? (e.g. creating school environments conducive to learning or building capacity to implement standards-based reforms) Should we "tinker" with the current principles?

3. Should we incorporate Goals 2000 into the ESEA reauthorization proposal, and if so, how?

4. How do we create a reform umbrella with cross-cutting outcomes?

We discussed ideas such as regrouping programs around outcomes expected and/or common themes. We also discussed, however, the importance of examining the role of special populations within each of those themes. We also discussed the merits of narrowing the number of programs. The Work Group should explore whether there are programs that can be collapsed as well as ways that we might counter Gorton-type block grant proposals.

5. How can we improve the technical assistance supported by the Department? (This may have to be a separate work group that will include people from across the Department.)

We need to address questions such as how to tailor our technical assistance, how to define technical assistance, and what or who should provide technical assistance.

6. How can we strengthen professional development programs through the reauthorization process? How do we connect our professional development initiatives (e.g. class size, bilingual, technology, etc.)? What do we want in professional development? What is our overall goal? How do we connect approaches to professional development to changes in classroom practice? How do we strengthen school leadership?

7. How should we address the issue of strengthening accountability for student results?

How do we increase accountability for student learning instead of focusing solely on compliance with the law? What are the responsibilities of the different players within the education system?

8. How should we approach equity issues?

Equity should be examined broadly. The Work Group should continually examine how proposals affect special populations. Similarly, how can ESEA address achievement gaps and dropout issues? How should accountability for equity be framed? The Work Group should examine all options. One idea that was presented was that when schools define their indicators of success, one should not be able to distinguish the SES of students based on performance. Another approach is to focus on targeting resources.

9. How can we strengthen linkages between our programs and other programs? *-idea, Van Ed, Head Start*
We would like the Work Group to examine strengthening linkages among programs during implementation as well as ways that linkages could be strengthened legislatively.

** L.R. - How do we do things differently w/ new technology tools?*
*JH - How do we strengthen parent involvement?
Coordinated services?*
*Stueck
Johnson*



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

July 7, 1997

MEMORANDUM

To: Mike Smith

FROM: Gerry Tirozzi *Gerry*

SUBJECT: Considerations Regarding the Reauthorization of Goals 2000

Background

As you are aware, Titles III and IV of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, as well as the authorization for appropriations for the Goals panel and for assessment and evaluation grants in Title II, expire in FY 1998. The automatic one year extension for programs that is provided for in the General Education Provisions Act will allow the programs to receive appropriations for fiscal 1999. Since Title III of Goals is forward funded, fiscal year 1999 funds will be used during the 1999-2000 school year; funds for Title IV (Parental Assistance Centers) and the Goals panel would be used during the 1998-99 school year.

It is time to consider what steps, if any, the Department should take in regard to Goals 2000. We need to consider timing, content, and process.

Timing

There are three main options.

Option one. Seek a one year extension of Goals 2000 as part of the 1999 budget request.

PROS:

- Would more clearly programmatically link Goals to ESEA allow development of a more complete package of assistance.
- Would avoid consideration by Congress of Goals 2000 alone, which would probably be contentious.
- This could result in a more cohesive approach to reform by combining Goals with other reform based legislation, such as Titles III and VI of ESEA, and any choice programs we seek, such as Charter Schools.

- Acting now for extension (rather than waiting until 2000) leaves us time to consider how to proceed if the extension is not granted.

CONS:

- This delays consideration of Goals until the next Congress, which might be more difficult to deal with on this program.
- May confound consideration of other parts of ESEA, especially Title I, on issues related to accountability, by bringing the issue of state and local control into the forefront.
- A request for extension will probably result in Congressional amendments - we could, in essence, be trying to reauthorize the legislation two years in a row.
- Extension of the legislation in its present form - as support for reform planning - may not make sense. States have plans and need help in implementing some particularly difficult components of them.

Option two. Send a revised reform bill to Congress for enactment next year.

PROS:

- Avoids the cons to extension discussed above.
- Provides a forum for debate on reform itself.
- Allows for redirection of the program now - we can clear out some baggage.

CON:

- It will be difficult to enact as a stand alone measure and will be a target for all kinds of amendments.

Option three. Defer any action now and have the reauthorization proposal accompany the FY 2000 budget request.

