

Speeches and Testimony

Richard W. Riley
U.S. Secretary of Education

**Fourth Annual State of American
Education Address**
Putting Standards of Excellence into Action

The Carter Center, Atlanta, Georgia
February 18, 1997

President and Mrs. Carter, Senator Cleland, Governor and Mrs. Miller, ladies and gentlemen: I am pleased to be here in Atlanta to give my fourth annual state of American education speech. I begin by extending my thanks to President Carter for his kindness in introducing me, and for his foresight in creating the U.S. Department of Education.

Many years ago, when President Carter created the Department there was some heated criticism. It was not needed, critics charged, and through the years they never gave up. And, yet today, can anyone really say that advancing education should not be our nation's number one priority?

I tell you, Mr. President, when I go into a Cabinet meeting, I take all the children and college students of America with me. There I see to it that they are represented, that their education is always an issue to be dealt with. Mr. President, on behalf of all these young people, I want to thank you for creating a seat in the President's Cabinet dedicated to advancing American education.

Four years ago, I began this tradition by giving my first speech at Georgetown University, President Clinton's alma mater. Each year since then, I have tried to capture some feature of American education that deserves our attention.

All of these speeches, and the one I intend to give today, are rooted in my belief that we need to stop dumbing down our children, and reach up and set higher expectations. We need to unleash all the brain power stored in the heads of America's young people, and make excellence happen. Our children are smarter than we think. We must give them more responsibility as young children and then expect more of them as they grow and develop.

If ever there was a time to push American education to a higher level, it is now. The sparks are all around us, and many of them have been created by President Clinton, and by so many of you here today and those of you joining us from around the country at the many downlink sites. Keep up your good work, you are making things happen.

Everywhere I go I feel it -- the excitement and the determination of the American people to expect more

from our schools and more from their children. This preoccupation with education is as old as America itself. Even before they wrote the Constitution, our Founding Fathers set aside land for the common school. Now, at the edge of the 21st century, the high expectations of the American people can only be achieved if we strive for national standards of excellence, and commit ourselves to decisive reform on every front.

This is the purpose of my speech today: to suggest to you how we can put standards of excellence into action to improve American education. And to tell you that we must not drift nor lose time.

I have a very personal stake in this effort. Last year, when I gave this speech in Saint Louis, I had the pleasure of announcing the birth of my seventh grandchild -- Anna Maureen Riley. Well, my children seem to be on a regular schedule. Today, I announce the birth of my eighth grandchild, Maryann Gardiner Riley, just three weeks ago.

I have a lot invested in the education of Anna and Maryann and their six cousins. I intend to read wonderful children's books to both of them -- books like *The Wednesday Surprise* by Eve Bunting.

The Progress of the South in Setting High Expectations

As we move toward the 21st century, nothing should be more important to us as a nation than the actions we take *now* to help our young people prepare for the future. This is one of the principal reasons why I chose to come to Atlanta to give this speech.

Georgia is an example to the nation. From your emphasis on early childhood -- to tougher requirements for high school graduation -- to Hope Scholarships for college -- Georgia is a state on the move. I commend you, Governor Miller, for your leadership. Georgia has opened the doors of college to all of its citizens and given young people a reason to buckle down and get smart.

Listen to what a Georgia State freshman told NBC News just two weeks ago: Without the Hope Scholarship, I wouldn't be going to college because my parents can't afford it."

And one high school freshman said: "I started thinking about the Hope Scholarship when I was in the 6th grade, and I started concentrating on my grades and how I wanted to keep them up."

These are powerful statements. They express hope and something more -- when we give young people something to respond to, they make the connection. They change their expectations and study habits in a fundamental way. This is exactly what President Clinton seeks to achieve in creating a national Hope Scholarship initiative.

Yet we are told by some Washington pundits that this is unwise -- too costly they say -- and not needed. A few even go on to suggest that too many Americans want to go to college. Well, I know this President. He isn't about to put a ceiling on the dream of any American who wants to work hard to get an education. Every American should have that chance.

Here in the South, we were once stuck in the rut of low expectations. Not any more. We have come a long way in the last 20 years. Many more children are in kindergarten and programs for four-year-olds. Almost 60 percent of high school graduates are now taking the tough academic courses that prepare them for college. This is a four-fold increase since the mid-80's.

College attendance in the South is close to reaching the national level -- another new milestone. And the

Southeast, like much of the country, is responding to record breaking enrollments by hiring many more new teachers.

Much of the credit for this progress must go to educators like Mark Musick and the leadership of the Southern Regional Education Board for staying the course to raise standards.

The Changing Context of American Education

This is good progress but we cannot be satisfied. Knowledge is exploding all around us. We live in a new golden age of discovery. Astronomers probe the unfolding majesty of the universe, even as scientists race to map the genetic makeup of humanity. Yet we struggle to put the old industrial model of education behind us.

And, never before have our nation's classrooms been so crowded. From Los Angeles to Gwinnett County here in Georgia to Fort Lauderdale, Florida -- the portable classroom is a common sight in school yards.

The entire context of American education is changing. We need teachers skilled in using computers as a powerful teaching tool, and many more teachers well-versed in teaching English as a second language. Our teachers need to teach to a higher level of achievement, and be prepared to teach all of America's children -- the gifted and talented, our many new immigrants, the college-bound achiever, and the disabled child who is learning so much more because he or she is now included.

We have much to do. Achievement scores are not moving up fast enough. Truancy and drop-out rates are still too high. The equity gap in school financing remains a nagging problem in too many states. The jewel of American education is our system of higher education -- yet, too many families struggle to pay tuition, and too many high school graduates are going to college but not graduating.

Education as a National Priority

Today, more than ever before, education is the engine that drives our economy. Education is now the great "fault line" that determines who is part of the American Dream. The earnings gap between the educated and the less educated is growing, and it will continue to grow unless we educate all of our young people to high standards. An average education just isn't good enough anymore.

Automobile plants seek new hires who have some college education. America's new entrepreneurs and small business owners are just about desperate to find employees who are motivated, creative and well-educated. The military recruits only high school graduates who score in the upper half of their class in verbal and math skills. And our great institutions of higher learning want freshmen who don't need remedial help.

And here I shall be as strong as I can be. There can be no equality in this nation without a renewed commitment to excellence. Educating every child to use his or her God-given talent is the pre-condition for full equality. One cannot happen without the other.

My friends, we have the attention of the American people. Our country is prosperous and at peace. We have the unique opportunity to do what is best for our children. This should be our great patriotic cause -- our national mission -- giving all of our children a world-class education by putting standards of excellence into action.

The President's Call to Action

This is why President Clinton, in his State of the Union speech, gave us a bold vision of what American education can become. From helping our children to master the basics -- to better teaching and modernizing our schools -- to helping families pay for college through increased Pell Grants and Hope Scholarships -- the President has made excellence in education our national mission.

The President's 10-point "Call to Action" is a bold approach that is national in scope -- yet local in action because that's the American way. This is leadership at its best. I am pleased that the Congress has joined President Clinton in a bi-partisan commitment to make sure that politics stops "at the schoolhouse door." As I have said before, we don't educate our children as Democrats or Republicans. We educate them as Americans.

This is what the American people want and expect of us. I urge Congress to pass the President's education agenda and to recognize the important contributions that it can make this year to advancing American education.

This year, the Congress will have to re-authorize many major pieces of legislation: Voc-ed, Adult-ed, Voc-rehab and the IDEA bill that insures the education of 5.4 million disabled children. And I am pleased by the open dialogue I have had with the higher education community as we prepare to re-authorize the Higher Education Act.

But we have much more to do. We are rushing headlong toward the 21st century, yet too many of our young people are falling by the wayside. I want to be very clear. It's not enough to have high expectations or set challenging standards. We must put standards of excellence into action. This is my agenda.

Our young people must master the basics once and for all. Our schools need to rethink and shake-up our current approach to drug prevention. Fixing failing schools must become our first order of business, not our last. Our children need to be part of the Information Age sooner rather than later -- to get connected to the world of technology as it unfolds around them.

We must make sweeping changes in how we prepare America's teachers. Public schools and higher education must develop a fundamentally new relationship -- a new partnership to prepare young people for college-level work. And, we need a smart tax policy for the 21st century to support life-long learning for all Americans.

First, we must master the basics once and for all. Forty percent of our children are not reading as well as they should by the end of the third grade. And this nation is below the international average when it comes to 8th grade math.

That's just not good enough in my book. All of our research tells us that reading well by the 4th grade and having good math skills -- including algebra and some geometry -- by the 8th grade are critical turning points in the education of our young people.

This is why the President has called for challenging, voluntary national tests in fourth-grade reading and eighth-grade math. We have a President who has the courage to fight for our children's education, respecting the state and local role but challenging our schools and communities to get on with it.

Reading is reading. Math is math. For these basics, let's not cloud our children's future with silly

arguments about federal government intrusion. These proposed tests are an opportunity not a requirement, a national challenge not a national curriculum.

The President and I are firmly opposed to any form of national curriculum. And we have done all we can to cut red tape and cut people loose. In the last four years, we have eliminated about half of all federal regulations for elementary and secondary education, while never losing sight of our constitutional obligations.

I encourage every state and school district to accept the challenge by the President to participate in these voluntary national tests. Yes, there may be a high failure rate in the beginning. But in time, we will have a high success rate as well -- if all Americans see themselves as part of the solution.

The President's effort to support the work of one million volunteer tutors through the *America Reads Challenge* is a clear message that the solutions must come from the American people. This is why I am pleased to announce that a broad spectrum of religious denominations here in Atlanta will spearhead a drive to support the President's reading challenge.

Led by the Georgia Baptist Literacy Mission, the Atlanta Board of Rabbis, the African Methodist Episcopal Church and the United Methodist Church, Atlanta's faith communities are going to make sure every child in Atlanta is reading a book. And, in the weeks ahead, I will work with religious leaders from across the country to rally tens of thousands of volunteers to this national effort.

If reading well is the first basic, we also know that math is the gateway to learning many more advanced skills. In the last decade, we have made substantial progress in improving math and science education.

But we need to notch up our standards even higher. Only 20 percent of our young people are taking algebra by the end of the 8th grade. In the rest of the advanced world, the vast majority-- if not all -- students have studied algebra by the end of the eighth grade. I believe our students should do the same.

Protecting Our Children from Drugs and Violence

The next point I want to emphasize and this is critical -- achievement can only occur if we have schools that are safe and drug-free. An unsafe school is a failing school. Children cannot learn if they are surrounded by drugs and violence. Today, we are confronted by the fact that eighth-grade drug use is up for the fifth year in a row.

Here I want to speak directly to baby-boomers who are now parents. Some of you have tried it all, and now you know better-- don't send your children a mixed message when it comes to drugs, alcohol and smoking.

A child in second or third grade is perfectly capable of getting the message that drugs, alcohol and smoking are bad for them. Children are starting to make bad choices by the fifth and sixth grade, and by middle school too many of our young people are taking risks and experimenting with drugs.

And to the children of America -- don't kill off your brain cells -- don't mess up your lives -- when there is so much hope and possibility around you.

To give our young people that hope, our schools must do a better job of making our classrooms drug-free. There is an enormous variation in the effectiveness of our drug prevention programs, and this concerns me for good reason. We have 10 years of rising enrollments ahead of us. We must place a

much stronger focus on creating stable, comprehensive drug prevention programs with determined leadership.

We know a lot about what works when it comes to drug prevention, programs like Project Alert and Life Skills. We also know that these proven models are not being used as much as they should. Too often our schools -- with the best of intentions -- are flying by the seat of their pants when it comes to drug prevention. Using proven, tested, research-based drug prevention programs must become a top priority.

I ask every school board, superintendent, principal and PTA to mount a vigorous review this year of existing drug prevention programs to see if they can pass muster. General Barry McCaffrey is the President's effective leader in the fight against drugs -- he and I will work with you. For my part, I promise the same vigorous review of our federal Safe and Drug Free Schools Program.

As always, we remain faithful to the core idea that our schools are where we teach our young people basic American values. Our commitment to this core idea has taken many forms: protecting the religious liberty of students by issuing historic guidelines, supporting strong character education efforts, and placing a very strong emphasis on family involvement.

For too long, parents have been the missing link in our efforts to improve our schools. Experts talk to experts, and conference after conference is held about new models of education reform. I urge a different approach: Start with parents. The moral child and the achieving student are just about always connected to an involved parent.

Parents who set high expectations, even a parent with a limited formal education, is a powerful force for excellence. Ultimately, the character of American education is going to be defined by the character and commitment of involved parents and other caring adults.

First Order of Business: Fix Failing Schools

My next point is that we cannot and must not tolerate failing schools. To meet the new expectations of the American people, we must confront the all-too-common problem of schools that are low-achieving and even dangerous. In America today, there are schools that should not be called schools at all. These schools have done just about everything they could to kill the sense of wonder in their students. And then we wonder why truancy increases and young people drop out.

Our willingness to abide these schools goes to the heart of my concern about low expectations. Too often, we fall into the trap of thinking that the children who are stuck in failing schools are the problem. We accept the easy way out, the false assumption that they cannot learn because they are the wrong color, from the wrong side of the tracks, or because they speak the wrong language.

Yet, we all know from first-hand experience that there are good public schools, good parochial schools and private schools in every inner city in this country that are islands of excellence. Dick Elmore, a Harvard researcher in the field of education, has often made this point to me -- in every city that he has visited, he has found three of the best schools in the country and three schools that are just about the sorriest.

I think Dick has it about right and that is what troubles me. We need to stop making excuses and get on with the business of fixing our schools. If a school is bad and can't be changed, reconstitute it or close it down. If a principal is slow to get the message, find strength in a new leader. If teachers are burned out, counsel them to improve or leave the profession. If laws need to be changed, get on with it.

This is not an impossible task. The efforts of Rick Mills and Rudy Crew in New York, Paul Vallas in Chicago, Gerry House in Memphis, Bill Rojas in San Francisco are all examples of putting aside the "business as usual" attitude.

Now, fundamental change is hard. Some of you may read the cartoon Dilbert Dilbert is sort of a befuddled technocrat of the 1990's. My wife Tunky and I were visiting the zoo one day when we saw a teenager with a Dilbert T-shirt that read: "Change is good -- you go first."

Well, those of us who believe in excellence for all children need to take the risk of going first. When people tell me that public schools can't excel, I tell them that they haven't worked hard enough to get the job done.

I also tell them not to be fooled by those who want to use public tax dollars for vouchers to help a few students get out of a troubled school. If a boat is sinking because of a hole, you fix the hole right away. You don't let it keep sinking and then throw out a lifeline so that a few can survive.

The strength of our diverse democracy is the direct result of our belief in a quality public education for all. This is why I will not yield to those who want to abandon public schools. We need to build up public education, not tear it down.

Do we need many more models of how we can fix troubled schools? Yes, of course we do and fortunately, help is readily available. Dedicated educators like James Comer, Henry Levin, E.D. Hirsch, Deborah Maier, Ted Sizer, Marc Tucker and Gene Bottoms are doing the hard work of creating new models of excellence. The models are each unique in their own way. But they all have one common denominator -- they all set high standards.

The New American Schools Development Corporation is another powerful example of how change can take place. It has developed seven different, well-conceived models of how to fix a failing school. Local parents and school leaders choose the right model that fits their community. That's public school choice at its best. A community may want to choose its own approach to fixing a failing school -- or choose any of these models of excellence -- or start a charter school.

But make the effort, that is the point. Superintendent Ben Canada here in Atlanta is making that effort right now. He is reconstituting low-achieving schools and starting them on the road to excellence -- the A.T. Walden Middle School is one of them.

And here I want to stress an important factor. There is federal funding available through our Title I program, Goals 2000, and our new Charter School program that can be used to fix a failing school or launch a new one. There are over 100 schools now working with Robert Slavin and the New American Schools Development Corporation that are using federal funds to achieve excellence. I urge school officials to follow the example of these schools. Don't use the lack of funding as an excuse to allow failure to continue.

Connecting to the Information Age

The next issue on my action agenda deals with a very important subject: technology in education. We simply can't leave any child behind in this Information Age. This spring the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) is scheduled to pass the E-rate or education rate. Final approval by the FCC will cut access charges to the Internet in half for the vast majority of our schools. Use of the Internet for our poorest schools will be almost free. This is a very big decision for American education, and it needs to

happen.

The Internet is the blackboard of the future and our young people get into it. Today, 65 percent of our schools are linked to the Internet, but only 14 percent of our classrooms are connected. This is why the E-rate is so important, and why it has the strong support of the President, Vice-President Gore and educators all across this country.

This proposal should not be held up by any unnecessary delays. Let's not put our children's future on hold. I urge the FCC, state regulators and telecommunications leaders to step up for our children and make the E-rate a reality this year.

A Teaching Force for the 21st Century

Now, I want to talk to you about teaching. I urge sustained attention to the task of preparing America's future teachers. Improving American education happens classroom by classroom. There is no other way to get it done. And as a nation, we have a great task in front of us. In the next 10 years, we need to hire two million teachers to replace a generation of teachers who are about to retire, and to keep up with rising enrollments.

But we are not as prepared as we should be for this enormous undertaking and there are several reasons why. We do not, for example, do a very good job of recruiting people to this demanding profession, and we have really failed to do justice to the task of recruiting talented minority candidates and males.

Another reason: our colleges of education and departments of education are too often treated like forgotten stepchildren in our system of higher education. And when eager new teachers enter the classroom for the first time, we give them little, if any, help. As a result of this longstanding "sink or swim" approach, we are losing 30 percent of our new teachers in the first three years. In addition, 25 percent of our nation's current teachers are now teaching out of their field.

These are astonishing figures that will only grow as schools rely on hard-working substitute teachers to stem the tide of crowded classrooms. We will never have "A" students if we can only give ourselves a "C" as a nation when it comes to preparing tomorrow's teachers. We cannot lower our standards -- as we have in the past -- to meet the growing demand for new teachers.

Now is the time to get it right -- to step back and rethink how we recruit, prepare, and support America's teachers. This is why the recent report of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future chaired by Governor Jim Hunt is a valuable road map to changing the status quo.

New teachers -- like new lawyers and new doctors -- should have to prove that they are qualified to meet high standards before getting a license. This would mean that prospective teachers are able to pass a rigorous, performance-based assessment of what they know and what they are able to do. And, once a new teacher is in a classroom he or she should be linked to master teachers during their first few years of teaching.

Those who prepare America's teachers must rise to the demand for better teaching, and expect to be held accountable for the success of their students in achieving certification. Stronger public accountability will help, both in identifying where strengths and weaknesses lie and where special attention needs to be focused.

I encourage college and university leaders to strengthen links between your schools of liberal arts and

schools of education. See this as an important part of your mission. Greater attention needs to be paid to the content of what future teachers need to know in their subject area. Rigorous pre-med and pre-engineering science courses are the accepted norm. The same cannot be said for the courses being taken by students who look forward to careers in teaching.

Teaching is a demanding profession, and it will be even more demanding in the future. That is why the President and I strongly support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and its goal of certifying over 100,000 master teachers in the next decade. I challenge every school in the nation to have at least one board-certified teacher on your faculty.

