

D.C. RESIDENT TUITION PROGRAM
(Program level in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Alternative Level</u>
17	17	14	N/A	14

Subcommittee: District of Columbia

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 Budget requested \$17 million for the D.C. Resident Tuition Assistance Program (aka D.C. College Access), an initiative first proposed by the President in FY 2000 to equalize postsecondary education opportunities for students from the District of Columbia. Eligible students can attend public colleges nationwide at in-state tuition costs, or can receive a grant to attend private colleges in the D.C. area.

Latest House Action: The House Committee provided \$14 million for Resident Tuition Assistance, \$3 million below the FY 2000 level and the President's request.

The Subcommittee report language included detailed cost estimates from the D.C. Access program office showing that the program will cost \$13 million in FY 2000 and \$16 million in FY 2001. The Subcommittee, therefore, contended that with the funds remaining from FY 2000, \$13 million would be more than adequate in FY 2001. The Full Committee added another \$1 million for the program.

However, the Mayor and Representative Norton had hoped to expand the program to include students who will be college seniors this fall by either rolling back or eliminating the cut-off date (the current authorization restricts eligibility to students who graduated after January 1, 1998). The House Committee, Rules, and Floor SAPs urged that an amendment be offered to fully fund the Resident Tuition Support program and ensure that all students in their first four years of college be included. This expansion may not be possible if funding is reduced to \$14 million for FY 2001.

Latest Senate Action: There has not yet been any action in the Senate. However, the Senate 302(b) allocation for the District is \$27 million higher than the House allocation and only \$4 million less than the President's request for D.C. Funding levels in the Senate can, therefore, be expected to be more acceptable than the House levels.

Alternative Funding Level: If the program's authorization is not changed to include students who graduated before January 1, 1998, \$14 million is sufficient to provide full benefits for all eligible students.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: This program received \$17 million in FY 2000, the President's requested level.

Subcommittee: District of Columbia

Ranking: High Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The FY2001 budget does not contain any language about this issue.

House Action: The House Full Committee bill (section 128 of the General Provisions), expands D.C. public charter schools' preference for leasing and purchasing surplus school properties. Under current law, public charter schools enjoy limited preference, with the Mayor empowered to deny charter school claims if he determines that granting the charter school's request will result in a significant loss of revenue that could be obtained through other uses of the property. The House provision would amend D.C. Code to limit Mayoral discretion over the proper use and purchase price of surplus school properties.

In the Report, the Committee notes its opinion that charter schools have not been provided adequate or timely access to surplus facilities, but it ignores local efforts to address this deficiency. A March 2000 D.C. Control Board Order transferred authority of surplus school properties from the Board of Education to the Mayor in order to expedite disposition of surplus facilities. The Mayor's Office is currently developing a strategy to improve surplus properties disposition.

Currently, public charter schools receive a discount of 15-percent on property valued under \$1 million dollars and a 25-percent discount for transactions at or above that level. Also, the District can require public charter schools to participate in a bidding process with other commercial entities to determine the highest acceptable bid. The House provision would enable charter schools to acquire any of the surplus properties under the Mayor's control before a competitive bidding process could begin. Public charter schools could acquire a surplus property in this manner for "fair market value" less a 25-percent discount. If a bidding process is used, a charter school could also obtain the property by matching the highest bid and then receiving the 25-percent discount.

Senate Action: The Senate has not yet acted on the bill.

Solution/Options: Section 128 should be removed from the bill and the District should be allowed to implement its own surplus properties plan. The District has been a leader in the Nation's charter school movement, having the highest proportion of charter schools as a percentage of all public schools of all American school districts. With D.C. having such a robust charter system, the surplus properties provision would needlessly restrict local control over this successful reform. The D.C. Control Board has recently addressed the preferences issue in its March 2000 Order and the Mayor is implementing a plan for surplus properties. Congressional interference is unwarranted and could be considered a breach of Home Rule.

While DPC staff understand why the Administration opposes the House provision—as articulated in the JULY 25 SAP—they recommend this be handled at the staff level to minimize taking a higher visibility public position.

Justification:

- Denying the Mayor the flexibility to disperse unused property in a locally appropriate manner would restrict private investment and economic growth.

- Public charter schools are already granted fiscal advantages and bidding preferences in surplus school properties acquisitions. Congressional expansion of these preferences limits local management of local schools.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: No action in FY 2000.

Prepared By/Date: Brian Matteson (5-4643), 7/26/00, I_Facilities Preference.wpd

ATTORNEYS' FEES IN SPECIAL EDUCATION CASES

Subcommittee: District of Columbia

Ranking: High _____ Medium X Low _____

2001 Budget Policy: The budget proposed to remove language included in the Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY2000 which imposed a cap of a maximum of \$60/hour, and \$1,560/case, on reimbursement of attorneys' fees in cases brought against D.C. Public Schools (DCPS) under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). The prevailing rate in D.C. is about \$200/hour, and attorneys fees can only be awarded when the parents of children with disabilities prevail. Last year's provision also allowed D.C. to raise, or lower, these caps if the Mayor, the D.C. Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority, and the DCPS Superintendent established a new rate through a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

Latest House Action: The House bill does not include any attorneys' fee cap language. Rep. Cunningham (R-CA) proposed an amendment to add this language in the Subcommittee markup, but this amendment failed 5-2. In our House Full Committee letter and SAPs on this bill, we note that the Administration is pleased that the House removed this provision.

Latest Senate Action: The Senate draft Committee bill includes the same attorney's fee language as was enacted last year. Sen Hutchinson (R-TX) supports keeping the cap.

SEC. 120. (a) None of the funds contained in this Act may be made available to pay the fees of an attorney who represents a party who prevails in an action, including an administrative proceeding, brought against the District of Columbia Public Schools under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq.) if--

(1) the hourly rate of compensation of the attorney exceeds 120 percent of the hourly rate of compensation under section 11-2604(a), District of Columbia Code; or

(2) the maximum amount of compensation of the attorney exceeds 120 percent of the maximum amount of compensation under section 11-2604(b)(1), District of Columbia Code, except that compensation and reimbursement in excess of such maximum may be approved for extended or complex representation in accordance with section 11-2604(c), District of Columbia Code.

(b) Notwithstanding the preceding subsection, if the Mayor, District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management Assistance Authority and the Superintendent of the District of Columbia Public Schools concur in a Memorandum of Understanding setting forth a new rate and amount of compensation, then such new rates shall apply in lieu of the rates set forth in the preceding subsection.

Conference Action: None to date.

Solution/Options: Remove this provision. If the provision is removed, or if the rate is increased significantly, there may be pressure to not allow this change to be retroactive. Under current law, some judges have awarded attorneys fees higher than the cap, even through the District cannot pay fees above the cap. If the cap is removed or raised, DCPS may be liable for fees awarded in the last two years that exceeded the cap.

Justification:

The District is the only jurisdiction in the country that could set an attorney's fee cap, and maintaining the cap in D.C. sets a bad national precedent. Any other State or local government that set a fee cap would be in violation of the IDEA, and would risk losing

their federal dollars. Congress gets around the IDEA statute by only prohibiting D.C. from paying attorney's fees over the cap; judges are still allowed to award attorney's fees in according with the IDEA.

Even though last year's provision allowed D.C. to set a higher hourly and case rate through an MOU, the District never set a higher rate. A contributing factor to this may be that D.C.-based special education attorneys, who would presumably benefit from a higher fee cap, have not urged the Mayor or D.C.PS to raise the current rates because doing so would legitimize the existence of the cap. These attorneys prefer to try to eliminate the cap altogether than negotiate on what the cap should be.

DCPS has incurred large attorneys' fees because of its long history of serious noncompliance with the IDEA. In recent years, hundreds of D.C. special education students did not have their disabilities properly evaluated, as required by the IDEA, and hundreds more had not been placed in educational settings which meet their special needs (D.C. has reportedly reduced its backlog in evaluations).

The current IDEA statute already includes provisions to ensure that attorney's fees are not excessive, and ensures that the attorney's fees awarded shall be reasonable and based on rates prevailing in the community.

Since Congress imposed the cap, several parents of special education children have been unable to find attorneys to take their IDEA cases, several attorneys are now unwilling to represent parents at these lower rates, and both public interest groups and law schools, already overloaded with cases, cannot assume the extra workload.

The ability of parents, including those with limited financial resources, to access the IDEA's due process system is an important enforcement mechanism. If parents cannot afford a lawyer, they are less likely to exercise their due process rights to ensure their child receives the special education services he/she is entitled to under IDEA.

This provision gives an unfair advantage to DCPS in special education cases because DCPS is allowed to pay its own attorneys more than the caps imposed on attorneys representing children with disabilities. Last year, DCPS retained six private law firms to represent it in special education due process hearings. These law firms were paid, at minimum, nearly three times the \$60 hourly cap it imposes on attorneys representing special education children, and had no per-case cap. We do not know whether DCPS is still retaining these law firms.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The Consolidated Appropriations Act for FY 2000 imposed the cap, and allowed D.C. to raise it through an MOU (see above). Last year, former DCPS Superintendent Ackerman strongly supported the cap. Mayor Williams' FY 2001 Budget proposed to remove the cap, and last year the Mayor had said he did not support the cap. Rep. Norton has no specific opinion on this issue; she supports the Mayor's position. There is no partisan consensus on this issue; several Republicans and Democrats both support and oppose the cap. Congress first enacted attorney's fee cap language in FY 1999. In his signing statement for the FY 1999 Act, the President noted that he strongly opposed the cap, and pledged to work to eliminate it next year.

Prepared By/Date: David Rowe (x53846), 9/13/00, J:\DATA\00-52\DC\I_DC Attorneys Fees.wpd

**NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE
HUMANITIES, AND INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES**
(Program Level in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	
NEA	98	150	98	105	Interior
NEH	115	150	115	120	Interior
IMLS					
Museum	24	33	24	25	Interior
Library	166*	173	170	168	Labor/H

(*Included \$11 million in earmarks)

Subcommittee: Interior and Related Agencies; Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy:

NEA: The FY 2001 Budget requests \$150 million, a \$52-million increase over FY 2000 enacted. The increase will fund Challenge America, an effort carried out in partnership with the State Art Councils, to get grants out to traditionally underserved communities. Challenge America will focus on five areas: arts education, access to the arts, youth at risk, cultural heritage/preservation; and community arts partnerships. [NOTE: In addition, the FY 2001 budget requests \$10 million in the Department of Education's Arts Education Program (Labor/HHS/ED) for a grant competition focused on arts programs for youth at risk to be conducted in collaboration with the National Endowment for the Arts. Both the House and Senate have increased funding for Arts Education.]

NEH: The FY 2000 Budget requests \$150 million, a \$35-million increase over FY 2000 enacted. The increase would focus on "Rediscovering America Through the Humanities" -- an effort to broaden understanding of and access to humanities programs in traditionally underserved areas. The increase will also expand NEH's acclaimed summer seminars and institutes that provide professional development opportunities to teachers, increase preservation to digitize humanities texts, artifacts and brittle books, and increase public radio and television programs.

