

Ed -
Talking Pt.

1. The First National Effort to Reduce Class Size: A \$12 Billion Plan to Hire 100,000 New Teachers over 7 years to Reduce Class Size in Grades 1-3 to a Nationwide Average of 18.

- Small classes make a difference. Studies in Tennessee and elsewhere have found what parents and teachers already know -- that smaller classes improve student performance, especially in the early grades and for students who need help most. This will help meet the President's goal to make sure every 8-year-old can read.
- Every new teacher will have to pass a state competency test, and states will receive funds to train teachers and raise teacher standards. To ensure that there's a competent teacher in every classroom, this plan requires new teachers to pass basic skills tests. States can use 10% of the funds for teacher training and testing.
- This plan builds on successful reforms the President pioneered in Arkansas. In Arkansas, Gov. Clinton reduced class size to 20 in kindergarten and 23 in grades 1-3, and required basic skills testing for teachers.

2. A Ten-Year, \$10 Billion School Modernization Bond Initiative to Build and Renovate Classrooms.

- As we hire more teachers and reduce class size, we need to build more classrooms. The President is proposing federal tax credits to pay interest on nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate public schools. (This is more than double the assistance proposed last year, which covered half the interest on an estimated \$20 billion in bonds.) The tax credits will cost the Treasury \$5 billion over 5 years, and more than \$10 billion over ten years.

3. A Nationwide School Reform Plan to Provide \$1.5 Billion over 5 Years for 50 Education Opportunity Zones in Poor Urban and Rural Areas That End Social Promotion and Adopt Other Sweeping Reforms.

- This initiative says to schools: If you stop promoting students who don't learn, we'll give you resources to make sure they do learn. We're not doing students any favors by moving them from grade to grade without teaching them the basics. We need to help schools lift everybody up.
- We'll hold a national competition to reward school districts that adopt the kind of sweeping reforms that are working in Chicago and elsewhere: ending social promotion and providing extra help -- from tutors to summer school -- to make sure children meet standards; getting rid of incompetent teachers; providing districtwide choice; and turning around failing schools. Urban zones will receive \$10-25 million per year; rural zones will receive up to \$3 million a year.

1. The First National Effort to Reduce Class Size: A \$12 Billion Plan to Hire 100,000 New Teachers over 7 years to Reduce Class Size in Grades 1-3 to a Nationwide Average of 18.

- Small classes make a difference. Studies in Tennessee and elsewhere have found what parents and teachers already know -- that smaller classes improve student performance, especially in the early grades and for students who need help most. This will help meet the President's goal to make sure every 8-year-old can read.
- Every new teacher will have to pass a state competency test, and states will receive funds to train teachers and raise teacher standards. To ensure that there's a competent teacher in every classroom, this plan requires new teachers to pass basic skills tests. States can use 10% of the funds for teacher training and testing.
- This plan builds on successful reforms the President pioneered in Arkansas. In Arkansas, Gov. Clinton reduced class size to 20 in kindergarten and 23 in grades 1-3, and required basic skills testing for teachers.

2. A Ten-Year, \$10 Billion School Modernization Bond Initiative to Build and Renovate Classrooms.

- As we hire more teachers and reduce class size, we need to build more classrooms. The President is proposing federal tax credits to pay interest on nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate public schools. (This is more than double the assistance proposed last year, which covered half the interest on an estimated \$20 billion in bonds.) The tax credits will cost the Treasury \$5 billion over 5 years, and more than \$10 billion over ten years.

3. A Nationwide School Reform Plan to Provide \$1.5 Billion over 5 Years for 50 Education Opportunity Zones in Poor Urban and Rural Areas That End Social Promotion and Adopt Other Sweeping Reforms.

- This initiative says to schools: If you stop promoting students who don't learn, we'll give you resources to make sure they do learn. We're not doing students any favors by moving them from grade to grade without teaching them the basics. We need to help schools lift everybody up.
- We'll hold a national competition to reward school districts that adopt the kind of sweeping reforms that are working in Chicago and elsewhere: ending social promotion and providing extra help -- from tutors to summer school -- to make sure children meet standards; getting rid of incompetent teachers; providing districtwide choice; and turning around failing schools. Urban zones will receive \$10-25 million; rural zones will receive up to \$3 million.



Educ - Talking Points

Donna Fly

- You decide what to teach, how to teach, who to teach
- You set stds - just measure up
- [WE'RE NOT TELLING YOU TO DO STUPID THINGS]
- WE DON'T WANT TO MICROMANAGE
w/ NEW REQS FROM EDUC DEPT.
- RILEY has been moving other way
- WORK WITH GOVS. AS WE WRITE THIS LEGIS. ^{closer}
- WE KNOW YOU NEED FLEXIBIL - ACCTABILTY
FOR THIS TO WORK.

1) TOBACCO - quit smoking + FARMERS

2) OTHER PUBLIC HEALTH + CHILDREN

- Donna's comm health centers

- E.G.'s:

- 1) Comm Health Centers
- 2) Early Learning / ^{Voices} _{vick}

[McCAIN MAN LAST YEAR

- harder, but need to work together

- A LITTLE HISTORY

- compromise

IF WE DON'T GET A MENU, LAW REQUIRES DOT-HHS
TO WITHHOLD \$. WE'LL END UP IN CT, EVERYBODY
A LOSER

DEMOCRATIC GOVERNORS' ASSOCIATION



Educ-
Talking Pts.

Good morning Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

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

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

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

BACKGROUND AND ACCOMPLISHMENTS

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

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

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

Signs of Progress

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

Tomorrow the National Center for Education Statistics will release its national report card on reading, and I understand we will see some improvement. Making sure that every child can read well and independently by the end of the 3rd grade is a key benchmark of whether or not American education is improving. This has been a very high priority for the Administration and over the past few years a strong, bipartisan consensus has emerged on the importance of helping all children master this key prerequisite for all further learning. Title I provides substantial resources to improve reading instruction, and last year, Congress on a bipartisan basis passed the Reading Excellence Act to strengthen State and local efforts to improve reading in the early grades. We also now have some 20,000 College Work-Study students serving as reading tutors.

“Leading-Edge” States

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

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

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

New Flexibility at the Federal Level

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

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

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

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

ED-Flex

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

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

Federal Education Dollars to the Local Level

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

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

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

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

THE NEXT STAGE: RAISING ACHIEVEMENT IN OUR SCHOOLS AND CLASSROOMS

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

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

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

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

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

Strengthening Accountability

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

Much of our thinking about accountability has been informed by successful accountability initiatives at the local and State levels. The most thoughtful education leaders at the State and local level are doing what we are proposing: they are ending social promotion, requiring school report cards,

identifying low-performing schools, improving discipline in schools and classrooms, and putting in place measurable ways to make change happen, such as basic skills exams at different grade levels. They are striking a careful balance between giving schools the increased support and flexibility they need to raise achievement levels and, at the same time, holding schools accountable when they do not measure up to clearly established goals. We are trying to strike that same balance in our reauthorization proposals.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Meeting State Standards

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

Turning Around the Lowest Performing Schools

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

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

Annual Report Cards

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

For report cards to make sense they need to be easily understood by and widely distributed to parents and the public. As I indicated earlier, while 36 States already require report cards, many parents and

teachers from these States say that they have never seen them. Our proposal is intended to give parents a tool they can use to join the debate over bringing high standards into the classroom, to advocate on behalf of their children and their children's schools, and to work with teachers and principals to make improvements.

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

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

Ending Social Promotion

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

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

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

Strategies to end social promotion include early identification and intervention for students who need additional help—including appropriate accommodations and supports for students with disabilities.

After-school and summer-school programs, for example, can provide extended learning time for students who need extra help to keep them from having to repeat an entire grade.

Ensuring Teacher Quality

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

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

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

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

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

The issue of improving teacher quality is also of great importance to all of us who want to improve

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

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

TITLE I

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

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

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

The 1994 Act expanded schoolwide programs by permitting schools with poor children making up

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

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

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

Progress Since the 1994 Reauthorization

Current information on Title I indicates progress on several fronts. Title I has contributed to the rapid development of challenging State standards that apply to all students in Title I schools. Teachers in Title I schools are increasingly reporting that standards are helping to guide instruction. Moreover, preliminary data gathered for this reauthorization from States that have implemented the Title I standards and assessment provisions generally show increased achievement levels in high-poverty schools. For the 1997-98 school year, 7 of the 10 States with standards and aligned assessments in place for two years report increasing percentages of students meeting proficient and advanced performance standards in schools with poverty rates of at least 50 percent. These State-level data are particularly encouraging since final assessments are not required to be in place until school year 2000-2001. This and other information, including data indicating that Title I is driving higher standards to poor districts and schools, will be discussed in greater detail in the Congressionally mandated National Assessment of Title I scheduled for release in late February.

Despite these initial signs of progress, I would be the first to admit that we are not anywhere near where we need to be in turning around the thousands of low-performing high-poverty schools that are served by Title I. This is why the President is so strong for improving teacher quality and increasing accountability. We know that many States, districts, and schools are not making as much progress as we had hoped. However, we did not expect to turn around the long, sorry history of setting low expectations for our Nation's poorest children in just four years. I believe we are now

on the right course in aligning Title I with the best efforts of State and local school systems. We simply need to stay the course in fitting all the pieces together to raise achievement levels.

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

Proposed Changes to Title I

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

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

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

The Department also is considering proposals to promote high quality professional development for early childhood educators and others to help children develop better language and literacy skills in the early years. The NAS's reading study presented strong evidence that children who receive enrichment services focused on language and cognitive development in early childhood show significantly higher reading achievement in the later elementary and middle school years. We believe that professional development based on recent research on child language and literacy development—including strategies that could be shared with parents—could make a significant contribution toward the goal of ensuring that every child can read well by the end of the 3rd grade. Our proposal would target those children most at risk of experiencing difficulty in learning to read by working with early childhood educators in Head Start and Title I pre-K programs.

QUALITY TEACHERS AND HIGH STANDARDS IN EVERY CLASSROOM

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

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

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

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

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

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

would use their funds to implement standards in schools and to invest in professional development in core subject areas, with a priority on science and mathematics.

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

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

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

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

SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

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

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

Program funds would be distributed in larger, more effective grants, because our proposal

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

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

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

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

SUPPORTING STUDENTS WITH LIMITED ENGLISH PROFICIENCY

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

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

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

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

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

To increase teacher quality, for example, all institutions of higher education applying for Title

VII grants would be required to show that their teacher education programs include preparation for all teachers serving LEP students.

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

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

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

EXCELLENCE AND OPPORTUNITY IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

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

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

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

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

many public school districts are far more in touch with parents than they think and are giving parents the choices they seek.

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

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

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

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

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

MODERNIZING SCHOOLS FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

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

The Administration is proposing \$25 billion in bonding authority to finance the construction or renovation of up to 6,000 schools. As part of the President's tax legislation, the Federal government will provide bondholders with tax credits in lieu of interest payments. State and local bond issuers will be responsible for repayment of principal. In addition, through the reauthorized ESEA, we would make grants to involve citizens in designing schools that reflect the needs of the entire community. The President's 2000 budget would provide \$10 million for these grants under the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

CONCLUSION

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

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

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

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

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

TEACHER TALKING PTS.

\$1.2 B to begin hiring 100,000 teachers to reduce class size in grades 1-3.

A. BACKGROUND

① BC reduced class size to 20 in Ark in mid-80s

② Inspired by 2 things:

- Research that shows what every parent knows: smaller classes mean more indiv. attn, better discipline, greater achievement esp. in early grades (TN, WI, NC, IN - '90s DOE study)
- Firm belief that educ. ~~is a local issue~~ (like crime) is a local issue and a nat. priority, and nat. govt has a respons. to help comm. ~~give~~ strengthen public schools
- Just as 100,000 cops \$ is helping reduce crime, 100,000 teachers can increase educ. achievement (GOPs resisted CoPS too)

③ Dem priority since BC proposed in SOTU

- Murray, EMK, Bill Clay, leaders
- GOPs left it out of their budget and voted down a nearly identical proposal (Senate rejected _____ in House _____)
- We believe in deathbed conversions. We always thought this should be a bipartisan issue, - we're glad to have GOP support.

B. HOW IT WORKS

⑤ KEY PROVISIONS OF BC'S PLAN

- ① 100,000 TEACHERS - we asked for \$1.1 B to put us on track to 100,000 in _____ yrs.
- ② ALL THE \$ FOR TEACHERS, not ^{bureaucrats,} ^{SLUSH FUND} books, field trips, Mariachi band uniforms. We got \$1.2
- ③ CLASS SIZE REDUCTION IN EARLY GRADES - R's resisted. We got it.
- ④ TARGETED TO LOCAL COMMS. THAT NEED IT MOST.

- ⑥ 10% FOR QUALITY
- ⑤ TESTING FOR NEW TEACHERS

- Under our plan, not \$1 for fed. bureaucrats.
- GOP plan - states keep 20% off-top, no limit on local bureaucracy. - Explain 80/20.

PRESIDENT CLINTON, VICE PRESIDENT GORE, AND CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS WIN ON THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING BUDGET

	PRESIDENT'S REQUEST	HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET	FINAL BUDGET	DIFFERENCE (BETWEEN HOUSE & FINAL)
Smaller Class Sizes	\$1.1 billion	\$0	\$1.1 billion	+\$1.1 billion
Child Literacy (America Reads)	\$260 million	\$0	\$260 million	+\$260 million
College Mentoring (GEAR-UP)	\$140 million	\$0	\$121 million	+\$121 million
Summer Jobs	\$871 million	\$0	\$871 million	+\$871 million
Youth Opportunities Area	\$250 million	\$0	\$250 million	+\$250 million
Teacher Recruitment	\$67 million	\$0	\$75 million	+\$75 million
Title I (Basic Skills)	\$392 million increase (\$7.767 billion)	\$0 (\$7.375 billion)	\$301 million increase (\$7.676 billion)	+\$301 million
Education Technology	\$721 million	\$541 million	\$729 million	+\$188 million
After-School Programs	\$200 million	\$60 million	\$200 million	+\$140 million
Goals 2000	\$501 million	\$246 million	\$491 million	+\$255 million
Head Start	\$313 million increase (\$4.66 billion)	\$153 million increase (\$4.50 billion)	\$313 million increase (\$4.66 billion)	+\$160 million
School Modernization	\$5 billion over five years	\$0	\$0	-
Education Opportunity Zones	\$200 million	\$0	\$0	-

25% INCREASE FOR CHARTERS

PRESIDENT CLINTON, VICE PRESIDENT GORE, AND CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS WIN ON THE BUDGET, BUT THERE IS STILL MORE WORK TO DO

October 14, 1998

Today's budget agreement represents a significant step forward for America, protecting the surplus until Social Security is reformed, forging a bipartisan agreement on funding the International Monetary Fund, and putting in place critical investments in education and training, from smaller class sizes to after-school care, and from summer jobs to college mentoring. While the final budget agreement is clearly a win for President Clinton, Vice President Gore, and Congressional Democrats, there is still more work to do to prepare America for the 21st century. Unfortunately, Republicans blocked school modernization, Patients Bill of Rights, comprehensive tobacco legislation, child care investments, and campaign finance reform.

Budget Victories:

Saving Social Security First. The President's commitment to Save Social Security First held the line against several Republican efforts to drain the surplus.