We can't adopt a hit-or-miss approach to improving teacher quality. We have to keep at it year in and year out. This is why I will issue a biennial report on teacher quality beginning next year. Just as we expect a great deal from our students, we have an obligation to expect a great deal of ourselves in supporting America's teachers. David Haselkorn -- the head of Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. -- may have said it best: "Teaching is the profession that makes all other professions possible."

A New Partnership Between Public Schools and Higher Education

This leads me to my next proposal. For too long public education in America and higher education have gone their separate ways, each dedicated to its own vision of excellence and learning. This 19th-century model is outdated.

We need a new model appropriate for the 21st century, an ongoing dialogue at every level of education to raise expectations and achieve high standards.

Many young people, for example, are defining their expectations about whether to go to college as early as eighth grade. How do we capture the attention of a twelve- or thirteen-year-old and get them on the path that prepares them for college-level work? Surely this is a shared interest.

And, we must spread the word that there are many ways to achieve excellence: Advanced Placement, School-to-Work, International Baccalaureate, and Tech-Prep. Our colleges and universities should not always be in the remedial education business.

This is why I will hold a national forum this spring, bringing together the nation's best teachers, public education leaders, and members of the higher education community. This forum will explore how we can recruit the next generation of teachers and do a better job of preparing teachers for the challenges of the classroom.

Making Expectations a Reality: Financing a College Education

Where do I think that all of this focus on standards and new expectations will lead our nation? It will lead more of our young people to aspire to learn more, and to carry their education further. That means access to college -- my final point -- whether it is a community college, a state college or a private institution of learning.

The President and I are deeply committed to ensuring access to higher education for every student who works hard to make the grade. This commitment has taken many forms: the creation of a streamlined direct lending program -- the biggest increase in Pell Grants since its inception, as well as Pell Grants for

more students -- and a growing College Work-Study program with a new emphasis on community service.

This commitment is also why the President is following Georgia's lead in proposing his own Hope Scholarship program. Georgia's Hope Scholarship pays tuition and fees for qualified Georgia high school graduates who attend a college or university in the state. This is a big idea.

The result: 97 percent of the freshman class at the University of Georgia attend on a Hope Scholarship. All Americans -- whether they live in Atlanta, Houston or Seattle -- should have a similar chance to earn a college education.

Under the President's plan working and middle-income students of all ages can receive a tax credit of up to \$1,500 for the first two years of college. That amount covers tuition at the typical community college. This plan will go a long way to making the first two years of college universally available. Universal -- another big idea.

In addition, middle-income Americans have the option to deduct up to \$10,000 from their income, in determining their taxes, for college tuition throughout their lifetime. This benefit is available to meet college or training expenses at any time.

Now, some have said the President's plan is not needed. I disagree. When it comes to trying to afford the costs of college, many middle-income families are in practical terms, barely holding on -- and many do not even consider college an option.

Let me suggest why Hope is needed: For families with incomes of \$22,000 to \$67,000, the percentage of students who earn a bachelor's degree by age 24 has held steady at around 20 percent since 1980. But for families with incomes above \$67,000, the percentage of students who earn a bachelor's degree has shot up during that same period -- from less than 50 to about 80 percent.

That gap is unacceptable. Much of America's working and middle class has been shut out. We need to close that gap, and fundamentally change the expectations of many Americans who have never even considered college a possibility.

All Americans -- poor, working and middle income -- deserve the opportunity to go to college. Our economy will continue to prosper in this Information Age only if more Americans can afford to go to college, not fewer.

I point to history for an instructive lesson. For most of the Industrial Age, we used the tax code to encourage business to invest in plant and equipment. For the Information Age, we should provide tax incentives that encourage our people to invest in themselves by getting a college education.

The Hope Scholarship, the tuition tax deduction, and penalty-free IRA withdrawals -- when considered as part of an overall student-aid plan -- represent smart tax policies for the 21st century.

Conclusion: A Nation on the Move

I end now where I began by asking you to recognize the new possibilities, the new excitement and the rising expectations of the American people. The American people are tuned into education. The sparks are all around us. And we have a President in the White House -- in Bill Clinton -- who cares deeply about education. If ever there was a time to come together for the good of our children it is now.

America is on the move, and every school, college and university can be a bastion of hope, creativity and learning. For education is much more than getting a degree or learning a new skill. There is joy to learning, and the freedom of the intellect that brings with it new discovery and new thinking.

Thomas Jefferson, America's first great educator, told us many years ago: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." Good citizenship, then, has its roots in education. And, as my late father often told me, there is no greater honor in America than that of being called a "good citizen."

We are, my friends, at the door to a new time. And, in this new era, we will not build with bricks and mortar. We will build with minds -- with the power of knowledge -- and with the talent of every well-educated American who is eager to participate in our free enterprise system and strengthen our democracy.

The year is 1997 -- the issue is education -- the question is: will we meet the challenge? I believe we can.

Thank you.

-###-

[Return to Speeches and Testimony](#)



[More on the President's 10-Point Plan](#)

This page last modified January 26, 2000 (kms)

**Remarks Prepared for
Richard W. Riley
U.S. Secretary of Education**

**National Forum: Attracting and
Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century**

April 17, 1997

Thank you Terry for your gracious introduction and for giving me another opportunity to show off my pictures. I take great delight in my grandchildren, and I always learn something from each and every one of them.

I want to welcome all of you to this national forum -- those of you who are attending here in Washington -- and all of you who are listening in at over 120 down links sites all across America. We have over fifty of the best teachers in America attending this forum as well as college and university Presidents and Deans from 24 states.

We also have over 1,000 teachers, college educators and students joining us from every part of the country. We are joined by teachers and students at Cal State -- Sacramento, teachers at Mission View Elementary in Tucson, Arizona, and I am told that there is a very large gathering at Ohio State University.

We are down linked to Indiana University in Bloomington, we have listeners at the University of South Florida, and we are connected to educators attending the national mathematics conference in Minneapolis, Minnesota.

I'm please that all of you are joining us -- for this really is a national dialogue of great importance to the future of our country. How we teach our children defines in many ways the future of America in this new Information Age.

This is also an exciting time of challenge because we are confronted by many new dynamics. Our nation's classrooms have never been more crowded. From Los Angeles to Atlanta to Miami, Florida -- the portable classroom is a common sight in school yards.

The entire context of American education is changing. We need teachers skilled in using computers as a powerful teaching tool, and many more teachers well-versed in teaching English as a second language. Our teachers need to teach to a higher level of achievement, and be prepared to teach all of America's children -- the gifted and the talented, our many new immigrants, the college bound achiever, and the disabled child who is learning so much more because he or she is now included.

Yet, we struggle to put the old industrial model of education behind us. The jewel of American education is our system of higher education yet too often our colleges of education are treated like

forgotten step-children. And for too long public education in America and higher education have gone their separate ways, each dedicated to its own vision of excellence and learning.

I believe that this 19th-century model is outdated. We need a new model appropriate for the 21st century, an ongoing dialogue at every level of education to raise expectations and achieve high standards. This is one of the chief purposes of this national forum -- to break down the disconnections -- to get good people at every level of education talking to one another.

We must also recognize that too often in the past when we have been confronted with the demand for many teachers we have traded quality for quantity and paid the price by accepting mediocrity in our schools. I also believe that we must make a concerted effort to attract Americans from all walks of life to this demanding profession.

To my way of thinking one of the best ways to make teaching attractive is to make it a real profession with high quality preparation programs that are rigorous and relevant to today's classrooms. And we need to do a better job at promoting teaching as a way of life to young people who are now growing up. Let's remember, young people are starting to make choices as early as 9th grade.

As Terry noted in her remarks now is the time to get it right -- to step back and rethink how we attract, prepare, and support America's teachers. We have little hope of raising standards and giving our young people the skills they need unless we have better prepared teachers in the classroom. Teachers who are well trained and prepared for the realities of today's classroom.

This is why I want to share with you the results of a questionnaire we asked the teachers of the year who are with us tonight to fill out. The Council for Basic Education took charge of this project for us and the results are quite instructive.

We asked our state teachers of the year to answer eleven questions on teacher preparation with a special focus on the new teachers they have mentored or are mentoring now. Here is what they told us.

The first thing they told us is that the new teachers they are mentoring know the content of their subjects. They also told us that these first years teachers have good mechanics -- they know how to give tests, they are well prepared when it comes to planning daily lessons, to direct classroom activities and monitoring student progress. This is all very positive.

But the teachers also voiced some common concerns. They were overwhelming in their view that new teachers are unprepared to manage classroom discipline. The teachers also expressed very strong concerns that new teachers are not prepared to use technology and they have some difficulty engaging parents in the learning process.

The teachers also seem to suggest that new teachers are not being prepared enough to teach young people from many different ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. The same view holds true when it comes to teaching young people with physical and learning disabilities.

The teachers also noted that new teachers really are not given adequate time for student teaching -- and all too often new teachers are on their own during the first two years of teaching. We haven't created a process that gives future teachers a true sense of the American classroom here in 1997 -- and then we leave them to fend for themselves.

A few more concluding thoughts. Our little poll told us that new teachers are not as sure as they should

be when it comes to connecting their teaching practices to content standards or in using performance based assessment.

At the same time, the majority of the teachers tell us that university faculty value their assessment of the student teachers they are mentoring. Yet, they also suggest a disconnect as well -- there is a real need for more practicing teachers to be teaching in university programs.

Now this is a very small poll but it is a poll of some very smart Americans. And I suspect that much of what these teachers are telling us rings true with many of you in the audience. These teachers have given us something to think about.

Teaching is a demanding profession, and it will be even more demanding in the future. This is why I want to encourage every teacher in America to think about following in the footsteps of Sharon Draper - our new national teacher of the year -- who chose to become board certified.

President Clinton and I strongly support the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards and its goal of certifying over 100,000 master teachers in the next decade. I challenge every school in the nation to have at least one board-certified teacher on your faculty.

And I want to thank all of you who are doing the hard work of thinking through what we must do prepare our teachers for the 21st century. My wife Tunky and I were visiting the zoo one day when we saw a teenager with a Dilbert T-shirt that read: "Change is good -- you go first."

Well, some of you are going first -- you're breaking new ground -- and that's hard work -- a heavy load. But we need to get on with it -- to be willing to rethink what we are doing when it is appropriate -- to get into the classroom more -- and let go of old habits and ways of thinking in light of changing circumstances.

This is my charge to all of you -- use this dialogue not as an end, but as a beginning -- become serious and committed advocates for change. Do the hard work of upgrading teacher preparation and certification in your state.

The American people are tuned into education. The sparks are all around us. And we have a President in the White House -- in Bill Clinton -- who cares deeply about education. If ever there was a time to come together to improve teaching it is now.

America is on the move, and every school, college and university can be a bastion of hope, creativity and learning. For education is much more than getting a degree or learning a new skill. There is joy to learning, and the freedom of the intellect that brings with it new discovery and new thinking.

I end now with a quote from an old friend of mine from South Carolina, the writer Pat Conroy. This quote is from his novel the Prince of Tides.

And in this passage the main character of the book Tom, a teacher, is asked why he chose to "sell himself short" when he was so talented and could have done anything in his life.

Tom's reply goes like this, "There's no word in the language that I revere more than 'teacher.' None. My heart sings," he says, "when a kid refers to as his teacher and it always has. I've honored myself and the entire family of man by becoming a teacher."

I believe that there are a great many Americans listening tonight who feel the same. I thank you for your commitment to the teaching profession.

Thank you.

-###-

[[Return to Speeches and Testimony](#)]  [[Attracting and Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century](#)]

Last Updated -- April 21, 1997, (pjk)

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Statement by
Richard W. Riley, Secretary
on
the Reauthorization of the Higher Education Act
before the
Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources

February 27, 1997

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am pleased to appear before you to discuss the Administration's postsecondary education strategy, and the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 (HEA) in particular. Our dialogue about Federal education policy comes at a time when, more than ever before in our history, education is the fault line between those who will prosper in the new economy and those who will be left behind. We know that most of today's good jobs require more skills and training than a high school diploma affords. Effective and accessible postsecondary education is critically important both for individuals and for the strength of America's economy and democracy. That is why President Clinton made excellence in education our national mission in his State of the Union address, and why he has issued a bold "Call to Action for American Education in the 21st Century." I have with me copies of this education action agenda to share with you.

Our Nation faces great challenges when we strive to ensure access to effective education. In the next decade, demand for postsecondary education will expand significantly, due to increasing numbers of high school graduates and to increasing desire and need for life-long education and re-training opportunities. A growing population of disadvantaged students will need financial and other forms of support. These demographic changes will occur against the backdrop

provide students who are enrolled at least half-time and have no prior drug-related felony convictions with a maximum \$1,500 tax credit for tuition and required fees for their first year of postsecondary education, and another \$1,500 for the second year if they stay drug-free and earn at least a B minus average. This credit would put \$18.6 billion in the hands of students and their parents over the next five years. It would help 4.2 million students in 1998 alone, allowing them to pay the full cost of tuition at a typical community college and encouraging them to work hard and achieve excellence. In 1998, 8.1 million other students would have available to them a \$5,000 tax deduction for higher education expenses. The deduction would increase to \$10,000 beginning in 1999. Families would save \$17.6 billion over the next five years with this deduction. Eligibility for both of these tax proposals, because they are designed to help middle-income families pay for college, would be phased out for families with incomes between \$80,000 and \$100,000, and for individuals with incomes between \$50,000 and \$70,000.

We must also do more to encourage families to save for their children's education. That is why we have proposed greater flexibility in using Individual Retirement Accounts so that funds saved in these accounts can be used for postsecondary education expenses, free from early withdrawal tax penalties. In addition, we have proposed an expansion in eligibility for tax-deductible IRA contributions with phase-outs for high-income ranges similar to those used for the HOPE Scholarship tax credit and the deduction. This expansion would double the previous eligible income levels. Families who save through an expanded IRA, and then use the savings for higher education, could deduct up to \$10,000 of their withdrawals a year, making savings for college virtually tax free. I am aware that there are similar proposals in the Senate, so I look forward to working with you on this idea.

income students to earn bachelor's degrees within five years, and one of the main reasons that students drop out of college is lack of money. By putting more resources in the hands of students and families, we can help to increase degree attainment. In addition, many adult workers could be expected to return to school on a part-time basis in order to improve their job skills and credentials.

One often overlooked benefit of using tax incentives to provide educational assistance is their predictability. Students are more likely to pursue and complete postsecondary education when they are aware early in their schooling of predictable and consistent financial aid. Taxpayers who see a specific line item reference to the HOPE tax credit and the deduction on their tax forms year after year will be well aware of these sources of college financing. As a result, we expect to see increases in the participation and completion rates of low- and middle-income families.

Thus, the tax proposals will help working families who are struggling to pay for college. They will improve both access and college completion among middle-income students. They will reward savings and help reduce the need to borrow. And they will encourage adult workers to pursue re-training and life-long learning. We know, however, that the tax code may not be the best vehicle for helping the neediest students, who often do not have significant tax liabilities. That is why we have dedicated ourselves to doing all we can to increase the availability of need-based grants, as well.

Fiscal Year 1998 Budget Proposals

Our fiscal year 1998 budget proposals are an integral part of our commitment to accessible and effective higher education for all students. Our budget request would make an unprecedented \$47 billion in student financial aid available to some eight million students in fiscal year 1998,

would help students finance their education and gain valuable work skills. In addition, the President has challenged the higher education community to use one-half of the Work-Study increase for community service. As part of the "America Reads" Challenge, I waived the institutional matching requirement for those schools that use Work-Study funds to tutor young children in reading. Over 70 institutions have already accepted the President's challenge. We cannot miss this opportunity to give financially needy college students the valuable experience of mentoring and tutoring children, while ensuring that no child gets left behind, unable to read, at the start of his or her schooling.

We propose several smaller budget items that are important to us because of the high achievement and effective learning that they encourage and reward. The Presidential Honors Scholarships program would award one-year, \$1,000 scholarships to the top five percent of graduating students in every high school in the nation. For the first time, we are requesting funding for the Advanced Placement Fee program, which adds to our effort to raise academic expectations by partnering with the States to help low-income students pay for Advanced Placement tests. In addition, in order to take advantage of our programs, students often need non-financial forms of support. That is why we continue our strong commitment to the TRIO programs. Everything we know about ensuring access to postsecondary education tells us that we must reach children early so that they regard education after high school as a possibility for them.

Higher Education Act Reauthorization

This brings me to the third component of our higher education strategy, the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act. As I mentioned earlier, we believe that the current HEA provides a strong foundation of support for higher education. Its programs work well and have opened the

encouraged that we seem to be moving in the same direction and look forward to working with you as we continue this important endeavor. Let me share with you now the four principles that guide the development of our reauthorization proposal, as well as the directions in which we are headed in some specific areas.

The first principle is access -- opportunity with responsibility. We must continue our efforts to ensure that all students, including disabled and economically disadvantaged students, have access to higher education. At the same time, we must help families and students take responsibility for their own education. Postsecondary institutions, too, have the responsibility to protect the value of their students' access by providing high-quality programs, supporting students, restraining tuition increases, and being fiscally responsible in their management of federal funds. And States must take responsibility for investing in the education of their students in spite of tight state budgets and limited resources. We are considering several changes to the HEA that will enhance access.

Of course, Pell Grants are critical to ensuring access, and we will do our best to guarantee that the HEA provides a strong Pell Grant program for years to come. We will complement our increased funding for the program this year by authorizing future maximum awards that are ambitious but also paid for within our balanced budget proposal. In addition, however, we believe that students and families should be encouraged to take responsibility for their educational opportunities. We are concerned that there is a perception that students and families are penalized for saving for their future postsecondary education expenses under the current need analysis system. We believe that the Federal government should do all that it can to encourage savings, and we will include a proposal that reflects this belief.

Our second reauthorization principle is the support of effective education, high standards, and high achievement. Federal programs should continue to promote and enhance outstanding educational opportunities and encourage students to take advantage of those opportunities to the best of their abilities. We should also encourage the effective use of new technologies to meet the changing needs of students by providing access to high quality postsecondary education.

As the President emphasized in his "Call to Action," the professional development of teachers is of critical importance. Teaching is a key variable in students' learning; without effective teaching, the highest standards in the world will not ensure that our children are well educated. We must give teachers the education and support that they need to teach to higher standards. We face major challenges in this undertaking, given that over the next decade, we will need an additional two million teachers to keep up with student population growth and the increasing diversity of our nation's students.

It is with these challenges in mind that we approach the reauthorization of Title V. Whereas Title V currently authorizes a myriad of disconnected programs, we plan to propose targeted programs that can make a difference in a few priority areas. I am planning to hold a national forum in mid-April to discuss our nation's best ideas for a strong Title V. The forum will convene some of our nation's best teachers, public education leaders, and members of the higher education community to explore ways to strengthen all phases of professional development, with a particular focus on recruiting the next generation of teachers, preparing them well, and supporting them in their first few critical years. As a nation we simply are not doing enough in these three areas. We cannot afford to wait another moment to go to work to ensure that we have a talented and dedicated teacher in every classroom in the nation.

are necessary to complete this project successfully. Students deserve a friendly system of acquiring information about, applying for, and receiving financial aid. Lack of sufficient information and difficulty in applying can be significant barriers to access to postsecondary education. Schools, in turn, would have more resources to spend on education if the administrative burdens of the delivery system were reduced through simplification and greater use of technology. In cooperation with postsecondary education institutions, we are examining ways that the HEA could encourage a streamlined delivery system for student financial aid.