IMLS: Office of Museum Services -- The FY 2001 Budget requests \$33 million, a \$9 million increase over FY 2000 enacted. The \$9 million increase would support digitization efforts, expand after-school programs housed in museums, and the Museums On-line program to improve museum access to communities and schools.

Office of Library Services -- The FY 2001 Budget requested \$173 million, a \$7 million increase over FY 2000 enacted (or an \$18 million increase less the \$11 million FY 2000 Congressional earmarks.) The increase includes support for digitization efforts and increased formula grants to support State Library Associations.

House Action:

- Funded NEA at \$98 million, the same as FY 2000 enacted, and \$52 million below the request. NEA did, however, win a critical vote in the House on an amendment that supported the NEA. The House numbers would preclude NEA from moving forward with Challenge America.

- Funded NEH at \$115 million, the same as FY 2000 enacted, and \$35 million below the request. The House numbers would preclude NEH from expanding its summer seminar series and its outreach efforts.

·Funded IMLS' Museum Services at \$24 million, the same as FY 2000, and \$9 million below request. The House number would preclude IMLS Museum Services from expanding digitization efforts, after-school programs in museums, and on-line access to museums.

·Funded IMLS' Library Services at \$170 million, \$3 million below the request, but \$4 million above FY 2000 enacted.

Senate Action:

·Funded NEA at \$105 million, a \$7 million increase over FY 2000, but \$45 million below the request. NEA feels they have true bipartisan support in the Senate. This funding level, while better than the House, would still provide only limited implementation of NEA's Challenge America program.

·Funded NEH at \$120 million, a \$5 million increase over FY 2000, but \$35 million below the request. This increase would allow only a limited expansion of NEH's outreach efforts and summer seminars.

·Funded IMLS Museum Services at \$24.9 million, a \$600,000 increase over FY 2000, but \$8 million below the request. This small increase would virtually preclude IMLS Museum Services from expanding its digitization efforts, after-school programs in museums, and on-line access to museums

·Funded IMLS Library Services at \$168 million, an increase of \$2 million over FY 2000, but \$5 million below the request.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 Budget requested \$150 million each for NEA and NEH. NEA was funded at the FY 1999 level of \$98 million; NEH won a \$4 million increase to \$115 million. (Although NEA had won a \$2 million increase in the Senate, the Conferees went with the House number.) The FY 2000 Budget requested \$34 million for IMLS/Museum Services and \$155 million for IMLS/Library Services. Museums was funded at \$24 million, a \$1 million increase from FY 1999 enacted, and Libraries was funded at \$166 million, with \$11 million in earmarks.

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS, NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE
HUMANITIES, AND INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES
(Program level in millions of dollars)**

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
NEA	98	150	98	105		150
NEH	115	150	115	120		150
IMLS						
Museum	24	33	24	25		33
Library	166	173	170	168	210	210

Subcommittee: Interior, Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: Press for the full request for NEA, NEH, and the Museum portion of IMLS. (The Library funding in the Labor/HHS/Education bill is adequate.) The requested levels will enable NEA to move forward with its Challenge America program, NEH to expand its summer seminar series and Rediscover America initiative, and IMLS to move forward on digitization efforts and expanding after-school programs in museums and on-line access to museums. The Administration believes that there is strong bipartisan support in both the House and Senate that would sustain further increases made to these agencies.

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR TITLE II: TEACHING TO HIGH STANDARDS-STATE GRANTS**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
Teaching to High Standards State Grants	0	690	0	0	0	0
Eisenhower Professional Development Grants 335	0	0	435		435	635

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: While the Administration should press for full funding for Eisenhower State Grants, an alternative level of \$635 million would be a \$200 million increase from the tentative conference funding level. This level would nearly double the current appropriation and would substantially strengthen the State Grants program. This program is one of the few funding sources for states to provide crucial in-service teacher training, helping educators align curricula and assessments with content standards. At the alternative funding level, State Grants would provide funds for more than 1,100,000 teacher participations in high-quality professional development activities.

In addition to seeking this funding, the Administration should press for two important language additions. First, due to expiration of the authorization for Goals 2000 on September 30, 2000, Federal support would be eliminated for States to work on standards, assessments and alignment of curricula. The Administration should seek language in Title II-Eisenhower State Grants that would provide a \$50 million set-aside to allow States to continue improving these important reform tools.

Secondly, to improve local accountability, language should be included to ensure Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with large numbers of uncertified teachers receive additional funds under Title II to address this problem

Prepared By/Date: Brian Matteson (5-4643), 9/15/00, A1_Teacher Quality State.wpd

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR AFTER SCHOOL
(Program level in millions of dollars)**

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate (if applicable)</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference Alternative</u>	
After School	453	1,000	600	600	600	900

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: Press for the full request, but \$900 million would be acceptable -- a \$447 million increase over FY 2000 enacted, essentially doubling funding for the program. Along with a local match, \$900 million would support over 7,000 before- and after-school centers (compared with nearly 8,000 at the President's request) and serve approximately 2.25 million children (compared with 2.5 million at the President's request).

NOTE: On 9/12, the President personally directed a change be made to his arrival speech to mention the \$1 billion he was seeking for After School to address the problem of latchkey children identified in the recent Urban Institute report.

Prepared By/Date: Leslie Mustain x57768/Mary Cassell x55881, 9/7/00, A1_After-school

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR CLASS SIZE REDUCTION**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
Class Size	1,300	1,750	0*	0*	0*	1,650

*House, Senate, and preliminary conference funded block grants that have class size as an allowable, but not required, activity -- see below

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: \$1,650 million would be acceptable, \$100 million less than the request. The \$1,650 million level, along with a local match, would fund the hiring of approximately 14,100 new teachers (compared to 16,723 at the President's request) and continue support for the 29,000 teachers already hired. This level still keeps us on the path to hiring 100,000 new teachers by 2005.

Prepared By/Date: Leslie Mustain x57768/Mary Cassell x55881, 9/7/00, A1_Class Size

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR ADULT EDUCATION: ENGLISH LITERACY/CIVICS
(Program level in millions of dollars)**

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
EL/Civics	26	75	26	0	0	75

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: The full budget request of \$75 million is needed for this initiative to provide critical English as a second language services, coupled with civics education to approximately 250,000 recent immigrants and/or limited English proficient adults. Although the Administration requests this amount be funded out of the National Activities authority, we could accept funding as a set-aside within the State Grants authority. Last year, this initiative was funded as a set-aside through the State Grants authority at \$26 million.

Prepared By/Date: Quirina Orozco (5-3895), 9/7/00, A1_ EL-Civics

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR GEAR UP**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
GEAR UP	200	325	200	225	200	300

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: \$300 million would be more than sufficient to fund all non-competing continuation grants and to run a sizeable new competition. At the alternative level, 1.2 million students would receive services, compared to 1.3 million at the President's request level and 710,000 at the conference level.

Prepared By/Date: Jennifer Kron (5-7767), 9/6/00, A1_GEARUP

Addenda #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVELS
FOR NEXT GENERATION TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION, TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION
CHALLENGE GRANTS, STAR SCHOOLS**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
Next Generation Technology Innovation	0	170	0	0	0	0
Technology Innovation Challenge Grants	146	0	198	100	190	190
Star Schools	<u>51</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>51</u>	<u>51</u>
Total	197	170	243	143	241	241

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education.

Alternative Level: The current conference level of \$241 million exceeds the President's request by \$44 million and is an acceptable alternative funding level. The Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) reauthorization proposal attempts to consolidate Technology Innovation Challenge Grants (TICG) and Star Schools into one cutting edge program, Next Generation Technology Innovation. ESEA reauthorization will not be completed this year and Congress has acted to fund TICG and Star Schools at \$241 million in conference. Funding for technology has been an Administration priority and the conference level, even at \$71 million more than the President's request, is acceptable.

\$100 million in earmarks have been placed in the appropriations language for TICG and Star Schools. Coupled with the \$113 million that is required to fund continuation grants, less than \$28 million would be available, at the tentative conference funding level, to fund a grant competition for new awards.

Prepared By/Date: Brian Matteson (5-4643), 9/13/00, A1_Next Generation Tech.wpd

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR PREPARING TOMORROW'S TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology	75	150	85	125	125	125

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: The current conference funding level of \$125 million is an acceptable alternative level. While the President's budget proposed a \$75 million increase for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology, the current conference level provides a \$50 million increase over last year's appropriations. At the conference level, the Administration would obtain a substantial increase in program funding from (FY01) appropriations and enable the program to serve about 230,000 pre-service teachers. While the ideal outcome would be the President's \$150 million request, the program would be adequately supported at the conference level.

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND ASSESSMENT**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
Research, Statistics, and Assessment	277	325	277	287	287	310

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: The alternative level of \$310 million is \$23 million above the current conference level. With the additional \$23 million, we should seek:

- an additional \$7 million for Research (\$13 million below the request) to support the Initiative on Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Students (\$6 million) and Field-Initiated Studies (\$1 million); and
- the full request (an additional \$16 million) for Statistics to carry out essential activities, such as a mandatory redesign of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS) and two separate longitudinal studies of early childhood cognitive development.

Prepared By/Date: Craig Wacker (5-1192), 9/11/00, A1_Research, Statistics, and Assessment.wpd.

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	FY 2000	FY 2001	House	Senate	Preliminary Conference	Alternative
State Grants	439	439	439	447	439	429
National Programs	111	151	110	145	145	145
Coordinator Init.	50	50	50	50	50	50
Project SERV	0	10	0	0	0	10
Total	600	650	599	642	634	634

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: Continue to press for the request, but accept the conference figure of \$634 million. Within the total conference level, seek a reallocation of \$10 million from State grants to finance Project SERV (for which we sought new authorization and \$10 million.)

State Grant program evaluations have shown that while some prevention programs lowered student self-reported use of alcohol and other drugs, the effects were minimal. Moreover, although the State Grant program distributes funds to 97% of the nation's school districts, most districts (59%) receive less than \$10,000--a sum too small to implement meaningful change.

define?

Prepared By/Date: Craig Wacker (5-1192), 9/12/00, A1_Safe and Drug Free.wpd.

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR SCHOOL RENOVATION**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	FY 2000	FY 2001	House	Senate	Preliminary Conference	Alternative
School Renovation	0	1,300	0	0	0	1,300

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: Continue to press for the President's full request, but the program design may change. The original proposal was for a loan subsidy and grant program that would be administered at the Federal level. Possible alternatives include distributing funds to States on a need-based formula and requiring states to ensure that they will leverage a specified amount while targeting funds to the needed areas. This would allow the Federal school renovation program to reach the goal of leveraging \$6.5 billion in renovations and repairing about 5,000 schools, while easing the management burden on the Department of Education.

Block grant?