Investing in Education and Training. In the face of House Republican efforts to slash his education budget by more than \$2 billion, President Clinton delivered on his education agenda:

- ✓ **More High-Quality Teachers With Smaller Class Sizes:** \$1.1 billion for the first year of the President's new initiative to hire 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size in the early grades to a national average of 18. Through smaller classes this initiative will help recruit high-quality teachers and will insure that students will receive more individual attention, a solid foundation in the basics, and greater discipline in the classroom.
- ✓ **After School Programs:** \$200 million to expand programs and serve up to 500,000 children.
- ✓ **Child Literacy:** \$260 million for a new literacy initiative, consistent with the President's America Reads proposal.
- ✓ **College Mentoring for Middle School Children:** \$121 million for GEAR-UP, a new mentoring initiative to help up to 100,000 low income middle school children prepare for college.
- ✓ **Education Technology:** A \$145 million increase to ensure that every child has access to computers, the Internet, high-quality educational software, and teachers that can use techno/ogy in the classroom.
- ✓ **Child Care Quality:** \$182 million to improve the quality of child care for America's working families.
- ✓ **Teacher Recruitment:** \$75 million for new teacher quality programs including to recruit and prepare thousands of teachers to teach in high-poverty areas.
- ✓ **Head Start:** A \$313 million increase to fund President's request of up to an additional 36,000 slots for children and keeping on track towards 1 million children served by 2002.
- ✓ **Charter Schools:** A 25% increase in funding for Charter Schools to keep on track toward 3,000 quality charter schools early in next century.
- ✓ **Hispanic Education Initiative:** Increases of \$524 million to enhance educational opportunities.
- ✓ **Pell Grants:** The largest maximum award ever for Pell grants -- \$3,125 a year per eligible student.
- ✓ **Summer Jobs:** \$871 million to provide up to 530,000 young people Summer Jobs.

Investing in a Cleaner Environment. President Clinton won important new investments to combat water pollution, protect national parks, natural forests, and other public lands, restore salmon and other endangered species, and develop clean energy technologies and defeated many anti-environment riders:

- ✓ \$1.7 billion for the President's **Clean Water Action Plan**.
- ✓ \$325 million to preserve **precious lands**.
- ✓ A 23 percent increase to protect threatened **endangered species**.
- ✓ More than \$1 billion, a 25 percent increase, to fight **global warming**.

Responding to the Farm Crisis at Home. The final budget includes about \$6 billion in emergency assistance to farmers, ranchers, and their families -- \$1.7 billion over the vetoed agriculture bill.

And to the Financial Turmoil Abroad. The final budget includes the President's full funding request of \$17.9 billion for the IMF.

Moving People from Welfare to Work and Empowering Communities. President Clinton and Vice President Gore are committed to tapping the potential of America's urban and rural communities. This budget moves forward on their vision to help revitalize America's communities.

- ✓ **Welfare to Work Housing Vouchers:** \$283 million for 50,000 vouchers.
- ✓ **Access to Jobs:** \$75 million to link people on welfare to jobs.
- ✓ **Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund:** A 20% expansion.
- ✓ **Empowerment Zones:** \$60 million in flexible funding.

A Strong Research and Development Agenda. The President's budget included an unprecedented commitment to key civilian research. The final budget includes many increases in priority areas:

- ✓ **National Science Foundation:** A 7 percent increase in support for science and engineering research.
- ✓ **National Institutes of Health:** A 14 percent, \$1.9 billion increase to support greater research on diabetes, cancer, genetic medicine, and the development of an AIDS vaccine.
- ✓ **Next Generation Internet:** More than \$100 million for a Federal R&D initiative which will connect more than 100 universities at speeds that are up to 1,000 times faster than today's Internet.
- ✓ **Advanced Technology Program:** About \$70 million for new awards for leading-edge civilian technology projects.

Other Highlights:

- ✓ **EEOC:** A \$37 million increase to reduce the average time it takes to resolve private sector complaints and reduce the backlog of cases.
- ✓ **Fighting Abusive Child Labor:** A 10-fold increase, from \$3 million to \$30 million, in our commitment to the International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labor (IPEC).
- ✓ **Police on the Street:** Funding for 17,000 additional Community Oriented Police Services (COPS) Program police officers toward the President's goal of 100,000 additional officers by 2000.
- ✓ **Food Safety Initiative:** \$75 million to expand food safety research, risk assessment capabilities, education, surveillance activities, and food import inspections
- ✓ **HIV/AIDS Prevention and Treatment:** An unprecedented \$360 million increase to help prevent and treat HIV/AIDS, with special efforts to address the needs of the minority community.

Much Work Still Left to Do:

In the waning days of the session, the President and Congressional Democrats prevailed in making critical investments to advance the President's comprehensive education agenda. Much work remains for the future because Republicans in Congress killed, at least for now, critical priorities, including:

- X **School Modernization.** Beginning with his State of the Union address, the President fought all year to modernize our schools. His fully paid for tax credits would have leverage nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate schools. In the final days of the budget negotiations, Republicans in Congress refused to even meet on the critical issue of school construction.
- X **Patients Bill of Rights.** President Clinton repeatedly urged the Congress to pass a strong, enforceable patients' bill of rights that would assure Americans the quality health care they need. Congressional Republicans killed this year's effort to pass a Patients Bill of Rights.
- X **Comprehensive Tobacco Legislation.** This year, President Clinton made passage of legislation to reduce youth smoking a top priority, in order to stop kids from smoking before they start through a significant price increase, measures to prevent tobacco companies from marketing to children, and critical public health prevention and education programs. Congressional Republicans opted to act as politicians instead of parents, and killed this year's effort to pass bipartisan comprehensive tobacco legislation to reduce youth smoking.
- X **Campaign Finance Reform.** At the beginning of the year, the President made passage of bipartisan, comprehensive campaign finance reform a priority for his Administration. After months of delay, the House of Representatives overcame defenders of the status quo and passed the Shay-Meehan bill. However, the Senate Republicans killed this historic legislation.
- X **Child Care Initiative.** In his State of the Union, the President proposed an historic child care initiative to make child care better, safer and more affordable for America's working families. The President's proposal included \$7.5 billion over 5 years for child care subsidies for low-income working families and tax credits to help 3 million working families pay for child care. The Republicans refused to support these critical investments.
- X **Work Incentives Bill for People with Disabilities.** (Note: still pushing to include) At the commemoration of the Americans with Disabilities Act last July, the President endorsed the bipartisan Jeffords-Kennedy bill that enables people with disabilities to go back to work by providing an option to buy into Medicaid and Medicare, as well as other pro-work initiatives. This bill was on the list of top Administration priorities in the final budget negotiations, but rejected by Republicans. The President will continue to fight to give people with disabilities the opportunity to work --including the critical health insurance that makes work possible.
- X **Speeding Toxic Cleanups.** President Clinton called for an additional \$650 million -- a 40 percent increase -- to accelerate Superfund cleanups with a goal of completing a total of 900 cleanups by 2001. The Republican majority refused these funds, threatening to delay cleanup at up to 171 sites across the country.

1. Class Size

The President's top priority this year in education is the plan he set forth in SOTU to hire 100,000 new teachers over the next 7 years to reduce class size to a national average of 18 in grades 1-3.

Studies show that smaller classes help teachers provide more personal attention to students and spend less time on discipline, and help students to learn more and get a stronger foundation in the basic skills.

Any teacher & any parent will tell you that smaller classes make all the difference. This isn't politics. It's just common sense.

Neither the House or Senate has included class size in their budget, but we're going to insist on it. Congress should not go home to campaign until they've passed a budget that provides communities the funds to reduce class size.

2. After school programs

The President's budget would provide after-school opportunities to more than 425,000 students. It serves two purposes: students can get tutoring and extra help, and just as important, they'll have somewhere to go besides the streets.

Most juvenile crime occurs in those after-school hours between 3 and 6. That's when kids get into trouble with drugs or take up smoking.

Our budget asked for \$200 million. The House bill only includes \$60 million. **If this Congress is serious about improving public education and public safety, they'll give us our full request.**

3. Teacher recruitment

Earlier this week, the President signed HEA, which includes his proposal to help recruit and prepare teachers to teach in high poverty communities. It authorizes funds for partnerships between universities and local school districts in high need communities to: 1) strengthen teacher preparation programs by making sure teachers are well-trained in the subject matter they will teach, and by giving prospective teachers more classroom experience before they become teachers; and 2) give **scholarships to prospective teachers** who agree to teach in high-need areas for a set number of years.

It also provides funds to states to raise teacher certification standards and hold teacher education programs accountable, including by creating "report cards" for teacher education programs.

Our budget requested \$67 million for these programs. The House provided \$2.2 million. **We're not going to help kids learn more if we try to shortchange the training we give their teachers.**

4. Goals 2000

In 1994, an overwhelming bipartisan majority in Congress passed the President's Goals 2000 legislation to help states raise standards and accelerate education reform. But in the last few years, Republicans in the House have led a partisan effort to gut the program.

This year, the President asked for \$501 million, a modest increase from last year. The House bill would cut the program in half, to \$246 million. We won't stand for it. **We should be moving forward on standards, not backward.**

5. Title I

Congress is even trying to shortchange Title I, the principal program for helping low-income children get extra help in learning the basics. We asked for a 6% increase. The House bill includes no increase.

6. Education Opportunity Zones

Finally, the President proposed a new effort called Education Opportunity Zones to give underachieving school districts around the country an incentive to undertake the ambitious reforms that have been such a success in Chicago. This initiative basically says that if a community finally holds schools accountable for results by ending social promotion for kids who don't learn, we'll give them the money to pay for summer school and extra help to make sure those kids do learn.

As you've heard the President say on many occasions, we want every school district to do what Chicago has done. Our budget asked for \$200 million for zones, and Congressman Bill Clay has introduced a bill to put them into effect.

You'd think this Congress would want to join us in holding schools, teachers, and students accountable for results, but apparently not. **The House bill doesn't include a penny for ending social promotion.**

**PRESIDENT CLINTON, VICE PRESIDENT GORE, AND
CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS WIN ON THE BUDGET,
BUT THERE IS STILL MORE WORK TO DO**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- I. Education and Training Budget Chart
- II. 3-Page Budget Overview
- III. Budget Victories for President Clinton, Vice President Gore, and Congressional Democrats (11 pages)
- IV. Despite All the Progress in this Year's Budget, There Is Still More Work Left to Do

**PRESIDENT CLINTON, VICE PRESIDENT GORE, AND CONGRESSIONAL
DEMOCRATS WIN ON THE EDUCATION AND TRAINING BUDGET**

	PRESIDENT'S REQUEST	HOUSE REPUBLICAN BUDGET	FINAL BUDGET	DIFFERENCE (BETWEEN HOUSE & FINAL)
Smaller Class Sizes	\$1.1 billion	\$0	\$1.2 billion	+\$1.2 billion
Child Literacy (America Reads)	\$260 million	\$0	\$260 million	+\$260 million
College Mentoring (GEAR-UP)	\$140 million	\$0	\$120 million	+\$120 million
Summer Jobs	\$871 million	\$0	\$871 million	+\$871 million
Youth Opportunities Area	\$250 million	\$0	\$250 million	+\$250 million
Teacher Preparation and Recruitment	\$67 million	\$0	\$75 million	+\$75 million
Title I (Basic Skills)	\$392 million increase (\$7.767 billion)	\$0 (\$7.375 billion)	\$301 million increase (\$7.676 billion)	+\$301 million
Education Technology	\$721 million	\$541 million	\$698 million	+\$157 million
After-School Programs	\$200 million	\$60 million	\$200 million	+\$140 million
Goals 2000	\$501 million	\$246 million	\$491 million	+\$245 million
Head Start	\$313 million increase (\$4.66 billion)	\$153 million increase (\$4.50 billion)	\$313 million increase (\$4.66 billion)	+\$160 million
School Modernization	\$5 billion over five years	\$0	\$0	-
Education Opportunity Zones	\$200 million	\$0	\$0	-

PRESIDENT CLINTON, VICE PRESIDENT GORE, AND CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS WIN ON THE BUDGET, BUT THERE IS STILL MORE WORK TO DO

October 15, 1998

The final FY99 budget represents a significant step forward for America, protecting the surplus until Social Security is reformed, forging a bipartisan agreement on funding the International Monetary Fund, and putting in place critical investments in education and training, from smaller class sizes to after-school care, and from summer jobs to college mentoring. While the final budget is clearly a win for President Clinton, Vice President Gore, and Congressional Democrats, there is still more work to do to prepare America for the 21st century. Unfortunately, Republicans blocked school modernization, Patients Bill of Rights, comprehensive tobacco legislation, child care investments, and campaign finance reform.

Budget Victories:

Saving Social Security First. The President's commitment to Save Social Security First held the line against several Republican efforts to drain the surplus.

Investing in Education and Training. While House Republican tried to slash their education budget by over \$2 billion, President Clinton and Congressional Democrats delivered on their education agenda:

- ✓ **More High-Quality Teachers With Smaller Class Sizes:** \$1.2 billion for the first year of the President's new initiative to hire 100,000 new teachers to reduce class size in the early grades to a national average of 18. Through smaller classes this initiative will help recruit high-quality teachers and will insure that students will receive more individual attention, a solid foundation in the basics, and greater discipline in the classroom.
- ✓ **After School Programs:** \$200 million to expand programs and serve a quarter of a million children.
- ✓ **Child Literacy:** \$260 million for a new literacy initiative, consistent with the President's America Reads proposal.
- ✓ **College Mentoring for Middle School Children:** \$120 million for GEAR-UP, a new mentoring initiative to help up to 100,000 low income middle school children prepare for college.
- ✓ **Education Technology:** A \$114 million increase over FY98 to ensure that every child has access to computers, the Internet, high-quality educational software, and teachers that can use techno/logy in the classroom.
- ✓ **Child Care Quality:** \$182 million to improve the quality of child care for America's working families.
- ✓ **Teacher Recruitment:** \$75 million for new teacher quality programs including to recruit and prepare thousands of teachers to teach in high-poverty areas.
- ✓ **Head Start:** A \$313 million increase to fund President's request of up to an additional 36,000 slots for children and keeping on track towards one million children served by 2002.
- ✓ **Charter Schools:** A 25% increase in funding for Charter Schools to keep on track toward 3,000 quality charter schools early in next century.
- ✓ **Hispanic Education Initiative:** Increases of \$524 million to enhance educational opportunities.
- ✓ **Pell Grants:** The largest maximum award ever for Pell grants -- \$3,125 a year per eligible student.

Investing in a Cleaner Environment. President Clinton won important new investments to combat water pollution, protect national parks, natural forests, and other public lands, restore salmon and other endangered species, and develop clean energy technologies and defeated many anti-environment riders:

- ✓ \$1.7 billion for the President's **Clean Water Action Plan**.
- ✓ \$325 million to preserve **precious lands**.
- ✓ A 23 percent increase to protect threatened **endangered species**.
- ✓ More than \$1 billion, a 26-percent increase, to fight **global warming**.

Responding to the Farm Crisis at Home. The final budget includes about \$6 billion in emergency assistance to farmers, ranchers, and their families -- \$1.7 billion over the vetoed agriculture bill.

And to the Financial Turmoil Abroad. The final budget includes the President's full funding request of \$17.9 billion for the IMF.

Moving People from Welfare to Work and Empowering Communities. President Clinton and Vice President Gore are committed to tapping the potential of America's urban and rural communities. This budget moves forward on their vision to help revitalize America's communities.

- ✓ **Welfare to Work Housing Vouchers:** \$283 million for 50,000 vouchers.
- ✓ **Access to Jobs:** \$75 million to link people on welfare to jobs.
- ✓ **Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFI) Fund:** A 20% expansion.
- ✓ **Empowerment Zones:** \$60 million in flexible funding.

A Strong Research and Development Agenda. The President's budget included an unprecedented commitment to key civilian research. The final budget includes many increases in priority areas:

- ✓ **National Science Foundation:** A 7 percent increase in support for science and engineering research.
- ✓ **National Institutes of Health:** A 14 percent, \$1.9 billion increase to support greater research on diabetes, cancer, genetic medicine, and the development of an AIDS vaccine.
- ✓ **Next Generation Internet:** More than \$100 million for a Federal R&D initiative which will connect more than 100 universities at speeds that are up to 1,000 times faster than today's Internet.
- ✓ **Advanced Technology Program:** About \$70 million for new awards for leading-edge civilian technology projects.