We also can improve management of the Title IV programs and reduce burden by continuing to improve the Department's system of oversight of institutions that participate in these programs. We will continue to strive toward a proper balance between reducing burdens on schools and protecting students and Federal funds. To strike this balance, we expect to propose a performance-based, tailored approach to statute and regulation instead of the current "one size fits all" approach. In recognizing the diversity of American institutions of higher education, a gatekeeping and oversight system based on institutions' track records will reduce burden where appropriate, provide incentives for institutions to be fiscally and administratively responsible, and target Federal oversight resources on high-risk institutions.

And our fourth principle is that we must improve outreach to potential students and ensure strong links among elementary and secondary education, postsecondary education, and employment. As the President emphasized in his "Call to Action," this principle is key to our goal of making college more accessible and more affordable for Americans. Too many young people lose their way between high school and the world of work. We must reach out to potential students as part of our effort to change the way that young people and their families participate in

Developing the Title V Proposal: Logic Mixed With Luck

Developing a legislative proposal should involve a rational, systematic approach based on research, extensive outreach with the field, and thoughtful debate. However, the most logical process can be disrupted by events totally unrelated to the legislative process. In the case of Title V of the Higher Education Act, two such events intervened. One nearly sabotaged the whole process while the other helped to ensure its success.

With no prior legislative experience and little background in higher education, I approached my role as chair of the Title V Task Force -- charged with developing the Clinton Administration's proposal for reauthorization -- with great humility. I openly admitted my inexperience and recognized my shortcomings. However, as a twenty-year classroom veteran and a former National Teacher of the Year, I brought great practical experience in teaching to the process and a deep commitment to improving the profession. As Secretary Riley's Special Advisor on Teaching, I also had the responsibility for leading the Department's initiative to ensure a talented, dedicated, and well-prepared teacher in every classroom. Clearly, the demographic reality facing the teaching profession -- the need to hire more than 2.2 million teachers in the next decade, over half of whom would be first time teachers -- provided the Administration with a historic opportunity to dramatically change the way teachers are recruited, prepared, and supported in America. Therefore, I was determined to approach the task of developing our Title V proposal as thoughtfully and thoroughly as possible. It was an opportunity we could not afford to squander.

**"To know what you know is knowledge.
To know what you don't know, that is true knowledge."**

--Confucius, *The Analects*

Looking back on the process, I realize that my greatest strength was in not knowing what we should do. I was, therefore, untainted by the fallacy of thinking I knew the right policy answers, a flaw that plagues the policy world in Washington, D.C. and elsewhere. Because everyone knew I was not an expert, I could freely seek advice and ask questions that others might avoid for fear of admitting their ignorance.

Because the Office of Postsecondary Education (OPE) did not have staff members with a substantive background in teacher development, I began by creating a cross-Departmental team of individuals with backgrounds and interest in teacher development or the legislative process. The team included individuals who had been assigned by their principal offices and others who volunteered because of personal interest in the issue.

Starting in January 1997, we agreed to meet every Tuesday for two hours. We started with a careful look at the current Title V and concluded that we had to develop a proposal that would be coherent and conceptually defensible. We could not afford to recreate the current hodgepodge of small, disconnected programs. To ensure that we

understood as thoroughly as possible the policy problems that our new proposal would address, we spent the first half of most meetings listening to presentations by outside experts or our own members. We invited representatives from the Interstate New Teacher and Assessment Consortium, the National Council of Accreditation for Teacher Education, the Council of Basic Education, the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, and Recruiting New Teachers, Inc., among others. We listened to Department staff describe the current Eisenhower Professional Development Program, the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program, and the Eisenhower National Program. Some of our grantees described to us their experiences in trying to improve teacher education. We also sought the advice of Department staff who had been part of past efforts to improve teacher quality, such as the Teacher Corps Program of the 1960's and 1970's. We even reached out to other federal agencies to determine lessons learned from their efforts. Most notably, we invited the National Science Foundation to talk with us about their Collaboratives for Excellence and Teacher Preparation. Finally, we talked with the foundation world to determine what they were learning from their investments in teacher development.

To ensure that we made steady progress in developing our proposal, we devoted the second half of each meeting to discussing the implications of the presentation we had just heard and trying to reach consensus on decisions that would move the process forward.

Between the task force's regular meetings, small groups did research on other government efforts such as loan forgiveness for teachers and the National Health Service Corps designed to help rural communities get qualified doctors. In addition, I conducted more than 40 hours of personal and telephone interviews with leading researchers such as Linda Darling-Hammond, John Goodlad, Michael Fullan, Lee Shulman, and Gary Sykes. Notes from these interviews were typed, distributed, and discussed at our meetings.

While I had had preliminary meetings with some of the professional organizations such as the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education, by March we felt it was time to bring leaders of professional organizations representing both higher education and K-12 together to present their views on Title V. It soon became clear that reaching any kind of consensus between these two communities would be difficult. The long history of resentment between the two groups spilled out in this first meeting.

The K-12 community believed that higher education was not responsive to their needs and concerns. Many felt that teacher educators were not in touch with the realities of the classroom and treated K-12 educators with a condescending attitude. These feelings had been reinforced when the higher education community organized a working group to develop a proposal for Title V. While the higher education proposal did call for K-16 partnerships to prepare future teachers, all of the money would clearly go to higher education institutions, and none of the K-12 organizations except the Council of Chief State School Officers had been involved in developing the proposal.

The groups also disagreed about the focus of Title V. The K-12 groups wanted to use Title V as another vehicle to address the massive needs of in-service education (i.e., professional development for the current teaching force), a more important priority for their constituents. With limited resources available, the higher education groups wanted to focus Title V on pre-service education (i.e., training for future teachers). They argued that the federal government already spent \$335 million on in-service education through the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. They believed Congress would reject a Title V that appeared to duplicate the purposes of the Eisenhower Program.

It soon became clear that members of the higher education task force had come prepared to stack the deck at this first outreach meeting. The higher education community had developed its own proposal which involved sending formula grants to state education agencies (SEAs) to fund K-16 partnerships. While readily admitting that their proposal was not the strongest possible nor what was needed to significantly improve teacher education, they argued it was the only viable approach to Title V given the political realities of a Republican-led Congress. The Republicans had a penchant for by-passing the federal government and giving money directly to the states. One higher education representative after another argued vehemently that the approach taken by the higher education proposal was the only viable one to ensure funding for Title V. They appeared to have choreographed their statements, creating a situation in which the K-12 representatives had few opportunities to speak unless they interrupted people.

The meeting quickly dissolved into a cat and dog fight, mediated by the Department. Despite its adversarial nature, however, we left the meeting with some clear direction. First, K-12 educators must be equal partners in whatever proposal we put forward. While the K-12 lobbyists were not organized around a particular approach, they would clearly fight any proposal that gave all the money to the higher education community.

Second, the case for focusing Title V on pre-service education was compelling. The nation was faced with preparing record numbers of new teachers. In addition, members of Congress were already investigating what they believed was serious duplication among the Department's programs. Finally, developing a proposal for the Higher Education Act seemed to argue for a pre-service focus. Efforts to improve in-service education could be addressed through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that was scheduled for reauthorization the following year.

Despite the clear differences between the higher education and K-12 groups, there did seem to be one point of agreement between them. Both sides wanted to avoid a disastrous Christmas tree approach to Title V. Everyone understood we could not go forward with numerous, small, disconnected programs and hope to get any substantial funding.

The Department also began to reach out to members of Congress. We wanted to benefit from their early thinking about Title V. Therefore, I met jointly with staff from the offices of Senator James M. Jeffords (R-Vt.) and Senator Edward M. Kennedy (D-

Mass.), and separately with staff from the offices of Congressmen William Goodling (R-Pa.) and William L. Clay (D-Mo.). They pressed me hard on the specifics of what we planned to propose. While I did not have such details at this point, it quickly became clear to me that the Department of Education had the greater knowledge base in these discussions. We had carefully gathered information that Hill staff had neither the time nor, in some cases, the interest in gathering. I came out of those first meetings with the realization that the Administration's job was to develop a proposal that Congress would tear apart. My role, then, must be to lead us through a process that would result in a proposal that could be defended as thoroughly as possible.

The Department made one final effort to seek input for Title V. In April we hosted a National Forum on Attracting and Preparing Teachers for the 21st Century. The Forum brought together the state teachers of the year and deans, presidents, and provosts of teacher preparation institutions for candid discussions about how best to attract and prepare teachers.

As a result of all these efforts, by April the Title V Task Force was ready to begin drafting its proposal. Three critical needs had emerged through all of our outreach efforts. First, as a nation we needed to identify and rigorously evaluate best practices in teacher education. Second, when exemplary teacher education practices were identified, they needed to be spread to other institutions; otherwise, good programs would remain islands of-excellence with little impact on the great majority of prospective teachers. Third, because quality teacher preparation demands strong collaboration with elementary and secondary schools, school districts and teacher preparation institutions needed to create real partnerships in order to prepare teachers effectively for the realities of today's classrooms.

Our general approach would be to propose federal funding for what we decided to call Lighthouse Partnerships. These partnerships would accelerate the change process by linking higher education institutions from around the country with each other, and with K-12 schools, to share best practices and learn from each other's work. Because each institution involved in the program would be at a different stage in its restructuring efforts, the institutions would have much to share. In addition, the partnerships would likely represent a variety of approaches to teacher education and could transcend state and regional boundaries. What was needed at this point was to bring a group of education deans and university presidents to the Department to help us flesh out the details of our proposal.

By late April we were feeling good about our progress. While we still did not know how our proposal would address the role of states, we were unanimously opposed to the approach taken by the higher education community. We felt that giving states money to fund K-16 partnerships would lead to the dribbling out of federal dollars to everyone, with no guarantee of quality or real change. We felt the states' role was more appropriately leveraged to change the system by doing such things as strengthening requirements for the initial licensing of teachers and developing policies that would support teacher quality. Rather than including such measures in our proposal, we were

beginning to think that this work could be funded through existing federal programs, such as the Fund for Innovation in Education.

How to address the nation's teacher recruitment challenge was far from settled, however. While loan forgiveness was extremely popular among Democrats and Republicans, we could find no evidence that it actually increased the pool of teacher candidates nor kept those who did become teachers in communities with the greatest need. Our ideas for recruitment fluctuated wildly with individual task force members lobbying for their pet ideas in the absence of strong evidence that any one approach held greater promise than another.

While recruitment remained a problem, our task force felt as if things were falling into place. Our hard work was paying off. Suddenly, however, we found ourselves faced with a threat to our work from a totally unexpected quarter. In April the President announced that he would host a Summit on Volunteerism and asked Colin Powell to lead the Summit, which would involve all the living Presidents. Given the enormous media attention the Summit would generate, the White House wanted to unveil some major initiatives. One of our former task force members, who was now working at the White House, put forward for White House consideration a teacher recruitment proposal he had floated earlier with our Title V Task Force. It involved giving scholarships to talented individuals who agreed to become teachers.

There was great interest in his teacher recruitment proposal at the White House. Education was the President's top priority, and the nation's schools faced the enormous challenge of hiring more than 2 million teachers in the next decade. There was talk of funding the proposal at more than \$400 million. Normally, dedication of these sums of money to teacher recruitment would have thrilled our task force. The focus on teachers at such an important event would provide invaluable national attention to a critical challenge facing America.

However, other factors were at work. The President had been working in a bipartisan fashion with Congress to secure a balanced budget agreement. The President was on record as saying that all new Administration proposals would be made within the context of a balanced budget. If we devoted \$400 million to teaching scholarships, no funds would remain to support the Lighthouse Partnerships to improve teacher education. The teacher recruitment proposal would be our Title V proposal. Unveiling a teacher recruitment proposal at the Summit was troubling for another reason. The Summit was to highlight the importance of volunteerism. Therefore, the public would equate teaching, at least subconsciously, with volunteerism.

We faced a terrible dilemma. If we fought the White House proposal, we might lose an opportunity to bring incredible attention and funding to teacher recruitment. However, if we supported the proposal, there would be no resources left to devote to improving teacher education. All of our careful work would have been in vain. What should we do?



Classroom Activity: Work in groups of two or more. Prepare the pros and cons of supporting or opposing the White House plan to announce a \$400 million teacher recruitment initiative at the Volunteer Summit. In a debate format, try to persuade your classmates to either support or oppose a White House announcement.

A Reprieve and a Little Luck

In the end, the White House chose not to pursue the teacher recruitment proposal. Instead the President unveiled a plan to enable students to defer the interest on their college loans while they performed public service. The experience, however, taught me a valuable lesson.

In June, I received an e-mail from a member of the White House staff. The President was scheduled to speak at the NAACP conference in Philadelphia on July 17, and the White House was seeking something he might announce at this conference. There was mounting public pressure for the President to make a substantive proposal during the NAACP speech. On June 13 at the University of California at San Diego, amid great fanfare, the President had launched "One America: The President's Initiative on Race" in order to improve race relations in America. The initiative's advisory board had been plagued with controversy because of infighting among the Commission members and a rising criticism that the President's race initiative was all talk and no action.

While we still had some details to work out, our Title V proposal was in very good shape. We had settled on a two-pronged approach. Our Lighthouse Partnership proposal was designed to improve teacher education, and we were close to finishing our proposal to address teacher recruitment. After much discussion and indecision about how to tackle recruitment, our task force had learned of a teacher recruitment program funded by the DeWitt Wallace-Reader's Digest Foundation. The Foundation's Pathways to Teaching Program had been successful in recruiting and retaining teachers in high-poverty communities by investing in the preparation of individuals already living in the community.

Therefore, the Title V Task Force proposed to address teacher recruitment through competitive grants to partnerships between high-poverty school districts and

institutions of higher education. The partnerships would identify the kinds of teachers needed in the district and a potential pool of candidates, and then design a program that met the needs of the targeted individuals. For example, the partnership might determine that math, science, or minority teachers were needed. Depending on the location of the district, the partnership might target retired military personnel, paraprofessionals, or bright high school seniors in their recruitment efforts. Teacher candidates would receive scholarships, high-quality preparation, and support services in exchange for teaching at least three years in the partnership district. Individuals who failed to complete the teaching obligation would be required to pay back a portion of their scholarships.

I saw our opportunity. The rest of the Higher Education Act was mired in conflicts between the Department and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), and the Administration was being criticized for its tardiness in sending the proposed legislation to Congress. The President's personal announcement of the Title V proposal at the NAACP conference would enable us to break through the problems with OMB and get at least one concrete proposal to Congress.

In addition, if we could sell the White House on announcing our Title V proposal at the NAACP conference, we could generate a great deal of press coverage because of the heightened interest in this particular speech. We could build momentum for the next stage of the legislative process – selling the proposal to Congress, education lobbyists, and higher education and K-12 educators. There surely would be other competing ideas for the July 17 speech. What should our approach be with the White House? How could we best present our case that teacher recruitment and preparation was the perfect message for the NAACP conference?



Discussion Topics:

1. What themes within the Title V proposal would resonate with the NAACP audience?
2. How might the Title V and the race initiative message be linked?
3. What practical, policy, and political arguments might be made to convince the White House to announce the Title V proposal at the NAACP conference?

Compromise and Victory

I immediately responded to the White House e-mail and informed the author that we were almost finished with our Title V proposal. There was great interest, but no commitment. We continued our campaign to be included in the speech, arguing that education is the key to ending racial prejudice and inequities, and good teachers are at the core of a quality education. In addition, the focus on high-poverty communities in our teacher recruitment piece was tailor made for the NAACP audience. Announcing our Title V proposal would allow the President to address his top priority – education – and reaffirm the race initiative.

We began intensive meetings with the staff from the White House Domestic Policy Council and OMB. They scrutinized every detail of the proposal, insisting that changes be made. We fought some of the changes successfully and others we lost. The most significant change to which we agreed dealt with the focus of our Lighthouse Partnerships. Although we had not originally intended to focus the partnerships on high-poverty communities, the White House insisted we do so. White House staff contended that the most difficult problem to address in teacher education was how to prepare teachers to teach successfully in high-poverty schools. I could not argue with that assessment.

Another reason for targeting high-poverty communities was unspoken, but understood. The President's NAACP speech needed to address in some substantive way specific actions he planned to take to address the goals of the race initiative because no concrete proposal had yet been put forth by the White House. Criticism was mounting as people waited to hear what the President would do beyond calling for a dialogue on race. Therefore, targeting the Lighthouse Partnerships to serve high-poverty communities – communities that are overwhelming minority – served both a policy and political purpose.

Although we had not resolved all the outstanding issues that had arisen during the intensive negotiations with the Domestic Policy Council and OMB, we had enough detail that a presidential announcement would be credible. Two days before the NAACP conference, we finally got word from the White House that the President would personally announce the Title V proposal, something that is rarely done.

I did not realize how important the Presidential announcement was at the time, but I soon learned its value. At the last minute the Department of Justice questioned some of our language about minority teacher recruitment. The presidential announcement forced Justice to resolve the problem quickly so that Senator Kennedy could introduce our legislative proposal before Congress adjourned on July 31. Unlike the rest of the Higher Education Act that was mired in conflicts with OMB for months, OMB quickly cleared Title V. Again, there were positive and negative results. On one hand, I was disappointed that we were only able to get OMB to fund Title V at \$67 million because of the balanced budget agreements. On the other hand, it was the only new initiative that was protected in the routine budget negotiations that take place between federal agencies and OMB each year before the President submits his budget to Congress.

If our Title V Task Force had not been ready and I had not responded quickly to the White House e-mail, our proposal would not have gained such a high profile. This time, the desire to announce something at an event had worked in our favor. Because the President was on record personally calling for its passage, our negotiating position was strong. I could now focus on selling our Title V proposal to members of Congress and the education establishment. Now I had the power of the presidency behind me.

Selling the Title V Proposal: Lessons in Sabotage

The legislative process brings out both the best and the worst in people. To be successful, one must start from a sound, well-researched position, have developed excellent diplomatic skills, and be willing to compromise. However, the process also brings out a competitive spirit that can lead to division and deception. Deliberate and inadvertent acts of sabotage plagued attempts to sell the Clinton Administration's Title V proposal.

The most difficult people with whom I dealt in trying to sell the Clinton Administration's Title V proposal were the lobbyists for the higher education professional organizations. These individuals had formed a task force to develop a united proposal that they could bring to Members of Congress as the "higher education proposal." Early in the Department's deliberations, representatives from the higher education task force tried to sell us on the legislative proposal that they had developed through a consensus-building process. The process had been particularly arduous because of the diversity, large numbers, and uneven quality of the institutions that prepare teachers.