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR SPECIAL EDUCATION NATIONAL ACTIVITIES**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
State Improvement	35	45	45	35	40	40
Research/Innovation	64	74	64	74	70	70
TA and Dissem.	45	53	45	45	45	53
PIC's	19	26	22	26	26	26
Other	118	116	118	119	121	121
Total	282	316	295	300	302	310

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: Pursue full funding of the \$8 million requested increase for Technical Assistance (TA) and Dissemination, to support grants to States so they have the necessary resources to help schools comply with special education laws and correct deficiencies found through Federal and State monitoring. This monitoring has shown chronic problems at State and local levels in meeting the IDEA's requirements (e.g., child find, assessment). While the 1997 IDEA reauthorization increased State responsibility in administering and enforcing the IDEA, it did not provide a corresponding increase in set aside funds for the States.

Accept the preliminary conference levels for Parent Information Centers (PICs) and the "other" National programs, since they both meet or exceed the Budget. Accept the preliminary conference level for both State Improvement and Research and Innovation.

- In State Improvement, the conference level will allow the Department of Education to award 10 new competitive grants to States, compared to 15 new awards under the Budget.
- In Research and Innovation, the Budget's \$10 million requested increase would be used to help implement research-based practices to serve children with disabilities who have reading problems and/or exhibit behaviors that may lead to discipline problems as they get older. The conference level's \$6 million increase would just support a smaller-scale investment in these same research-based practices.

All things considered, IDEA National Activities have fared relatively well this year. In recent years, Congress ignored the President's request, and provided little or no increase to these programs.

Prepared By/Date: David Rowe (x5-3846), September 7, 2000; A1_Special ED Nat'l Activities.wpd

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR TEACHING TO HIGH STANDARDS-OTHER NATIONAL ACTIVITIES**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
All National Activities	15	310		38 138	38	38

*Note: See Teacher Quality funding table for individual program levels

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: An acceptable alternative funding level for Teacher Quality National Activities is \$138 million. The tentative Conference Report and House and Senate bills provided \$38 million for National Activities. They fully fund the Administration's \$15 million request for the preexisting Eisenhower Regional Math & Science Consortia and provide \$23 million in funding for the preexisting and unrequested Eisenhower Professional Development Federal Activities.

At the alternative level of \$138 million, \$100 million remains to fund some of the President's new National Activities initiatives. The four initiatives that are funding priorities are:

- **T-T:** Transition to Teaching (currently Troops to Teachers)
- Early Childhood Educator Professional Development
- School Leadership Initiative
- Hometown Teachers

Prepared By/Date: Brian Matteson (5-4643), 9/07/00, A1_Teacher Quality National.wpd

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
FOR TITLE I -- GRANTS TO LEAs**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

<u>Program</u>	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
Title I -- Grants to LEAs	7,941*	8,358*	7,941*	8,336*	8,272*	8,358**

* These numbers represent the program level -- the base appropriation plus an advance appropriation to be made available October 1 of the following year.

**This level does ^{not} include funds to accommodate States that lose funding under the Senate's 100% hold harmless. The hold harmless could require an additional \$150-\$450 million.

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: The alternative level for this program is the President's request of \$8358 billion, including \$250 million for the Accountability Fund. This level does not include funds to accommodate a Senate proposal to include a 100% hold harmless on last year's funds. Providing funds to States that lose funds as a result of the hold harmless could cost anywhere between \$150 million and \$450 million on top of the request.

According to the Conference funding table, conferees include \$8.272 billion. This level equals the President's request, minus the \$250 million for the proposed Accountability Fund, plus \$164 million for States that would otherwise lose funds if all districts are held 100% harmless from this year. Estimates of what is required to accommodate the hold harmless are still in flux. Conferees do not include funds or language for the Accountability Fund.

THE DEPARTMENT IS RUNNING A CHANGE TABLE TO SHOW THE APPROXIMATE INCREASES THAT STATES WOULD GET UNDER THE CONFERENCE LEVEL

more on Acct. Fund?

Prepared By/Date: Leslie Mustain x57768, Mary Cassell x55881, 09/12/00, A1_Title I Grants to LEAs.wpd

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High X Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 Budget assumed passage of a multi-year authorization for this program as part of the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Therefore no appropriations language was included in the FY 2001 Budget, even though annual appropriations language for this program was included in both the FY 1999 and FY 2000 Labor-HHS-ED bills. We are requesting \$1.75 billion for the third year of funding to reach the President's goals of hiring 100,000 teachers by 2005, supporting, 17,000 new teachers in addition to the 29,000 already hired. (See Class Size Reduction funding one-pager). Since ESEA will not pass this year, authorizing language is required for this program in the appropriations bill. The President's proposal includes a local matching requirement on funds above the FY 1999 level of \$1.2 billion. Without the match, the request would fund about 4,000 fewer new teachers, for a total of about 42,000 rather than 46,000 teachers.

House Action: The House provides no funding nor a specific authorization for Class Size Reduction. Instead, it provides \$1.75 billion for the House-passed Teacher Empowerment Act (TEA), a teacher quality block grant that allows districts to spend funds to reduce class sizes, but does not provide a dedicated funding stream for that purpose.

Senate Action: The Senate has not completed action on any of its ESEA proposals. Therefore, the appropriators provide \$3.1 billion under Title VI, the education block grant, and allow \$2.7 billion of those funds to also be used to reduce class sizes and to renovate schools. As in the House, the Senate does not have a specific authorization or dedicated funding stream for class size reduction.

Preliminary Conference Action: Conferees have adopted the Senate position, and therefore devote \$2.7 billion to an expanded version of the Title VI block grant to allow funds to be spent on class size reduction and school construction, but guarantees funding for neither program.

Solution/Options: Use the same language that ^{include match?} was negotiated in the FY 2000 appropriations process for Class Size Reduction. That language retained the original structure (same funding formula and general uses of funds), but made some compromises to gain broader congressional support without undermining any aspect of the program. In order to hire 46,000 teachers, a matching requirement would need to be added to this language on the new funding. Below is a table that shows how many teachers, in total, can be supported at various funding levels, and with and without a local matching requirement.

Number of Teachers Hired				
FY 2000	FY 2001 – Request Level (\$1.75 billion)		FY 2001 – Alternate Level (\$1.65 billion)	
	w/ match	w/o match	w/ match	w/o match
29,000	46,000	41,000	43,000	38,000

Justification:

- This high priority Presidential initiative has been authorized in annual appropriations language for the past two years and needs authorizing language this year to continue.
- Without authorizing language, support would be jeopardized for the the 29,000 teachers already hired and the 17,000 additional teachers that could be required under the President's request.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 appropriations bill included extensive language authorizing this program. While the negotiated language retained the original components and goals of the program, it provided more flexibility by raising the cap on funding devoted to professional development from 15% to 20%.

Addendum #1

**ALTERNATIVE FUNDING LEVEL
AMERICA'S TESTS**
(Program level in millions of dollars)

Program	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>	<u>Alternative</u>
America's Tests	0	5	0	0	0	2

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Alternative Level: The alternative level of \$2 million would allow the National Assessment Governing Board (NAGB) to fund two new studies:

- * **Reporting Results to Teachers and Parents.** The research study would analyze the best methods for reporting student assessment results to parents and teachers. The emphasis of the study would be on strengthening the parent-teacher dialogue. Analysis would include investigation of performance reporting on general test themes as well as mastery of tasks and subtasks.
- * **Test Accommodations to Students with Disabilities.** This study would weigh how the provision of testing accommodations to students with disabilities influences the validity and reliability of assessment results. The conclusions of the study would help determine the best manner in which to provide testing accommodations to students with disabilities.

Prepared By/Date: Craig Wacker (5-1192), 9/12/00, A1_America's Tests.wpd.

AMERICA'S TESTS
(BA in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
2	5	0	0	0

Note: FY 2000 funding is expended from the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) account, a practice that Congress discouraged in the FY 2000 House Committee report, and ED reports that it has not utilized any of those funds, as it had projected.

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 President's Budget requests \$5 million for the America's Tests program. This funding will be used to complete test item development and move forward with plans for pilot testing, and administration. These activities have been funded since FY1997 through the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE). The FY 2001 funds for America's Tests would support continued development and a pilot test of test items.

House Action: The House-passed bill provides no funding for this program. In addition, the House bill includes language that would prohibit development, pilot testing, field testing, implementation, administration, and distribution of the tests unless explicitly authorized. The language may also prevent the Department from closing out contracts initiated in prior fiscal years, restricting proper management of those contracts.

Senate Action: The Senate-passed bill provides no funding for this program.

Preliminary Conference Action: The preliminary conference agreement provides no funding for this program.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 Budget requested \$16 million for the Voluntary National Tests program. Congress did not appropriate any funds for Voluntary National Tests. The program was funded at \$2 million through the Fund for the Improvement of Education.

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION
(Program level in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
1,300	1,750	0*	0*	0*

*House, Senate, and preliminary conference funded block grants that have class size as an allowable, but not required, activity -- see below

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/ED

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 President's Budget request of \$1.75 billion, an increase of \$450 million, would provide the third installment in the President's initiative to recruit, hire, and train 100,000 new teachers in order to reduce class size in the primary grades to an average of 18. The goal is to reach 100,000 teachers by 2005. The request, along with local matching funds, would fund the hiring of ~~20,000~~ 17,000 new teachers and continue support for the 29,000 teachers already hired. The Administration proposes hiring the teachers over a seven year period to provide districts sufficient time to find high quality teachers and to make adjustments in instruction and in facilities to accommodate smaller classes. Districts may use up to 25% of their funds for professional development to ensure that teachers can take full advantage of teaching fewer students. The Administration proposed in ESEA reauthorization that school districts with a poverty rate of less than 50% provide a 35% match on funds they receive in order to ensure local buy-in; no match is required of districts with a poverty rate of 50% or more. Below is a table that shows how many teachers, in total, can be supported at various funding levels, and with and without a local matching requirement.

Number of Teachers Hired				
FY 2000	FY 2001 – Request Level (\$1.75 billion)		FY 2001 – Alternate Level (\$1.65 billion)	
	w/ match	w/o match	w/ match	w/o match
29,000	46,000	41,000	43,000	38,000

A multi-year authorization for this program was proposed in the Administration's ESEA reauthorization proposal. No appropriations language was included in the FY 2001 Budget, even though language for this program was included in both the FY 1999 and FY 2000 appropriations bills. This program would require authorization through appropriations language (see language paper for details).

House Action: The House does not provide any funds specifically for the Class Size Reduction program. Instead, it provides \$1.75 billion for the House-passed Teacher Empowerment Act (TEA) which consolidates Goals 2000, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Class Size Reduction into a block grant with no explicit funding stream for the class size initiative. This amount is \$1 billion below the Administration's request for Class Size and Teaching to High Standards. By not providing guaranteed funding for class size, it effectively repeals the bipartisan agreement on class size reduction, jeopardizing the Federal commitment to hire as many as 20,000 new teachers next year and to continue support for the 29,000 teachers already hired. As many as 2.9 million children could be denied the benefits of smaller classes.