Other Highlights:

- ✓ **EEOC:** A \$37 million increase to reduce the average time it takes to resolve private sector complaints and reduce the backlog of cases.
- ✓ **Fighting Abusive Child Labor:** A 10-fold increase, from \$3 million to \$30 million, in our commitment to the International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labor (IPEC).
- ✓ **Police on the Street:** Funding for 17,000 additional Community Oriented Police Services (COPS) Program police officers toward the President's goal of 100,000 additional officers by 2000.
- ✓ **Food Safety Initiative:** \$79 million to expand food safety research, risk assessment capabilities, education, surveillance activities, and food import inspections
- ✓ **HIV/AIDS Prevention and Treatment:** An unprecedented over \$350 million increase to help prevent and treat HIV/AIDS, with special efforts to address the needs of the minority community.

Much Work Still Left to Do:

In the waning days of the session, the President and Congressional Democrats prevailed in making critical investments to advance the President's comprehensive education agenda. Much work remains for the future because Republicans in Congress killed, at least for now, critical priorities, including:

- X **School Modernization.** Beginning with his State of the Union address, the President fought all year to modernize our schools. His fully paid for tax credits would have leveraged nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate schools. In the final days of the budget negotiations, Republicans in Congress refused to even meet on the critical issue of school construction.
- X **Patients Bill of Rights.** President Clinton repeatedly urged the Congress to pass a strong, enforceable patients' bill of rights that would assure Americans the quality health care they need. Congressional Republicans killed this year's effort to pass a Patients Bill of Rights.
- X **Comprehensive Tobacco Legislation.** This year, President Clinton made passage of legislation to reduce youth smoking a top priority, in order to stop kids from smoking before they start through a significant price increase, measures to prevent tobacco companies from marketing to children, and critical public health prevention and education programs. Congressional Republicans opted to act as politicians instead of parents, and killed this year's effort to pass bipartisan comprehensive tobacco legislation to reduce youth smoking.
- X **Campaign Finance Reform.** At the beginning of the year, the President made passage of bipartisan, comprehensive campaign finance reform a priority for his Administration. After months of delay, the House of Representatives overcame defenders of the status quo and passed the Shay-Meehan bill. However, the Senate Republicans killed this historic legislation.
- X **Child Care Initiative.** In his State of the Union, the President proposed an historic child care initiative to make child care better, safer and more affordable for America's working families. The President's proposal included \$7.5 billion over 5 years for child care subsidies for low-income working families and tax credits to help 3 million working families pay for child care. The Republicans refused to support these critical investments.
- X **Work Incentives Bill for People with Disabilities.** At the commemoration of the Americans with Disabilities Act last July, the President endorsed the bipartisan Jeffords-Kennedy bill that enables people with disabilities to go back to work by providing an option to buy into Medicaid and Medicare, as well as other pro-work initiatives. This bill was on the list of top Administration priorities in the final budget negotiations, but rejected by Republicans. The President will continue to fight to give people with disabilities the opportunity to work --including the critical health insurance that makes work possible.
- X **Speeding Toxic Cleanups.** President Clinton called for an additional \$650 million -- a 40 percent increase -- to accelerate Superfund cleanups with a goal of completing a total of 900 cleanups by 2001. The Republican majority refused these funds, threatening to delay cleanup at up to 171 sites across the country.

PRESIDENT CLINTON, VICE PRESIDENT GORE, AND CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS WIN ON THE BUDGET

October 15, 1998

Saving Social Security First

In his State of the Union address, President Clinton asked a basic question -- "what should we do with this projected surplus?" -- and gave an historic four-word answer: "Save Social Security First." With our fiscal house in order, marked by the first budget surplus in a generation, President Clinton is determined to seize this unique opportunity to strengthen this most important program for generations to come. Protecting the surplus is a key step towards enacting Social Security reform. President Clinton defeated repeated efforts to squander the surplus and, at the end of this Congress, it remains intact.

Invests in Education and Training

In the face of House Republican efforts to slash their education budget by more than \$2 billion, President Clinton and Vice President Gore delivered on their education agenda:

NEW EDUCATION AND TRAINING INITIATIVES IN FINAL BUDGET AGREEMENT:

- ✓ **More High-Quality Teachers With Smaller Class Sizes.** In his State of the Union address, President Clinton said, "Tonight, I propose the first-ever national effort to reduce class size in the early grades. My balanced budget will help to hire 100,000 new teachers." Throughout the year, Republicans failed to consider this important initiative. The final budget provides \$1.2 billion for the first year of the President's new initiative to hire 100,000 new, well-prepared teachers, to reduce class sizes in the early grades to a national average of 18.
- ✓ **GEAR-UP: College Mentoring Initiative To Help Up to 100,000 Students Prepare for College.** In his State of the Union address, President Clinton urged Congress "to support our efforts to enlist colleges and universities to reach out to disadvantaged children, starting in the 6th grade, so that they can get the guidance and hope they need so they can know that they, too, will be able to go on to college." The President proposed \$140 million to get this effort started, but the House appropriations bill denied funding and the Senate provided only \$75 million. The final budget provides \$120 million for this new initiative which was authorized as part of the higher education legislation enacted on October 7th. GEAR-UP will expand mentoring efforts by States, and provide new grants to partnerships of middle schools, institutions of higher education, and community organizations, to provide intensive early intervention services to help prepare up to 100,000 students at high-poverty middle schools for college.
- ✓ **Child Literacy Initiative to Help Children Read Well By the End of the Third Grade.** In 1996, President Clinton proposed an America Reads Challenge to help three million children improve their reading skills. In 1997, he insisted that the new initiative be included as part of the Balanced Budget Agreement. With this budget, he has won the \$260 million that he proposed to help ensure that all children can read well and independently by the end of third grade. The budget includes the legislation creating a program that is consistent with the President's America Reads proposal. The new program will provide competitive grants to States to (1) improve teachers' ability to teach reading effectively; (2) promote family literacy programs to help parents be their child's first teacher; and (3) improve the quality of tutoring programs by supporting tutor training.

- ✓ **Youth Opportunity Areas To Help Increase Job Opportunities for 50,000 Youth in High-Poverty Communities.** Authorized in the Workforce Investment Act, President Clinton's Youth Opportunity Grants to direct resources to high-poverty areas, including Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities, to provide comprehensive services designed to increase employment and school completion rates for disadvantaged youth. The President's FY99 budget included \$250 million for this new innovative program. While the House Republican budget did not fund this critical initiative, the final agreement includes the full \$250 million request, which will help provide job training and social services to 50,000 youth.
- ✓ **New Learning Anytime, Anywhere Initiative.** The President's FY99 budget included a new initiative to enhance and promote distance learning opportunities -- learning outside the usual classroom settings, via computers and other technology -- for all adult learners. The final budget includes \$20 million for the Education and Labor Departments to implement this new initiative to demonstrate new high-quality uses of technology for distance learning in post-secondary education and training, and to help provide more accurate labor market information.
- ✓ **Teacher Recruitment and Preparation -- \$75 million.** On October 7th, President Clinton signed legislation that had incorporated the President's Teacher Recruitment and Preparation proposal. While House Republicans did not fund this important initiative, the final budget provides \$75 million, which will help recruit and prepare thousands of teachers to teach in high-poverty urban and rural communities and will strengthen teacher preparation programs across the country.
- ✓ **Training New Teachers to Use Technology Effectively.** President Clinton's FY99 budget requested \$75 million to train new teachers in how to use technology to improve student achievement. The House and Senate Republicans denied the request. The final agreement includes the full \$75 million the President requested.
- ✓ **Hispanic Education Action Plan To Attack Unacceptably High Drop-Out Rate.** Because the high-school drop-out rate of Hispanics is unacceptably high, President Clinton's FY99 budget included the first-ever Hispanic Education Action Plan. As part of this plan, the President proposed significant increases in Title I funding and a number of other programs that enhance educational opportunity for Hispanic Americans. The final budget includes increases of \$524 million for these programs; for example, it provides a \$301 million increase for Title I; \$600 million for TRIO college preparation programs, an increase of \$70 million over FY 1998, which will provide support services for over 700,000 students; and \$50 million for Bilingual Education Professional Development -- double the FY 1998 level -- to begin to provide 20,000 teachers over five years with the training they need to teach Limited English Proficient students.

EXPANDED KEY EDUCATION AND TRAINING INVESTMENTS:

- ✓ **Expanded After-School Programs To Serve A Quarter of A Million Children.** In his State of the Union address, President Clinton asked Congress to "dramatically expand our support for after-school programs." The President and Vice President proposed \$200 million for after-school programs in their FY99 budget. While the House Republican budget did not fund \$140 million of the President's and Vice President's request, which would have denied services to about 175,000 children, the final budget includes full funding for the President's and Vice President's initiative, which will serve a quarter of a million children each year.

- ✓ **Expanded Head Start.** President Clinton proposed a \$313 million increase for Head Start to add 30,000 to 36,000 new slots for children, continuing on the path to serving one million children by 2002. The House Republican budget did not provide the President's increase and would have denied up to 25,000 children Head Start slots if enacted. The final budget includes the President's full increase for Head Start, which is funded at \$4.660 billion.
- ✓ **Summer Jobs Protected for Half a Million Youth.** While House Republicans attempted to eliminate the successful Summer Jobs program, President Clinton prevailed with his request for \$871 million in funding, which will finance up to 530,000 summer jobs for disadvantaged youth.
- ✓ **Expanded Educational Technology -- Connecting Our Children to the Future.** President Clinton's and Vice President Gore's budget requested \$721 million -- a \$137 million increase -- for educational technology to ensure that every child has access to computers, the Internet, high-quality educational software, and teachers that can use technology effectively in the classroom. The House Republican denied the President's and Vice President's request for a funding increase, cutting funding \$43 million below last year. The final agreement includes \$698 million -- a 20-percent increase over the \$584 million funding level in FY98, including the new \$75 million initiative for training new teachers and \$10 million for new grants to public-private partnerships in low-income communities to provide residents access to computer facilities for educational and employment purposes. Education technology has always been a top priority for the President and Vice President; since 1993, they have created the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund and increased overall investments in educational technology by thirty-fold, from \$23 million to \$698 million this year.
- ✓ **Protected Goals 2000 to Promote High Academic Standards.** President Clinton created Goals 2000 in 1993 to promote high academic standards for all students and proposed a modest expansion in this year's budget. While the House Republican budget tried to cut the program in half, the final budget includes \$491 million which will help all 50 States continue raise academic standards and help at least 12,000 schools implement innovative and effective education reforms.
- ✓ **Improved Child Care Quality.** In his State of the Union, the President proposed an historic child care initiative to make child care better, safer and more affordable for America's working families. While the budget does not include critical investments in subsidies and tax credits to help working families pay for child care, it does include the President's request of \$182 million to improve the quality of child care.
- ✓ **Expanded Work Study To Help Nearly One Million Students Work Their Way Through College.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included a significant expansion of the Federal Work Study program. The final budget agreement provides \$870 million -- a \$40 million increase over the FY 1998 level of \$830 million -- which will allow nearly one million students to work their way through college and keeps us on track to the President's goal of one million students in work study by the year 2000.
- ✓ **Expanded Job Training To Help 666,000 Dislocated Workers.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included a significant expansion in the dislocated worker program. While the House froze job training funds for dislocated workers, the final agreement includes \$1.4 billion

which will help some 666,000 dislocated workers get the training and reemployment services they need to return to work as quickly as possible. This represents an increase of \$55 million -- to help 27,000 dislocated workers -- compared to FY98. Since 1993, dislocated worker funding has been expanded by 171 percent -- helping to well more than double the number of workers served.

- ✓ **Expanded Charter Schools to Promote Creation High-Quality Public Schools.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included \$100 million for Charter Schools to keep us on track toward the President's goal of creating 3,000 high-quality public charter schools that will educate more than half a million students by early in the next century. Charter schools are public schools started by teachers, parents and communities, that are given flexibility in decision-making, in exchange for high levels of accountability for results. The final budget provides \$100 million -- the President's 25-percent increase -- for Charter Schools and will give parents and students more choice, better schools, and greater accountability for results in public education.
- ✓ **Assistance to Help Over 400,000 More Students in Distressed Communities Learn Basic Skills.** President Clinton proposed a \$392 million increase in Title I funding to help students in high poverty communities receive the extra help they need to master the basics to reach high academic standards. The House Republican budget proposed a freeze in Title I funding. The final budget provides a \$301 million increase, from \$7.375 billion in FY98 to \$7.676 billion in FY99. This funding will support educational services for nearly 11 million students, over 400,000 more than last year.
- ✓ **Largest Maximum Pell Grant Award Ever.** Last year, President Clinton signed into law the largest one-year increase in Pell Grant scholarships in 20 years. This year, the final budget provides \$7.7 billion for Pell Grants, an increase of \$359 million over FY98, increasing the maximum Pell Grant award from \$3,000 to \$3,125 -- that's the largest maximum award ever, 36-percent higher than it was in 1994. This year, approximately 4 million students will receive Pell Grant awards.
- ✓ **Extends Trade Adjustment Assistance (TAA).** President Clinton proposed extending TAA and NAFTA-TAA in his FY99 budget in order to provide training and income support to workers adversely impacted by trade. The final budget extends these important programs through June 30, 1999.

Moves Forward On The Environment

In the final budget, President Clinton won important increases to combat water pollution, protect national parks and other precious lands, restore salmon and other endangered species, and develop clean energy technologies. At the same time, President Clinton forced Congress to drop special-interest riders that would have cut roads through wilderness, forced overcutting on our national forests, crippled wildlife protections, and blocked common-sense actions to address global warming.

- ✓ **Clean, Safe Water for America.** The final budget provides \$1.7 billion -- an additional \$230 million or 16-percent increase from last year -- for the President's Clean Water Action Plan, a five-year initiative to help communities and farmers clean up the almost 40 percent of America's surveyed waterways still too polluted for fishing and swimming. In addition, the budget provides states \$2.15 billion in financing for clean water construction projects.

- ✓ **Preserving Precious Lands.** An additional \$325 million for FY99 -- a \$55-million increase from last year -- through the Land and Water Conservation Fund will be used to acquire dozens of natural and historic sites around the country, including critical winter range for Yellowstone bison, New Mexico's Baca Ranch and the last remaining private stretches of the Appalachian Trail.
- ✓ **Protecting Endangered Species.** The final budget provides an additional \$32 million in FY99 -- a 23-percent increase from last year -- providing funds for protection and recovery of endangered and threatened species, as well as enhancements for important habitats.
- ✓ **Leading the Fight Against Global Warming.** The final budget provides over \$1 billion -- a 26-percent increase from last year -- to support research investments that will reduce greenhouse gas emissions, oil consumption, and energy costs for consumers and businesses by promoting increased energy efficiency and clean energy technologies.
- ✓ **Defending Our Environment Against Stealth Attacks.** President Clinton forced Congress to drop special-interest riders that would have rolled back hard-won environmental protections. Anti-environmental language in the budget bills would have:
 - Forced overcutting of timber on national forests and accelerated logging of Alaskan rain forest.
 - Allowed intrusive helicopter landings in Alaska wilderness and the first road ever carved through a designated wilderness area.
 - Hindered salmon restoration in the Pacific Northwest, and allowed harmful commercial fishing in wilderness waters of Glacier Bay National Park.
 - Blocked common-sense actions to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and barred the Administration from informing the public about the threat of global warming.
 - Placed restrictions on the use of brownfields funds that would have denied municipalities the funds they need to undertake clean-up at brownfield sites.

Responds to the Farm Crisis at Home...

- ✓ **Emergency Farm Assistance.** President Clinton vetoed the Agriculture Appropriations bill on October 8th "because it fails to address adequately the crisis now gripping our Nation's farm community." The final budget includes a significant increase in total emergency assistance to farmers and ranchers compared to the bill the President vetoed -- about \$6 billion in the final budget versus \$4.2 billion in the vetoed bill, that's 40 percent more assistance than the bill the President vetoed. The final bill increased the amount for crop loss compensation by \$228 million, and increased the amount for economic loss compensation by \$1.4 billion, bringing the amounts for these to \$2.6 billion and about \$3 billion, respectively.