While the higher education task force had many conflicting "masters" to serve, there were also some very strong areas of agreement among its members. Their members agreed that the higher education proposal should focus on improving pre-service education. The nation was facing a teacher shortage at the same time that states were raising standards for K-12 students. Therefore, there would be growing pressure on colleges and universities to produce more and better teachers. A pre-service focus would also most directly benefit the higher education institutions represented by the task force members. The decision to focus the higher education proposal more narrowly also grew out of reality. With no unifying purpose or structure, the current Title V had not generated adequate political support for funding. Although authorized at more than \$400 million, only one small program, the \$2.2 million Minority Teacher Recruitment Program, was currently funded. Therefore, the biggest priority of the higher education lobbyists was to develop a proposal that would be politically viable in a Republican-led Congress and narrowly focused so that it could be both authorized and funded.

Because Republicans generally tend to support policies that send money directly to the states to spend as they see fit, the higher education task force proposed to send money to the states based on a formula similar to those used in other federal programs. The states would then decide which institutions should receive funding to create partnerships with K-12 districts for the purpose of improving teacher education programs.

The higher education case for focusing Title V on pre-service education was compelling. The nation was faced with the need to prepare record numbers of new teachers, and the federal government had not invested in teacher preparation in any significant way for almost 30 years. In addition, Members of Congress were already investigating what they considered unnecessary duplication among Department programs. The fact that we were developing a proposal for the Higher Education Act

also seemed to imply support for a pre-service focus. While the need to improve in-service education was also great, those issues could be addressed through the Elementary and Secondary Education Act that was scheduled for reauthorization the following year.

However, the higher education proposal had some serious flaws. The Administration had no reason to believe that sending money through the states to fund K-16 partnerships would lead to improvements in teacher education. Past experience and evaluations of similar approaches indicated that states tend to dribble the money out to everyone. While this was a desirable outcome for many in the higher education community (and understandably an approach upon which the higher education task force could reach consensus), the Administration did not feel that it would truly meet the needs of the country. Our research showed that to effect real change and improvement in teacher education, funding must be concentrated, sustained, and invested in partnerships that had the most promise of being successful. Quality, rather than quantity, had to be the guiding principle.

For this reason, the Administration, while supporting a focus on pre-service education, proposed to establish a competitive grant program that would identify best practices in teacher education. These "Lighthouse Partnerships" would receive substantial funding over a five-year period to expand and evaluate their work and engage other K-16 partnerships who were at various stages of restructuring their programs. This type of networking of K-16 partnerships committed to improving teacher education could provide both support for institutions undertaking the hard work of change and learning opportunities for all partners.

On July 17, 1997, President Clinton announced the Title V proposal during a speech at the annual NAACP Conference. His personal involvement generated a great deal of political energy behind the proposal and on July 31, our proposal was introduced by Senator Ted Kennedy (D-MA), the ranking minority member on the Senate Education Committee.

At the same time, despite intensive lobbying, the higher education proposal had only been introduced by two Members of Congress -- Senator Bill Frist (R-TN) and Congresswoman Carolyn McCarthy (D-NY) -- both serving their first term in office. To those unfamiliar with the ways in which legislative proposals make their way through the system, this bipartisan support looked promising for the higher education proposal. However, because neither member had any seniority, this bipartisan support was illusionary. Congressman William Goodling (R-PA), the chair of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce had shown no interest in the higher education proposal. In fact, he had treated it with disdain and threatened to fight anything that gave money to schools of education.

Our efforts to forge a bipartisan bill in the House had gotten nowhere due to Congressman Goodling's reluctance to deal with Title V. This was, in part, due to his general disdain for schools of education, but also because the House Republicans were severely divided on whether or not the federal government should be involved in teacher

preparation. Many of the Republican "traditionalists" felt that teacher education was strictly a state issue and did not favor any federal role. Other Republicans saw schools of education as the problem, and therefore, they could not be part of the solution to improving teacher quality. In the view of these Republicans, any federal dollars that found their way to colleges of education would be a travesty. Still other Republicans favored a more limited federal role in which the federal government might support efforts to strengthen the academic preparation of teachers. These Republicans wanted to ensure that prospective teachers had an academic major, not a degree in education.

Under normal circumstances, when the majority party is not united, the minority party can seize the opportunity to promote its vision and effectively shape the final legislative language. This could have worked well in favor of the Administration's proposal, however, the House Democrats were also divided. Their divisions were less about whether or not the federal government had a role in teacher preparation, but more about what that role should be. Despite the lack of evidence that loan forgiveness was an effective way to recruit teachers, it was being heavily promoted by Congressman Dale Kildee (D-MI), ranking minority member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce. Congressman George Miller (D-CA) was promoting a very strict accountability measure that would cut off federal student financial aid dollars to institutions whose teacher preparation programs were identified as low-performing. This punitive approach to improving teacher education made many other Democrats uncomfortable. Some Democrats were also bothered by the term "best practices" and the competitive nature of the Administration's "Lighthouse Partnerships," fearing that their constituents would not receive funding. Still others, who represented more affluent communities, did not like our emphasis on funding partnerships that served high-poverty schools. Despite the disarray of House Democrats, we continued to work with them in hopes that we could unite them behind a revised proposal that would incorporate the essential elements of the Administration's original vision.

While we did not have bipartisan support for our proposal in the House, on the Senate side, we were more optimistic. We were actively working with Senator James Jeffords' (R-VT) staff to use the Kennedy sponsored bill as the basis upon which to craft a bipartisan Title V. As chairman of the Education Committee, Senator Jeffords would play a powerful role in controlling what the final bill would look like. In general, Senator Jeffords seemed comfortable with our approach, though he wanted to see a role for states in the legislation.

While these negotiations were taking place in Washington, I began our efforts to sell Title V to groups around the country with the hope that they would write letters of support that would persuade additional Members of Congress to support our proposal. My lessons in sabotage began almost immediately.

They started when I learned of a concerted effort to mischaracterize our proposal. Early in our internal discussions we had used the term "flagship" as a code word for programs that exemplified "best practices." We quickly decided to drop the term, however, because in most states the term "flagship" refers to the major research

institution in the state. In fact, we wanted to invest in those institutions that prepare the bulk of teachers in America, and these were not, in most cases, the major research institutions. When one of the deans with whom we conferred came up with the term "lighthouse" we thought we had found an ideal substitute. Lighthouse would convey that we wanted to identify and support promising programs and spread their good work. The Lighthouse Partnerships would be beacons that could light the way for others who wanted to restructure their teacher preparation programs. However, no matter how many times we insisted that our goal would be to invest in those institutions that prepare a significant number of teachers for the state or region, the higher education lobbyists kept telling their members that we only wanted to fund the "elite" institutions.

I began hearing tales from some of the deans with whom we had conferred earlier in the process. One stood up at a meeting with her peers to defend the Administration's proposal, only to be asked if she had seen the list of 14 institutions that we had identified as lighthouses. Because she had not seen the list, she immediately sat down. The truth was that we had produced no such list. As a history teacher, images of Senator Joseph McCarthy's infamous (and non-existent) lists flashed across my mind.

At about the same time, I found out that the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE), had sent letters to deans of education in major urban areas explaining that our proposal would not support their efforts since we intended to fund only elite institutions. These deans had convinced their presidents to write members of Congress to tell them that the money had to go through the states. When Mike Casserly, head of the Council of Great City Schools, explained to the urban deans why he liked the Administration's approach and disliked the higher education proposal, they were shocked to learn what "going through the states" meant. In most cases, when money is funneled through the states, the urban areas never get their fair share of funding. This is one reason the federal role in education evolved in the first place. States were not serving the needs of their high-poverty communities.

The urban deans did not realize they could form a Lighthouse Partnership. In fact, that's exactly what we hoped to stimulate -- institutions with similar challenges working together to improve their teacher education programs. Some of the institutions would be further along in their efforts than others -- some would be "lead" institutions -- but all could learn from and support one another.

As I made phone calls to deans in states whose members served on the education committee, it quickly became clear that the higher education lobbyists had already gotten to them. I started to hear the same questions and the same phrases in response to my defense of our approach. "It has to go through the states" became the mantra that followed every one of my questions to the deans.

It also became clear to me that the way we had originally structured our Lighthouse Partnerships, while great in theory, would not work in practice. The higher education community's aversion to indicating that some institutions are better than others, made it untenable. We had to stop talking about "best practices" and "lead"

institutions, although both terms were accurate descriptions. Some teacher preparation programs were exemplary and some institutions were leaders in this arena by virtue of having begun the hard work of restructuring their teacher preparation program long before others. However, we repeatedly we were told that no one would want to be viewed as a "partner." And if the truth were known, most of the institutions that truly were leaders in teacher education would prefer to get money to continue their good work without having the responsibility of working in partnership with others.

Therefore, we began to reshape our language so as to better convey the concept of a partnership among institutions that would strengthen and support all members. No one institution would be strong in every area of teacher preparation, so the ideal "Lighthouse Partnership" would bring together institutions with different strengths and at different stages of their restructuring efforts to support and learn from one another.

In January, I was invited to give the Judith Lanier Lecture at the annual meeting of the Holmes Partnership. Originally called the Holmes Group, representing some of the nation's top research institutions, their mission was to reaffirm an institutional commitment to teacher education and to improve teacher education in America. They advocated the development of a "teaching hospital" model of preparation that would bring together exemplary practice with cutting edge research, similar to the training of physicians at medical universities.

After accusations of elitism, the Holmes Group had redefined its mission and membership to include K-12 partners and colleges and universities that were not viewed as leading research institutions. Although the name had been changed to the Holmes Partnership, the focus remained one of improving teacher education through a strong partnership between higher and K-12 education. The Holmes Partnership was a perfect audience to which I could pitch the Administration's Title V proposal.

In addition to giving the Lanier Lecture, I had been invited, along with several Members of Congress, to make a pre-conference presentation to the Holmes Partnership Board of Directors to describe our Title V proposals. My hope was that the Board of Directors might vote to support the Administration's Title V proposal. With the changes we had made in our language, and the obvious alignment between the goals of our Title V and the work of the Holmes Partnership, I felt that we had a good chance to get the endorsement of this very influential group of higher education and K-12 leaders.

Though given limited time on the program, I made my presentation and that evening went to the opening dinner. As I began to eat my salad, the head of the National Staff Development Council, Dennis Sparks, leaned over and said to me, "The President had a very bad day today." Because I had been on the road, I had not heard any news in 24 hours. I didn't know what he meant but assumed it had to do with some international incident, most likely in Bosnia. When I asked him to explain, I learned for the first time that the President had been accused of having an affair with a 21-year-old White House intern named Monica Lewinsky and lying about the relationship under oath. While the

President had adamantly denied the charges, it seemed that his answers were less than convincing and people were predicting that he would have to resign.

□ What I did not know until the next day was how badly the President's action had damaged my efforts on behalf of Title V. After my presentation to the Board of Directors, they had met in closed session. In discussing the various Title V proposals that had been presented to them, the Administration's proposal had been dismissed by the head of a higher education organization with the following words: "You can forget the Administration's proposal. It's dead. Everything has changed in the last 24 hours."



1. Why would a President's personal behavior affect his legislative agenda?
2. To what precedents might the higher education official have referred in declaring the death of the Administration's Title V proposal?
3. Research what happens to a president's political agenda during periods of scandals. What factors seem to determine whether or not the scandal has an impact on his effectiveness in getting legislation through the Congress?
4. If you were in my position, what would you do next?

When I returned to the Department, I found my colleagues totally demoralized. The President had been preparing a State of the Union address that was going to focus overwhelming on education. Many of us had planned to watch it together and pop champagne corks as soon as it was over. It was to be our moment in the sun, but the Lewinsky scandal had changed everything. The original State of the Union speech was abandoned, and in its place, the President had to deliver the speech of his life -- one that made him look presidential. Education was not an issue that defined American presidents.

These were dark days. While most of us did not know what or who to believe as the accusations and the denials became more strident, we were all embarrassed by the nature of the accusations that seemed to grow more lurid by the day. People would not speak, nor even look at one another as they passed in the hall. Most of the people I worked with had worked tirelessly for the Clinton campaign and emotions were running high, ranging

from total denial to bitterness and feelings of betrayal. The Department felt like a morgue.

It appeared that the higher education official was right. Everything seemed to come to a grinding halt. However, a week after the Lewinsky story broke, the First Lady appeared on the Today Show and delivered the most convincing, compelling defense of her husband. While the scandal did not disappear, people seemed less certain that the accusations were true. In addition, Secretary Riley met with all of his staff and told us that we had very important work to do -- that we did not have time to dwell on the events unfolding in the media, and that we must redouble our efforts on behalf of children.

With these words of encouragement, the mood changed in the Department. We were determined to continue to push our agenda and that meant that I would return to trying to sell our Title V proposal to those within and outside of Washington, D.C.

An opportunity arose in February with the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education (AACTE). The membership of the AACTE consisted of deans of colleges of education. While I knew that the leadership of AACTE in Washington supported the higher education proposal, I decided to take our message directly to the deans and agreed to do a session at the AACTE's conference.

Penny Early, the chief lobbyist for the AACTE, was to set the context for the session by providing a brief history of the federal government's investment in teacher education. I would then describe the Administration's Title V proposal and a Member of Congress would provide a different perspective. Penny was to moderate the question and answer period that immediately followed our two presentations.

As soon as I walked into the room, I realized I had been set up. Penny, who was to remain neutral, had selected Andy Goldberg, legislative assistant for Congresswoman Carolyn McCarthy (D-NY) to be my counterpart. Congresswoman McCarthy had introduced the higher education proposal. My lessons in sabotage continued.



□

1. Why would Congresswoman McCarthy have introduced the higher education proposal? What aspects of the Administration's proposal might she have disagreed with?
2. Why would Penny Early have chosen Andy Goldberg to present the higher education proposal rather than someone from the office of Senator Frist (R-TN)?
3. What problems did Andy's selection present for me as I tried to explain the strengths of our proposal versus the weaknesses of the higher education proposal?

My lessons in sabotage would continue and my teachers would come from many different groups and from across the political spectrum. However, in the end, we were successful. On October 8, the President signed the 1998 Higher Education Act Amendments that included the basic structure of our Title V proposal, and in the end, was far stronger than the one we had originally proposed. During the legislative process, Title V was moved up in the bill and became known as Title II, the Teacher Quality Enhancement Grant Programs.

The months and months of negotiations, while frustrating, had uncovered that while our original proposal had been great in theory, it also had important weaknesses. One of the most significant weaknesses had been our original emphasis on identifying those institutions that had exemplary teacher preparation programs and partnering them with institutions that were not as strong. This approach underestimated the strong aversion the higher education community had to stating that some institutions are better than others. To better ensure acceptance of our proposal, we were forced to de-emphasize the concept of one institution being a leader in the Lighthouse Partnership. Instead, we began to stress the learning that would take place among all the partners. Another weakness of our original proposal was the absence of a role for the state, despite the fact that states set teacher licensing standards and are ultimately responsible for the quality of their teaching force. The struggle to find a proper state role, led to the creation of a state grant program focused on helping states strengthen their teacher licensing standards, hold colleges and universities accountable for the quality of their teacher education programs, and develop statewide efforts to recruit and retain high quality teachers.

So despite the hard lessons I took away from the deliberate and inadvertent acts of sabotage I had to endure, the greatest lesson I took away from the whole experience is that our democratic process works.



Remarks as prepared for delivery by
U.S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley

Annual Back to School Address National Press Club

Washington, D.C.,
September 15, 1998

The Challenge for America: A High Quality Teacher in Every Classroom

Webcast of the Secretary's speech.

Good afternoon. At the beginning of every school year, I have the good fortune to come to the National Press Club to give my "Back to School" address. I have been traveling from Georgia to the Pacific Northwest as part of my annual back to school push, and I can tell you that America's schools are overflowing with children. It is an exciting time for children and parents; but in too many cases our schools are overcrowded, wearing out and in desperate need of modernization.

As I noted in our annual report on the "baby-boom echo" which we released last week, we are once again breaking the national enrollment record. There are currently 52.7 million young people in school and more on the way. And in the next ten years we will need to recruit 2.2 million teachers to teach them.

This is why I believe that the education of our children should be this nation's number one national priority in this time of peace and prosperity. I also believe that this is the patriotic thing to do as well.

Like many of you I had the opportunity to see the movie, "Saving Private Ryan." It is a wonderful movie that acknowledges the sacrifice of a generation of Americans who did their duty in World War II. Tom Hanks plays Captain Miller, an English teacher, who does what he has to do, even at the risk of his own life. I believe that the new patriots of our time will be those Americans, young and old, who go into teaching to educate this generation of children.

And I will tell you this -- as I travel around the country, parents tell me again and again that they have very clear priorities about what we should be doing here in Washington. They want safe schools, our help in building new schools and modernizing old ones, smaller classes, and the assurance that there is a good teacher in every classroom. This is the nation's business and we need to get on with it.

If Congress is serious about getting dollars to the classrooms, I urge them to enact our legislation to modernize our schools and reduce class size by hiring 100,000 new teachers. Rearranging existing programs, which seems to be the intent of the Congress, does nothing to address the real challenges facing schools today. In addition, Congress should fully fund the President's initiatives in the Appropriations bill that they are now considering.

The focus of my speech is on what we must do to prepare the next generation of teachers and this is why I am releasing a report today entitled, "Promising Practices" which highlights new ways that we can improve teacher quality. This publication was developed following a national search for models of excellence that address the needs at every stage of a teacher's career.

In preparing my remarks I have had the good advice of three members of my staff -- two former National Teachers of the Year -- Terry Dozier and Mary Beth Blegen -- as well as that of Paul Schwarz, the former principal of a nationally recognized high school -- Central Park East in New York City. Like all good teachers Terry, Mary Beth and Paul have clear opinions about how we can improve American education. In other words, they do not mince words. So I won't either.

Missing the Mark in Recruiting New Teachers

I am concerned that we are missing the mark when it comes to preparing the next generation of teachers. We do not seem to recognize the magnitude of the task ahead. In the next ten years, we need to recruit 2.2 million teachers. One-half to two-thirds of these teachers will be first time teachers.

We have more than a million veteran teachers on the verge of retiring. The first chart attached to my speech makes this point very vividly. By my reckoning, we are about five years away from a very dramatic change in our teaching force.

The vast majority of these experienced teachers who are about to retire are women. This, in fact, may be the last generation of women who went into teaching because there were limited

opportunities in other fields. In 1998, women have many more career options -- and that is a very good thing for our nation. These new opportunities for women will require us, then, to work much, much harder to recruit and train a new generation of teachers.

Many people ask me whether we have a teacher shortage. My answer is yes. We face a shortage of high quality teachers. We are already seeing spot shortages developing in specific fields of expertise -- math, science, special education and bilingual education. The recent news that New York City recruited math teachers from Austria highlights this growing dynamic.

School districts usually find a way to put somebody in front of every classroom, and that is the problem. Too many school districts are sacrificing quality for quantity to meet the immediate demand of putting a warm body in front of a classroom. This is a mistake. Even now, too many school districts are issuing emergency licenses.