Senate Action: The Senate does not provide any funds specifically for the Class Size Reduction program. Instead, it provides \$3.1 billion in a block grant (Title VI), \$2.7 billion of which may be used for class size and school construction, and \$400 million for activities under

the Title VI block grant. The proposed block grant is \$316 million less than the amount required to fully fund the President's request for class size reduction (\$1.75 billion) and school construction (\$1.3 billion), and to maintain Title VI at its FY 2000 level (\$366 million). As in the House, by not providing guaranteed funding for class size, it effectively repeals the bipartisan agreement on class size reduction:

Preliminary Conference Action: Preliminary conference funding tables indicate that conferees have accepted the Senate approach of placing \$3.1 billion in the Title VI block grant. However, conference notes indicate that class size-related funding and language issues are open.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: Class Size Reduction was authorized in appropriations and funded at \$1.3 billion. The FY 2000 appropriations bill included extensive language authorizing this program. While the negotiated language retained the original components and goals of the program, it provided more flexibility by raising the cap on funding devoted to professional development from 15% to 20%.

Prepared By/Date: M. Cassell 5-5881/L. Mustain 5-7768 8/28/00 f_Class Size.wpd

FUNDING FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION: COMMUNITY COACHES

(BA in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
0	5*	0	0	0

*\$5 million was requested through the Corporation for National and Community Service. A budget amendment requested that these funds be moved to FIE in the Department of Education.

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The budget amendment requests \$5 million for Community Coaches through the authority of the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE). Community Coaches are school-wide coordinators for community service activities that help students to build a connection to their community and develop personal, civic and academic skills. Community Coaches are usually teachers or guidance counselors. \$5 million will support Community Coaches in about 1,000 schools. Funding of \$5,000 per coach will support training activities, curriculum materials, web-based resources and evaluation of the Community Coaches program.

This program will support coaches by helping Do Something, a national youth leadership non-profit organization, expand their existing Community Coaches program. Currently Do Something has over 100 Community Coaches in 75 communities. Community Coaches programs are particularly strong in Wisconsin, New Jersey, Texas and Southern California.

House Action: The House bill provides no funding for Community Coaches

Senate Action: The Senate bill provides no funding for Community Coaches.

Preliminary Conference Action: The preliminary conference agreement provides no funding for Community Coaches.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: This program is a new proposal.

COMMUNITY TECHNOLOGY CENTERS

(BA in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
33	100	33	65	53

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 President's budget requested \$100 million, an increase of \$67.5 million over last year's funding. This request would provide funding for 1,000 new Community Technology Centers to extend access to computers and technology for adults and children residing in economically distressed, high-poverty areas.

The Centers are a key component of the Administration's strategy to end the Digital Divide by ensuring access to computers and technology for all Americans in the 21st century. Centers provide computer training and access for after-school activities as well as adult education, family literacy, career development and small business programs. A recent Commerce Department report stated that it is essential for community access centers to provide computer access and that these community centers are particularly well used by those groups that lack access at home or at work. Grants are used to create or expand these vital technology resources in high-poverty urban and rural communities and to provide them with technical assistance.

House Action: The House bill funds the program at its FY 2000 level of \$33 million, \$67 million less than the President's request. This funding level would not fund over 700 centers, denying access to computers and technology, particularly education technology, to thousands of adults and children living in economically distressed, high-poverty areas.

Senate Action: The Senate bill provides \$65 million for Community Technology Centers. This \$35 million cut from the request would fail to fund over 300 of these centers needed to help bridge the Digital Divide.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement provides \$53 million for Community Technology Centers, \$47 million less than the President's request. Over 500 new centers would be cut at this level.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The President's FY 2000 budget requested \$65 million, a \$10 million increase over FY1999 appropriations. FY 2000 enacted appropriations for Community-based Technology Centers were \$33 million, \$32 million below the request.

Alternative?

Prepared By/Date: Brian Matteson (5-4643), 8/28/00, f_Community Tech Centers.wpd

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT

(Program level in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
Program Administration	383	413	383	397	400
Office for Civil Rights	71	76	71	73	73
Inspector General	34	37	34	35	35
Total Dept. Management	488	526	488	505	509

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 President's budget requested \$526 million for Department Management, including \$413 million for Program Administration, \$76 million for the Office for Civil Rights, and \$37 million for the Inspector General.

Program Administration. Almost \$10 million of the increase will be used to pay scheduled cost of living adjustments for employees. About \$5 million of the increase will enable the Department to fund the final stage of replacing its financial management software, thereby enabling the Department to effectively track funds and generate financial statements. In addition, increases in Program Administration will provide the Department of Education with the resources required to implement new programs and manage critical elementary, secondary and postsecondary programs, and provide prompt services to grantees.

Office for Civil Rights. Funding increases to OCR will help the office to continue to reach efficient complaint resolutions, avoid backlogs, and provide new technical assistance activities that allow OCR to work with customers to prevent discrimination before it occurs.

Inspector General. Funding increases for the IG will enable the office to effectively carry out program oversight and financial statement review in order to mitigate potential waste, fraud and abuse in Department of Education programs. A substantial part of the increases will be used to develop internal computer system security expertise. Increases will also be used to undertake additional audits, investigations and reviews, pay the proposed cost of living adjustments for employees and pay mandatory overtime for investigators.

House Action: The House-passed bill freezes all activities at the FY 2000 level. This is a cut below the request of a \$30 million increase for program administration, \$5 million more for the Office for Civil Rights, and an additional \$3 million for the Inspector General. These cuts would severely hamper the Department's efforts to replace its accounting system, resolve civil rights complaints, and carry out program oversight to mitigate potential waste fraud and abuse.

Senate Action: The Senate-passed bill provided increases for all activities, but well below the requested levels. These include: \$397 million for program administration, \$16 million below the request; and \$73 million for the Office for Civil Rights, and \$35 million for the Inspector General, both \$2 million below the request. In addition, the Senate-passed bill includes \$206 million in across-the-board cuts to "department management" in the Departments of Education, Labor and Health and Human Services. These cuts have not been allocated by agency, but would certainly result in further cuts to Education's Department Management programs. These cuts would severely hamper the Department's efforts to replace its accounting system, monitor program effectiveness and resolve civil rights complaints.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative Conference agreement provides \$400 million for program administration, \$13 million below the request; \$73 million for the Office of the Inspector General, \$3 million below the request; and \$35 million for the Office for Civil Rights, \$2 million below the request.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 Budget requested \$493 million for the above activities; Congress provided \$488 million, nearly all the request.

RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND ASSESSMENT

(Program level in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY2000</u>	<u>FY2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
Education Research	169	199	169	179	179
Education Statistics	68	84	68	68	68
Assessment	40	43	40	40	40
TOTAL	<u>277</u>	<u>325</u>	<u>277</u>	<u>287</u>	<u>287</u>

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 President's budget requested \$199 million for Education Research, \$84 million for Education Statistics, and \$43 million for Assessment.

The increase in funding for Research would support the Interagency Education Research Initiative (IERI) a joint project among ED, NSF, and the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development. This project is designed to improve pre-K through 12 student learning and achievement in reading, math and science by supporting rigorous research on large-scale implementations of promising educational practices. Research will benefit students who are at risk for school failure. The request for Research would also fund an Initiative on Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Students and will support research on factors that impede or promote the acquisition of English reading and writing abilities by Spanish-speaking students. The request for Statistics would provide funding for surveys including the Birth Cohort of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Survey, the National Adult Literacy Survey, and several other projects. The request for Assessment funds will support continuation of the National Assessment of Educational Progress, a nationally representative assessment of American students.

House Action: The House-passed bill provides \$169 million for Education Research, \$30 million less than the request and a straight-line from FY 2000 enacted. At this funding level, the Department of Education would not be able to expand research efforts in IERI or the Initiative on Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Students. The House-passed bill provides \$40 million for Assessment. The House-passed bill provides \$68 million for Education Statistics, \$16 million less than the request and a straight line from FY 2000 enacted. At this level the Department of Education would be forced to eliminate several important surveys mentioned above.

Senate Action: The Senate-passed bill provides \$179 million for Education Research, \$20 million less than the request and a \$10 million increase from FY 2000 enacted. At this funding level the Department of Education would be required to scale back major research efforts including the IERI project and the Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Students projects. The Senate-passed bill provides \$40 million for assessment, and is identical to the House for Education Statistics, \$16 million less than the request and a straight line from FY 2000 enacted.

Preliminary Conference Action: The funding levels established in the tentative conference agreement are identical to those of the Senate-passed bill.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 Budget requested \$198 million for research and \$78 for Statistics. Congress appropriated \$169 million for research and \$68 million for statistics.

ADULT EDUCATION: English Literacy/Civics
(Program level in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
26	75	26	0	0

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The President's FY 2001 budget requested \$75 million in National Leadership funds to support the third year of the English Literacy/Civics initiative. These funds would continue to allow States or localities that are significantly affected by immigration and large limited English proficient populations to implement programs to help immigrants gain English literacy skills and knowledge about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship. These funds would be distributed through a competitive grant program run by the Department of Education's Office of Vocational and Adult Education. The President's request would provide approximately 250,000 LEP adults/immigrants with needed services, (165,000 additional students over the FY 2000 enacted level of \$25.5 million).

House Action: The House bill straightlines EL/Civics, providing \$25.5 million under Adult Education State Grants. The bill retains the same language as the FY 00 appropriations bill that designated the funds to be distributed via targeted formula grants -- 50% of the funds for States with the greatest overall need and 50% to States with the largest growth in need.

Senate Action: The Senate bill does not provide any funds for EL/Civics.

Preliminary Conference Action: The preliminary conference agreement does not provide any funds for EL/Civics.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The President's FY 2000 budget requested \$70 million for EL/Civics under National Leadership funds. The FY 2000 enacted level was \$25.5 million under the State Grants authority. Funds were to be distributed through targeted formula grants -- 50% of the funds were designated for States with the greatest overall need and 50% for States with the greatest increase in need.

GEAR UP
(Program level in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
200	325	200	225	200

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 President's Budget requested \$325 million for GEAR-UP. First funded in FY 1999, this program provides funds for States and local partnerships to help low-income students prepare for and attend college. At this level, ~~1.4~~ 1.3 million disadvantaged students would receive services.

In FY 2000, GEAR-UP funds support early intervention services for ~~767,000~~ 710,000 disadvantaged students. The President's FY 2001 Budget would allow these children to continue receiving the help they need to prepare for college, enable participating schools to extend services to the next cohort of middle-school students, and provide funds for new projects, expanding the number of students served to over ~~1.4~~ 1.3 million.

Children from low-income families and high-poverty schools are significantly less likely to enroll in and complete postsecondary education programs than other students. Research has shown that this gap is due largely to a lack of information among low-income families about the requisite steps in preparing for college. GEAR-UP provides counseling, tutoring, and mentoring to disadvantaged students to raise their educational expectations and assure them that college is both attainable and affordable.