....And to Financial Turmoil Abroad

- ✓ **Full IMF Funding To Help Address International Financial Crisis.** With America's fiscal house in order, the United States is now the bulwark of economic stability in the world. Some other nations around the world, however, are experiencing major economic upheaval, hurting our exports, farmers, and ranchers. A strong International Monetary Fund is a stabilizing force in the world economy and is a critical piece of President Clinton's strategy to protect the international financial system -- and therefore the U.S. economy -- against the risk of new, escalating, or spreading crises. President Clinton fought for and won full funding of \$17.9 billion for the IMF -- a critical part of his strategy to help address the global financial crisis and to keep our economy strong. A stronger IMF will give the U.S. and its allies new flexibility in developing responses to protect the world from the spread of the financial crisis.
- ✓ **Fully Funds President Clinton's Child Labor Initiative.** In his State of the Union address, the President pledged to send legislation to Congress to fight abusive child labor and proposed making the United States the world leader in supporting programs to reduce abusive child labor, with a 10-fold increase in our commitment to the International Programme for the Elimination of Child Labor (IPEC), from \$3 million to \$30 million a year. While the Senate, with the strong leadership of Senator Harkin, fully funded the President's request, the House failed to do so, providing only \$6 million. In the final budget, Congress agreed to the President's full request of \$30 million for IPEC. The budget also fully funds the President's \$9 million request for domestic enforcement and a migrant youth job-training demonstration.

Moves People from Welfare to Work and Empowers Communities

President Clinton and Vice President Gore are committed to tapping the potential of America's urban and rural communities. This budget moves forward on their vision to help revitalize America's communities:

- ✓ **50,000 Welfare-to-Work Housing Vouchers.** President Clinton's FY 1999 Budget included \$283 million for 50,000 new vouchers exclusively for people who need housing assistance to make the transition from welfare to work. The original House bill included \$100 million, while the Senate provided only \$40 million. The final budget includes President Clinton's full request of \$283 million for 50,000 welfare-to-work housing vouchers.
- ✓ **Flexible Funding for Empowerment Zones.** President Clinton and Vice President Gore requested mandatory funding for second-round urban and rural Empowerment Zones. The final budget includes \$60 million in this flexible discretionary funding for the next round of Empowerment Zones and 20 new rural Enterprise Communities.
- ✓ **Extended Welfare-to-Work Tax Credit.** This tax credit encourages employers to hire, invest in training, and retain long-term welfare recipients. The credit is for 35 percent of the first \$10,000 in wages in the first year of employment and 50 percent of the first \$10,000 in the second year. President Clinton proposed to extend the credit in his FY99 budget and the final budget includes an extension through June 30, 1999.
- ✓ **Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) Expansion.** The Administration requested a major expansion of the CDFI program to continue building a national network of

community development banks. The original House bill froze CDFI funding at \$80 million, while the Senate cut funding to \$55 million. The final budget increases CDFI funding from \$80 million in FY98 to \$95 million in FY99 -- a 19-percent increase.

- ✓ **Public Housing Reform.** This legislation makes the President's landmark housing reform a reality. This bipartisan bill will allow more economic integration and deconcentration in our Nation's public housing, encourage and reward work, provide protections for those most in need, and put the Nation back into the housing business with the first new housing vouchers in five years.
- ✓ **FHA Loan Limit Increased.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included an increase in the FHA loan limit to expand homeownership opportunities to more Americans. The final budget includes an increase in the FHA loan limit, raising the limit from \$86,317 to \$109,032 in the lowest cost areas and from \$170,300 to \$197,621 in the highest cost areas.
- ✓ **Extended Work Opportunity Tax Credit.** This tax credit encourages employers to hire individuals who have traditionally had a hard time securing employment. Targeted groups include disadvantaged youth, including those living in empowerment zones and enterprise communities, welfare recipients, and qualified veterans. The maximum credit paid to the employer is as much as 40 percent of an individual's first \$6,000 in wages. The President proposed to extend this credit in his FY99 budget and the final budget includes an extension through June 30, 1999.
- ✓ **"Play-by-the-Rules" Homeownership Initiative.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included \$25 million for the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation to start the "Play-by-the-Rules" homeownership initiative, which would make homeownership more accessible to 10,000 families who have good rental histories, but are not adequately served in the housing market. The final budget includes \$25 million for this new initiative.
- ✓ **Increased Funding for Homeless Assistance.** The President proposed a major expansion of HUD's continuum of care program, designed to help homeless persons obtain health care, jobs, and permanent housing. The final budget includes \$975 million in funds for the homeless -- a \$152 million, or 18 percent, increase over last year.
- ✓ **HUD Fair Housing.** The President proposed a major expansion of HUD's Fair Housing programs, as part of his "One America" initiative. The final budget expands HUD's Fair Housing programs from \$30 million in FY98 to \$40 million in FY99. That 33-percent increase includes \$7.5 million for a new audit-based enforcement initiative proposed by the Administration.
- ✓ **Regional Opportunity Counseling.** The Administration requested funds to help counsel Section 8 certificate and voucher holders on their full range of housing options. While the Senate did not include any funding for this initiative, the final budget includes \$10 million for this voluntary effort to expand the housing and employment opportunities available to low-income families.
- ✓ **Expansion of HUD's Youthbuild Program.** The Administration proposed expanding funds for Youthbuild by more than a quarter. While the original House bill provided \$35

million and the Senate provided \$40 million, the final budget includes \$42.5 million -- an increase of over 20 percent.

- ✓ **Cleaning Up Brownfields.** The Administration proposed \$91 million for EPA's brownfield activities, such as grants for site assessment and community planning. The final budget includes the President's request of \$91 million.
- ✓ **Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Expansion.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included an expansion of CDBG. The final budget increases funding for CDBG from \$4.675 billion in FY98 to \$4.750 billion in FY99 -- that's a \$75 million expansion this year.
- ✓ **Increased Help For Communities Suffering From Sudden and Severe Economic Dislocation.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included a 10-percent increase in funds for EDA so that they can better respond to sudden and severe economic dislocation. The final budget increases funding for EDA from \$361 million to \$393 million -- that's a 9-percent expansion this year.
- ✓ **Expansion of NADBank.** The Administration proposed providing the North American Development Bank's (NADBank) Community Adjustment and Investment Program \$37 million of paid-in capital, which would allow the Bank to leverage private capital markets to provide additional financing to trade-affected communities. The final budget includes \$10 million of paid-in capital for the NADBank.
- ✓ **\$75 Million for Welfare-to-Work Transportation Funds.** While the House and Senate provided \$50 million -- the minimum amount "guaranteed" in the transportation bill -- the final budget includes \$75 million for this competitive grant program. These funds will assist states and localities in developing flexible transportation alternatives, such as van services, to help former welfare recipients and other low income workers get to work.
- ✓ **Individual Development Accounts.** Since 1992, President Clinton has supported the creation of Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) to empower individuals to save for a first home, post-secondary education, or to start a new business. Congress recently passed legislation authorizing IDAs, and the final budget includes \$10 million to get this program off the ground.
- ✓ **Heating and Cooling Assistance for Low-Income Families Protected.** More than five million low-income families receive help to pay for home heating costs through this program, yet the House Republicans tried to eliminate it. The final budget includes the President's full request for funding to help low-income families pay for home heating and cooling assistance.

Advances a Strong Health and Technology Research Agenda

For six years in a row, President Clinton and Vice President Gore have proposed substantial increases in the Federal government's research and development portfolio to build a healthier, more prosperous, and productive future. In FY 1999, the President proposed, within the first balanced budget in a generation, the largest commitment to key civilian research in the history of our country as part of the "Research Fund for America." Congress agreed to support significant increases in

R&D, including:

- ✓ **Expansion of National Science Foundation.** President Clinton proposed a major expansion of research and development funds for the National Science Foundation (NSF). The final budget includes a 7-percent increase -- from \$3.4 billion in FY98 to \$3.7 billion in FY99 -- in the NSF research budget to support science and engineering research across all fields and disciplines. NSF supports nearly half of the non-medical basic research conducted at universities.
- ✓ **Expansion of National Institutes of Health for Biomedical Research.** President Clinton's FY99 budget included the largest-ever dollar increase in funds for the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The final budget includes almost \$2 billion expansion of NIH research funding -- a 14-percent increase. Scientists are on the cusp of important new breakthroughs in biomedical research, which could revolutionize the way medical experts understand, treat, and prevent some of our most devastating diseases. This increase will enable scientists to pursue a wide range of cutting edge research from Alzheimers to AIDS to genetic discoveries.
- ✓ **Research and Experimentation Tax Credit.** President Clinton proposed to extend the research tax credit because it provides incentives for private sector investment in research and innovation that can help increase America's economic competitiveness and enhance U.S. productivity. The final budget extends this research tax credit until June 30, 1999.
- ✓ **Expansion of Energy Department Science Budget.** President Clinton's FY99 included an 8-percent increase in the Department of Energy's science budget, including support for the National Spallation Neutron Source. The final budget fully funds the President's request.
- ✓ **Funds Next Generation Internet.** In his State of the Union address, President Clinton said, "I ask Congress to step up support for building the next generation Internet... And the next generation Internet will operate at speeds up to a thousand times faster than today." The final budget includes more than \$100 million funding for the Next Generation Internet, a Federal R&D initiative which will connect more than 100 universities at speeds that are up to 1,000 times faster than today's Internet, and establish the foundation for the networks and applications (e.g. telemedicine, distance learning) of the 21st century.
- ✓ **Expansion in Advanced Technology Program (ATP).** President Clinton's FY99 budget proposed an expansion of ATP to promote cutting-edge high-technology projects. While the Senate froze funding at the FY98 level and the House cut funding by \$13 million, the final budget increases ATP funding to \$204 million -- an \$11 million increase over last year -- which will allow for about \$70 million in new awards to develop high-risk technologies that promise significant commercial payoffs and widespread economic benefits.

Improving the Public Health of America

For six years, President Clinton and Vice President Gore have been working hard to expand our Nation's health care investments, including research, prevention, and quality care for more Americans.

- ✓ **New Efforts to Prevent and Treat HIV/AIDS.** The Congress has responded to the

President's and Vice President's request to substantially increase efforts to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS. Congress has provided \$1.4 billion for Ryan White Care Act activities. This funding level includes a 61-percent increase for the AIDS drug assistance program, which provides funds to States to help uninsured and underinsured people with life-saving treatments for HIV/AIDS. In addition, Congress provided about \$630 million for HIV prevention activities at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

- ✓ **Historic \$130 Million Effort to Address HIV/AIDS in Minority Community.** Minority communities make up the fastest growing portion of the HIV/AIDS caseload (44 percent of all new HIV cases). In FY99, there will be an unprecedented \$130 million investment, including that will improve prevention efforts in high-risk communities, and expand access to cutting edge HIV therapies and other treatment needed for HIV/AIDS.
- ✓ **Critical New Investments to Protect Public Health at the Centers for Disease Control (CDC).** The Congress has responded to President Clinton's request for a \$2.4 billion investment -- a \$222 million increase -- in public health at the CDC. This critical investment will address a host of public health challenges, including fighting emerging infectious diseases, combating new resistance to anti-biotics, and improving prevention for some of our nation's leading killers, such as diabetes, HIV/AIDS, and heart disease.
- ✓ **New Efforts to Improve the Quality of Health Care.** Congress has responded to the President's request for a \$25 million investment in new research at the Agency of Health Care Policy and Research (AHCPR) to research on the quality, costs, and outcomes of the health care delivery system. Identifying critical health care problems and educating health plans, medical professionals, patients, and advocates about solutions can lead to important improvements in the quality of health care.
- ✓ **Increasing Funding to Provide Health Insurance to Low-Income Children in Puerto Rico and the Territories.** Thousands of uninsured children in both Puerto Rico and the other territories will now be eligible for meaningful health care coverage for the first time under the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). The territories were currently on schedule to receive an inadequate and inequitable \$10.7 million in FY99. Today, the Congress responded to the President's request and provided the territories with an additional \$32 million in FY99 for their new CHIP programs that will meet the needs of their uninsured children.
- ✓ **Funding the President's Commitment to Eliminate Racial Health Disparities.** Minorities suffer from higher rates for a number of critical diseases. For example, African Americans under the age of 65 have twice the rate of heart disease as whites, and Native Americans suffer from diabetes at nearly three times the average rate. The Congress has taken a critical first step in investing in the President's multi-year proposal to eliminate racial health disparities in six health areas, including HIV/AIDS, cancer, diabetes, and immunizations. The Congress has given the Administration authority to fund grants for communities to develop new strategies to address these disparities and has granted the President's request for increases in other critical public health programs, such as heart disease and diabetes prevention at CDC, that have proven effective in attacking these disparities.

- ✓ **Lead Poisoning Prevention.** The President requested a \$25 million increase in funding for HUD's Office of Lead Hazard Control, in order to reduce the threat posed by childhood lead poisoning and other housing-related environmental health hazards. While the Senate did not provide any additional funding, the final budget includes a \$20 million increase for lead poisoning prevention.

Other Highlights...

- ✓ **Reduces Backlog and Expands Alternative Dispute Resolution at Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC).** The President's FY99 budget included \$279 million -- a \$37 million increase over the previous year -- to significantly expand EEOC's alternative dispute resolution program and reduce the backlog of private sector discrimination complaints. The final budget fully funds the President's request -- providing the first real increase for EEOC in several years.
- ✓ **President Clinton's Food Safety Initiative.** The final budget provided approximately \$79 million in new funds for the President's Food Safety Initiative to help implement a far-ranging plan to improve surveillance of food borne illnesses, education about proper food handling, research, and inspection of imported and domestic foods. The new funds are part of an Administration-wide effort, led by the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health and Human Services, to create a seamless, science-based food safety system.
- ✓ **More Police on the Streets.** In 1994, President Clinton fought for and won a commitment to put 100,000 police officers on the street. The final budget includes funds for 17,000 additional Community Oriented Police Services (COPS) Program police officers toward the President's goal of 100,000 cops on the beat by 2000.
- ✓ **Increasing Law Enforcement in Indian Country.** The final bill includes \$20 million in FY99 for more police officers and public safety initiatives in the approximately 56 million acres of Indian lands serving more than 1.4 million residents.
- ✓ **Brings Financial Stability to Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA).** The final budget includes \$50 million that will allow TVA to better provide for the citizens of the seven states -- Alabama, Georgia, Kentucky, Mississippi, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Virginia -- that it serves. The agreement will let TVA refinance part of its debt to compensate for the loss of Federal funds for its non-power programs. The final budget also prevents TVA from losing the Land Between the Lakes Recreation Area.

**DESPITE ALL THE PROGRESS IN THIS YEAR'S BUDGET,
THERE IS STILL MORE WORK LEFT TO DO**

In the waning days of the session, the President and Congressional Democrats prevailed in making critical investments in advancing the President's agenda. However, much work remains for the future because Republicans in Congress killed, at least for now, critical priorities, including:

- X School Modernization Tax Credits.** Beginning with his State of the Union address, the President fought all year to modernize our schools. His fully paid for tax credits would have leveraged nearly \$22 billion in bonds to build and renovate schools. In the final days of the budget negotiations, Republicans in Congress refused to even meet on the critical issue of school construction.
- X Patients Bill of Rights.** President Clinton repeatedly urged the Congress to pass a strong, enforceable patients' bill of rights that would assure Americans the quality health care they need. Congressional Republicans killed this year's effort to pass a Patients Bill of Rights.
- X Comprehensive Tobacco Legislation.** This year, President Clinton made passage of legislation to reduce youth smoking a top priority, in order to stop kids from smoking before they start through a significant price increase, measures to prevent tobacco companies from marketing to children, and critical public health prevention and education programs. Congressional Republicans opted to act as politicians instead of parents, and killed this year's effort to pass bipartisan comprehensive tobacco legislation to reduce youth smoking.
- X Campaign Finance Reform.** At the beginning of the year, the President made passage of bipartisan, comprehensive campaign finance reform a priority for his Administration. After months of delay, the House of Representatives overcame defenders of the status quo and passed the Shays-Meehan bill. However, the Senate Republicans killed this historic legislation.
- X Child Care Initiative.** In his State of the Union, the President proposed an historic child care initiative to make child care better, safer and more affordable for America's working families. The President's proposal included \$7.5 billion over 5 years for child care subsidies for low-income working families and tax credits to help 3 million working families pay for child care. The Republicans refused to support these critical investments.
- X Speeding Toxic Cleanups.** President Clinton called for an additional \$650 million -- a 40 percent increase -- to accelerate Superfund cleanups with a goal of completing a total of 900 cleanups by 2001. The Republican majority refused these funds, threatening to delay cleanup at up to 171 sites across the country.