PROS:

- We could present as part of ESEA at that time, though ESEA would still have its extension year in which to operate.
- It gives us more time to consider content - we don't have a lot of data on Goals 2000 effects at this time.
- It avoids the double consideration inherent in option one.

CONS:

- It leaves no option if Congress doesn't act on the reauthorization request - there would be

no basis for appropriations and funding would cease.

- It pushes consideration to the next Congress.

RECOMMENDATION: An initial discussion of the issue among Judith Johnson, Jennifer Davis, Tom Fagan and Catherine Jovicich concluded that we should to send a reauthorization request to accompany the FY1999 budget.

Content

In considering how to proceed with any reauthorization, now or in the following year, it may be helpful to briefly discuss what we have learned since the legislation was originally conceived.

Legislation similar to Goals 2000 was originally proposed by the Bush Administration but failed to be enacted, primarily over inclusion of a voucher provision. As another part of its effort to spur reform, that administration, following the lead of the National Council for Mathematics, entered into contracts with several discipline based organizations to develop national standards in several academic areas. The assumption behind this effort was that these new national standards, like those developed for math, would be the basis for state standards in the various disciplines. Goals 2000, as originally proposed and as finally passed, would assist states in developing their own standards, using the national models as guides, and assessments aligned to those standards. The standards, while not uniform across the states, would have some commonality derived from the national standards and, along with the assessments, would begin to look uniform across each state.

This is not how it has panned out. Many of the national standards seem to be unworkable when viewed as a basis for instruction. There are more standards than can possibly be taught to in schools; the various disciplines have stated their standards in different ways; some areas, such as history and English/language arts, have been fraught with contention; and, most important, the issue of local control of curriculum has made it difficult for national standards to be accepted and for state standards and assessments to be uniform throughout the state. Therefore, we need to seriously rethink the Goals legislation to bring it more in line with where we are, keeping in mind that the legislation should seek to address the real differences in education children receive - differences that cut across economic rather than state lines. The education children in wealthy suburbs receive is similar across states, as is that afforded children in our poorest areas.

Therefore rather than sending up a bill that amends the current legislation, we propose one that is more focussed on the areas of comprehensive reform that are proving most difficult to implement. There are currently several sources of such information, including:

- The District and School Survey Data;

- Results of peer review of state plans;
- Information gathered by the State Collaborative (housed in CCSSO);
- Information gathered by CPRE; and
- Information provided by the states, especially those in the forefront of reform.

While a more detailed look at these (as well as other) sources is needed, it now appears that the areas of most concern now are:

Performance standards and assessments. Everyone is having a tough time with this, from developing valid and reliable performance assessments, the cost of those assessments, accommodations for LEP children and those with disabilities, misunderstanding by the public, etc. There is confusion between content and performance standards. In addition, we need to consider this issue in relation to the proposed national tests in reading and mathematics. We also need to consider what role, if any, Achieve can play in this area.

Professional development. A recurring issue in discussion with state and local official and with teachers is the difficulty of providing enough quality professional development to move standards to instruction.

Bring reform to scale. This is related to both of the items above, especially to professional development, but also involves the inertia of the system; the complexity of the system; and the confusion about standards based reform in the first place. The district and school survey results illustrate this - schools report that they are carrying out standards-based reform and it did not involve much change. It is also about a certain lack of urgency, especially about improving our most troubled schools and districts.

Accountability. Many states are relying solely on school and district report cards that are less than easy to understand; the local control issue makes strong state action difficult in many states; strong state actions taken have not had a dramatic effect of student achievement; choice issues cloud the picture; benchmarking is not generally understood or practiced; accountability becomes a paperwork exercise.

Public understanding. This overlays the whole effort - it is directly related to the local issue; there is simply a lack of trust. It leads to demands for norm referenced assessments rather than those tied to the standards; standards are viewed as a move away from basic education, rather than seeing the old basics as a standard.

Evaluation. How do we know if the reforms are working at national, state, local, and school levels.

Putting it all together. States and local communities are having the same problem that we are having in the department. Goals 2000 is often used as just another program, supporting a discrete set of services which may have been included in an overall plan, but the remainder of the plan does not get attended to. The best example of this is the pressure on Goals to use the money for technology.