Many of these emergency teachers are dedicated and want to do their best. But I have heard about and read too many horror stories about provisional teachers who are teaching by the seat of their pants with no preparation and no guidance.

The coming wave of retirements has enormous implications in our continuing effort to raise standards, to develop successful recruitment strategies, and prepare new teachers. We also need to recognize that the teaching profession is dramatically changing -- the use of computers, teaching in teams, and the recognition that children learn in many different ways -- are just three of the many factors reshaping this demanding profession.

Three other dynamics also require our attention: the increasing diversity of our classrooms and the lack of diversity of our teaching force; the increasing number of special education children and Limited English Proficient (LEP) children in the regular classroom and teachers who lack the training to teach them; and the need for many more incentives to keep veteran teachers up-to-date and in the classroom.

What is Wrong with the System

I believe we also need to take a hard look at the very structure of our current teaching system and get on with the task of modernizing it as well. We cannot allow an outdated teaching system to frustrate and even destroy the hopes and dreams of too many teachers.

The task is multi-dimensional. For example, too many teacher education programs are focused on theory and not enough on clinical experience.

Also, the current certification process is a cumbersome obstacle course that has little to do with excellence and much more to do with filling out paperwork.

And once a new teacher enters the classroom we allow a perverse "sink or swim" approach to define the first years in teaching. New teachers are usually assigned the most difficult classes in addition to all the extra-curricular activities that no one else wants to supervise. Then we wonder why we lose 22% of new teachers in the first three years -- and close to 50% in our urban areas.

This churning process and over-reliance on emergency teachers just doesn't cut it in my opinion. Imagine the outcry if a quarter of all new doctors left the profession after their first three years. This is why I encourage local school districts to develop some type of long-term induction or mentoring program to help new teachers stay in the profession.

Creating a National Partnership

Education, as I have said many times before, is a state responsibility, a local function and a national priority. We cannot address the task at hand in a piecemeal fashion. We need a nationwide partnership among K-12 leaders, our higher education community, and political leaders at all levels.

Now a great deal of effort has gone into improving and supporting the teaching profession in the last decade. The National Commission on Teaching led by Governor Jim Hunt of North Carolina and Linda Darling Hammond has provided an excellent "road map" to improve the teaching profession. This is all to the good. But now we need to make things happen and go to a new level of intensity.

And I assure you -- we will place a very strong emphasis on teacher quality when we ask the Congress to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act next year. The bipartisan leaders of the Congressional education committee understand that need, and we will be working with them to shape that legislation.

Improving Recruitment

There are other steps we can take now to encourage more Americans to enter the teaching profession.

The Clinton Administration strongly supports the Feinstein-Boxer Amendment to the Higher Education Act that will provide Pell Grants for a fifth year to those college students who want to become teachers and need another year to meet state fifth year requirements. This is particularly important to the state of California which has the daunting task of recruiting 250,000 teachers in the next decade.

I am pleased that strong support is developing in the Congress for improvements in teacher education and standards. The Administration will continue to press the Congress to pass our proposal to recruit nearly 35,000 teachers over the next five years for underserved areas. As members meet today to advance this higher education legislation, I urge them to support our recruitment proposals.

This important piece of legislation will almost certainly include valuable new teacher loan forgiveness provisions that have been championed by Senator Kennedy.

I also urge Congress to fund the President's initiative to train new teachers in technology.

I support the creation of some type of national job bank to match teachers with districts with a growing shortage of quality teachers. There are wide regional variations in the need for teachers. We can do a lot to help get teachers in different parts of the country matched with school districts in other regions that are facing growing shortages.

At the same time, the increasing mobility of Americans is going to require states and school districts to take a serious look at the portability of teacher credentials, their years in service, and pensions. We do not need artificial shortages developing because states have not brought their policies up-to-date.

Our federal efforts to enlist millions of Americans to go into teaching can have an impact. Our best hope, however, is the strong encouragement of parents and grandparents whose lives have been touched by good teachers. I get distressed when I hear stories about parents discouraging their children from going into teaching. Teaching is about serving your country and being patriotic.

I also challenge the myth that teaching is only for those who can't

cut it in other professions. Anyone who has ever spent an hour in a classroom full of demanding second graders or had the challenge of motivating a group of teenagers knows how difficult the job can be.

America's teachers are some of the most idealistic and patriotic Americans in this country. I am extremely proud of them. So many of them have entered teaching because they want to change the world and many of them do.

What are our other challenges?

Challenges to America's Higher Education Community

I challenge the leaders of America's great colleges and universities to make teacher education a much higher day-to-day priority. Teaching teachers has to be the mission of the entire university. Our nation's colleges of education can no longer be quiet backwaters that get a mere mention in the annual report to university trustees. College administrators who complain about the high cost of remedial classes would do well to pay more attention to how they prepare teachers. Here several suggestions come to mind.

First, colleges of education should give basic skills tests to students entering teacher education programs prior to their acceptance and at the same time hold themselves more accountable for their graduates. This is why I endorse the thrust for accountability by Senator Bingaman and Representative George Miller.

Second, stronger links must be developed between our colleges of arts and sciences and colleges of education. Future teachers should major in the subject they want to teach, and that type of course work takes place in the colleges of arts and sciences.

Third, I urge teacher prep programs to put a much stronger focus on giving future teachers rigorous grounding in developing the skills they need to teach. It is harder than you think. Knowing your content is not enough. There is a skill and a craft to it all, and that is especially true when it comes to teaching reading. This is why I believe that every teacher who is seeking a certificate in elementary education should have solid preparation in reading.

One of the major aspects of the reading bill now up in the Congress is strong support for increased professional development for reading. I support this effort and ask the Congress to pass this needed legislation. We will never raise standards if we just stay with the status quo when it comes to

improving literacy.

Fourth, colleges of education need to recognize that our special education and LEP populations are growing and deserve much more of their attention as they prepare teachers.

Finally, I urge colleges and universities to develop much stronger links with local schools. The El Paso school district, which we feature in our report "Promising Practices," has dramatically improved its test scores by working hand-in-hand with the University of Texas in El Paso to improve teacher education.

Challenges to State Government and Local School Districts

State governments and local school districts have a powerful role to play in reshaping the teaching profession.

This is why I challenge every state to create a demanding but flexible certification process. Becoming a teacher should not be an endurance test that requires future teachers to overcome a bureaucratic maze of hoops and paperwork.

I believe a much stronger focus should be placed on assessing the knowledge and skills of future teachers however they got them. This is why I support rigorous alternative pathways to teaching which can be so helpful in recruiting mid-career professionals to the teaching profession.

I challenge every state to eliminate the practice of granting emergency licenses within the next five years. You cannot set standards and then immediately discard them when the need for another warm body arises. New York State has taken the lead in doing away with emergency licenses and other states should follow this good example.

At the same time, we cannot challenge high poverty schools to raise their standards and then shortchange them by doing nothing to help them recruit the best teachers. This is why we are pushing the Congress to pass our strong teacher recruitment initiative. At the same time, our nation's urban areas have to do their part as well. Outdated hiring practices sometimes seem to be the reason that they are losing good candidates for teaching positions to suburban school districts.

State and local school districts must also end the practice of teaching "out of field." (Over 30% of all math teachers, for example, are now teaching out of field.) I believe that every teacher, at a minimum, should have a minor in the subject that

they teach.

I cannot even begin to tell you how baffled foreign education ministers are who visit me when I explain our unusual habit of allowing teachers to teach "out of field."

Incentives for Veteran Teachers

As we seek to raise standards for our students, we need to work much harder at giving veteran teachers the opportunity to keep on learning. Current professional development courses with their emphasis on workshops that put a premium on "seat time" really need to become a thing of the past.

We are developing more and more evidence that school districts that invest in quality professional development for their teachers see positive results in the classroom. The good work of Tony Alvarado in District 2 in New York City, who made sure learning new skills was an everyday experience for his teachers is a wonderful national model.

We need other incentives as well. The current system of providing salary increases for credits earned seems flawed. There is often no connection between the credits earned by a teacher and what he or she actually teaches in the classroom. And, there is little incentive to encourage teachers to gain more knowledge or improve specific skills for their classrooms. Excellence, in a word, is not rewarded.

Only 14 states, for example, currently provide salary supplements to those teachers who set out to become master teachers through the National Board Certification process. As a result many of the best teachers leave the classroom to get a bigger paycheck as a school administrator.

teachers leave the classroom to get a bigger paycheck as a school administrator.

This is why I ask states and local school districts to take a good look at a new and developing concept called "knowledge and skill-based pay." Put simply, teachers are paid extra for new skills and knowledge they acquire. Teachers under this system get rewarded for specific skills and knowledge that help a school reach its own established goals.

Now, a word about teacher salaries. As I have said many times before, we cannot expect to get good teachers on the cheap. Mary Beth Blegen, the national teacher of the year in 1996, was being paid a \$36,000 salary with 30 years of experience -- a

fraction of what she deserved -- and what other professionals expect after years in service.

If we are going to entice more Americans to enter teaching we need to offer them fair and competitive salaries. And, if we are going to ask teachers to meet new and demanding standards we also need to pay them for their effort.

States like Connecticut and North Carolina have had the good sense to raise standards for teachers and raise salaries at the same time. The results in the classroom are promising. I believe every state would be wise to follow their good example.

If we really want to recruit and retain good teachers we need to let them teach in first class school buildings. What kind of message do we send our children and our teachers when we ask them to go to a run down school building just a mile down the road from an immaculate prison? President Clinton has proposed a very strong school construction initiative. Congress needs to get off the dime and pass it.

In this speech, I have challenged many different groups to come forward and join a national partnership for excellence in teaching. It seems appropriate to end my remarks by taking a moment to talk to America's teachers. You are the heart and soul of the renaissance of American education. As I travel throughout the country, I have the opportunity to meet many of you. Each time I am struck by how important, yet how difficult, your job is.

As teachers, you are being asked to know more and do more than ever before. Please continue your good work and go out of your way to recruit new teachers. Let others know the joy you get from teaching. Help the struggling teacher to improve -- and help to counsel out of the profession those who cannot. And make the effort to measure yourselves against the best.

I end now with a quote from an old friend of mine from South Carolina, the writer Pat Conroy. This quote is from his novel *Prince of Tides*. In this passage, Tom, a teacher who is the main character of the book is asked why he chose to "sell himself short" when he was so talented and could have done anything in his life.

Tom's reply goes like this, " There's no word in the language that I revere more than "teacher." None. "My heart sings" he says, "when a kid refers to me as his teacher and it always has. I've honored myself and the entire family of man by becoming a teacher."

With that I thank all teachers on behalf of the American people.
Thank you.

-###-

[[Return to Speeches and Testimony page](#)]



Last Updated -- September 25, 1998, (pjk/gkp)

Summary of HEA Title V Task Force Meeting
April 10, 1997

*Make
concepts +
append!*

Presentation by Dr. Terry Woodin from the National Science Foundation

Dr. Woodin briefed us on NSF's projects relating to the reform of undergraduate teacher preparation in math and science. NSF has two programs that focus on teacher preparation. (Teacher preparation reform is encouraged through other programs as well, but in these other programs the efforts are less systemic and focused within a discipline.)

The Alliance for Minority Participation program seeks to improve the diversity of the research force by encouraging minorities to receive PhDs in science and engineering. The program recently expanded its focus to teacher preparation as well.

The Collaboratives for Excellence in Teacher Preparation, for which Terry W. is responsible, is NSF's major thrust in teacher preparation. NSF has devoted \$18 million to teacher preparation; \$12-14 million of that funding goes to the Collaboratives. Collaborative projects receive \$5 million, 5-year grants. There are currently 13 collaboratives (which include a total of 110 institutions), and there will be 16 collaboratives in June. The projects are multi-institutional and, within each institution, multi-departmental. They include arts and science faculty working with the education faculty so that *both* faculties feel responsible for teacher preparation and so that both will treat students preparing to become teachers as important students. The collaboratives also tie in school systems by including teacher mentors, administrators, and support for novice teachers. Some projects include entire states.

There are two challenging issues in reforming teacher preparation. The first: certification issues, which are drivers for other reform efforts. NSF recently co-sponsored a meeting with Chief State School Officers and the National Research Council as well as schools of education and arts and science faculty to discuss what new math and science standards mean for state certification standards and what changes are needed. (The report from this meeting may be found at <http://www.nap.edu>.) Another challenge is assessment and evaluation. What kinds of information can we put in the hands of arts and science faculty so that they see their efforts in teacher preparation as worthwhile? What kinds of indicators and measures do we have to prove that the projects have been successful enterprises? How does one keep the momentum going, given the realities of working across disparate systems?

Terry D. asked how the program is structured in legislation. Terry W. outlined the grant process, including pre-proposals reviewed by teams of three, and full proposals. Tom clarified that the statutory frameworks of NSF and ED are very different. NSF has an organic act, and then a National Science Board that provides direction and policy. Most of the programs are not in statute; they are flexible and discretionary.

Terry D. asked what lessons NSF has learned and what changes they'd make. Terry W. said that she wouldn't redesign the program announcement -- just the way she managed the program. She would have brought in the evaluators of the program from the beginning. She also would do more on-site monitoring, including talking to students and faculty.

Arthur asked how projects were able to bring about the partnerships. Terry W. said that the Principal Investigators in the leadership teams are key. It takes a certain type of person and a good listener to make it work.

Tom said that NSF is 4 years into the program and asked how it is going, given that undergraduate teacher preparation is often thought to be an intractable problem about which the federal government can do little. Terry W. answered that it's a good idea to keep programs to improve teacher preparation separate from programs for teacher enhancement, since the former gets swallowed by the latter. She

said that when the administration of an institution of higher education gets involved, that's when real reform happens and a difference is made; faculty are understandably skeptical of reform efforts until they see its visible signs, such as pay that's based on involvement in reform activities. It takes a year or two to make sure that the tenure committees follow the words of the IHE administrations.

Tom asked whether NSF's focus on only math and science has been an impediment to comprehensive reform. Will the projects' activities have an effect on the preparation of English teachers, as well? Terry W. answered that the projects won't tell us that, but that overall reform does seem to be happening in some places. Barbara asked how much real cooperation is emerging between arts and sciences and colleges of education. Terry W. said that the level of cooperation is highly variable among projects, and sometimes within projects as deans change.

Alicia asked whether the institutions in the collaboratives are public colleges. Terry W. replied that some of them are; in Montana's project, for example, all of the 4-year colleges participate, as well as all 7 of the tribal colleges in the state.

Terry D. asked whether the money is awarded to the lead university. Terry W. said yes but that money flow varies greatly among different projects. Subgrants go to other institutions. The money flow in some projects is highly centralized and the university reviews each applying institution; others meet together on more equal footing.

Frances mentioned the importance of on-site monitoring. NSF doesn't really do on-site monitoring. Once a year, "visiting committees" made up of experts in the field give NSF advice and conduct a few site visits. In the third year, the projects do a report. NSF said that if they had more funding, they would use it for more travel to the sites.

Title V meeting

First, bagels and orange juice to celebrate *Alicia Coro Hoffman's* recent wedding!!!

Vision paper

The vision paper was sent out to the forum participants, but we can still make changes. Everyone, please read it carefully and suggest what changes you think should be made.

Dena Stoner's proposal/ Flagships

Terry D. said that everyone to whom she's talked (including Mike Smith) about the flagship idea has been very interested. Perhaps there are some things we could marry with it from the NSF presentation. We need to think about how to achieve collaboration and partnership and to ensure that the K-12 community comes to the table with power and resources. How can we get support from a broad constituency? The K-12 community wants to be represented in our Title V proposal; Dena's idea has appeal for this reason.

Frances said that she loves Dena's proposal. Alicia said, however, that the problem is that she still proposes short-term programs. NSF funds their programs for five years; change will take a long-term investment. One- to two- year grant programs will not change teacher preparation. We can already do the kinds of things that Dena calls for. Clare clarified that Dena is talking about two-year planning grants followed by 5-year program grants (and possible renewal), so it is in fact more long-term. Alicia then said that we should focus on institutions of higher education if we want to change the ways teachers are prepared; however, we do not want to alienate CEDaR and the K-12 community, which lobbies on the Hill.

Vicki said that Congress recently asked, regarding the Minority-Teacher Recruitment program, what other education funds the institutions received. Congress is looking across the board at these issues. However, Tom cautioned not to get too excited about that question, which probably came from the Appropriations Committee.

Pat said that she's not sure how Dena proposes that the funds flow to the K-12 schools, giving them a partnership role, by using one grant. Terry responded that this is unclear; Dena is struggling with how to involve K-12 schools as partners and how to operationalize the partnership. Linda Quinn's school received Goals 2000 funds in order to "go shopping" for a university with which to partner, but this isn't an option in many rural places. Pat asked whether Dena proposes to give money to both K-12 schools and universities and to hope that they get together. Clare responded that, under Dena's plan, there are two phases. Planning grants are awarded separately to K-12 schools and universities, so that the K-12 schools have independent funds. In the implementation phase, the two partners decide by creating a budget who will do what, and apply as a partnership for funds. In this way, the K-12 schools are not completely at the mercy of universities.

Terry asked how we can make sure that the two get together. Audrey said that in the Teacher Corps model, they are forced to partner by the guidelines; the partners had to apply with a single application and to submit a partnership agreement in their proposal. However, the funds eventually were given to the IHE. It was very effective that the partnership requirement was written in the law. The Teacher Corps program was successful at getting colleges of education to work with schools; however, it was difficult to get the arts and sciences to buy in. That was the biggest problem. Many partnerships already exist. Just about all colleges of education have a plan to work with school districts. We need to work on a strong arts and sciences piece. Barbara agreed that the connection to the arts and sciences is the weak link. There are good examples out there (Goodlad).

Pat suggested using the Baldrige Award approach to identify the flagships, instead of a grant competition. Terry asked how Baldrige would differ from a grant. Pat replied that the process used to identify the

models would be different because in a grant competition we can't do the site visits that would be necessary to identify the best models. Tom said, however, that we can do site visits in grant competitions. It's having the time and money to do them that's the issue.

Terry asked whether the group agrees that we want to figure out a way to grant K-12 schools clout in the partnerships. Without that, the K-12 folks, who know best what teachers need, have no real voice. Pat mentioned the option of a budget set-aside for the K-12 schools, or a 50-50 split of funds. Tom said that he doesn't know how many of those decisions need to be made now. Terry said that there seems to be a consensus that we want the K-12 schools to be partners with resources with which to come to the table. Tom added that this is different from our original notion; this new idea is closer to the Professional Development School model. Jon Schnur said that this shows us that the details do matter. Dena's implementation grants would include funds for both K-12 and IHEs, a truly equal 50/50 split.

Alicia asked whether we advocate a regional-based program, including model institutions from different regions -- or whether we prefer a free-for-all program in which we can't influence regional diversity. We could have 5 or 10 regions, in that way giving opportunity to different parts of the country. In addition, if these are long-term grants, most institutions never even get a chance to apply.