GEAR-UP supports partnerships between colleges, high-poverty elementary and secondary schools, and national and community-based organizations and businesses to provide intensive services to students from the 6th through the 12th grade.

House Action: The House-passed bill provides \$200 million for GEAR-UP, a straightline from FY 2000. ~~767,000~~ 710,000 students would receive services, ~~644,000~~ 600,000 fewer than at the President's Budget level.

Senate Action: The Senate-passed bill provided \$225 million for GEAR-UP, a \$25 million increase over FY 2000. ~~One million~~ 915,000 students would receive services, 400,000 fewer than at the President's Budget level.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement provides \$200 million for GEAR UP, the same as the House and as FY 2000 enacted. ~~767,000~~ 710,000 students would receive services, ~~644,000~~ 600,000 fewer than at the President's Budget level.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 Budget requested \$240 million for GEAR-UP. Congress appropriated \$200 million.

Prepared By/Date: Jennifer Kron (5-7767) 8/28/00 f_GEAR UP.wpd

Hispanic Education Action Plan (HEAP)

HEAP Component	2001 Budget Policy	House Action	Senate Action	Preliminary Conference Action	FY 2000 Appropriations Action
Bilingual Education	The FY 2000 request is \$296 million, a \$48 million increase over FY 2000 enacted, for strengthening bilingual education programs which help LEP students become proficient in English and prepare them to meet high standards in academic subjects.	The House provided \$248 million for funding Bilingual Education—a straightline at the FY 2000 enacted level.	The Senate provided \$279 million for Bilingual Education – \$17 million less than the President's request.	Preliminary conference agreement includes \$279 million, \$17 million below President's request.	FY2000 PB requested \$259 million, an increase of \$35 million over FY 1999 enacted. Congress appropriated \$248 million.
Hispanic-Serving Institutions	The FY 2001 request is \$62.5 million, a \$20.25 million increase over FY 2000 enacted, for colleges and universities that serve large numbers of Latino students.	The House provided \$68.5 million for HSIs—\$6 million more than the President's request.	The Senate provided the President's request -- \$62.5 million.	Conference provides \$68.5 million, \$6 million above President's request.	FY2000 PB request was \$42 million, a \$14 million increase over FY 99. The final appropriation was \$42 million.
High School Equivalency Program & College Assistance Migrant Program	FY 2001 request is \$30 million, an \$8 million increase over FY 00 enacted. HEP helps migrant students 16 years + who are not currently enrolled in school obtain a h.s. equivalency and go to college or non-migratory employment. CAMP provides tutoring and counseling, stipends, tuition, room and board to first-year, undergraduate migrant students.	The House provided the President's request for both programs.	The Senate provided the President's request for both programs.	Conference provides President's request for both programs.	FY 2000 request was \$22 million, a \$9 million increase over FY 1999 enacted. The final enacted level was \$22 million.

Adult Education	FY 2001 request was \$555.50 million, an \$85.5 million increase over FY 2000 enacted, for Adult Education, including \$75 million in National Leadership Programs for the EL/Civics initiative.	The House provided \$490.5 million, or \$65 million less than the request. The bill provides \$25.5 million for EL/Civics under State Grants -- a straightline from FY 2000.	The Senate provided \$490.5 million, or \$65 million less than the request. The Senate does not provide any funds for EL/Civics.	The conference provides \$490.5 million, or \$65 million less than the request. The conference does not provide any funds for EL/Civics.	FY 2000 request was \$575 million, a \$190 million increase over FY 1999, for Adult Education, including \$70 million for EL/Civics initiative. The final enacted was \$470 million, with \$25.5 million for EL/Civics.
HEAP Component	2001 Budget Policy	House Action	Senate Action	Preliminary Conference Action	FY 2000 Appropriations Action
Migrant Youth Programs	The FY 2001 request was \$15 million for Migrant and Seasonal Youth Opportunity and \$5 million for Migrant Youth Job Training, Labor Department programs to provide training and education assistance to migrant youth, including literacy assistance, worker safety training, and dropout prevention.	The House provided \$7 million, \$8 million below the President's request, for Migrant and Seasonal Youth Opportunity. The House provided \$5 million, the President's request, for Migrant Youth Job Training.	The Senate provided \$10 million, \$5 million below the President's request, for Migrant and Seasonal Youth Opportunity. The Senate provided \$5 million, the President's request, for Migrant Youth Job Training.	The conference provides \$10 million, \$5 million below the President's request, for Migrant and Seasonal Youth Opportunity. The conference provides \$5 million, the President's request, for Migrant Youth Job Training.	The FY 2000 request was \$10 million for Migrant and Seasonal Youth Opportunity and \$5 million for Migrant Youth Job Training. Final enacted was \$10 million for Youth Opportunity and \$5 million for Job Training
Title I, Migrant Education	FY 2001 request was \$380 million, a \$25 million increase over FY 2000 enacted, to provide additional educational assistance to migrant children.	The House provided \$354.689 million for Migrant Education—a straightline at the FY 1999 and FY 2000 enacted levels.	The Senate provided the President's request of \$380 million.	The conference provides the President's request of \$380 million.	FY 2000 request was \$380 million, a \$25 million increase over FY 1999 enacted. Final enacted was \$355 million – a straightline from FY 99 enacted.
Title I, Grants to LEAs	FY 2001 request was \$8.358 billion, a \$400 million increase over FY 2000, to improve the academic achievement of disadvantaged youth.	The House provided \$7.941 billion – \$417 million less than the President's request and a straightline from FY 00 enacted level.	The Senate provided \$8.336 billion, \$22 million less than the President's request.	The conference provides \$8.252 billion, \$106 million less than the President's request.	FY 2000 request was \$7.996 billion. Final enacted was \$7.941 billion.

TRIO

FY 2001 request was \$725 million, a \$80 million increase over FY 2000 enacted, for programs that work with disadvantaged high school and college students to help them attend and graduate from college.

The House provided \$760 million for TRIO—an increase of \$35 million over the President's request.

The Senate provided \$736.5 million – an increase of \$11.5 million over the President's request.

Conference provides \$760 million, \$35 million over the President's request.

FY 2000 request was \$630 million, a \$30 million increase over FY 1999 enacted. Final enacted was \$645 million.

HEAP Component	2001 Budget Policy	House Action	Senate Action	Preliminary Conference Action	FY 2000 Appropriations Action
GEAR UP	The FY 2001 request was \$325 million, a \$125 million increase over the FY 00 enacted, to support early college awareness and preparation among low-income elementary and secondary students.	The House provided \$200 million – \$125 million less than the President's request and a straightline from the FY 00 enacted level.	The Senate provided \$225 million, \$100 million less than the President's request.	Conference provides \$200 million, \$125 million below the President's request.	The FY 00 enacted was \$200 million -- \$40 million below the President's request.
LEP Research	The FY 2001 request was \$10 million to support research designed to identify critical factors that influence the development of English-language literacy.	The House provided no funding for this research.	The Senate provided no funding for this research.	Conference provides no funding for this research.	This is the first year that funds were requested.

H
E
A
P

1

1

HISPANIC EDUCATION ACTION PLAN (HEAP)
millions of dollars)

(Program level in

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
9,938*	10,762	10,105	10,555	10,475

*For comparability purposes, this number includes GEAR UP and LEP research, two programs that were not part of HEAP in FY 2000.

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Please see attachment for specifics on each program in HEAP.

2001 Budget Policy: The Hispanic Education Action Plan (HEAP) is a cross-cutting initiative with the goal of improving the educational attainment of Hispanic students. HEAP is composed of ten programs in the Department of Education and two programs in the Department of Labor. The President's FY 2001 budget requests \$10.762 billion, an increase of more than \$800 million over FY 2000, to support programs that serve large numbers of Hispanic Americans. Specific details on each of the twelve programs are discussed on the attached pages.

House Action: The House bill provides \$10.1 billion, or \$657 million less than the President's request. The House provides nearly \$50 million less than the President's request for Adult Education EL/Civics, denying over 165,000 immigrants and limited English proficient (LEP) adults instruction in the literacy and civics skills necessary to become successful participants in American society. The House does not include any of the \$48 million requested increase for Bilingual Education. This reduction would deny grants to over 100 school districts, primarily districts with little prior experience serving limited English proficient students, as well as failing to provide over 2,300 additional new or certified teachers with the training and skills they need to teach LEP students. The bill provides no increase in funding for GEAR UP, which helps low-income students prepare for college, denying these services to as many as 644,000 students.

Senate Action: The Senate bill provides \$10.6 billion, or \$207 million less than the President's request. The Senate does not provide the \$75 million requested for Adult Education EL/Civics, denying 250,000 immigrants and limited English proficient (LEP) adults instruction in the literacy and civics skills necessary to become successful participants in American society. The Senate provides \$17 million less than the President's budget for Bilingual Education, failing to provide 1,200 additional new or certified teachers with the training and skills they need to teach LEP students. The Senate bill provides a \$25 million increase in funding for GEAR UP, \$100 million below the President's request. The Senate bill would deny GEAR UP services to more than 400,000 students.

Preliminary Conference Action: The preliminary conference agreement provides \$10.5 billion, \$287 million below the President's request. The conference does not provide the \$75 million requested for Adult Education EL/Civics, denying 250,000 immigrants and limited English proficient (LEP) adults instruction in the literacy and civics skills necessary to become successful participants in American society. The conference provides \$17 million less than the President's budget for Bilingual Education, failing to provide 1,200 additional new or certified teachers with the training and skills they need to teach LEP students. The conference bill provides no increase in funding for GEAR UP, \$125 million below the President's request. The conference bill would deny GEAR UP services to as many as 644,000 students.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The President's FY 2000 request was \$10 billion, an

increase of almost \$600 million over the FY 99 enacted adjusted level. The House bill provided \$9.5 billion while the Senate provided \$9.9 billion. The final adjusted enacted level was \$9.7 billion. These FY 2000 levels do not include GEAR UP and LEP research – those two programs were not part of HEAP in FY 2000.

**NEXT GENERATION TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION, TECHNOLOGY INNOVATION
CHALLENGE GRANTS, STAR SCHOOLS**

(BA in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
Next Generation Technology Innovation*	0	170	0	0	0
Technology Innovation Challenge Grants	146	0	197	100	190
Star Schools	<u>51</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>43</u>	<u>51</u>
Total	197	170	242	143	241

*Request includes \$10 million for Mississippi Delta Initiative.

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 Budget requested \$170 million for Next Generation Technology Innovation, a new initiative to replace the Technology Innovation Challenge Grants and the Star Schools programs and develop and expand cutting-edge technologies to improve education. The Next Generation Technology Innovation proposal will support the development and expansion of state-of-the-art educational technology applications such as web-based instruction in distance learning. Within this proposal, \$10 million is provided for the Mississippi Delta Initiative, a targeted demonstration project designed to provide training to middle school teachers in the Delta region.