- X **Work Incentives Bill for People with Disabilities.** At the commemoration of the Americans with Disabilities Act last July, the President endorsed the bipartisan Jeffords-Kennedy bill that enables people with disabilities to go back to work by providing an option to buy into Medicaid and Medicare, as well as other pro-work initiatives. This bill was on the list of top Administration priorities in the final budget negotiations, but rejected by Republicans. The President will continue to fight to give people with disabilities the opportunity to work --including the critical health insurance that makes work possible.

- X **Education Opportunity Zones.** President Clinton, in his budget, called for Education Opportunity Zones to help high-poverty urban and rural communities increase student achievement by raising standards, improving teaching, ending social promotions, and turning around failing schools. The Republican majority refused to provide the requested \$200 million in funds, which would have helped about 50 high-poverty, low-achieving, urban and rural school districts.

- X **Minimum Wage.** President Clinton and Congressional Democrats called for a \$1 increase in the minimum wage over two years -- to raise the wages of 12 million workers. For someone who works full-time, this minimum wage increase would have meant an additional \$2,000 per year. However, 95 percent of Senate Republicans voted to kill the President's minimum wage increase.

- X **Medicare Buy-In.** President Clinton proposed providing new options for Americans ages 55 to 65 to obtain health insurance, including buying into Medicare. This policy would not have hurt the Medicare Trust Fund. The Republican majority killed this new initiative that would have helped provide health care to hundreds of thousands of vulnerable Americans.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

March 27, 1996

To: Leon Panetta, Mike McCurry, Carol Rasco, Bruce Reed, Marcia Hale,
Bruce Lindsey, Ginny Terzano, April Mellody

From: Gene Sperling

Subject: Background Materials: NGA Education Speech

The following are materials that should be helpful in giving members of the media the details and the examples that they need to do more in-depth analysis of some of the proposals the President will be making in his education speech today.

Several people worked overtime today to try to get these materials together. Leslie Thornton, with help from Jennifer Davis helped pull material from the Department of Education on little notice, and Gaynor McCown of the DPC wrote the accomplishment document and put together much of the materials. Jason Goldberg and Matt Catapano worked late (as usual) to help get this done.

BACKGROUND MATERIALS

	Page
No Social or Automatic Promotions:	
Talking Points	1
Paragraph on 5 State Promotion Tests	2-3
Facts on Social Promotion from Recent clips	4-5
NGA Grid on 50 State Efforts	6-7
Teacher Standards:	
Background Facts on Teacher Certification	8
50 State Chart On Special Teacher Cert.	9
4 Examples of Teacher Tenure Reform Law	10-11
2 Examples of Teacher Incentive Programs	12
3 Programs for Weak/Excellent Teachers	13
50 States National Board Experience	14-19
Hold Schools to High Standards	
Charter School Summary	20
Charter School Example	21-23
Safe, Drug Free and Disciplined Schools	
Community School Summary and Examples	24-28
NYT Article on Teacher Authority to Suspend Students from Classroom (NY and Indiana)3/5/96	29
Administration Accomplishments	30-32

TALKING POINTS ON NO SOCIAL OR AUTOMATIC PROMOTIONS

Getting Serious About High Expectations and High Standards: The President is sending a strong message to the nation: that it is long past time to get serious about standards, accountability and high expectations.

End Entitlement Mentality: We have to end the entitlement mentality that says that anyone who shows up deserves to pass and that just getting by is good enough. Passing from one grade to another should be an accomplishment -- not an entitlement. It should signify that the student really did learn -- and that the school is doing its job.

Tests for Promotion From Each Level of School: The best way to make that crystal clear is for every state to say clearly: no one graduates from one school to the next -- from elementary school, from middle school, and from high school -- unless they have met a state performance test.

Purpose is to Help Young People Succeed -- Not Hold them Back: The purpose of this is not to hold young people back: it is to inspire schools, teachers, parents and students to do everything possible -- from tutoring, after school work, summer school, before school -- to help those students meet the grade. Staying back should be a last resort.

Governor Clinton pioneered this idea. His 1983, "Competency Based Education Act of 1983" called for young people to be tested in 3rd grade, 6th grade and 8th grade -- with students having to pass the Arkansas Minimum Performance test in 8th grade to be promoted to the 9th grade. This may be the toughest example of a state using a state-wide performance test as a threshold for promotion. Governor Clinton was the first Governor in the nation to pass an 8th grade competency test for promotion. Only four other states current use some form of tests for promotion.

The President's proposal is call for a bold step, beyond what any state has done so far. The focus on tests for graduation from elementary, middle school and high school is the right approach. *This approach puts accountability on each school to perform* and show their students can pass. It assures standards, accountability and performance throughout school -- ending the mentality of entitlement and social promotion.

Bold, But Reasonable Reform: Even though this approach is stronger and bolder than what any state has done, we feel that it will take hold, because the logic of ensuing that young people are learning as they go through school while holding each school and each students accountable.

STATE TESTS FOR STUDENT PROMOTION

ARKANSAS.

In 1983, Governor Clinton pushed through and signed the "Competency Based Education Act of 1983" in a special or "extraordinary" legislative session. The act called for students to be tested in 3rd grade, 6th grade and 8th grade. The tests in 3rd and 6th grade were used to device educational improvement plans to help students. Yet, students had to pass the Arkansas Minimum Performance test in 8th grade to be promoted to the 9th grade. This may be the toughest example of a state using a state-wide performance test as a threshold for promotion.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

In 1983-84 then-Governor Riley led a statewide education improvement effort, that resulted in the passage of the 1984 South Carolina Education Improvement Act which raised standards and put in place tough student achievement requirements. The Act required an exit exam for graduation, the use of basic skill scores to be part of the promotion criteria from grades 6 and 8. It also included a no-pass, no-play provision.

The combination of the tough standards for promotion and graduation, and no-pass no-play, coupled with extra help for kids that wanted it and needed it, resulted in basic skills scores improving for an unprecedented four out of five years in reading, math, and writing across the state.

In two studies of teachers' opinions about school reform from 1983-1989 by the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, South Carolina's reforms were constantly rated the highest in the nation for putting more rigor and achievement into the schools.

LOUISIANA.

The Louisiana Educational Assessment Program (LEAP) includes state-developed criterion referenced tests at grades 3, 5, 7, 10, and 11 as well as the norm-referenced California Achievement Test (CAT-5) at grades 4 and 6. At grades 3, 5, and 7, districts are expected to consider students' LEAP scores as a major, but not sole, criterion for promotion. Districts develop their own pupil progression plans for promotion and retention. In general, districts and individual schools use LEAP scores in conjunction with grades and other indicators to determine student promotion.

Districts must provide state-funded remediation for students at any level who fail a LEAP test. Districts determine how to structure the remediation, which must focus on students' weaknesses as indicated on their individual LEAP student reports. Districts choose which students to serve and may provide services during the school year or the summer.

Contact: Claudia Davis, Louisiana Department of Education, Section Administrator, (504) 342-3748

NORTH CAROLINA.

North Carolina administers state-developed tests at the end of grades 3 through 8 as well as end-of-course tests at the high school level. The state cut back testing this year and will administer only reading and math tests for grades 3-8 as well as high school end-of-course tests in those subjects required for graduation. Students in grades 3-8 can score from 1-4 on the end-of-grade tests; the state's goal is for all students to score at level 3 or above. The state expects districts to provide any student who scores below level 3 with some type of remedial instruction. Districts set their own promotion policies and are expected to take test scores into account along with any other relevant information.

Contact: Doris Tyler, North Carolina Department of Public Instruction, Senior Consultant in Testing
(919) 715-1207

VIRGINIA.

Virginia's test is actually more of a graduation test than a promotion test. In 1990, state mandated a sixth grade literacy test that students must pass to graduate from high school. It is a multiple choice and essay test in reading and math. Students who do not pass the test by the 8th grade become quote "unclassified" and have until the end of the 12th grade to pass the test and graduate.

SUMMARY OF RECENT NEWS ARTICLES ON STUDENT PROMOTIONS

Texas. *Statewide Survey on Student Promotions.*

- 68 percent of Texas elementary school teachers report that students they flunked were promoted [Dallas Morning News, 1/23/96]
- 61 percent of middle school and high school teachers said students who failed their classes were allowed to move on without retaking the class. [Dallas Morning News, 1/23/96]
- Jon Cole, president of Texas Teachers Group, said that social promotions -- designed to keep students with others their own age -- are widespread in Texas. Nearly 40 percent of the 2,132 teachers in the poll said failing students were promoted even though teachers recommended they be retained. [Austin American Statesman, 1/23/96]
- Cole estimates that more than 150,000 of the state's 3.6 million students are advanced a grade level each year despite failing grades. [Austin American Statesman, 1/23/96]
- Texas governor George Bush admits the state has a basic skills problem: "Last year, one in four Texas schoolchildren who took the state reading test failed. That's 350,000 children who do not have the basic skills to learn." [The Economist, 2/20/96]
- Houston teachers: most of the 2,832 Houston teachers who responded to the state-wide survey said they were promoted despite failing grades. [Houston Chronicle, 1/23/96]
- Houston promotions: last year Houston promoted nearly 15,000 students who did not pass their coursework but had already been retained the maximum time allowed by law. [Houston Chronicle, 1/23/96]
- Dallas teachers: The survey found that 56 percent of the 1,581 teachers who responded to the survey believed that social promotions were encouraged by their school administrators. [Dallas Morning News, 1/23/96]

New York City.

- Nearly 3/4 of New York City teachers (61%) report that their elementary schools promote students to the next grade even when the students haven't earned it. [Newsday, 2/29/96]
- 9/10 of New York City teachers want a statewide core curriculum in basic subjects. [Newsday, 2/29/96]
- 25% of New York City elementary school teachers report that their districts already require kids to pass a test before they can be promoted. [Newsday, 2/29/96]
- Nearly 60% of Long Island's elementary teachers reported that they feel pressure to promote kids to higher grade levels even when they're unable to handle the more advanced work. [Newsday, 2/29/96]

Detroit, MI.

- In response to concerns that students are not graduating with the basic skills they need, Detroit Public Schools are currently considering a new idea that sounds old: "flunk students if they don't qualify to move on to the next grade." [Detroit Free Press, 3/26/96]
- School Board Member April Howard Coleman's plan would require students to prove they have acquired the skills necessary to move to the next grade. [Detroit Free Press, 3/26/96]
- The Detroit proposal has the support of most school board members. [Detroit Free Press, 3/26/96]

Gwinnet County, GA

- Sidney Faucette, the Atlanta-area's new Superintendent took office in July of 1995 and pledged to immediately end social promotions for students and set up efficiency exams in order for students to be promoted. The proposal received immediate widespread support. [Atlanta Journal and Constitution, 7/24/95]
- By the end of September of 1995, the Gwinnet School District passed the new standards, ending social promotions. Social promotions were eliminated and final exams became mandatory as the school board charted a new course that they hoped would boost test scores and prepare their students "legitimately" for college. [Atlanta Journal and Constitution, 12/31/95]

Table 3: Student, Teacher, and School Accountability in the States ⁽¹⁾

State	Student Accountability			Teacher Accountability			School Accountability						
	Promotion	Awards/ Recognition	Graduation	Certification gain/loss	Financial rewards/ penalties	Probation	Funding gain/loss	Accreditation/ Loss	Awards/ Recognition	Performance Reporting	Probation/ Warning	Takeover/ Dissolution	Other
Alabama			●	●				●		●	●	●	
Alaska										●			
Arizona										●			
Arkansas ⁽²⁾	●		○					●		●	●	○	
California										●			
Colorado ⁽³⁾								●		●			
Connecticut		●					●			●			
Delaware													
Florida		●	●							●			
Georgia			●						●	●			●
Hawaii			●				●			●			●
Idaho										●			
Illinois ⁽⁴⁾								●	●	●	●		●
Indiana ⁽⁵⁾	●		○					●	●	●			
Iowa ⁽⁶⁾													
Kansas								●		●			
Kentucky		●			●	●	●		●		●	●	●
Louisiana	●	●	●				●			●			
Maine ⁽⁷⁾		●								●			
Maryland			●				●	●	●	●	●	●	
Massachusetts ⁽⁸⁾			○						○		○	○	
Michigan		●					●	●	●	●	●	●	
Minnesota ⁽⁹⁾			○							○			
Mississippi			●					●	●	●	●	●	
Missouri		●						●					

● = in place

○ = under development

Table B: Student, Teacher, and School Accountability in the States (continued)

State	Student Accountability			Teacher Accountability			School Accountability						
	Promotion	Awards/ Recognition	Graduation	Certification gain/loss	Financial rewards/ penalties	Probation	Funding gain/loss	Accreditation/ Loss	Awards/ Recognition	Performance Reporting	Probation/ Warning	Takeover/ Dissolution	Other
Montana													
Nebraska													
Nevada			•							•			
New Hampshire										•			
New Jersey			•				•	•	•	•	•	•	
New Mexico			•							•			
New York ⁽¹⁰⁾		•	•							•	•		•
North Carolina	•		•		•		•	•		•	•	•	•
North Dakota		•						•					
Ohio			•							•	•		
Oklahoma								•		•	•	•	•
Oregon ⁽¹¹⁾		○								•			
Pennsylvania										•			
Rhode Island										•			
South Carolina	•		•				•		•	•	•	•	•
South Dakota										•			
Tennessee			•				•		•	•	•	•	
Texas		•	•					•	•	•	•	•	•
Utah		•								•			
Vermont										•			
Virginia ⁽¹²⁾	•		•							•			
Washington ⁽¹¹⁾			○				•			•			•
West Virginia		•				•		•	•	•	•	•	
Wisconsin										•			•
Wyoming													

• = in place

○ = under development

BACKGROUND POINTS ON TEACHER CERTIFICATION.

Over 40 states have alternative certification programs for teachers. While their use has expanded recently, less than 2% of current teachers have entered through alternative routes, most of those in a small number of states (e.g. California, Texas) facing severe teacher shortages in inner cities and remote rural areas and in specialized fields such as bilingual ed.

We should talk about alternative routes to teacher certification, not alternative certification. Standards for entry into teaching must be high no matter how one enters and there must be strong preparation and ongoing support programs for all. No "back door" approaches should be tolerated.

Alternative routes currently vary greatly in quality. There are examples of rigorous programs but there are many that put persons in classrooms who are not prepared to teach. This problem is exacerbated by the fact that alternative routes often are needed to provide teachers for our most at-risk students - those who most need highly competent teachers.

Alternative routes have had more success than "traditional" programs in attracting a diverse teaching force. Diverse in terms of career changers from business, the sciences and the military; new and talented liberal arts graduates; committed para-professionals already in schools; also in terms of attracting much needed persons of color. The key is to ensure both excellence and diversity in recruits.

We do not have to choose between "traditional" and alternative routes to teaching. We should take lessons learned from both and create new strategies that are more flexible and take into consideration the recruits experience and expertise while at the same time insisting on uniformly high standards for all approaches.