One of the major objections to going forward with a reform piece of legislation outside of ESEA is that several of the programs in ESEA are also pieces of reform and should be connected. One of the major ones is Title III, educational technology. A major reason for placing the technology fund in the Goals 2000 office is the premise that technology is a key component of reform and that, without instructional reform, technology is just a lot of machinery and wires. Unlike most of the formula grant programs in ESEA, Title III is current year funded, which means its last year of fund availability to states and local communities coincides with that of Goals. In addition, the Title III legislation, used to support the Fund, is not consistent with the four activities contained in the national technology plan the fund is to help implement. We propose adding technology to this reform bill. This has been discussed briefly with Linda Roberts and she expressed interest in taking this approach, focussing technology more on improving instruction.

Process

Assuming that we wish to try to develop a bill this year, we should do the following:

1. Set up a team to lead the effort. The team should represent those persons in the Department who know the most and will be most affected by the bill.
2. Have the team immediately establish a process to gather input from states, local communities, business, and other interested parties. We will need strong support for anything we send forward.
3. Gather all the data there is on the progress of reform and evaluation of its effectiveness, including that on use of technology as part of that reform. This will be difficult, given the lack of studies on Goals 2000 and the preliminary nature of the evaluation of technology. However, we will need the information on Goals 2000 even we decide to only seek an extension.
4. Determine areas for commission of papers that can add to our knowledge.
5. Frame an outline of what we wish to do using the data we have gathered, connections to ESEA, the National tests, the Reading initiative, etc. This needs some guidance from you.
6. Have the team construct a plan, with timelines, and try like heck to follow it. The bill will have to be ready to go to the hill before hearings on the appropriation, I would think.

Please let me know how you wish to proceed.

TO: Reauthorization workgroup

FROM: Tom Fagan

RE: Request for development of option for reauthorization of Goals 2000 and other programs.

At a meeting Monday afternoon of the reauthorization core group. Mike Smith agreed to go forward with exploration of an option to consolidate several programs dealing with whole school reform into a single authority. THIS IS NOT A DECISION TO PROCEED IN THIS MANNER, BUT TO EXPLORE IT AS AN OPTION.

The programs to be considered are Goals 2000, Titles II, III(Technology Fund), VI, and the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (Obey Porter) funded under Title I and the Fund for the Improvement of Education. The total current appropriation for these programs is about \$1.8 billion.

We need to put together a description of what a piece of legislation combining these programs would look like, while also determining if it makes sense to do so. We don't need draft legislation or even rough legislative specifications. Just a paper that describes what the legislation would contain and what it would hope to accomplish. It might have sections describing the various sections included in most state formula legislation - How states get money, how funds would be distributed to states, what entities would be eligible to get funds from states, how states would allocate money (Mike favors discretionary grants, but formula should be looked into), how some form of accountability could be constructed (this is why Mike favors discretionary), reporting requirements, length of awards, state plan requirements (as part of a comprehensive plan?)

In determining if it makes sense to do this, think about implications for inclusion of Eisenhower when our scores in math and science are poor, and the inclusion of technology which is a high priority for the administration - is there a way to keep focus on these areas?

Consider the following factors as well. Obey-Porter is school based, Goals 2000 has a State, district and school approach as does Eisenhower, while Title VI is more district based. What should we be after?

The Goals 2000 report to Congress includes some specific areas of reform that need more attention. How can the proposal get at those areas?

Obey-Porter is research driven school based reform, and really talks about model adoption. Should that focus be included in the proposal (I think so). If so, how?

The main thrust is on standards driven reform, with alignment of the instructional system to

those standards and assessments to measure progress of schools in getting all children to meet the standards. This is to further that effort, not replace it. Will a major change in our legislative approach disrupt current state efforts?

While Goals 2000 is legislatively concerned with comprehensive reform, as are Title I schoolwide programs, at local level they are sometimes viewed (and used) as funding sources for projects that may add to the instructional program, but don't really change it. Whatever we do with Goals, we need to do something to make it more of a change agent. How can we do that?

I think this is more than enough for you to chew on. Please let me know if I can help. You may want Heidi Ramirez to brief you on the report to Congress and an earlier compilation on the state of school reform. She also has several source documents that might help you think this through.