The Next Generation Initiative is designed to focus the progress that Star Schools and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants have fostered in education technology applications and concentrate new educational technology efforts on cutting-edge applications. For example, while the Star Schools program has made conceptual advances in the field of distance learning, the Next Generation proposal updates these concepts for an environment that reflects the recent rapid advances in technology. Technology Innovation Challenge Grants support partnerships among educators, business, industry, and other community organizations to develop innovative applications of technology. The Next Generation Technology Innovation program will strengthen those efforts by concentrating on cutting-edge, new applications of educational technology.

Note: This proposal cannot be carried out under existing law and requires an authorization. For this reason, it is not funded by Congress and existing programs are.

House Action: The House bill does not fund the Next Generation Technology Initiative (and the Mississippi Delta Initiative), failing to promote education technology innovation and withholding much-needed technology professional development from teachers in the Mississippi Delta region. This bill provides \$242 million for Star Schools and Technology Challenge Grants, two programs not in the President's request.

Senate Action: Like the House bill, the Senate does not fund the Next Generation Technology Initiative (and the Mississippi Delta Initiative), failing to promote education technology innovation and withholding much-needed technology professional development from teachers in the Mississippi Delta region. This bill provides \$143 million for Star Schools and Technology Challenge Grants, two programs not in the President's request.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement does not fund the Next Generation Technology Initiative (and the Mississippi Delta Initiative) while providing \$241 million for Star Schools and Technology Challenge Grants, two programs not in the request.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The President's budget request for Star Schools and Technology Innovation Challenge Grants was \$155 million. Congress appropriated \$197 million. No funding was sought for the Next Generation Technology Innovation program.

PREPARING TOMORROW'S TEACHERS TO USE TECHNOLOGY
millions of dollars)

(BA in

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
75	150	85	125	125

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: FY 2001 Budget requested \$150 million, doubling last year's appropriation for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology. This program supports pre-service teacher preparation for the effective use of technology in the classroom. At the request level, the program would provide 267,000 pre-service teachers with critical technology training. Funds would provide 175 new Capacity Building awards to stimulate State and local initiatives for campus-wide teacher education reform, 120 new Implementation and Catalyst grants, and 167 Implementation and Catalyst continuation grants.

The proposed funding increase for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology is supported by research that cites a need for teachers to be both technology-literate and able to apply technology in the classroom. This program provides the only Federal funding available to ensure that teacher preparation programs are integrating the use of technology into the pre-service development of future teachers.

This program is one of the highest priorities for educational technology. It was proposed by the National Economic Council and was specifically mentioned as a priority in a letter to conferees from elementary and secondary teachers associations.

House Action: The House bill provides \$85 million for the program, \$65 million less than the request. Training for over 100,000 pre-service teachers would be eliminated at this funding level compared to the President's request.

Senate Action: The Senate bill provides \$125 million for the program, \$25 million less than the request. While the Senate level is a \$50 million increase from FY2000, training for about 40,000 pre-service teachers would still be eliminated compared to the President's request.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement provides \$125 million for Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology, the same as the Senate. This level would eliminate training for about 40,000 pre-service teachers compared to the President's request.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The President's budget request of \$75 million was enacted.

SAFE AND DRUG FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

(Program level in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY2000</u>	<u>FY2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
State Grants	439	439	439	447	439
National Programs*	161	201	160	195	195
Project SERV	0	10	0	0	0
TOTAL	600	650	599	642	634

(* Includes \$50 million for Coordinators program listed separately last year)

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: FY 2001 Budget requested \$650 million, a \$50 million increase over FY 2000 enacted. Specifically, the budget requested increases of:

\$40 million for National Programs. The National Programs request includes an increase of \$40 million for Safe Schools/Healthy Students, an interagency collaboration with ED, DOJ, HHS, and Labor to assist 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. The request (along with funds from the other agencies) would support grants to 40 new communities and support ongoing projects in roughly 70 communities across the Nation.

\$10 million for a new initiative, Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence). Project SERV is a new initiative to provide a coordinated Federal response to violent deaths and other crises affecting schools. It would help provide, for example, extra security measures, mental health counseling, crisis training for state and local officials, and other needs of students and school personnel in the event of a crisis, such as that experienced at Columbine High. Project SERV would be a multi-year program. Funds would be appropriated to remain available until expended.

Project SERV was proposed in the Administration's ESEA reauthorization. No appropriations language for this program was included in the Budget. This program would require authorization through appropriations language.

House Action: The House-passed bill provides \$599 million — \$439 for State grants; \$160 million for National programs; and \$0 for Project SERV. Cutting the request for National programs by \$40 million would deny 40 Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants to develop community-wide strategies for creating safe and drug-free schools. Not authorizing or funding project SERV will preclude emergency assistance to schools affected by serious violence or other crises.

Senate Action: The Senate-passed bill provides \$642 million — \$447 million in State grants, \$195 million in National Programs; and \$0 for Project SERV. The \$6 million cut in National Programs would deny approximately 6 Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement provides \$634 million — \$439 million in State grants, \$195 million in National Programs; and \$0 for Project SERV. The \$6 million cut in National Programs would deny approximately 6 Safe Schools/Healthy Students grants. Not authorizing or funding project SERV will preclude emergency assistance to schools affected by serious violence or other crises.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 budget requested \$ 591 million, including \$12 million for Project SERV; \$600 million was enacted, but no funds for Project SERV.

1

1

1

200-704 R 5200

SCHOOL RENOVATION
(Program level in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
0	1,300	0	0	0

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 President's budget requests \$1.3 billion through appropriations language for the new school renovation program. This program would consist of three parts:

- a \$50 million grant program for LEAs with high concentrations of Native Americans;
- a \$125 million grant program for LEAs with little or no capacity to borrow funds urgently needed for renovation;
- and a \$1.125 billion loan subsidy program that would provide no-interest loans to LEAs with urgent repair needs.

charter schools set aside?

All told, this program would support \$6.5 billion in repairs in up to 5,000 schools. This initiative would help school districts fund renovations to items such as roofs, heating and cooling systems, and electrical wiring.

Based on a 2000 Department of Education study, \$127 billion is needed to bring America's schools into good overall condition. An estimated 3.5 million students attend schools that need major repairs or replacement. These need estimates do not include school construction expenses associated with rising enrollment or technology infrastructure needs.

Appropriations language for this program was included in the Budget. This program would require authorization through appropriations language.

House Action: The House-passed bill does not provide any funding for school renovation.

Senate Action: The Senate-passed bill does not provide any dedicated funding for school renovation. In the Title VI Innovative Education program in the Senate Bill, school construction is an allowable activity. Under this authority, the Senate provides \$2.7 billion that can be used for activities including class size reduction and school renovation.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement does not provide any dedicated funding for school renovation. As in the Senate bill, school construction is an allowable activity under Title VI. The tentative conference agreement provides \$2.7 billion in Title VI that can be used for activities including class size reduction and school renovation.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 Budget did not request any funding for a discretionary school renovation program.

SPECIAL EDUCATION NATIONAL ACTIVITIES
(Program level in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
State Improvement	35	45	45	35	40
Research/Innovation	64	74	64	74	70
TA and Dissem.	45	53	45	45	45
PIC's	19	26	22	26	26
Other	<u>118</u>	<u>116</u>	<u>118</u>	<u>119</u>	<u>121</u>
Total	282	316	295	300	302

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 Budget includes increases to four Special Education National Activities, which complement the Special Education State Grants programs by using a variety of strategies to help improve the educational results of students with disabilities.

State Improvement (+\$10 million): This program helps States improve their systems for providing education and related services to children with disabilities, primarily by improving their teacher training and professional development activities. This training and professional development is for both regular education and special education teachers. The Budget would increase the number of State awards from 28 to 43.

Research and Innovation (+\$10 million): This program supports a variety of special education research, demonstration, and outreach projects. The Budget's requested increase would be used to help implement research-based practices to serve children with disabilities who have reading problems and/or exhibit behaviors that may lead to discipline problems as they get older.

Technical Assistance (TA) and Dissemination (+\$8 million): This program supports technical assistance for individuals and organizations serving children with disabilities. The Budget's requested increase would support new awards for States to help schools comply with special education laws and correct deficiencies found through Federal and State monitoring.

Parent Information Centers (PIC's) (+\$7 million): This program supports centers that help parents understand the nature of their child's disability and their child's rights under the IDEA.

Both State Improvement and Research and Innovation were noted in the Labor/HHS/Education letter to the conferees.

House Action: The House provides the President's request for State Improvement, but provides no increase for Research and Innovation or TA and Dissemination. The House provides a \$3 million increase for PIC's.

Senate Action: The Senate provides the President's request for Research and Innovation and PIC's, but provides no increase to State Improvement or TA and Dissemination.

Preliminary Conference Action: The preliminary conference level provides the President's request for PIC's, a \$5 million increase for State Improvement, a \$6 million increase for Research and Innovation, and no increase for TA and Dissemination.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 Budget requested a \$64 million increase for Special Education National Activities, and the final FY 2000 appropriations bill provided a \$3 million increase. \$5 million of the FY 2000 total was for four Congressional earmarks.

SMALL, SAFE, AND SUCCESSFUL HIGH SCHOOLS
(BA in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
45	120	45	0	45

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/ED

2001 Budget Policy: The President's Budget includes \$120 million for this program to help about 600 high schools plan and implement reforms to create smaller learning environments of no more than 600 students. Such reforms include schools-within-schools and career academies within a larger high school. Over time, high schools have become increasingly larger and students feel disconnected from adults. Research shows that when students are part of a small and more intimate learning community, students are more successful academically, are more involved in their schools, and exhibit less negative behavior like truancy or delinquency. At the requested level, about half of the schools would receive planning funds and half would receive implementation grants.

The FY 2001 Budget includes appropriations language for this program using an existing authority supporting smaller learning environments in the Fund for the Improvement of Education, but adds language to focus it on high schools. The appropriations language in the Budget is exactly the same as last year's language. Even though the program was first funded in FY 2000, it was considered an initiative in this year's Budget because the funding level was tripled.

House Action: The House provided \$45 million for this program, the same as last year. At that level, 400 fewer high schools would receive services compared to the President's Budget. The House includes the same language proposed in the FY 2001 Budget.

Senate Action: The Senate provided no funding and no language for this program.

Preliminary Conference Action: Conferees provide \$45 million for this program in the Fund for the Improvement of Education, as in the House bill.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: This program was first funded at \$45 million in FY 2000 as an initiative by Congressman Obey.