The Department of Education supported 29 projects around the country in the Mid Career Teacher Training Program from 1991-1994. These projects included collaborations among school districts, 2 and 4 year higher education institutions, the military, and the private sector to recruit, prepare and provide initial support for career changers interested in teaching. The lessons learned in those efforts and similar efforts are framing a new national study of such programs, to be conducted by Recruiting New Teachers, Inc. with support from Dewitt Wallace - Readers Digest and others. This study will provide state and local programs with concrete examples of efforts that incorporate innovative recruitment strategies, flexible and rigorous preparation programs and support for the transition into beginning teaching. The study's advisory board will have an ED rep.

Contact: Joe Vaughan, DoEd, 202/219-2193

Table 2. Does your state offer any special programs leading to teacher certification for any of the following?

	Transitioning military personnel	Recent liberal arts graduates	Re-entering teachers who need to upgrade credentials	Mid-career changers	Returning Peace Corps members	Other
Alabama						
Alaska	no	no	no	no	no	
Arizona						
Arkansas	yes	yes		yes	yes	
California	yes			yes	yes	yes
Colorado	yes	yes		yes	yes	
Connecticut						
Delaware	yes			yes		
D. C.		yes		yes	yes	
Florida						
Georgia	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Hawaii	yes			yes		
Idaho						
Illinois						
Indiana	no	no	no	no	no	
Iowa						
Kansas						
Kentucky	yes					
Louisiana						
Maine						
Maryland						
Massachusetts		yes		yes		
Michigan	yes	yes		yes	yes	
Minnesota						
Mississippi	yes	yes			yes	
Missouri						
Montana	no	no	no	no	no	
Nebraska	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Nevada						
New Hampshire						
New Jersey	yes	yes		yes		
New Mexico	no	no	no	no	no	
New York						
North Carolina						
North Dakota						
Ohio	yes					
Oklahoma	yes		yes			
Oregon						
Pennsylvania						
Rhode Island	no	no	no	no	no	
South Carolina	yes	yes		yes		
South Dakota						
Tennessee	yes	yes	yes	yes		
Texas						
Utah						
Vermont	no	no	no	no	no	
Virginia	yes	yes		yes		
Washington	yes		yes			
West Virginia						
Wisconsin	yes					
Wyoming		yes	yes			

STATE LAWS ON TEACHER TENURE

Massachusetts. The 1992 Comprehensive School Reform Bill removed the word "tenure" from the education code and replaced it with "professional teacher status." Unlike tenure, which was awarded by local school committees, professional teacher status is granted by district superintendents at the recommendation of school principals.

Section 42 of the code was amended to give dismissed teachers with professional status the right to appeal to an independent arbitrator before the case reaches the legal system. The teacher has the right to select from among three arbitrators from the American Association of Arbitration. Although the teacher retains the right to sue the district after the arbitration hearing, most cases are resolved in arbitration.

Contact: Kathy LeBlanc, Legal Division, Massachusetts Department of Education

Colorado. Legislation passed in 1990 removed the word tenure from the education code and replaced it with "continuing professional status." It also shortened time lines for hearings requested by tenured teachers dismissed by their districts.

The most significant change was the addition of "unsatisfactory performance" as a legitimate reason for dismissing a teacher with continuing status. Each district was required to establish standards of satisfactory performance, but these did not have to be approved either by the state or the union. All principals and administrators who rate teacher performance must now undergo 30 hours of training in personnel evaluation before they are allowed to rate any teachers. The Colorado Education Association was involved in developing these proposals and supported the final legislation.

Contact: Carol Ruckel
Office of Professional Teacher Licensing
Colorado Department of Education

Florida. All new teachers are hired under professional service contracts for no more than five years. The contracts are automatically renewable at the end of five years unless a teacher receives an unsatisfactory performance rating from his or her principal. In these cases, districts may make efforts to provide support to improve the teacher's performance. If these efforts do not yield improved ratings, the district may choose not to renew the contract.

All teachers employed before 1984 retained their tenure status and are exempt from the professional service contracts.

Contact: Kathy Christie, Education Commission of the States

Oklahoma. In 1992, the legislature amended the state education code to remove the term "tenure" and to tighten the time line for the dismissal of incompetent teachers. Under the law, "career" teachers can be dismissed for willful neglect, negligence, mental or physical abuse of a child, incompetency, instructional ineffectiveness, or unsatisfactory teaching performance.

Upon receiving written notification of the district's intent to dismiss a teacher, the teacher has the right to request a hearing, which must be held between 20 and 60 days after the teacher receives the notice. If, after the hearing, the board decides to dismiss the teacher, the teacher has just 10 days to file suit in district court. If a suit is filed, the district has just 20 days to respond; the trial must be held between 10 and 30 days after the district files its response. At the conclusion of the trial, the judge has just 3 days to issue his or her ruling. The losing party must pay the legal fees of the winning party.

Contact: Bob Mooneyham
Executive Director
Oklahoma State School Boards Association

District Teacher Incentives

Rochester, New York

Contact: Jean Castania
Career in Teaching Program
Rochester City Public Schools

The Career in Teaching (CIT) program includes four career development stages: intern, resident, professional, and lead teacher. Assignment to the first three levels is based on teacher certification, tenure, and experience in teaching. Lead teachers are selected in an open competitive process and assume additional responsibilities in the district. Only teachers who have attained the status of Professional and have seven years of classroom experience can become Lead Teachers. They also receive a 10 percent increase of their base salary.

Lead Teachers can assume a variety of responsibilities, but the most significant one is that of mentor for new teachers. Lead teachers assigned as mentors are released from their regular classroom responsibilities for 40-50 percent of their time. Each has a caseload of four interns, each of whom is released for six full days to pursue professional growth opportunities with their mentors. Additional contact between the mentor and the intern is at their discretion.

Toledo, Ohio

Contact: Sue Yager
Communications Department
Toledo Public Schools

The career ladder program in Toledo grew out of negotiations between the Toledo Federation of Teachers and the Toledo Board of Education as a strategy for keeping outstanding teachers in the classroom. About 50 of the district's 2,500 teachers participate in the program. In order to participate in the program, a teacher must submit a project proposal to the Board of Review. Proposals can include research projects or special programs to address individual school needs. The board then reviews the proposal based on a set of criteria; these criteria become increasingly rigorous as teachers advance up the ladder. As teachers move up the ladder, their salary increases proportionally. The state funds the career ladder program through a special line item in the state budget. Toledo was the first district in the state to implement a career ladder.

Examples of programs designed to work with weak teachers/recognize excellence

United Federation of Teachers -- New York City Peer Intervention Program

Exemplary teachers work intensively with peers who voluntarily seek help. If efforts to improve the performance of these weak teachers fail, they are counseled out of the profession. The program has been in effect for eight years and 20% of its participants have been counseled out of the profession (without the trauma and cost of the legal process). Last year it was recognized as a finalist for the Innovations in State and Local Government award sponsored by the Ford Foundation and the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

Cincinnati Federation of Teachers

Their program is the same as the NYC program with the exception that they also work with beginning teachers to ensure that potential problems are avoided before they are granted tenure. In addition, teachers do not have to volunteer for assistance. They can be recommended by administrators for the program.

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards

The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) is a non-profit organization dedicated to setting high and rigorous standards for experienced teachers and developing a voluntary assessment program to identify and certify the nation's highly accomplished teachers. The creation of the NBPTS in 1986 underscored the need for a higher standard for teachers to seek, sending a signal that professional development does not end the day they begin teaching.

The NBPTS is a historic development in education because, for the first time, it provides a realistic measure of what a highly accomplished teachers should know and be able to do. Much as content and performance standards are revolutionizing student learning, Board standards could serve as the framework for reform of initial teacher education and continuing professional development.

The U.S. Department of Education is proud of its support for the NBPTS because the rigorous assessment process provides assurances that teachers who achieve broad certification are highly accomplished. The NBPTS is premised on the belief that teachers must take responsibility for their own professionalism, which is why the evaluation process is voluntary and rigorous. At the same time, the Board realizes that teachers need support from their communities, which is why districts are encouraged to give teachers financial and other incentives to apply for board certification. (Governor Hunt of North Carolina chairs the National Board and has been a leader in providing incentives for teachers in his state to seek this advanced certification.)

State Action Supporting National Board Certification

ALABAMA

Legislation has established:

- that Alabama shall use certification by the NBPTS as national reciprocity when National Board Certification has been fully implemented.

CALIFORNIA

The Department of Education has formed:

- the California Task Force on National Board Certification which met over an eighteen month period to consider the implications of National Board Certification for California's education system. The Task Force report, containing an action plan for implementation, was released in the fall of 1994. Copies are available from Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), Graduate School of Education, 3653 Tolman, University of California, Berkeley, California 94720-1670.

COLORADO

The State Board of Education has determined:

- that professionally licensed teachers who achieve National Board Certification (NBC) are eligible for Colorado "master teacher" certification.
- that professional development activities associated with National Board Certification may be submitted for license renewal.

GEORGIA

The Professional Standards Commission for the State of Georgia has established:

- certification rules that allow "Georgia teachers achieving NBPTS certification during their five-year renewal cycle to renew clear renewable certificate fields for either the next cycle or the subsequent five-year cycle."
- that teachers entering Georgia will be able to use NBPTS certification to meet Georgia's test, teaching of reading, and recency-of-study/experience requirements; however, special education course work will continue to be required, if not previously met.

ILLINOIS

The State Board of Education is implementing:

- a pilot project to sponsor twenty selected teachers statewide who will prepare for National Board certification and will create a support network for these teachers.

IOWA

Legislation has established:

- that an individual who has received National Board Certification shall receive an Iowa endorsement on his/her license when the State Board of Examiners determines that National Board standards meet or exceed the Iowa requirements.
- the Department of Education professional development funds allocated to each district may be used for teachers to participate in the assessment activities necessary for National Board Certification.

State Action Supporting National Board Certification Continued

MARYLAND

The State Department of Education has adopted:

- a policy that will permit the Maryland State Department of Education to grant a license to National Board Certified Teachers who come from out of state without requiring them to meet any other education or testing requirements.
- CEU equivalents will be granted to teachers who complete the National Board Certification process.

MASSACHUSETTS

The Department of Education has established:

- that National Board Certification is recognized as an option for fulfilling the new requirements for teachers to become recertified. Teachers are asked to develop an "Individual Professional Development Plan" describing the activities that they will undertake within a five year cycle to acquire the minimum of 120 professional development points for licensure renewal.

MICHIGAN

The State Board of Education has determined:

- that teachers who enter the National Board Certification process and complete the portfolio component of the assessment will receive one-half of the credits (SB-CEUs) required for renewal of the Professional Education Certificate.
- that National Board Certified Teachers will receive full credits for one renewal of the Professional Certificate.
- that veteran National Board Certified Teachers will receive SB-CEUs for participating in assessor training and for serving as assessors.

MISSISSIPPI

Legislation has established:

- that a National Board Certified Teacher who is employed in a local district will receive a salary supplement of \$3000. The salary supplement shall take effect when the number of subject areas for NBC is sufficient to allow 80% of existing teachers in Mississippi to be eligible to apply.

NEW MEXICO

Legislation has established:

- a Senate Joint Memorial that asks that State Board of Education (SBE) to allow teachers who achieve National Board Certification to become eligible for the Level 3A license within 3 years of receiving National Board Certification. Requests SBE to allow out-of-state teachers who are National Board Certified to receive New Mexico certification without having to fulfill additional requirements normally required for teachers relocating to New Mexico.
- requests SBE to work with state universities' teacher preparation programs to examine teacher education competencies to ensure they are compatible and consistent with the National Board's teaching standards.

State Action Supporting National Board Certification Continued

NORTH CAROLINA

Legislation has appropriated \$475,582 for the 1995-96 fiscal year that will be used to:

- (1) provide funds to pay the fee for teachers who complete the National Board Certification process;
- (2) provide up to three days of release time for candidates, to work on their portfolios and prepare for the assessment center exercises, and
- (3) provide an annual bonus of 4% of teachers' state-paid salary to those who achieve National Board Certification. Teachers will continue this bonus as long as they retain NBPTS Certification.

The State Board of Education has adopted policy recommendations to:

- (1) adopt the core propositions of NBPTS;
- (2) grant a North Carolina teaching license to relocating teachers who possess National Board Certification;
- (3) waive recertification requirements for up to five years following completion of NBPTS portfolio work;
- (4) create staff development plans that incorporate the work of NBPTS in the training programs, and
- (5) develop plans to incorporate the National Board's standards into institutions of higher education programs.

OHIO

Legislation has established:

- that certification fees will be provided for up to 250 teachers seeking National Board Certification in the 1995-96 school year and fees for up to 400 teachers in the 1996-97 school year.
- that an individual achieving National Board Certification will receive an annual award of \$2,500 for the life of the certificate.

The Office of Teacher Education and Certification has determined:

- that any Ohio teacher who completes the NBC process will receive enough equivalent continuing education credits (CEU's) to have his/her license renewed.

OKLAHOMA

Legislation has established:

- the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation to address issues associated with NBPTS as well as the design, development and implementation of a competency-based teacher preparation system.
- that out-of-state teachers who have achieved National Board Certification and are relocating to Oklahoma can receive Oklahoma certification without having to fulfill additional requirements normally required for teachers relocating to Oklahoma.
- that the SBE modify teacher licensing categories to be compatible with National Board Certification categories.
- that the SBE develop an incentive system to encourage teachers to achieve National Board Certification.

VIRGINIA

The State Board of Education has determined:

- that participation in National Board Certification is an option for an "educational project" that will allow teachers to earn 90 professional points of the required 180 for license renewal.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification

NEWPORT-MESA, CALIFORNIA

- As part of the long range staff development plan presented to and accepted by the board of education, it states "The District will provide the support required to assist teachers in preparing for and passing the National Board Exams (sic)."

DOUGLAS COUNTY, COLORADO

- The Douglas County Schools (Denver Metro area) negotiated contract language that provides a \$1,000 annual bonus for teachers who achieve "outstanding status" designation ("outstanding status" may include achievement of National Board Certification); in addition, teachers who achieve National Board Certification may be eligible for "state master teacher" designation and further monetary compensation.
- Douglas County Schools is maintaining a fund that: 1) Provides no interest tuition loans for professional development efforts (negotiated with the AFT); NBPTS fees may be eligible. 2) Tuition fee reimbursement plan for professional development; may apply for reimbursement of NBPTS fee.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

- District of Columbia Schools will award three of the required six in-service/recertification credits to teachers who complete the National Board Certification process.

FLORIDA

BROWARD COUNTY

- In Broward County, Nova University presented a National Board Certified Teacher with a \$25,000 scholarship to pursue graduate studies. Candidates who were not certified were awarded a \$1,000 scholarship in recognition of their lifelong commitment to learning demonstrated through their involvement in National Board Certification.
- Broward teachers who have achieved National Board Certification will receive a supplement of \$2,000 each year for the term of the certificate. Teachers who complete the National Board Certification process will receive in-service points that can be applied toward state license renewal.

DADE COUNTY

- The Dade-Monroe Teacher Education Center in collaboration with the University of Miami, has been awarded a Goals 2000 Preservice/Inservice Grant which includes professional development, support and assistance for potential candidates for National Board Certification in 1995-96.

NORTHWEST INDIANA

- The Northwest Indiana Business Forum will make available \$500 per candidate to teachers in 41 northwest Indiana school districts to help offset the application fee for the 1995-96 National Board Certification process.

NEW ORLEANS, LOUISIANA

- The New Orleans School Parish and The United Teachers of New Orleans reached an agreement that teachers who hold valid certification from the National Board shall receive in addition to their regular salary an annual five percent (5%) supplement, provided the teacher is serving in the area for which NBPTS certification has been granted.