Terry said, regarding selection of flagships, that Mike Smith favored granting funds to those institutions that really produce teachers, not to schools like Harvard and Stanford. Flagships should have excellent teacher preparation, not necessarily excellent policy centers. Clare said that flagships should be both good schools and those that will make a difference by producing teachers. Vicki asked about a good school like, for example, Seattle University; what if it wanted to be a flagship? It perhaps doesn't produce many teachers now, but maybe it could in three years or so. Pat said that when they do, they can apply. Frances said that the bottom line is that flagships must indicate quality. Tom suggested that a flagship could be a smaller institution as long as it is truly a teacher preparation institution.

Terry said that we'll have to define flagships and that they would have to work with others. She steered the conversation back to the K-12 link.

Alicia said that there is nothing stopping the flagships from entering into partnerships with K-12 schools. Jon responded that that is very different from giving money directly to the schools. Sue asked, doesn't giving funds separately to K-12 schools and institutions presume that they won't stay together in a partnership? Aren't we encouraging them NOT to work together by separating the funds? We should structure the program so that they will work together. We simply wouldn't fund one if it weren't a true partnership.

Richard added another option: make sure that the criteria for selection clarify the need for teachers in K-12 schools to be involved in planning what they need from the university. Sue said that the idea is that master teachers will be in the university also, providing instruction to future teachers. Clare said that, from her background in K-12 education, she has reservations about the partnerships because from the K-12 perspective, the partnership is always described by the university. Parity is not common. The university views partnerships with K-12 schools differently than K-12 schools see these partnerships.

Sue agreed that this is an issue, but said that we are talking about grants to 5 or 10 model institutions. They will have to show us true partnerships. Richard added that if the selection process includes site visits, we can talk to the partners to see whether the partnership is indeed real. Peggy said that we do similar thing now, in School-to-Work. Terry agreed with Sue that there is a difference between a broad program and 5-10 grants. She has strong feelings about ensuring parity for K-12 schools in a broad program; however, with a small program, site visits will determine the strength of the partnerships.

Frances said that, as a teacher, she never felt an equal partnership with universities. Clare asked whether this is a funding issue. Frances suggested giving the money to K-12 schools, and letting them tell

universities what they need. Audrey replied that this will not change colleges of education, and suggested instead co-proposal managers (or principal investigators). Frances asked why it wouldn't effect change. Alicia answered that the Eisenhower program already gives funds to the K-12 level; it can include pre-service, but the program just doesn't reform the schools of education. Barbara said that we should award grants to those institutions that already show evidence of equal partnership.

Terry said that we have consensus that this evidence of parity needs to be there. Tom added that we need a strong message about parity in the legislation. Sue said that some of the funds could be controlled by the K-12 school; we just don't need to give two grants. Jon clarified that Dena's proposal agreed that some of the funds must go to the K-12 level. Vicki said that her program, Minority Teacher Recruitment, just funded a school district for the first time, and that that was a wake-up call for the universities. She liked Audrey's idea of having co-principle investigators. Terry said that the funds do not have to be split 50/50, as long as the partnerships are jointly administered. Sue reminded us that we are, after all, trying to change the institution of higher education.

Terry said that it seems we're in agreement; we just need to look at the details. We'll need a strong statement in the legislation about partnerships, to ensure that clinical settings get the money that they need to do what they want to do. Under the flagship idea, there will already be a strong partnership; we're not creating one. Maybe we could satisfy Dena's people with this idea. We need to market our proposal, and highlight that we've heard the K-12 concerns and are concerned as well. Tom said that we could add that our proposal isn't that different from their ideas.

Jon warned us that there will be considerable pressure, within the Department and in Congress, to expand the number of IHEs that can receive grants. This expansion would make it much more difficult to address the K-12 concerns. Sue added that it would also be difficult to deliver the amount of money that's needed to more than 5-10 institutions. Alicia agreed; the need for change requires a large, long-term investment, not a spreading out of funds. Sue then cautioned that wanting a long-term impact seems to argue also for spreading out the funds, so that we can impact many schools. Terry said that we should find out how many institutions received how much money in the Flexner scenario.

Terry prefaced her next remark by saying that she may be naive and idealist, and that Susan Fröst said that our idea would get only 10 votes in Congress -- but that if we decide that the flagship idea is the most effective approach, then expanding the number of institutions for political popularity is wrong. We can't compromise before we even make our proposal. Tom said that another thing to keep in mind is that the burden at OMB and in Congress is on those who want more money.

Audrey mentioned the need to build into the institutions a process that will continue at the end of the grants so that the reform continues. This should be written in the legislation. Alicia added that we could fund the grantees for additional years if they are doing a good job. Audrey reiterated the need for the institutions to be able to continue the efforts, without our grant support. Terry said that we can build matching funds into the program from the beginning.

Sue asked how much will it cost to do what we want to do. If we know this, then when people press us to expand the program, we can show them how hard it would be, given the investment that is needed for each institution. Terry suggested that, since Mike Smith has given us funding in order to bring in experts who can help us with the details of our proposal, they could help us estimate the cost. Pat warned that it is possible to give too much money, because this undermines the institution's possibility of continuing the reforms.

Barbara asked about what we hope will be the outcome of the flagships -- institutions spreading good ideas? Connections to state reform efforts? Alicia said that there are many pieces of it; we do envision institutions working on a regional basis with each flagship, and they would have to work with states and deal with state certification issues. Terry said that we will require the production of "deliverables" -- case

studies that can be used by others who don't have the resources to develop curriculum models. This is another end result: others looking to flagships when re-designing their programs. And finally, as the Flexner approach did for medical schools, flagships will ultimately generate an agreed upon curriculum for teacher preparation. We just can't necessarily say it in those words publicly.

Terry noted that we also face pressure from the White House. The President has decided to do a commencement address at a college of education and will probably want to announce what we are doing in Title V. She asked the group whether we have reached enough agreement about our broad framework that it's now time to bring in an outside consultant to help with the details. Frances replied that, before we can do a budget, we need a clear idea of our proposal; we have more work to do. Sue said that we should bring in a K-12 person to help us figure out the costs of what we envision.

Jon clarified his earlier remark by saying that he is not suggesting that we water down our idea; he just wants us to be ready for the pressures that we'll face from other groups and Congress. If we can develop a preliminary budget that's in the ballpark, it will be very clear why we can't expand our idea to 100 institutions. Perhaps we could have a discussion with Terry Peterson and Mike Smith to work on a strategy for protecting our focus on a small number of institutions. Alicia said that we can also point out that if, as in NSF's program, other institutions receive money as well, and matching funds are required, in a few years we will have reached more than just a few institutions.

Tom Risado (?) from OMB made a surprise appearance at the meeting. He said that OMB will be looking at our Title V proposal to see how it relates to other ED programs and how it will be different from what other federal agencies are doing. Is there overlap across the federal government (for example, between ED and NSF)?

Tom Corwin responded that NSF is probably the only agency with a program focusing on reform of teacher preparation. We will need to articulate clearly how our proposal is different from what they are doing and how we can do it better. The NSF Collaboratives are not flagships; the grants are just \$1 million a year.

Terry said that Dena's proposal emphasizes urban centers and preparing teachers to teach in the most challenging environments. Do we want to make this a top priority? Barbara responded that this would mean that we'd be reaching just urban institutions and excluding others. Sue added that perhaps it could be a focus (thought not an exclusive one) -- after all, what is the value of the program if it doesn't provide help in the toughest situations? Audrey commented that we need to include at least one rural institution. Vicki suggested either urban or rural schools, with a certain percentage of minority students, but Tom said that stating a set percentage is not a good idea. Alicia said that we'll also be reaching satellite institutions, which can include urban schools. Tom reminded us that just because an institution is urban does not mean that it is preparing its students to teach in that urban community; Nancy Zimpher's institution (Ohio State), for example, had not been doing that, and is now redesigning its mission. Jon said that he likes the urban focus -- although this idea is a "non-starter" with some Congressmen such as Chairman Jeffords, who is from Vermont.

Terry asked a question about the overall Title V proposal: Are we still planning to propose a broad authority in addition to the flagship idea? Alicia said that there are problems with doing this because we already have a general authority. Terry replied, and others agreed, that Tom did a good job of showing why ours would be different. We need someplace to put our other Title V ideas-- support for INTASC, for example.

Jon asked for clarification on the group's thoughts on professional development for administrators. We agreed that we do want this focus in the flagship idea and in the broader authority.

Next steps

The group agreed to go forward with the options paper, maintaining all 3 options (after Tom updates it based on our latest meetings). The group consensus on Minority Teacher Recruitment is that we continue to support it with an increase in funding. Terry will set up a meeting with Mike Smith, Terry Peterson, maybe Mike Cohen, David Longanecker, Maureen McLaughlin, Ray Cortinez, Kay Casstevens and Gerry Tirozzi to present our ideas.

The Minority Teacher Recruitment Program: Policy Options, Pragmatic Concerns and Political Realities

The legislative process is filled with dilemmas. Throughout the process, decisions are made for policy, pragmatic, and political reasons. During the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act, the decision of what to do with the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program illustrates just how complicated these decisions can become.

The growing diversity of America's student population has led to an unprecedented demand for teachers of color. Minority students comprise 30% of the K-12 student population while only 13% of teachers are minorities. More than 40% of all schools do not have even one teacher of color. The gap between the make up of the student population and the teaching force is growing. At a time when America's teaching force is becoming increasingly white and female, the student population is projected to be 37% minority by 2003.

Given these dramatic statistics, there was never any doubt that the teacher recruitment piece of the Administration's proposal for Title V of the Higher Education Act would address the need for more teachers of color in American classrooms. However, while recruiting, preparing, and retaining more minority teachers was clearly a priority, it was not the only recruitment challenge facing the nation. In addition to shortages of minority teachers, there were nationwide shortages of math, science, special education and bilingual teachers. Data from the National Center for Education Statistics revealed that over the next ten years, communities throughout the nation would face severe teacher shortages of all kinds. American schools would need to hire more than 2.2 million teachers due to increased student enrollments and massive retirements of a veteran teaching force.

Schools that face shortages of qualified teachers often are forced to hire less qualified individuals. The impact of this reality on high-poverty schools is clear. As the attached graph shows, the very students who need the best prepared teachers because of the challenges that poverty brings to the classroom often have teachers who are the least qualified. As the Administration worked to create its teacher recruitment proposal, it sought to address the inequities that existed between high poverty and low poverty school districts when it comes to qualified teachers of all kinds. How to address these inequities, however, was unclear.

The most popular policy option among Democrats and Republicans was loan forgiveness for individuals who agree to teach in high-poverty schools. The problem with this option, however, was that the Government Accounting Agency (GAO), responsible for reporting to Congress on the effectiveness of federal programs, had found no evidence that this approach actually increased the number of individuals entering teaching nor kept those that did become teachers in communities with the highest need. According to GAO reports, loan forgiveness simply provided money to individuals who had already decided to become teachers, many of whom were white and middle class.

Once educated, these individuals tended to return to their suburban communities rather than complete their service requirement in high-need schools.

Another approach explored was that taken by the medical profession in the 1970=s. In the National Health Service Corps, individuals had their education paid for in exchange for setting up their medical practice in remote rural areas. This approach also was not successful because, after a brief stint in the rural communities, most newly trained doctors chose to return to more affluent urban and suburban areas.

The DeWitt Wallace-Reader=s Digest Foundation offered another approach to recruiting and retaining qualified teachers in communities with the highest need. The Foundation hypothesized that high-poverty communities needed to grow their own teachers. In other words, they needed to invest in individuals already living in the community who would remain there once their training was complete. Since 1987 DeWitt Wallace-Reader=s Digest had invested more than \$10 million in their Pathways to Teaching Program. Early evaluations of the program were promising. Unlike loan forgiveness, which seemed to provide financial assistance to individuals already committed to becoming teachers, the Pathways to Teaching Program had reached individuals who would not have otherwise entered the profession. For example, many of the Pathways programs focused on helping paraprofessionals become fully certified to teach. Through the Pathways Program, paraprofessionals who had been working as aides in schools for 10-15 years completed the necessary training to become teachers. Even more impressive was the fact that large percentages of these individuals, once trained, stayed in the communities and were evaluated as above average teachers.

Given the Administration=s desire to address the teacher workforce inequities that existed between high-poverty and low-poverty school districts and the impressive evidence that a grow your own approach was most effective in recruiting and retaining qualified teachers in high-poverty areas, the Title V Task Force proposed to address teacher recruitment through competitive grants to partnerships between high-poverty school districts and institutions of higher education. The partnerships would identify the kinds of teachers needed in the district and a potential pool of candidates, and then design a program that met the needs of the targeted individuals. For example, the partnership might determine that math, science, or minority teachers were needed. Depending on the location of the district, the partnership might target retired military personnel, paraprofessionals, or bright high schools seniors in their recruitment efforts. Teacher candidates would receive scholarships, high-quality preparation, and support services in exchange for teaching at least three years in the partnership district.

Because 92% of large urban public schools reported an immediate demand for more minority teachers, the Title V Task Force felt certain that allowing the recruitment partnerships to identify the kinds of teachers needed in high-poverty areas would result in many partnerships focusing on recruiting minority teachers. Therefore, we believed this approach would help address the need for greater diversity in America=s teaching force. However, the Title V Task Force still faced a dilemma about the Minority Teacher

Recruitment Program, the only program in Title V that was currently funded. Should it be maintained or should it be eliminated and folded into the larger recruitment proposal?

From a policy perspective the choice seemed clear. The Title V Task Force had made the decision to craft a proposal that would be coherent and conceptually defensible. The goal was to avoid the pitfall of the current Title V, which authorized numerous, small programs and pet projects, but failed to generate funding support. Although authorized at more than \$400 million, only the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program at \$2.2 million was funded in 1997. Continuing the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program as part of the Administration's proposal would open the door to what could become a flood of small, disconnected programs. Lack of coherence in Title V would greatly diminish our chances of passing and funding any programs that would address in a significant way the nation's need to recruit and prepare over a million teachers in the next decade.

There were basic legal questions as well. Recent court decisions called into question whether focusing a program on minority teacher recruitment was legally defensible. In Hopwood v. Texas (1997), the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals found consideration of race and ethnicity Afor the purpose of achieving a diverse student body [not to be of] compelling interest under the Fourteenth Amendment.≡

For these reasons, the Title V Task Force favored eliminating the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program and folding it into the larger teacher recruitment proposal. Pragmatic and political considerations, however, made the favored option problematic.

As the only Title V program that had been consistently funded by Congress, the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program clearly had support. Lobbyists for Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCUs) and Hispanic-serving institutions would certainly fight to retain a program that directly helped to support their institutions, however underfunded it was. Eliminating funding for the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program in the budget might incur the wrath of the Black Caucus, an important group for the Administration. The Department of Education leaders held a deep concern that risking a fight among our allies over a mere \$2.2 million was not wise. We could tie ourselves up, losing the momentum that had followed the Presidential announcement of the Administration's Title V proposal. A fight over the future of the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program might risk Democratic support for the Administration's entire proposal. In addition, the President had launched his race initiative on June 13, 1997 at a speech at the University of California at San Diego. Eliminating the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program might be viewed as a retreat from this highly publicized effort to bring attention to racial inequities and to improve race relations in America.

The Republicans had a very different perspective on teacher recruitment. The Republican leadership of both the House and the Senate did not believe America was facing a teacher shortage. House Chairman William Goodling of Pennsylvania represented a state that produces more teachers than it needs and Senate Chairman James Jeffords of Vermont was not hearing dire reports of an impending teacher shortage in his state. Overall, the Republican position was one which argued that we did not need to

recruit more people into teaching. They pointed out that there were many qualified people with teaching degrees in America who were not currently teaching. Therefore, the solution was not to recruit and prepare more teachers. The solution was to get qualified people already in our communities into our classrooms and to attract smarter people into teaching. In particular, they wanted to unlock the education establishment's stranglehold on teacher licensure and certification to enable talented people with academic, not education, degrees to become teachers.

Because there was no Republican support for any proposal that addressed teacher recruitment, eliminating the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program did not pose a problem for Republicans. In fact, one of their priorities in the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act was to eliminate or consolidate programs. As the majority party, the Republican position needed to be carefully considered by the Administration. No Title V proposal could pass without their support.

With such conflicting policy, pragmatic, and political considerations, no decision would be without risk. As leader of the Title V Task Force, I had repeatedly urged my colleagues to resist compromising our policy position before we submitted the Administration's proposal to Congress. I recognized that the democratic process required compromise, but I believed that we should go forward with the strongest proposal possible. Compromise should begin from a position of intellectual strength. Therefore, making decisions based on pragmatic or political considerations too early in the process seemed self-defeating. On the other hand, successfully maneuvering through the legislative process required careful attention to the realities of politics. If we did not consider the political realities from the very beginning, our Title V proposal would be declared dead on arrival.

What, then, should the Administration do with the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program?



1. Why is the recruitment of minority teachers important?
2. What information and factors justified the need for a minority teacher recruitment program?
3. What information and factors argued against retaining a separate Minority Teacher Recruitment Program?

4. Which factors seemed most compelling?
5. Which option carried a greater political risk? Why?
6. With six year terms, should senators be expected to take a larger view than members of the House whose two year terms make them more vulnerable to the views of the constituents? In this case, why do you think Senator Jeffords and Representative Goodling took the same approach to the issue of minority teacher recruitment?
7. What other options might be considered?
8. On what basis should the Administration make its decision on what to do with the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program?
9. What other information might be needed before making the final decision?

Extra Credit: Download from the Internet the President's speech of June 13, 1997 at the University of California at San Diego and press coverage of his race initiative. Assume the role of one of the members of the race initiative's advisory board. Write a letter to the Secretary of Education to convince him to continue the Minority Teacher Recruitment Program.

Vision Paper
 ① Minority Recruitment
 ② Scholarship options
 ③ Same State option
 ④ Flagships w/ Balanced Budget approach

Title V

Draft
 3/28/97

TRANSFORMING THE VISION INTO A LEGISLATIVE STRATEGY

The Title V team has developed a vision for improvement of teaching that spans the continuum of educator professional development, from initial recruitment through preservice preparation, licensure, induction, and continuing education throughout every educator's career. The next step is to translate that vision into a proposal for the reauthorization of Title V. What follows is an analysis of how we can develop that proposal.

The team's initial recommendation is that the new Title V focus mainly on the "front end" of professional development, that is, on the recruitment, initial preparation, licensure, and induction of K-12 educators. The reason for this recommendation is that the Department already has a major "in-service" program, Eisenhower Professional Development. Although Eisenhower cannot do everything -- it is underfunded, and it focuses mainly on strengthening teaching in the core academic subjects (particularly mathematics and science), not on general improvement of the profession -- the team believes that a Title V proposal that also covers continuing professional development would be perceived, in Congress and elsewhere, as overlapping with the Eisenhower program. The Department would, justifiably, have difficulty generating appropriations for two overlapping programs. Moreover, the team strongly believes that major needs in educator recruitment, preparation, licensure, and induction are not being adequately addressed through existing (primarily non-Federal efforts) and that limited Federal resources, if carefully targeted, can make a difference in those areas.