Teacher Quality (in millions)

Program	FY 2000 Approp.	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Prelim. Conference
Teaching to High Standards – State Grants <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, State Grants</i>	0	690	0	0	0
Eisenhower Professional Development <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, State Grants</i>	335	0	0	435	435
Eisenhower Professional Development Federal Activities	23	0	23	23	23
Eisenhower Regional Math & Science Consortia	15	15	15	15	15
School Leadership Initiative <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, Other National Activities</i>	0	40	0	0	0
Improvement of Teaching and School Leadership <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, Other National Activities</i>	0	25	0	0	0
Hometown Teachers <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, Other National Activities</i>	0	75	0	0	0
Higher Standards/Higher Pay <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, Other National Activities</i>	0	50	0	0	0
Teacher Quality Incentives <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, Other National Activities</i>	0	50	0	0	0
Transition to Teaching <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, Other National Activities</i>	0	25	0	0	0
Early Childhood Educator Professional Development <i>See one-pager: Title II - Teaching to High Standards, Other National Activities</i>	0	30	0	0	0
Teacher Empowerment Act	0	0	1,750	0	0
TOTALS	\$373 million	\$1 billion	\$1.788 billion	\$473 million	\$473 million

TITLE II: TEACHING TO HIGH STANDARDS—OTHER NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

(BA in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
45 38	310	38	38	38

*Note: See Teacher Quality funding table for individual program levels

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The President's FY 2001 budget requests \$310 million for a group of national programs within the Teaching to High Standards initiatives designed to improve teacher quality.

The Transition to Teaching program is funded at \$25 million in the FY 2001 budget and is designed to build upon the successes of the Department of Defense's Troops to Teachers program. Troops to Teachers has been highly effective, injecting the talent, skills and experience of military service members and Federal civilian personnel into high-poverty schools. Transition to Teaching would expand upon Troops to Teachers by including other mid-career professionals to join the 3,300 former military personnel hired as teachers since 1994.

The FY 2001 budget includes \$40 million for the proposed School Leadership Initiative. The Initiative responds to problems that local education agencies have experienced in finding well-qualified candidates to fill superintendent and principal vacancies. Program funds will strengthen local efforts to provide current and prospective superintendents and principals, particularly those in high-poverty, low-performing schools, high-quality training to improve their capacity for effective leadership. The requested level would support approximately 20 centers that would provide professional development opportunities for approximately 10,000 current or prospective school administrators.

The Early Childhood Educator Professional Development Grants program is a new initiative intended to create high-quality professional development opportunities for early childhood educators working in communities with high concentrations of child poverty. With funding of \$30 million, the competitive grants will focus exclusively on professional development in early language, literacy and reading development as supported by research outlining this vital need.

Other Federal teacher quality leadership activities include the Higher Standards, Higher Pay program, funded at \$50 million in the FY 2001 budget, which would award competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to attract and retain high-quality teachers and principals through better pay. The proposed Teacher Quality Incentives competitive grant program, funded at \$50 million, is designed to increase the percentage of certified teachers in high-poverty districts and decrease the percentage of a district's secondary teachers who are teaching out-of-field. The proposed Hometown Teachers program, funded at \$75 million, is designed to help high-poverty school districts develop a comprehensive approach to teacher recruitment and retention. Hometown Teachers would provide incentives and support for middle and high schools students in high-poverty districts to become teachers and work in their home district or a similarly disadvantaged area.

Note: This proposal cannot be carried out under existing law and requires an authorization. For this reason, it is not funded by Congress and existing programs are.

House Action: The House bill provides \$45 38 million of the \$310 million requested.

Senate Action: The Senate bill provides \$45 38 million of the \$310 million requested.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement provides \$45 38 million of the \$310 million requested and is the same as the House and Senate bills.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: ~~These programs are all new proposals.~~ Provided \$38 million.

TITLE II: TEACHING TO HIGH STANDARDS—STATE GRANTS
dollars)

(BA in millions of

	<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
Teaching to High Standards State Grants	0	690	0	0	0
Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants	<u>335</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>435</u>	<u>435</u>
Total	335	690	0	435	435

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The President's FY 2001 budget request includes \$1 billion for teacher quality initiatives, \$690 million of which would be included in the Teaching to High Standards State Grants program. This program is designed to strengthen teacher in-service training by supporting sustained and high-quality professional development. A recent evaluation of the Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants program, the current teacher quality state grant program, suggests that teachers believe professional development contributes most to improving their knowledge and skills if it is long-lasting and connected to State and district standards and assessments. Teaching to High Standards grants will provide funding for educators to support State and local efforts to align curricula and assessments with challenging content standards.

In the Eisenhower program, at least \$250 million is set aside for math and science professional development. Teaching to High Standards would increase this level to at least \$300 million.

The \$690 million for teacher quality state grants represents a \$355 million increase for this need. Teaching to High Standards State Grants is designed to replace the Eisenhower program that was funded at \$335 million in FY 2000.

Note: Teaching to High Standards State Grants cannot be carried out under existing law and requires an authorization. For this reason, it is not funded by Congress and existing programs are.

House Action: The House bill failed to fund any of the President's proposals for professional development. Both Teaching to High Standards and the preexisting Eisenhower program were not provided any funding. The House funded only \$15 million of the President's \$1 billion teacher quality proposal for State and National activities.

The House bill appropriates funds for its own teacher quality proposal, the Teacher Empowerment Act, but fails to guarantee the kinds of high-quality, sustained professional development opportunities that the President's request supports. The Teacher Empowerment Act provides grants to states that can be used for professional development or class size reduction but does not require states to integrate standards into its professional development.

Senate Action: The Senate bill underfunds the \$1 billion Teaching to High Standards teacher quality programs and provides less funding for teacher quality state grants than the Administration's request. The Senate only provides \$435 million for teacher quality state grants, \$255 million less than the President's request. While the Senate provides limited funding for state grants, these funds are allocated to the existing Eisenhower Professional Development State Grant program and not the President's proposed Teaching to High Standards initiative.

Preliminary Conference Action: The tentative conference agreement underfunds the \$1 billion Teaching to High Standards teacher quality programs, providing only \$435 million for teacher quality state grants, \$255 million less than the President's request. This is the same as the Senate level and provides no funding for the House's Teacher Empowerment Act.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The President's budget request for FY 2000 for the Eisenhower program was \$335 million and was fully funded.

Educational Technology (in millions)

Technology Program	FY 2000 Appropriations	FY 2001 Request	House	Senate	Preliminary Conference
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund <i>See one-pager on Technology Literacy Challenge Fund</i>	425	450	517	425	450
Technology Innovation Challenge Fund <i>See one-pager on Next Generation Technology...etc.</i>	146	0	198	100	190
Regional Technology in Education Consortia	10	10	10	10	10
Next Generation Technology Innovation <i>See one-pager on Next Generation Technology...etc.</i>	0	170	0	0	0
Technology Leadership Activities	2	2	2	2	2
Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers to Use Technology <i>See one-pager on Preparing Tomorrow's Teachers...</i>	75	150	85	125	125
Community Technology Centers <i>See one-pager on Community Technology Centers</i>	33	100	33	65	53
Star Schools <i>See one-pager on Next Generation Technology...etc.</i>	51	0	45	43	51
Ready to Learn Television	16	16	16	16	16
Telcom Demo Project for Mathematics	9	0	0	9	9
Telcom Program for Professional Development	0	5	0	0	0
TOTALS	767	903	906	795	906

TITLE I -- GRANTS TO LEAs
(Program level in millions of dollars)

<u>FY 2000</u>	<u>FY 2001 Req.</u>	<u>House</u>	<u>Senate</u>	<u>Preliminary Conference</u>
7,941*	8,358*	7,941*	8,336*	8,252*

* These numbers represent the program level – the base appropriation plus an advance appropriation to be made available October 1 of the following year.

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

2001 Budget Policy: The President's FY 2001 budget requested \$8.358 billion for Title I – Grants to LEAs, including \$250 million for the Accountability Fund (see Title I - Accountability language paper for details), an increase of \$417 million over FY 2000, \$116 million of which represents an increase in the Accountability Fund. Title I Grants to LEAs provide supplemental education funding to schools and districts in high-poverty areas to help disadvantaged students learn to the same high standards as other students. The Accountability Fund provides extra assistance to States and districts to turn around low-performing schools, which tend to be in the highest poverty communities. While opponents describe the Fund as drawing funds away from Title I Grants to LEAs, in effect, the Fund helps target additional resources toward the neediest districts. At the requested level, over 13 million students would receive services and over 5,000 failing schools would receive extra assistance.

House Action: The House-passed bill provides \$7.941 billion, \$417 million below the President's request. The House does not include the Accountability Fund and would also reduce or eliminate services to more than 260,000 disadvantaged students as a result of the cut to Title I Grants to LEAs.

Senate Action: The Senate-passed bill provides \$8.336 billion, \$22 million below the President's request. However, the Senate does not include the Accountability Fund. It therefore provides \$228 million more for the Title I Grants to LEAs program than the President's request but does not provide any additional resources to help the lowest performing schools.

Preliminary Conference Action: According to the funding table, conferees include \$8.252 billion. This level equals the President's request, minus \$250 million for the proposed Accountability Fund, plus \$145 million for States that would otherwise lose funds if all districts are held 100% harmless from this year. Conferees do not include funds or language for the Accountability Fund.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: Title I – Grants to LEAs was funded at \$7.941 billion in FY 2000, of which \$134 million was reserved for the Accountability Fund. Winning support for the Accountability Fund was a major victory in last year's appropriations negotiations. Over 12.5 million students received services.

**AFTER SCHOOL
21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS**

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/ED

Ranking: High X Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: (See Funding Paper on After-School). The FY 2001 President's budget requested \$1 billion, an increase of \$547 million over FY 2000 enacted. Along with a local match, this would support nearly 8,000 before- and after-school centers and serve over 2.5 million children. No appropriations language was proposed for 21st Century in the FY 2001 budget. The President's ESEA reauthorization proposal requested a local match and reservation of up to 10 percent of the appropriated funds for community-based organizations (CBOs). Without the local match, the \$1 billion request would serve approximately 1 million fewer children. Currently, the authorization for this program requires that awards be made to schools (or Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) on behalf of schools). Under the ESEA proposal that would reserve up to 10 percent of the funds for CBOs, the CBOs would have to provide evidence of the concurrence of the LEA, thus ensuring a link with school programs. Examples of CBOs include the YMCA and the Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

House Action: The House funded 21st Century at \$600 million, \$400 million below the request. There were no language issues.

Senate Action: The Senate funded 21st Century at \$600 million, \$400 million below the request. In addition, the Senate passed the Gregg amendment that would allow community-based organizations (CBOs) to be eligible for 21st Century grants on the same basis as schools. This would erode the important link between after-school programs and in-school instruction.

Preliminary Conference Action: Conference notes do not indicate that the Senate language has been rejected; this remains an open issue.

Solution/Options: Support the Administration's proposal in the ESEA reauthorization that allows up to 10 percent of the appropriated funds to be awarded to CBOs, with the concurrence of the LEA. Do not pursue the local match provision at this time.

Justification:

The ESEA reauthorization language allowing only up to 10 percent of funds be reserved for CBOs would continue the program's ability to link after-school programs with students' classroom needs, helping to increase the academic achievement of students through extended learning opportunities.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 budget requested \$600 million; \$453 million was appropriated.