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification Continued

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

- In a contract negotiated between the Boston Public Schools and the Boston Teachers Union/AIT, the Boston Public Schools will reimburse teachers for the cost of National Board Certification fees. Although not a requirement, successful completion of National Board Certification may be considered as a special qualification for "lead teacher" status, which includes a 10% to 20% salary increase.

MICHIGAN

FARMINGTON

- The Farmington Education Association and Farmington School District ratified a 3 year contract which includes a salary line providing \$1,250 per year to any National Board Certified Teacher. The school district will pay one-half of the fee for teachers seeking National Board Certification in 1995-1996.

ANN ARBOR

- The Ann Arbor Education Association and Ann Arbor School District have agreed to a revised teacher evaluation system based on the standards from the NBPTS publication "What Teachers Should Know and Be Able To Do."

MINNESOTA

MINNEAPOLIS

- The 1995-97 contract for Minneapolis teachers officially reads: "National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: Any Minneapolis Public Schools professionally licensed teacher who achieves National Board Certification will qualify for the next lane (except lane X) on the teachers salary schedule beginning school year 1996-97." Any teacher going through the National Board Certification process may use this process for his/her MPS professional development plan.

ST. PAUL

- The St. Paul School District, St. Paul Federation of Teachers, Metropolitan ESCU, Metropolitan Teacher Center and the University of Minnesota collaborated on a pilot project to support 20 teachers through the NBC process through the 1995-96 school year. The school district has paid the application fee; the university and other partners will design and implement professional support programs for the candidates. The project is supported in part by a grant from 3M Company.

SOUTHEASTERN MISSISSIPPI

- The Mississippi Power Foundation is sponsoring 10 teachers as candidates for National Board Certification in 1995-96.

NEW YORK

JERICHO

- The Jericho, New York school district will reimburse the application fee for all teachers completing the National Board Certification process; pay a \$2,000 stipend to teachers who complete but do not achieve National Board Certification; and give National Board Certified Teachers a \$4,000 stipend.

ROCHESTER

- The Rochester Teachers Association (NYSUT/AFT) and the Rochester City School District ratified a four-year contract in December, 1993 that included the following provisions:
"Teachers who complete the certification process of the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards (NBPTS) shall be reimbursed by the District for the costs of certification application fees. Successful completion of NBPTS certification requirements shall be considered as a special qualification for Lead Teacher eligibility."

Local Action Supporting National Board Certification Continued

MARLBORO COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

- The Marlboro County Board of Education has approved payment of \$500 of the \$975 application fee and two days professional leave for any teacher who wishes to participate in the certification process.

CORPUS CHRISTI, TEXAS

- The Corpus Christi Independent School District has agreed to pay a \$1,500 salary increase to National Board Certified Teachers each year for the term of the certificate.

FAIRFAX COUNTY, VIRGINIA

- Fairfax County Public Schools will award half of the required "recertification" points to teachers who go through the process of National Board Certification. Recertification is required of all Virginia teachers every two to five years. In 1995-96, Fairfax County Public Schools agreed to pay the application fee for a pilot group of up to 20 teachers.
- Fairfax County Public Schools instituted a 15 hour course, run by National Board Certified Teachers, to prepare teachers for National Board Certification. Any person completing the course will receive CEUs.

VANCOUVER, WASHINGTON

- Vancouver School District #37 will cover \$600 for candidate fees and pay for three days of substitute time for candidates in 1995-96.

CHARTER SCHOOLS

Charter schools are independent public schools, which do not have to comply with most government regulations imposed on other schools in the public system. Charter schools are created by groups of parents, teachers, community leaders, and administrators and are held accountable for their results through a performance based contract with a local school board or state. Charter schools provide more choices for families by allowing them to decide which public school their children will attend. President Clinton has long been an advocate of innovative solutions such as Charter Schools and under his leadership as Governor, Arkansas was one of the first states to promote public school choice.

The reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (Improving America's Schools Act-IPSA), which the President signed into law in October of 1994, reflects his belief that "parent and student choice among public schools can assist in promoting comprehensive educational reform and give more students the opportunity to learn to challenging state content standards and challenging state student performance standards, if sufficiently diverse and high-quality choices, and genuine opportunities to take advantage of such choice are available to students." IPSA legislation provides FY 1995 funding - charter schools start-up grant program - which will be awarded to 12 sites this month.

Since 1991, 19 states have enacted laws permitting the establishment of charter, or independent public schools. About 110 charter schools have opened their doors in seven states: California, Minnesota, Michigan, Colorado, New Mexico, Wisconsin, and Massachusetts. More than 100 other schools have received charters and plan to begin operation by next year. State charter laws differ significantly from one another, but they all charter schools have some features in common -- charter schools are:

- **Public Schools.** Charters do not charge tuition, they are non-sectarian, they abide by health, safety, and civil rights laws, and they are accountable to public authorities.
- **Independent And Relatively Autonomous.** Charter schools operate independently from school districts, and are free from most education rules and regulations. They are given much more decision-making authority than other public schools but the degree of autonomy varies considerably from state to state.
- **Accountable For Results.** Charter schools are accountable for results and a charter will only be renewed if the school meets performance standards as outlined in its contract.
- **Create Alternatives And Choice For Teachers, Parents, And Students Within The Public School System.** In many states charters are designed and managed by teachers, parents, non-profits, or other private organizations.

Other federal funds, including those provided under Goals 2000 and School-to-Work, may be used by states and communities to support charter schools. Massachusetts and Michigan, for example, are already using Goals 2000 funds to support the development of charter schools. In addition, U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley has been asked by President Clinton to use broad waiver authority to provide maximum flexibility in the use of federal funds to help charter schools adapt to tailor the use of federal program resources to those needs.

President Clinton's 1996 budget request for charter schools was \$20 million. The U.S. House of Representatives action provides \$6 million and the Senate Appropriations Committee would grant \$10 million. The first grants to be awarded under the charter schools start-up grant program -- the only direct support from the Federal Government exclusively to charter schools include grants to California, Texas, Colorado, Minnesota, Michigan, Louisiana, Georgia, Arizona and Massachusetts.

①

Charter Schools -- Federal Support and Some Examples

Federal support for charter schools. The Clinton-Administration is supporting charter schools in several ways.

- **Charter Schools Start-up Program.** The President proposed a "public charter schools program" that is now providing grants to help start 200 charter schools in 11 states.
- **Other Federal Funds.** Goals 2000, Title I, and other federal funds can be used to support charter schools, and to share lessons learned with other schools. At least 3 states -- Minnesota, Massachusetts, and Michigan -- use Goals 2000 funds for charter schools.
- **Standards development.** Accountability for performance is a central aspect of charter schools. Some charter school leaders say our most important support is for the development of challenging academic standards by which charter and other public schools can be held accountable.

Some good examples of charter schools.

Vaughn Elementary School, in Los Angeles, California, was visited by Hillary Clinton earlier this year. Vaughn was a public school that became one of California's first charter schools in July, 1993. Parents and teachers call this school "the little school that could", and indeed -- after more than two years of intensive focus on academic restructuring and family involvement -- attendance and test scores have improved significantly. Reading and math scores are up, and attendance has gone from one of the worst in the area to be the best in the L.A. school system.

The school has also cut administrative costs considerably, and has used the savings to reduce class size and build a new computer center. While most charter schools are quite small, Vaughn serves 1200 students, grades K-6. All of its students are eligible for the federal free lunch program, and 75% speaking a native language other than English.

City Academy, in St. Paul, Minnesota, was the first charter school to open its doors in the nation. Founded by two teachers and members of the Minnesota Education Association, the school focuses on out-of-school youth. The school places a heavy emphasis on student responsibility, and has had remarkable success: last year, most of the seniors graduated and went on to some kind of post-secondary education. Like most of the charter schools in Minnesota, this school was started from scratch, rather than converted from an existing school.

The school's director is also helping the National Education Association with a project to assist union members in other states to create charter schools. Despite mixed feelings

within the unions about charter schools, this project may help show the ability of teachers and their unions to start high-quality charter schools.

Honey Lane Community School, in Ann Arbor, Michigan, was founded by parents interested in giving their children a more personalized learning environment. The school, located in suburban Ann Arbor, is K-3 and serves about 40 students. Honey Creek received a Goals 2000 grant to focus intensively on technology: both children and teachers use multi-media digital technology will have regular access to the internet.

While some Michigan charter schools have sparked controversy because they were converted from existing private schools and chartered by bodies other than local or state school boards, Honey Creek is a new school that was approved by (and founded in close cooperation with) an intermediate school district.

P.S. 1, in Denver, Colorado, was started as part of a empowerment zone-style project to revitalize a deteriorating area in downtown Denver. The school received a federal charter schools start-up grant to develop interdisciplinary assessments that measure how well its students are doing on Colorado's tough academic standards. The school is trying to help its students gain knowledge and skills needed in core academic areas, but through an interdisciplinary teaching approach.

This is an example of how charter schools can pursue their innovative approaches, and still be held accountable for challenging state or local academic standards.

New Visions School, in Minneapolis, Minnesota, is called "The Reading School" for its intensive focus on reading, and helping children overcome reading deficiencies. The school was started by a parent who has a child with a disability and who had worked within the Minneapolis school system on innovative approaches to reading. The school's students are making substantially more progress in reading than before, and it received a Goals 2000 grant to help teachers in nearby school districts learn about its effective strategies help kids read.

While some people express concern that charter schools will not serve children in special education, New Visions shows why charter schools serve slightly higher proportions of special education students than do other public schools.

O'Farrell Community School, visited by the President last fall to announce the federal charter schools start-up program, was converted from a relatively new public school in San Diego to a charter school in 1993. The school is comprised of 1400 students grades 6-8, and is divided into schools-within-schools or "families" of about 160 students and 6 teachers each. The school places tremendous emphasis on high standards for all students.

O'Farrell is also truly embedded in the community, through a rich set of partnerships with parents, local businesses, universities, and social service agencies. Students present their work for parents and community members during frequent open houses, and the school provides one computer for every five students. The school, working with Cox Cable, Apple Corporation's Christopher Columbus Consortium, and San Diego University -- makes effective use of computers and educational technology across the curriculum.

City on a Hill, Boston, Massachusetts, was founded by two teachers eager to structure a school around civic education, community service, and diplomas awarded on the basis of clear academic progress. The school is working with Northeastern University and other local groups to provide learning and volunteer opportunities in the community. The school serves 60 students, grades 9-10, and plans to expand over the next few years to 220 students, grades 7-12.

The school's high expectations are embodied in academic requirements for what students must do and learn in order to receive a diploma. For example, students must be able to write a well-structured and interesting essay, defend their views on various subjects, analyze important American historical documents, converse in a second language, and read a core list of great books.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS PROGRAM

The Family and Community Endeavor Schools Grant Program -- Title III of the Violent Crime Control And Law Enforcement Act signed by President Clinton in 1994 -- contains \$9 million in grants which will offer youths in 48 communities across the country constructive opportunities for positive youth development. The 1997 budget contains \$14 million (CHECK).

These grants are awarded for a five year period to community-based organizations which will provide entrepreneurship, academic and tutorial programs and apprenticeship programs. The community schools grants build on current existing community partnerships and coalitions working toward meeting the developmental needs of youth. Giving them the opportunity to engage in positive activities beyond school hours will benefit each individual, their families and their communities. Some examples include:

- The Children's Aid Society in New York City in collaboration with Community School District Six and a consortium of partners, will utilize the grant to transform an intermediate school in the Washington Heights / Innwood neighborhood in Northern Manhattan. In order to help break the cycle of crime and violence by improving youth's educational, health, and social outcomes through, the neighborhood center will provide extended-day learning, academic tutoring, and one-to-one mentoring to improve the students' academic achievement and improve their skills.
- The Community Connections program in Saint Charles, Missouri will utilize the grant to promote the successful transition of youth from childhood to adolescence, enhance their academic and social success, and promote their good health and well-being. After school, on evenings and weekends, and during the holidays, the project will provide curriculum-based activities designed to increase the performance of middle school youth.
- In Miami, Florida, the ASPIRA Wynwood Neighborhood Program will utilize the grant to continue serving one of the highest crime areas in the country by providing academic, social, and developmental services to 350 low-income and minority youth after school, in the evenings, on weekends and holidays, and during the summer months. The funds will provide an opportunity to respond to gaps in services, infrastructures, and opportunities for community youth by providing a variety of age specific programs.
- The Mano a Mano Community/School Violence Prevention Partnership Project in San Diego, California will utilize the grant to "gang proof" local neighborhood children. This program seeks to increase children's social competence, academic development, and resiliency; empower and enhance the skills of community residents to change social and community conditions; and mobilize community residents to change in the prevention and reduction of crime and violence in their neighborhood.

Family and Community Endeavor Schools Grant Program

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS YOUTH SERVICES AND SUPERVISION PROGRAM

Grantee Name: The Children's Aid Society
Address: 105 East 72nd Street
New York, NY 10010

Principal Contact Person: Philip Coltoff
Telephone: (212) 949-4918

FY 1995 Federal Funding Level: \$200,000
Grant Number: 90-YA-0025
Project Period: 60 Months

Federal Project Officer: Kaaren Turner
Telephone: (202) 205-3914

Target Population: Middle school youth ages 11 to 19, at risk of violence, crime, and academic failure

Geographical Area Served: New York, New York
Region: II

The Children's Aid Society, in collaboration with Community School District Six and a consortium of partners, will implement the Community Schools Youth Services and Supervision Program to break the cycle of crime and violence by improving youth's educational, health, and social outcomes. The program will transform an intermediate school in the Washington Heights/Inwood neighborhood in northern Manhattan into a neighborhood center for 560 youth ages 11 to 19. The neighborhood center will provide extended-day learning, academic tutoring, and one-to-one mentoring to improve the students' academic achievement and build their workplace competencies. Career readiness activities and entrepreneurship programs will also be provided to prepare the participants for the work world. By participating in programs that reduce economic and emotional stress, these youth will have fewer reasons to resort to crime and violence to resolve conflicts. The principles guiding the program are that the youths' needs should be at the center of all decisions and services provided, and that children must be viewed in the context of their families, their culture, and the community. This approach recognizes that childrearing techniques and values are influenced by cultural traditions. Violence prevention will be addressed directly through the promotion of positive peer group and adolescent-adult interactions which are critical to future workplace effectiveness, and will be emphasized in a Peer Mediation and Conflict Resolution Program. An evaluation of the program's effectiveness will inform the ongoing planning process and design of program modifications. The program will be guided by an active consortium of parents, teachers, and community-based agencies and will provide a comprehensive set of interventions that will guide the youth into a better future.

Family and Community Endeavor Schools Grant Program

MANO A MANO COMMUNITY/SCHOOL VIOLENCE PREVENTION PARTNERSHIP PROJECT

Grantee Name: Home Start, Incorporated
Address: 5005 Texas Street, Suite 203
 San Diego, CA 92108

Principal Contact Person: Laura S. Spiegel
Telephone: (619) 692-0727

FY 1995 Federal Funding Level: \$200,000
Grant Number: 90-YA-0004
Project Period: 60 Months

Federal Project Officer: Alice Bettencourt
Telephone: (202) 205-8024

Target Population: Hispanic children in kindergarten through sixth grade and their families

Geographical Area Served: San Diego, California
Region: IX

The Mano a Mano (Hand in Hand) Community/School Violence Prevention Partnership Project represents a strong, collaborative partnership designed to "gang proof" young children in Barrio Logan, a small geographically defined community in San Diego. The Barrio is a predominately Hispanic community with a prevalence of monolingual Spanish-speaking residents; it has one of the highest murder and violent crime rates in San Diego. Ninety-five percent of second-graders have reported witnessing drug deals, and 85 percent have reported seeing or knowing someone who had been killed. The project seeks to increase children's social competence, academic development, and resiliency; empower and enhance the skills of community residents to change social and community conditions; and mobilize community residents to become agents of social change in the prevention and reduction of crime and violence in their neighborhood.