The team has identified three potential mechanisms for funding improvements in the "front end": (1) a State formula grant program; (2) a portfolio of categorical discretionary programs; and (3) a smaller number of programs (between one and three) tailored to meet to address highest-priority needs in a manner that, the team believes, can have the greatest impact. For reasons set forth below, the team believes that the third of these options is most promising.

Option 1: Propose a formula grant program

The team is aware that some members of the education community will advocate creation of a State formula grant program under Title V. Such a program would allow each State to develop improved front-end systems suitable to the State's own needs and priorities. It might also be politically attractive, as it would be less likely, than a discretionary program, to appear to involve the Department in State and local decision-making.

However, the team believes that, with limited funding under Title V, the Federal Government can achieve the most impact if it targets funds on a limited number of promising approaches. (See discussion of these approaches in the discussion of Option 3.) This type of targeting would be difficult under a formula program; more likely, any focus on real reform and improvement would be diffused.

In addition, we note that the Eisenhower State Grants program, although it is focused on inservice instruction, does authorize support for preservice activities, particularly through the portion of the program that funds competitive grants to institutions of higher education. Although it appears that States use very little Eisenhower funding on preservice concerns, creation of a second formula grant authority would, as in the earlier discussion, raise the duplication issue, and probably make it difficult to generate adequate appropriations for either Eisenhower or the new program. Thus, we appear to disagree, with those members of the community who support a formula grant, about the likelihood of obtaining funding for a formula versus a competitive program.

A final problem with the formula option is that it would take considerable resources, probably several hundred million dollars annually, to make it viable, and we are unsure that, in a tight budget environment, adequate resources would be available.

Option 2: Propose several categorical discretionary programs

Other members of the community believe that Title V should include fairly large number of discretionary programs dealing with distinct areas of need and priority — much like the current Title V. While there may be little substantive difference between, on the one hand, authorization of a group of categorical programs and, on the other, an authorization of a few broader programs encompassing a range of allowable activities, the continued Congressional concern about the plethora of Federal education programs (the myths about the 760 programs, the 32 literacy programs, etc.) makes it appear unwise to propose the creation of several different programs. Indeed, Congressional and Administration concern about the number of programs in the Department has resulted in the defunding of several Title V authorities in the last few years. Moreover, creation and funding of multiple programs would limit the Department's flexibility to respond to new needs and priorities.

Option 3: Propose between one and three authorities focused on highest-priority needs.

The team is proposing three individual programs. The HEA steering committee may decide, however, to put forward fewer than three authorities. In that case, any of the three proposals, or any combination of the three, would be acceptable.

A description of the three proposals follows.

Option 3A: A broad discretionary program focusing on promising approaches to improvement of the front end of teacher preparation.

Under a Fund for Excellence in Teaching (but a better name is needed), the Department would fund activities likely to have a national impact on the development of "a capable and committed teacher in every classroom." Within that broad authority, we would highlight the following types of activities as particularly worthy of support:

- o Funding of national reform projects focused on the improvement of teacher recruitment, preparation, licensure, or induction. For instance, the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (INTASC), a program of the Council of Chief State School Officers, is developing model core standards for licensing beginning teachers. INTASC is designing its standards to be compatible with the standards for experienced teachers developed by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS). Yet, unlike the relatively well supported NBPTS, INTASC is something of a shoestring operation, and its work is coming along much more slowly. Short-term Federal support could speed the work of the consortium and help motivate States to adopt its standards.
- o Model recruitment and preparation programs. While the Federal Government cannot, by itself, solve the problem of a pending teacher shortage (and there is reason to believe that the normal operation of the labor market may solve much of the problem), targeted efforts could help identify and validate approaches that may be followed by States, school districts, or IHEs. Several types of activities suggest themselves.

-- The Department could support model programs that enable education paraprofessionals to obtain full certification. The team finds this approach to recruitment and preparation attractive because: (1) the paraprofessional workforce is heavily

Which of the Dept. choose to fund?

minority, so programs aimed at paraprofessionals will help alleviate the under-representation of minorities in teaching; (2) minority paraprofessionals are concentrated in cities, and are unlikely to leave urban districts once they are certified, so their certification helps resolve the problem of teacher shortages in the cities; and (3) if paraprofessionals continue working during their training, the cost per person of training them may be relatively low, so a program aimed at certifying paraprofessionals may benefit from cost efficiencies.

-- The Department could support the development of model approaches to school administrator training. Research has shown conclusively that the quality of school leadership exhibited by principals and other administrators has a major impact on teaching and learning in the classroom. In addition, like teaching, school administration faces the problem of an aging labor force, and the need to recruit and train new talent in the coming years. Yet the existing array of professional development activities in the Department and other agencies does little to address the quality of administration. Because there are relatively few principals (compared to teachers), the Department may *be* able, with limited funds, to have a more immediate impact on the recruitment, preparation, and induction of administrators.

-- The Department could support the development and refinement of promising innovations like professional development schools (PDSs). PDSs, an idea first put forward by the "Holmes Group" on the reform of teacher education, employ a "teaching hospital"-type approach that links teachers colleges with elementary and secondary schools, gives prospective teachers a much more clinical education than is common in more traditional teacher ed programs, ensures that teacher college faculty have continuing, intensive involvement with K-12 schools, and allows schools to benefit from the research conducted by the IHEs.

The Department actually put forward support for the development of PDSs as its key Title V initiative for the last HEA reauthorization (1991-92). The idea was not accepted by Congress (except for the perfunctory inclusion of a PDS authority within a broader formula program that has never been funded), and PDSs have evolved without Federal support, with somewhat mixed results. The Department could play an important role in the expansion and improvement of professional development schools by supporting the adoption and evaluation of different PDS models, bringing together faculty from different PDSs to share information...[need some help here -- not sure what we would do that isn't already being done]. *Helping K-12 schools become full partners at the table*

Funding State efforts that combine, in a comprehensive manner, reforms in recruitment, preparation, licensure, and induction. Improvement in the front end of teacher preparation will be most successful if States address the issues comprehensively, rather than in a piecemeal manner. Several States have received modest support, through the National Institute on Educational Governance, Finance, Policymaking, and Management, to implement the recommendations of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, but much more could be done. The Department could fund efforts that leverage much larger amounts of State and other dollars, encourage more States to adopt reforms, and cause the reforms to take root more quickly than would be the case without Federal involvement.

Some Concerns with Option 3A

While the team believes that a broad discretionary program would be an effective mechanism for improving teacher preparation, there are issues and concerns that are likely to be raised during the

legislative process.

First, a fund for excellence in teaching could become a receptacle into which Congress dumps pork barrel-type projects (as has frequently happened with the Fund for the Improvement of Education), never letting the program become the flexible, reform-oriented vehicle that we intend. One way to address this problem might be to create a policy board to set priorities for the fund, as is the case with FIPSE. However, this approach would entail more administrative overhead, and even FIPSE has not been immune from the pork barrel problem.

Second, opponents of a proposal to create a new fund could claim that it would duplicate FIE and the Eisenhower National Programs, because both are authorized to support improvements in professional development. (The Eisenhower authority even includes language on "development of innovative models for recruitment, induction, retention, and recruitment" of new teachers.) We believe, however, that the case can be made for creation of a single authority focused specifically on the range of "front end" professional development issues, and that neither FIE or Eisenhower National will ever be able to make much of an impact on those issues.

Third, our recommendation to go forward with a single, broad authority under Title V raises the issue of what to do about the Minority Teacher Recruitment program, the only Title V program that is currently funded. Minority Teacher Recruitment, with an appropriation of only a little over \$2 million, deals with front-end issues (including the upgrading of paraprofessionals). A case could be made either for folding the program into our proposed broader authority or continuing it as a separate activity. Whatever happens with this program, the team strongly believes that recruitment and participation of minorities (as well as individuals with disabilities) should be a strong component of the entire range of activities carried out under the reauthorized Title V.

Option 3B: A discretionary program providing major support for the development of "flagship" teacher education programs.

Under this proposal the Department would make major awards -- for instance, \$5 million annually -- to approximately 10 IHEs with outstanding teacher training programs that can be looked on as national models. The institutions, places that already embody many of the reforms we believe are essential, would use the Federal resources to further nurture their programs and to provide leadership and guidance to the rest of the field. We would designate one flagship institution in each region.

This strategy would be patterned after the response to the "Flexner report," early in the century, which transformed American medical education. Key elements would include:

- o The grants would go to the IHE, not to its teachers college or education department, because the activities carried out would affect the institution as a whole; each institution would strengthen the relationship between its teacher education and arts & sciences components.
- o The recipient IHE would establish a mentoring relationship with an additional 10 or so "satellite" institutions within its region, sharing information, providing guidance, and perhaps making subgrants to strengthen the programs in the other institutions.
- o The institutions would operationalize key components of the PDS model: a heavily clinical preservice education, strong working relationships with the K-12 system, etc., and would have programs in place, or well under development, that really prepare teachers to teach all students to high standards.
- o The teacher training program in each institution would make a strong effort to recruit

How does this prevent it being captured off?

Need deliverables

minorities and disabled individuals, reflecting the demographic makeup of the region.

- o With the Federal funds, each institution would engage in a continuing process of evaluation (against its own performance goals), adjustment, and dissemination of best practices to one another and to the field.
- o Applicants would also be judged on their success in graduating and placing students.

Additional attributes that we could look for in funding these institutions include:

- o The existence (or a plan to commence) strong programs for paraprofessionals or for the preparation of school administrators.
- o Strong use of technology in the program, and preparation of teachers to use technology.
- o Involvement of the institution in reform of State licensure systems.

Issues and Concerns with Option 3B

While the team is generally enthusiastic about this option, we do raise the following issues:

1. With so many teacher education programs in existence, it may be difficult (operationally and politically) to designate only ten as flagships and provide them with very large awards.
2. There is some risk that once the program is created, it may be difficult to avoid funding the same institutions in perpetuity, even if it would be desirable to shift the funds to other IHEs or if the original rationale for the program no longer exists.

Option 3C: A program of scholarships targeted to students attending schools or colleges of education undergoing serious reforms.

Under this option, the Department would make grants to schools or colleges of education undertaking serious reforms of their programs. The IHEs would provide scholarships of up to \$5,000 to students in their 3rd, 4th, and, in five-year programs, 5th years of undergraduate teacher education -- or to students entering mid-career and other non-traditional programs. Some funds could also be used to support the preparation of principals and other school administrators. Selection of recipients would focus on merit as well as student financial need.

Of the money granted to each IHE, 90 percent would be used for scholarships; institutions could retain the remainder to support upgrading and reforming of the curriculum and to work with LEAs on the induction of new teachers.

Issues and Concerns with Option 3C

Members of the team believe this type of program, if adequately funded, could provide an inducement for ed schools to undertake significant reforms and for talented undergraduates, and older students, to enter the profession. It may have an impact on attracting minorities, individuals with disabilities, and other nontraditional candidates into the profession. By providing funds for student assistance, along with a modest amount for institutional reform, such a program may give IHEs a very strong incentive to adopt the reforms proposed by the National Commission, the Holmes Group, and others. If funded at \$100 million, and assuming that IHEs do not use any of the student scholarship funds for indirect costs, the program could provide more than 18,000 scholarships annually.

Nevertheless, the team believes that the following issues merit consideration:

1. Past Federal efforts to stimulate labor markets by subsidizing the preparation of entering professionals have generally achieved only mixed results. Those type of programs are probably most effective in occupations where high costs (a particularly expensive and lengthy preparation) constitute a major barrier to entry. In other areas, like teaching, the programs have been inefficient because, for the most part, they have paid for students to obtain an education they would have obtained anyway.
2. A scholarship program that does not provide financial assistance until the third or fourth year of college is likely to be particularly unsuccessful at stimulating new entries. This occurred with the (now unfunded) Douglas Scholarships program: most recipients were junior and seniors in schools of education who had started their preservice education without any promise of receiving a Douglas Scholarship. Few were attracted to becoming teachers by the presence of the program.
3. A proposal to launch a fairly major new scholarship program for future teachers would have to be considered within the overall context of Administration proposals to expand existing sources of financial aid (particularly Pell Grants) and start new ones through the tax system. A scholarship program that does not kick in until the junior year may dovetail with the Hope Scholarships, which would terminate after the sophomore year, but may not have much of an effect on student persistence since the first two years of college, according to the research, are the ones that students have difficulty completing successfully.
4. Members of the team believe that any new program that subsidizes preparation of new teachers not just seek to increase the numbers of teachers but generate high-quality graduates. However, the teacher ed programs undertaking reforms will not necessarily be those that already have high-quality programs, and they may not be the ones attracting the best students.
5. Analysts who have looked at minority teacher development efforts have sometimes been critical of those that target students already in college. The problem is that too few members of certain minority groups currently successfully ~~and~~ complete college. A program that provides a financial incentive to attract current minority undergraduates to teaching may end up drawing them away from professions where they are even less well represented. This line of reasoning favors teacher preparation programs that seek to increase the overall pool of minority college students, such as those that initially reach out to high school students.
6. Finally, more thinking needs to be done on the threshold requirements for institutional participation in the program. For example, what types of reforms would they have to be undergoing in order to obtain grants? What annual progress would we want to see on those reforms in order for the grants to continue? Would we make a partnership with elementary schools (the PDS model) a mandated component of the reforms? What kind of activities would we expect the IHEs to undertake with the 10 percent they would reserve for reform activities? How much real reform could they be expected to achieve?

Broad Agency Announcement (BAA) -- A Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching. U. S. Department of Education, Application and Control Center, GSA Bldg., Rm. 3633, 7th and D Streets, SW., Washington D.C. 20202-4725. Contract Officer: Helen Chang, 202-708-9740.

I. INTRODUCTION: The United States Department of Education (ED) requests proposals for A Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching. The Partnership shall: coordinate national efforts to support and sustain long-term improvements in teaching preparation, development, and accountability; conduct technical assistance and dissemination activities; and, carry out applied research on the incentives and impediments for positive change in teaching and its contexts.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION: ED will contemplate awarding one fixed-price contract. ED expects to award up to \$4,000,000 in the first year; up to \$4,000,000 for a second option year; and up to \$5,000,000 for each of three additional option years. Option years are at ED's discretion and subject to the availability of funds.

Teaching is professional work. It is non-routine, client-focused, highly interactive, and not subject to standardization. It is a demanding profession that calls for high levels of skill in a number of interrelated areas. In today's and tomorrow's schools and classrooms, teachers must seek out, understand and apply instructional approaches that take advantage of new theoretical insights; master subject matter content at new levels; be adept at accessing and using technology to enhance student learning and better manage classrooms; be aware of the particular perspectives and strengths every student brings to learning; and, have the skills to deal with more challenging academic standards, new assessment procedures, and new decision-making responsibilities. Individuals with the capabilities to meet these challenges must be recruited, prepared, licensed, inducted, professionally developed, certified at an advanced level, and retained in the profession at all levels -- Pre-K through 12th grade -- if *all* students are to receive a quality education, including students at risk of educational failure and other students with special needs.

Unfortunately, as stated in a report by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, *What matters most: Teaching for America's future* (September, 1996); too many teacher preparation and professional development programs are unresponsive to the new challenges teachers will face, lack sound theoretical underpinnings for what is offered and how it is offered, provide inadequate internships and support for beginning teachers, fail to promote continuous improvement among experienced teachers, and treat the various stages and demands of a teacher's professional life as distinct and separate. The results are that new and experienced teachers feel under-prepared to meet the challenges of a more diverse student population within the context of needed education reform and an unacceptably large proportion of teachers leave the profession within the first three years of their careers.

Clearly, these circumstances call for a new approach to the development and support of the teaching force -- one that results in reform on par with that advocated for this

nation's schools. What is required, therefore, is not merely improved *programs* but the creation of a professional development *system* that: both responds to changes in the schools and promotes school reform; that is systematically selective in its recruitment for the profession; that keeps teachers at all levels abreast of the most useful and current developments in their fields; that is firmly grounded on theories of teachers as adult learners and knowledge users; that supports on-going innovative research on professional development; that aligns desired teacher skills and knowledge with teacher licensing, advanced certification, and assessment; that both treats teachers as professionals and holds them accountable; and, that supports and sustains the interconnections along the continuum of professional development.

III. PURPOSE: The U.S. Department of Education solicits proposals for a Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching to respond to the conditions reported by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future. The Partnership shall bring together elementary/secondary and postsecondary educational institutions, state and local education entities, professional associations and other stakeholders whose influence is crucial to the success of teacher professional development and support for improving teaching effectiveness. The Partnership shall consist of a variety of member entities distributed across the nation and shall launch a focused, coordinated, comprehensive national effort to support and sustain long-term improvements in teaching and learning. The effort shall consider the entire spectrum of teacher professional development and tie knowledge-to-application-to-dissemination while continuing to "push the envelope" of professional development research.

IV. SUBMISSION REQUIREMENTS: ED will use a two-step submission process to evaluate proposals submitted in response to this announcement. For the first step, offerors must submit an abstract of a proposal. ED will evaluate all abstracts against the evaluation criteria below. To be considered, abstracts must include letters of commitment from the proposed Partnership members. For the second step, ED will invite full technical, past performance, and cost proposals from the top-ranked abstracts submitted in response to this BAA. In the invitation, ED will specify proposal format and the representations and certifications required under the Federal Acquisitions Regulations, the Education Department Acquisition Regulations and other ED clauses to be included in the contract that will result from the BAA. There will be no RFP or other solicitation regarding this requirement. An invitation to submit a proposal does not assure subsequent award. No award will be made under this BAA without a full technical and cost proposal. The cost proposal must provide sufficient detail to allow assessment of costs and the offeror's capacity to perform the work proposed.

To be considered, abstracts of proposals shall be received by **** p.m. EST, *****, 1997 at the Application and Control Center address stated above. All abstracts should include the identifier PR/AWARD#: ** 97 **** on the envelope and on the first page. The abstract should provide an overview of the project and associated costs. It shall be prepared on 8.5 X 11 inch plain paper and shall be printed on one side of each page only. It should be in no less than 12-point type, with one inch margins on all sides, and double spaced. The abstract shall include: (1) a description of the work the offeror

proposes to perform; (2) a summary table or chart specifying each proposed task and subtask by project year and the level of commitment proposed for each Partnership staff member; (3) projected costs for each year of the Partnership; and, (4) any other information the proposer wishes to have considered. Additionally, an appendix shall be attached to the abstract containing letters of commitment from all proposed partnership members. The abstract, including the description of the proposed work, the staffing table or chart, projected annual costs, and any other information shall not exceed 15 pages. The appendix containing letters of commitment is not included in this limitation, but shall contain only letters of commitment. Any cover letter, cover, fly leaf, etc. and all other attachments (save letters of commitment from proposed Partnership members) are subject to the 15 page limit. **Any pages beyond the 15th page of the abstract and any item in the appendix other than letters of commitment will be returned to you unread by reviewers.** Offerors shall submit an original and 5 copies of the entire submission.

V. TECHNICAL DESCRIPTION: Abstracts shall clearly state the purpose and objectives of the Partnership, specify and provide the rationale for its makeup, procedures, and activities, briefly describe anticipated products and their schedule, include a listing of the proposed Partnership members and their roles, and provide evidence of offeror's capacity to carry out the work -- including a summary table or chart specifying each proposed staff member's commitment to each proposed task and subtask by project year.

The abstract should indicate how the Partnership will:

1. Help develop and enforce rigorous standards for teacher preparation, initial licensing, continuing development, and advanced certification that will enable all teachers to bring every American child -- including at-risk students and other students with special needs -- up to world-class standards in core academic areas;

2. Help colleges and schools work with states to redesign teacher education so that new teachers are adequately prepared so that all teachers -- including teachers of at-risk students and other students with special needs -- have access to continuous high-quality learning opportunities;

3. Help states and districts pursue aggressive policies to put qualified teachers in every classroom;

4. Help districts, states, unions, and professional associations cooperate and make teaching a true profession with a career continuum that places teaching at the top and rewards teachers for their knowledge and skills;

5. Help education agencies and schools restructure schools to become genuine learning organizations for both students and teachers -- organizations that respect learning, honor teaching, and teach for understanding; and

When is the abstract price?

7
9

6. Collect, analyze, and use data on the incentives and impediments to the recommendations of the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future and on the evaluation of the results or impacts of teacher preparation, induction, and professional development programs.

7. Include a steering committee, executive committee, advisory group or some other entity responsible for: oversight of the entire project, recommendations of any mid-stream adjustments that might be required, and resolution of any problems that might arise. This group/committee/etc. shall be representative of the various perspectives and concerns of the Partnership, yet small enough to work efficiently.

In addition, the offeror should:

A. Specify the entities to be included in the Partnership, such as: institution(s) of higher education with nationally accredited teacher preparation program(s); K-12 schools; state and local education entities; national teachers' unions; and other national organizations and networks whose influence is crucial to the success of teacher preparation, professional development, effectiveness and accountability, such as groups representing state educational leadership, school reform, standards for student achievement, standards for the accreditation of teacher preparation programs, standards and assessments for the licensing of beginning teachers, and standards and assessments for certifying accomplished teaching; and, others, as appropriate; to carry out a number of activities that lead to effective and efficient strategies to prepare, induct and provide career-long professional development and support for K-12 teachers;

B. Specify plans for a major nation-wide dissemination effort that includes active on-site dissemination and a variety of communication media such as computer technologies, the Internet/WWW, networks, conferences/meetings/exhibits, satellite technologies, published reports/articles, television/cable, radio and print; and

C. Specify the anticipated products of each year's effort. Each product or deliverable must be submitted to the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) in draft for expert review and revised on the basis of this review before submission in final form.

VI. AWARD PROCESS: The expected award date is ***** **, 1997. ED reserves the right to select for award any or none of the proposals received, and to require an offeror to revise its proposal. Except when it is determined in accordance with FAR 17.206(b) not to be in the Government's best interest, the Government will evaluate offers for award purpose by adding the total price of all option years to the total price of the base year. For this announcement, technical quality is more important than cost or price. The Contracting Officer will determine whether the difference in technical merit is worth the difference in cost. Technical quality will be evaluated in a peer review panel, based on the criteria specified below.

VII. TECHNICAL EVALUATION CRITERIA: The following criteria apply to both

abstracts and full technical proposals requested under this announcement. No other technical criteria will be used to evaluate the abstracts or the invited full technical proposals.

- Offeror's demonstrated understanding of the nature of A Partnership for Excellence and Accountability in Teaching, the multitude of factors surrounding the creation and maintenance of such a partnership, and the critical need for such reform for teachers of students at risk of educational failure and other students with special needs. Maximum points: 20.
- Scope and quality of the work plan. Maximum points: 20.
3. Scope and quality of proposed dissemination plan and proposed products. Maximum points: 20.
4. The quality of the proposed composition and management of the Partnership. Maximum points: 15.
5. The quality and time commitments of proposed personnel, extent to which personnel have appropriate training and experience for conducting the proposed work. Maximum points: 15.
6. Facilities and equipment adequate to conduct the work proposed. Maximum points: 10.



**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
FINAL FY2001 EDUCATION BUDGET**

December 18, 2000

(In Thousands of Dollars)

Selected Discretionary Education Programs	FY 2000 Appropriation	FY2001 Appropriation	Increase from FY2000	Impact of Resources
ACCELERATING CHANGE				
<u>Title I Accountability Grants</u> : Helps States and districts turn-around low-performing schools.	\$134,000	\$225,000	+\$91,000	Accelerates State and local efforts to improve the lowest performing Title I schools through actions ranging from intensive teacher training to required implementation of proven reforms to school takeovers. Would provide help to 4,500 schools, an increase of 1,800 over last year.
<u>21st Century Community Learning Centers</u> : Funds after-school activities with community partners as part of a community school.	\$453,377	\$845,614	+\$392,237	Would provide before- and after-school and summer programs in safe, drug-free environments for approximately 650,000 additional school-age children in 3,100 new centers as well as life-long learning for adults. Approximately 6,700 centers would be supported in FY2001.
<u>Reducing Class Size</u> : Third installment in reducing class sizes in grades 1-3 to a nationwide average of 18 to give children more personal attention and get them on the right track.	\$1,300,000	\$1,623,000	+\$323,000	Approximately 8,000 new highly qualified teachers would be hired, in addition to supporting 29,000 teachers already hired. This is the third installment in the Administration's commitment to helping school districts hire and train 100,000 new teachers over 7 years to reduce class sizes in the early grades to 18 students per class.
<u>Comprehensive School Reform Demonstrations</u> : Helps schools develop or adapt, and implement, comprehensive school reform programs that are based on reliable research and effective practices. (Includes Title I and FIE funds)	\$220,000	\$260,000	+\$40,000	Would provide new grants to approximately 2,500 schools and continue support for 1,000 schools already using funds to carry out research-based school reform models.
<u>Research, Development and Dissemination</u> : Helps build a knowledge base for improving educational practice.	\$168,567	\$185,567	+\$17,000	Would double the Department's support for two interagency initiatives aimed at improving pre-K through grade 12 student achievement in reading, math, and science and improving learning for language-minority students.
<u>Small, Safe, and Successful High Schools</u> : (Builds upon the Smaller Learning Communities initiative created in FY2000.)	\$45,000	\$125,000	+\$80,000	Would help high schools undergo reforms and create smaller learning communities through such strategies as schools-within-schools and career academies. The amount requested would help approximately 600 additional high schools to create smaller, safer, and more intimate learning environments for 600,000 students.
<u>Charter Schools</u> : Stimulates comprehensive education reform and public school choice by supporting the planning and development, and initial implementation of public charter schools.	\$145,000	\$190,000	+\$45,000	Would support planning and implementation of as many as 1,700 new charter schools towards the Administration's goal of creating 3,000 charter schools by 2002.
CLOSING ACHIEVEMENT GAPS				
<u>Special Education</u> : Helps States provide high-quality early intervention, special education and related services to children with disabilities aged birth through 21 years.	\$6,036,196	\$7,439,948	+\$1,403,752	Would increase the Federal contribution for 6.4 million children with disabilities to 15 percent of APPE--the highest in the history of the program--and would help offset the cost of inflation for providing early intervention services to 193,000 infants and toddlers.
<u>Extra Help in the Basics (Title I LEA Grants)</u> : Helps disadvantaged students learn the basics and achieve to high standards.	\$7,807,397	\$8,376,721	+\$569,324	Would provide funds to help nearly 12.9 million educationally disadvantaged children boost their basic skills, master challenging curriculum, and meet high standards, and to help improve the overall academic program in their schools. This increase would provide extra help to more than 850,000 disadvantaged students in reading and math.
<u>Reading Excellence Act</u> : Helps children learn to read well	\$260,000	\$286,000	+\$26,000	Would support awards to 27 States to help high-need schools improve

Selected Discr ary Education Programs	FY 2000 Appropriation	FY2001 Appropriation	Increase from FY2000	Impact of Resources
<p><u>Indian Education</u>. Supplements the efforts of State and local educational agencies, and Indian tribes, to improve educational opportunities for Indian children.</p>	\$62,000	\$92,765	+\$30,765	<p>extended learning time, professional development, and family literacy activities. The increase will help an additional 100,000 children become successful readers, bringing the total number to 1.1 million for 2001.</p> <p>Would increase the per-pupil average from \$134 to \$200 to give local districts increased funds to expand existing programs, initiate new programs, or provide other services to address the needs of their Indian students.</p>
<p><u>Indian Education - American Indian Administrator Corps</u>. Helps train and recruit school principals and administrators for areas with high concentrations of American Indian and Alaska Native students.</p>	-	\$5,000	+\$5,000 NEW PROGRAM	<p>A new program that would recruit and train 200 new Indian principals and school administrators to work in Native American communities by funding program costs at tribal colleges and other postsecondary institutions and supporting in-service training for principals and administrators already employed in Indian schools.</p>
<p><u>Indian Education - American Indian Teacher Corps</u>. Supports the training of Indian teachers to take positions in schools that serve concentrations of Indian children.</p>	\$10,000	\$10,000	-	<p>Would train 1,000 Indian teachers over a five-year period to take positions in schools that serve concentrations of Indian children.</p>
<p><u>Safe and Drug-Free Schools</u>. Helps schools become safe, drug-free learning environments.</p>	\$602,000	\$644,250	+\$44,250	<p>Would provide \$439 million for State grants; \$117 million for Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants to support some 35 new projects and continue 77 projects to develop comprehensive, community-wide strategies for creating safe and drug-free schools and promoting healthy childhood development; \$78 million for other national leadership activities including \$50 million to continue the Coordinator Initiative in more than 600 middle schools; and \$10 million for Project SERV to provide emergency assistance to schools affected by serious violence or other traumatic crises.</p>
IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY				
<p><u>Eisenhower State Grants for Teacher Professional Development</u>. Provides formula grants to States and school districts to help teachers improve their skills in core academic subjects.</p>	\$335,000	\$485,000	+\$150,000	<p>Nearly 15,000 school districts would get \$150 million in additional Federal help to reduce the number of uncertified teachers and teachers who are not trained in the subjects they are teaching.</p>
<p><u>Eisenhower National Activities</u>. Provide support for activities to recruit, train and improve teacher quality.</p>	\$38,300	\$82,300	+\$44,000	<p>Would support important new initiatives to train early childhood educators and to help recruit talented mid-career professionals and college graduates into teaching.</p>
<p><u>Teacher Training in Technology</u>. Helps train new teachers to use technology in the classroom.</p>	\$75,000	\$125,000	+\$50,000	<p>About 110,000 additional future teachers would be trained in how to effectively use modern technology in their classrooms.</p>
<p><u>Bilingual Professional Development</u>. Helps school districts operate high-quality instructional programs to help children learn English.</p>	\$71,500	\$100,000	+\$28,500	<p>Would fund an additional 131 professional development grants to institutions of higher education to address the critical need for teachers prepared to serve limited English proficient students. These projects would produce a total of 18,000 teachers a year who are prepared to serve limited English proficient students.</p>
<p><u>Teacher Quality Enhancement (HEA Title II)</u>. Helps recruit and prepare excellent and diverse teachers for America's classrooms.</p>	\$98,000	\$98,000	-	<p>Maintains support for 28 grants to help recruit new teachers for high-poverty urban and rural areas, strengthen 30 partnerships between schools and universities to give the teachers the best preparation possible, and help 30 States improve the quality of their teaching force through reform activities such as teacher licensing and certification.</p>
MODERNIZING OUR SCHOOLS				
<p><u>Urgent School Renovation</u>. Provides \$901 million in support for short-term emergency repairs, \$274 million in additional funding for IDEA services or technology activities and \$25 million for a new charter school facility financing pilot</p>	-	\$1,200,000	+\$1,200,000 NEW PROGRAM	<p>Would provide schools new grants to help them make urgently needed building repairs and renovations. Would help schools with additional funds for serving disabled children and for making new investments in technology. Would also provide credit enhancement to help charter</p>

Selected Districtary Education Programs	FY 2000 Appropriation	FY2001 Appropriation	Increase from FY2000	Impact of Resources
<u>Technology Literacy Challenge Fund.</u> Helps provide students and teachers with computers, educational software, telecommunications, and technology training.	\$425,000	\$450,000	+\$25,000	Would assist approximately 3,400 high-poverty districts to improve the capacity of teachers in low-performing schools to use technology effectively in their classrooms to improve student achievement. Schools and districts would use the funds to, among other things, provide training activities for teachers to ensure that they are prepared to integrate technology effectively into curriculum and to increase student access to advanced technologies.
<u>Community-Based Technology Centers.</u> Funds technology learning centers in low-income communities.	\$32,500	\$64,950	+\$32,450	Would expand access to technology-based resources for low-income families by bringing technology to public housing, community centers, libraries, and other community facilities. The requested increase would expand the program to an additional 96 low-income communities, and continue funding for 57 projects funded in previous years.
REACHING AND COMPLETING COLLEGE				
<u>GEAR UP.</u> Gives disadvantaged students and their families pathways to college through partnerships of middle and high schools, colleges and universities and through state-administered programs.	\$200,000	\$295,000	+\$95,000	Would help an additional 490,000 low-income students obtain the critical skills and encouragement they need to increase their academic achievement and successfully prepare for and pursue a college education. Academic and support services, including mentoring, tutoring, counseling, and college visits, would be provided to approximately 1.2 million low-income students.
<u>TRIO Programs.</u> Provides education outreach and student support services designed to help disadvantaged individuals enter and complete college.	\$645,000	\$730,000	+\$85,000	Would help 765,000 disadvantaged students, 40,000 more than in FY2000, prepare for and persist in postsecondary education. Would provide academic and career counseling, admissions and financial aid information and tutoring services to 385,000 middle and high school students; encourage 222,000 disadvantaged postsecondary students to complete college and pursue graduate studies; and encourage over 158,000 adults to go back to school and pursue postsecondary education.
<u>Advanced Placement Incentives.</u> Provides grants to States to enable them to expand the pool of students to enroll in advanced placement (AP) courses, to cover part or all of the AP test fees of low-income students, and to prepare teachers to teach AP to interested students in the 9 th and 10 th grades.	\$15,000	\$22,000	+\$7,000	Would fund an estimated 13 additional discretionary grants to States to support activities designed to increase the availability of advanced placement classes in high-poverty schools.
<u>Pell Grants.</u> Provides grant assistance to low-income undergraduate students.	\$7,639,717 Max Grant \$3,300	\$8,756,000 Max Grant \$3,750	+\$1,116,283 Max Grant +\$450	Would help approximately 3.9 million financially needy students attend college – 105,000 more than last year – and would increase the maximum grant award by \$450 from \$3,300 to \$3,750.
<u>Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants (SEOGs).</u> Provides grant assistance to low-income undergraduate students.	\$631,000 ¹	\$691,000	+\$60,000	Would provide need-based aid to enable 1.2 million low-income undergraduates, 104,000 more than in 2000, to pursue a baccalaureate degree.
<u>Work-Study.</u> Helps undergraduate and graduate students pay for college through part-time work assistance.	\$934,000	\$1,011,000	+\$77,000	Would provide over \$1.2 billion in aid available, an increase of \$93 million over FY2000, to maintain the opportunity for a total of 1 million students to work their way through college.
<u>Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership (LEAP).</u> Provides Federal matching funds for States to support need-based postsecondary student grant assistance.	\$40,000	\$55,000	+\$15,000	Would support the Federal share of need-based aid to the States for 135,000 students, 15,000 more than in FY2000.
<u>Learning Anytime Anywhere Partnerships.</u> Provides grants to enhance the delivery, quality and accountability of	\$23,269	\$30,000	+\$6,731	Would support an additional 40 new projects to enhance asynchronous learning opportunities for individuals, such as the disabled, dislocated

Selected Discretionary Education Programs	FY 2000 Appropriation	FY2001 Appropriation	Increase from FY2000	Impact of Resources
postsecondary educational and career-oriented lifelong learning for underserved populations through asynchronous distance education.				workers, those making the transition from welfare to work, and others who do not have easy access to traditional campus-based postsecondary education.
<u>Vocational Education State Grants.</u> Provides formula grants that States, local education agencies, and postsecondary institutions can use to improve vocational education programs and to ensure that individuals with special needs have full access to those programs.	\$1,055,650	\$1,100,000	+\$44,350	Increases funds for State Grants for the improvement and expansion of vocational-technical education programs.
<u>Tech-Prep Education.</u> Provides grants to States, which provide subgrants to consortia of local educational agencies and postsecondary institutions, to develop links between secondary and postsecondary institutions, integrate academic and vocational education, and better prepare students to make the transition from high school to college and from college to careers.	\$106,000	\$111,000	\$5,000	Maintains funding for state formula grants that support secondary-postsecondary consortia that integrate academic and vocational education and prepare students for high-tech careers. The \$5 million increase will support a new demonstration of secondary school programs located on community college campuses.
<u>Strengthening Tribally-Controlled Institutions (HEA Title III).</u> Supports institutions that serve Native Americans.	\$6,000	\$15,000	+\$9,000	Would support the Administration's strong commitment to ensuring access to high quality postsecondary education by providing funds for 24 more institutions to strengthen TCCUs through academic program development and improved administrative management.
<u>Strengthening Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Graduate Institutions (HEA Title III)</u> Helps provide equal opportunity and strong academic programs.	\$179,750	\$230,000	+\$50,250	Would support the Administration's strong commitment to ensuring access to high quality postsecondary education by increasing funds to each eligible institution to strengthen HBCLUs and HBGIs through academic program development and improved administrative management.
<u>Developing Hispanic-Serving Institutions.</u> Helps strengthen colleges with large Hispanic populations.	\$42,250	\$68,500	+\$26,250	Would support the Administration's commitment to improving postsecondary opportunities for Hispanic student by helping to expand and enhance the academic offerings, program equity, and institutional stability of an additional 62 institutions that award a large percentage of undergraduate degrees to Hispanics.
<u>Javits Fellowships.</u> Provides merit-based fellowships to doctoral students in the arts, humanities, and social sciences.	\$20,000	\$10,000	-\$10,000	Would provide funding for 342 fellows for the 2002-2003 academic year, including 96 new fellows, at a stipend level of \$18,000. The FY2000 appropriation provided \$10 million for Javits Fellowships for academic year 2000-2001 and \$10 million for academic year 2001-2002.
<u>Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need.</u> Provides merit-based fellowships to financially need graduate students studying in areas of national need.	\$31,000	\$31,000	--	Would support 436 new awards for a total of 1,074 fellows at a stipend level of \$18,000.
FAMILY LEARNING <u>Adult Education and Literacy State Grants.</u> Provides adult and family literacy, English as a second language, and other educational programs.	\$450,000	\$540,000	+\$90,000	Would help an additional 486,000 adults become literate, strengthen their basic skills, and obtain good jobs. This total includes \$70 million in funds to continue the English literacy and civics education initiative that would provide additional resources to States and localities significantly affected by immigration and with large limited English proficient populations.

Total FY2001 Budget Increase for U.S. Department of Education Discretionary Programs: \$6.5 Billion