Approximately 640 children will benefit from the project, which specifically targets students in Perkins Elementary School, the only public school within the boundaries of Barrio Logan. Following the child's progression through elementary school, the project will focus on implementing developmentally appropriate activities that are designed to promote self-esteem, social skills development, a sense of belonging, and academic skills building. The violence prevention curricula will begin in kindergarten and continue through the third grade; 48 fourth-graders will also receive training in conflict resolution. An afterschool tutoring program will also be available for youth. Parents will have access to classes in parenting skills and English as well as training in conflict mediation and job skills. The project will benefit the community by developing and training community leaders and by fostering partnerships and collaborations that directly address issues of community violence and uncoordinated service delivery.

Family and Community Endeavor Schools Grant Program**ASPIRA WYNWOOD NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAM**

Grantee Name: ASPIRA of Florida, Incorporated
Address: 3650 North Miami Avenue
 Miami, FL 33127

Principal Contact Person: Raul Martinez
Telephone: (305) 576-1512

FY 1995 Federal Funding Level: \$200,000
Grant Number: 90-YA-0035
Project Period: 60 Months

Federal Project Officer: Anita Wright
Telephone: (202) 205-8030

Target Population: Latino and African-American youth ages 9 to 14, at risk of crime, violence, and gang activity

Geographical Area Served: Dade County, Florida
Region: IV

The ASPIRA Wynwood Neighborhood Program will serve one of the highest crime areas in the country by providing academic, social, and developmental services to 350 low-income and minority youth after school, in the evenings, on weekends and holidays, and during the summer months. At the heart of this program is an innovative ASPIRA Youth Leadership Development Model that works directly with students, parents, and schools to encourage the development of self-confidence, leadership skills, educational achievement, and a dedication to community improvement. Dade County is one of the highest crime areas in the country, and the gang activity among youth is particularly violent. This program will respond to gaps in services, infrastructures, and opportunities for community youth by providing a variety of age-specific youth clubs that emphasize personal development, conflict resolution, substance abuse prevention, career exploration, cultural awareness, crime prevention programs, and community involvement. Participants will receive academic and career counseling, participate in leadership retreats and field trips, and engage in a community service project. Middle school students will receive tutoring and computerized homework assistance and will be able to participate in sports, arts, cultural, and special interest activities. Specialized youth clubs will be created to meet the needs of young women, gang members, idle youth, and school dropouts. The ASPIRA Wynwood Neighborhood Program is also designed to bring the community together in concerted efforts to decrease juvenile crime and violence. The collaborative efforts of community agencies, public agencies, volunteer groups, and community schools will provide training events on crime prevention, peace marches and antiviolence rallies, counseling and drug treatment referrals, and a continuum of services and activities that help parent-child bonding.

Family and Youth Services Bureau

YEATMAN YOUTH - COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS

Grantee Name: Youth in Need, Incorporated
Address: 516 Jefferson
St. Charles, MO 63301

Principal Contact Person: James A. Braun
Telephone: (314) 946-0101

FY 1995 Federal Funding Level: \$200,000
Grant Number: 90-YA-0033
Project Period: 60 Months

Federal Project Officer: Armetta K. Johnson
Telephone: (202) 205-8069

Target Population: Youth in fifth through eighth grade, at risk of academic problems, and their families

Geographical Area Served: St. Louis, Missouri
Region: VII

The Community Connections Project operates to promote the successful transition of youth from childhood to adolescence, enhance their academic and social success, and promote their health and well-being. The Yeatman Community Education Consortium, which consists of nine entities, will coordinate the implementation of this project which will serve 60 youth and their families. The project will provide family and youth activities, education activities, community activities, and recreation and leisure activities. The family-focused programs will include case management, individual and family assessments, individual and family therapy, health care, and prevention education for high-risk behaviors and drug abuse. After school, on evenings and weekends, and during holidays, the project will provide curriculum-based activities designed to increase the performance of middle school youth while also increasing their self-esteem. Middle school students will be selected and trained to serve as "buddies" for incoming sixth-graders, and mentors and volunteers will be provided to target the academic remedial needs of youth who need individualized attention. Orientation activities will also be provided for incoming sixth-graders and their families. The project's community-focused activities will include a conflict mediation program, youth leadership opportunities, cultural heritage programs, and work readiness skills training. Community members will be recruited and trained as mentors and paired with individual youth. These mentors will be encouraged to maintain long-term relationships with the youth and enjoy educational, social, and recreational activities with them. The project will provide a continuum of recreational and leisure activities for the target population and other neighborhood residents, including organized and informal sports, noncompetitive group games, board games, and cultural activities. Participating youth will be offered opportunities to attend professional and college sports events, develop and perform dramatized skits regarding youth issues for youth and adult audiences, and participate in recreational and educational outings to diverse public facilities.

PATAKI PROPOSES LETTING TEACHERS SUSPEND STUDENTS

ALBANY SUPPORTS PLAN

Violent and Disruptive Pupils Could Be Barred From Class for 10 Days

By RAYMOND HERNANDEZ

ALBANY, March 4 — Seeking to give New York's teachers greater control over their schools, Gov. George E. Pataki today proposed legislation that would permit teachers for the first time to suspend disruptive children from their classrooms for up to 10 days.

The leaders of both the State Senate and the Assembly said today that they intend to pass similar bills in the coming days, indicating that some version of the Governor's proposal will most likely become law.

The plan comes as states around the nation are struggling with rising violence in public schools. In the last two years, more than 30 states have toughened their policies on suspending and expelling students, in large part to control weapons, according to the Education Commission of the States, a Denver-based education research and policy organization.

Still, New York would become only the second state, after Indiana last year, to give teachers the authority to suspend students from their classrooms — for violence, property damage, threatening the use of a weapon or refusing to behave in class, according to the Education Commission. Now that decision rests with principals, school district superintendents and school boards, often acting on a teacher's recommendation.

"We cannot allow those who refuse to learn to hold back the vast majority of students who want to learn and prepare themselves for a productive and promising future," Mr. Pataki said in a statement. "I know that most teachers want to teach. I know that many of those teachers have to struggle with unruly students."

The proposal drew qualified support from teachers and their unions, who have long complained that too

much of their time is spent trying to keep order in the classroom instead of teaching.

Roughly 5 out of every 100 students were suspended at least once in the 1993-94 school year, the latest for which figures were available from the State Education Department, up from 4 of 100 two years earlier.

"It would be great to have the power," said Mark Erceckoff, a junior high school science teacher at Intermediate School 145 in Jackson Heights, Queens. "It's important. The kids will realize that there are some real consequences if they get out of hand."

But critics of the plan, including children's advocates and school board representatives, said they are concerned that the proposal may trample on students' rights. Many of them contend that the proposed law might provide cover to teachers who want to get rid of children they simply do not like.

Louis Grumet, the executive director of the New York School Boards Association, said he worried that the changes would especially hurt black and Hispanic students, who are already subject to disciplinary action in disproportionate numbers.

"We do not believe that a teacher in the heat of anger should be able to deprive a youngster of an education," he said. "When a teacher can suspend a student on his own, he becomes witness, prosecutor, judge and jury. And that's wrong."

The Governor's proposal establishes several safeguards that he said would protect the rights of students. In less serious cases, the teacher must give the student reasons for the suspension and the opportunity for a discussion.

In more serious cases, the student and his or her parents must receive

the opportunity to review the case with the principal within 24 hours. The principal could reverse the decision of a teacher who acts arbitrarily or without properly substantiating the misconduct.

"We trust our teachers with our children every day," the Governor said. "This bill gives teachers the authority they need to teach, while offering the proper checks and balances to insure all students are treated fairly and with respect."

The Pataki bill identifies five categories of misconduct that could lead to removal from a classroom. They are committing an act of violence against a student, teacher or district employee; carrying a gun, knife or other weapon into a school or threatening to use one; damaging or destroying school property; damaging the personal property of teachers or other employees, and defying an order from a teacher to stop disrupting class.

The Governor's bill is similar to laws passed in other states as a result of Federal legislation adopted by Congress in 1994 that required districts to suspend students who bring a gun to school or onto school property. Many districts, including New York City, have adopted policies of mandatory yearlong suspensions for students with weapons.

"We think the Governor's plan goes a long way to minimizing violence in the classroom," said Alan Lubin, the executive director of New York State United Teachers. "This kind of legislation allows teachers to spend most of their time teaching rather than being a referee."

Still, the bill came under attack, in large part because it does not require schools to create a special classroom for students who are barred from a particular class.

"It isn't enough to just remove a student from a classroom," said Ron

Davis, a spokesman for the United Federation of Teachers. "It does expelled students no good if they have no place to go. We're not looking to punish them. We're looking to keep the educational process moving."

Teachers and students around the state also voiced concerns.

Susan Ross, an art teacher at Intermediate School 145, worried that some teachers might abuse their new authority.

"In theory, it's a great idea because we don't get much respect around here," she said. "Teachers ought to have some say, but no one person ought to have the right to destroy a child's life like that."

"There are teachers who have personal vendettas against students," she continued. "There are teachers who have been irritated by students for months and months and would use this as an opportunity to get even over the slightest infraction."

Christopher Vasquez, a sixth grader at the school, had similar misgivings. "I'm quite mad about it," he said. "Sometimes you have a bad day — let's say you come to school late or you had some trouble at home. You're not in the mood. Something happens and some teachers just blow their top. They can hold it in. Then I get suspended. It won't work."

BACKGROUND ON EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS UNDER PRESIDENT CLINTON

March 26, 1996

" America has to be serious about education. We have to be serious about education if we want to have a strong economy, if we want these young people to live up to fullest of their God-given abilities. If we really believe that our obligation to our children is to give them the ability to make the most of their own lives in this world we are living in, that means education, education, education. We must face it, embrace it, and be glad about it."

President Clinton
O'Farrell Community School; San Diego, CA
September 22, 1995

OVERVIEW

- **Unprecedented Commitment To Expanding Educational Opportunities.** The Clinton Administration has made an unprecedented commitment to reforming the federal role in education and training and to expanding the opportunities available to American children and adults to improve their skills and maximize their potential.
- **A Commitment To Balancing The Budget While Investing In Education.** President Clinton stood up to the Republican Budget that would have cut funding for key Education programs by \$31 billion. President Clinton's FY 1997 Balanced Budget shows that we can balance the budget in 7 years while continuing investments in key education programs:
 - **Increase In Overall Education Spending.**
 - 20% increase in major education and training programs in 1997 over 1993 levels.
 - \$61 billion more for education and training over 7 years than the Republican budget.
 - **Increase In Funding For Key Education Programs That Work.**
 - \$1 billion more for Title I for basic and advanced skills assistance in 1997 than in 1993.
 - Increases funding for other education and training programs that work, such as: Pell Grants, Safe & Drug Free Schools, Charter Schools, School to Work, and Goals 2000.
 - Major Expansion of Head Start:
 - Commitment to fund 1 million Head Start opportunities for preschool children by 2002.
 - \$1.2 billion increase in 1997 over 1993 levels.
 - Supports nearly 800,000 Head Start opportunities in 1997 -- 46,000 more than in 1995.
 - Continues Commitment To National Service:
 - Funds 30,000 AmeriCorps members in 1997 -- 5,000 more than this year -- for a total of 100,000 AmeriCorps opportunities over the program's first 4 years.
- **New Education Initiatives**
 - Technology Literacy Challenge -- \$2 billion to help states, local communities, and private sector bring the future to the fingertips of every child through computers & connections.
 - \$1000 Honors Scholarships for top 5% of graduates from every high school.
 - Expanded Work Study to reach 1 million students by the year 2000.
 - \$250 million job training initiative to reduce unemployment among low-income youth.
 - \$10,000 Tuition Tax Deduction to help middle-class families afford college.

THREE YEARS OF PROGRESS IN EDUCATION

HEAD START. President Clinton has made expanding and improving pre-schooling the starting point for helping families give their children a good start on the right course. He appointed the Head Start Advisory Commission to examine the program and to recommend ways to improve its operation. These recommendations formed the basis for the 1994 reauthorization of Head Start with major quality improvements. In his first two budgets, the President increased Head Start spending by \$760 million.

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT. President Clinton helped to create Goals 2000 and signed it into law in 1994. Goals 2000 supports state, community and school efforts to raise standards of achievement and discipline and encourage students to work hard to meet them. Goals 2000 affirms the President's belief in the critical role of education in building America's future and the federal government's central role as a partner in that effort. More than 40 states have already chosen to participate in Goals 2000 and have developed their own strategic plans -- based on raising academic and occupational standards, improving teaching and expanding the use of technology -- for educational reform.

IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT. Signed by President Clinton in October of 1994, this law focuses on improvements in teaching in more than 50,000 schools and has a direct impact on five million children in high poverty areas. By increasing school flexibility to use federal aid and supporting effective innovations, this law is a significant step in helping all students meet high academic standards.

SCHOOL TO WORK. Signed by President Clinton in May of 1994, this act broadens educational, career and economic opportunities for students not immediately bound for four-year colleges through local partnerships among businesses, schools, community organizations and state and local governments. By equipping students with the knowledge and skills necessary to pursue work or post-secondary training, this law helps ensure that America will be capable of performing and prospering in a competitive global economy.

NATIONAL SERVICE. President Clinton created the AmeriCorps program -- signed into law in September of 1993 -- to enable young people to earn money for education by serving their communities. This year alone, 25,000 volunteers are working in schools, hospitals, neighborhoods and parks.

DIRECT LENDING. President Clinton's Direct Lending program -- signed in August of 1993 as part of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act -- eliminates billions of dollars in unnecessary payments to lenders and third parties and makes student loans cheaper and more efficient for students, schools and taxpayers. Over 1,300 schools, representing 40% of the total number of loans, are participating in this program, which cuts bureaucracy and saves taxpayers and students billions of dollars, while allowing more borrowers flexible repayment arrangements -- including pay-as-you-earn plans through Individual Education Accounts. President Clinton remains committed to preserving the right of every college to choose Direct Lending.

EDUCATION AGENDA TO MEET THE CHALLENGES OF FUTURE

President Clinton remains committed to education reform and has vowed to continue helping Americans invest in their children's and their nation's future. In his State of the Union Address, the President made the following proposals:

TECHNOLOGICAL LITERACY FOR THE 21ST CENTURY. President Clinton has launched a national mission to make all children technologically literate by the dawn of the 21st century, equipped with communication, math, science, and critical thinking skills essential to prepare them for the Information Age. He has challenged the private sector, schools, teachers, parents, students, community groups, and all levels of government to work together to meet this goal by building four pillars that will:

1. Provide all teachers the training and support they need to help students learn through computers and the information superhighway;
2. Develop effective and engaging software and on-line learning resources as an integral part of the school curriculum;
3. Provide access to modern computers for all teachers and students;
4. Connect every school and classroom in America to the information superhighway.

HIGHER EDUCATION STANDARDS FOR STUDENTS AND TEACHERS. In order to ensure America's competitive strength, President Clinton wants to see public schools driven by demanding high standards for students and teachers.

PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE. President Clinton believes that information, competition, and choice among public schools should be the rule, not the exception. Any parent who is dissatisfied with either their own child's or the school's performance should have the opportunity to choose a public school that will do better.

CHARTER SCHOOLS. To ensure that every parent has the opportunity to choose a school for their child, the President called on all 50 states to enact charter school laws within 12 months. Twenty states currently have laws providing for the creation of charter schools -- public schools, created and managed by parents, teachers and administrators. Charter schools have greater flexibility but they are held accountable for their results through a performance-based contract with a local school board, state, or other public institution.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT. President Clinton believes strongly that parents are and should continue to be their children's first and most important teacher. The President asked parents to read with their children, see that their homework is done, see that they take the tough courses, know their children's teachers; talk to their children directly about the dangers of drugs and alcohol, and talk to them about the values they want them to have. The President has also challenged businesses, schools, and religious organizations to help parents find the time for all of this by being family-friendly for learning.