Prepared By/Date: L. Mustain (x5-7768)/M. Cassell (x5-5881) 9/11/00 L_afterschool

TRIO: College Completion Challenge Grants

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The FY2001 budget request proposed that of the \$80 million increase requested for TRIO, \$35 million should be used to establish a new College Completion Challenge Grant (CCCG) component of the TRIO program Student Support Services. The Administration later submitted to Congress authorizing language for CCCG. Under CCCG, competitive grants to institutions of higher education would support grant aid to students and summer orientation programs in conjunction with student support services for low-income students in their first years of college, with the goal of increasing college completion rates. Authorizing language is needed to use TRIO funds to provide grant aid to students.

House Action: The House-passed Higher Education Technical Amendments bill included authorizing language for a program similar to CCCG. Although the House appropriations bill provides \$35 million more for TRIO than the President's request, it is not clear if any of the increase was intended to fund CCCG.

Senate Action: The Senate has not yet considered the Higher Education Technical Amendments bill. Although the Senate appropriations bill provides \$11.5 million more for TRIO than the President's request, it is not clear if any of the increase was intended to fund CCCG.

Preliminary Conference Action: The conference does not appear to include language concerning CCCG. Although the conference provides \$35 million more for TRIO than the President's request, the same level as the House appropriations bill, it is not clear if any of the increase was intended to fund CCCG.

Solution/Options: Support appropriations language authorizing TRIO Student Support Services funds to be used for grant aid to students.

Justification:

Students from low-income families are significantly less likely than other students to persist in college once enrolled and to earn degrees. According to a Department of Education survey, of students attending four-year colleges, only 42% of those from families in the bottom income quartile earned bachelor's degrees within five years, compared to 62% of those from families in the top income quartile.

Research shows that three policies instituted by schools have a positive effect on the persistence of disadvantaged students: an intensive summer program for incoming first-year students; larger grants for students in their first two years; and a strong student support services program.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The Administration had requested \$35 million in FY 2000 for a CCCG initiative that was similar to this year's proposal but was separate from the TRIO programs. This initiative was not funded in FY 2000.

SCHOOL CONSTRUCTION

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High X Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: (See Funding Paper on School Renovation). The FY 2001 President's budget includes two school construction and renovation programs.

The Budget requests \$1.3 billion in budget authority to make about \$6.7 billion in grants and interest-free loans for emergency repairs in 5,000 schools per year. Over 5 years, this program would help 25,000 school repair items such as roofs, heating and cooling systems, and electrical wiring. This program included three components:

- \$50 million in grants to help build and repair schools where half or more of the students live on Indian lands;
- \$125 million in grants to high-need school districts with little or no capacity to borrow money for emergency repairs; and
- \$1.125 million in loan subsidies to fund about \$6.5 billion in interest-free, seven-year loans.

The President also requests authority to allocate nearly \$25 billion in interest-free, tax credit bonds to states and local education agencies for the construction and renovation of 6,000 public schools. Tax credit authority would be provided as follows:

- \$400 million to the Bureau of Indian Affairs schools;
- \$2.4 billion for an expansion of the existing Qualified Zone Academy Bonds program; and
- \$22 billion to be distributed equally between states (based on enrollement) and the 125 school districts with the largest number of low income children (In March, Johnson-Rangel proposed allocating 60% to states).

House Action: The House does not provide any funding for school construction or renovation.

Senate Action: The Senate makes school construction an allowable activity under the Title VI Innovative Education Block Grant. Of the \$3.1 billion provided under this program, \$2.7 billion can be used for school renovation.

Preliminary Conference Action: Conference notes indicate that the Senate language has been adopted; this remains an open issue.

Solution/Options: Continue to support the Administration's proposals for both a school construction tax credit program and a complementary spending side school renovation program. We are exploring the following structure for the spending side proposal, but there is no internal agreement on this structure:

- \$1.25 billion would be distributed to states through a formula based 50% on poverty and 50% on Title I fund allocation. This formula was also proposed in Goodling's School Infrastructure and Equipment Improvement Bill (H.R.4766).
- States would not be required to use particular funding mechanisms, but would be required to leverage \$5 for every one dollar of federal money. This amount of leveraging will support almost \$6.5 billion in repairs. States could use grants, matching grants, direct loans, guaranteed loans, interest subsidy grants or other mechanisms to reach their leveraging goal.
- States would be required to spend 30% of their funds on the poorest school districts.
- As in the Administration's original proposal, funds will be used for emergency repairs.
- Same as the Administration's proposal.

Justification:

- 3.5 million children attend schools where at least one building is nonoperational or significantly substandard. 11 million children attend schools where at least one building is in less than adequate condition.
- According to a Department of Education Study, America's schools need \$127 billion in repairs. A school renovation program could begin to address some of this need.
- According to the recent Baby Boom Echo Report, 2,400 new public schools will be needed by 2003 to accommodate rising enrollments and to relieve overcrowding

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 budget provided no funding for school construction or renovation.

CLASS SIZE REDUCTION

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High X Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 Budget assumed passage of a multi-year authorization for this program as part of the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Therefore no appropriations language was included in the FY 2001 Budget, even though annual appropriations language for this program was included in both the FY 1999 and FY 2000 Labor-HHS-ED bills. We are requesting \$1.75 billion for the third year of funding to reach the President's goals of hiring 100,000 teachers by 2005, supporting, 17,000 new teachers in addition to the 29,000 already hired. (See Class Size Reduction funding one-pager). Since ESEA will not pass this year, authorizing language is required for this program in the appropriations bill. The President's proposal includes a local matching requirement on funds above the FY 1999 level of \$1.2 billion. Without the match, the request would fund about 4,000 fewer new teachers, for a total of about 42,000 rather than 46,000 teachers.

House Action: The House provides no funding nor a specific authorization for Class Size Reduction. Instead, it provides \$1.75 billion for the House-passed Teacher Empowerment Act (TEA), a teacher quality block grant that allows districts to spend funds to reduce class sizes, but does not provide a dedicated funding stream for that purpose.

Senate Action: The Senate has not completed action on any of its ESEA proposals. Therefore, the appropriators provide \$3.1 billion under Title VI, the education block grant, and allow \$2.7 billion of those funds to also be used to reduce class sizes and to renovate schools. As in the House, the Senate does not have a specific authorization or dedicated funding stream for class size reduction.

Preliminary Conference Action: Conferees have adopted the Senate position, and therefore devote \$2.7 billion to an expanded version of the Title VI block grant to allow funds to be spent on class size reduction and school construction, but guarantees funding for neither program.

Solution/Options: Use the same language that was negotiated in the FY 2000 appropriations process for Class Size Reduction. That language retained the original structure (same funding formula and general uses of funds), but made some compromises to gain broader congressional support without undermining any aspect of the program. In order to hire 46,000 teachers, a matching requirement would need to be added to this language on the new funding. Below is a table that shows how many teachers, in total, can be supported at various funding levels, and with and without a local matching requirement.

Number of Teachers Hired				
FY 2000	FY 2001 – Request Level (\$1.75 billion)		FY 2001 – Alternate Level (\$1.65 billion)	
	w/ match	w/o match	w/ match	w/o match
29,000	46,000	41,000	43,000	38,000

Justification:

This high priority Presidential initiative has been authorized in annual appropriations language for the past two years and needs authorizing language this year to continue.

Without authorizing language, support would be jeopardized for the the 29,000 teachers already hired and the 17,000 additional teachers that could be required under the President's request.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The FY 2000 appropriations bill included extensive language authorizing this program. While the negotiated language retained the original components and goals of the program, it provided more flexibility by raising the cap on funding devoted to professional development from 15% to 20%.

INTERNET FILTERS

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High _____ Medium X Low _____

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 budget does not contain any language about this issue.

House Action: The House-passed Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill contains language in Section 304 of the general provisions, introduced by Rep. Istook, requiring schools to install a particular type of technology, such as filtering or blocking software, to protect children from inappropriate materials or dangerous situations while online. Schools that do not use the proscribed technology will not be eligible for FY2001 funding from Title III of the ESEA to purchase computers used to access the Internet or to pay for direct costs associated with accessing the Internet.

Senate Action: The Senate Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill includes two provisions that require schools to use filtering software to protect students from material that is obscene, pornographic, or otherwise harmful to minors. Senator McCain's Children's Internet Protection Act, incorporated into the bill as Sections 601 and 602 of Title VI, requires schools and libraries to implement filtering or blocking technology as a condition for receiving Universal Service Discounts which are provided under the E-rate program. This program was created in the Telecommunications Act of 1996 to provide discounts for schools and libraries to buy high-speed Internet access, internal wiring and telecommunications services.

The second provision, Senator Santorum's Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act, Title VII of the Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations bill, also restricts schools and libraries from receiving Universal Services Discounts or Universal Service assistance. This bill requires schools to implement filtering or blocking technology or to develop an Internet acceptable use policy to prevent student access to inappropriate material. The Internet acceptable use provision requires the school or library to hold at least one public hearing or meeting to address the proposed Internet use policy.

Preliminary Conference Action: ~~Preliminary conference notes indicate that this remains a problematic, unresolved issue.~~ The latest staff discussion language on Internet filtering for public schools and libraries includes components of the Istook, McCain and Santorum provisions. The new conference language mandates that schools and libraries use filtering or blocking software for all Internet activity or lose Federal E-rate and Title III funding. The language also appears to infringe upon civil liberties and potentially the First Amendment by forcing schools and libraries to protect children from "material harmful to minors" that "taken as a whole, lacks serious literary, artistic, political, or scientific value as to minors."

Solution/Options: The Administration strongly supports efforts to ensure that schools and libraries protect minors from inappropriate materials but does not see the need for a Federal mandate to eliminate local and State control over their Internet acceptable use policies. One option would be to include language that does not require schools and libraries to use a specific technology to protect minors. Instead, schools and libraries would be allowed to develop their own acceptable use policies to select the most appropriate means for protecting students from objectionable Internet and other computer-related content. While the Santorum amendment gives schools and libraries the flexibility to develop their own acceptable Internet use plan, the public hearing requirement is unnecessarily burdensome and should be eliminated. A second option would be to eliminate this provision from the Appropriations bill.

Justification:

- ~~Recent studies~~ An American Library Association study confirms that virtually all schools that have Internet access have acceptable use policies in place.
- Due to continuously evolving technology, a Federally-mandated technology may be soon obsolete and inappropriate for the needs of the local school district. Language that requires a local acceptable use plan achieves the desired outcome from mandated filtering while enabling local officials to select the most effective option for their needs.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: No action in FY 2000.

Prepared By/Date: Brian Matteson (5-4643), 8/28/00, I_internet filter.wpd

AMERICA'S TESTS

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The Budget requests \$5 million for America's Tests to complete test item development and move forward with plans for pilot testing, field testing, and administration for voluntary national tests in reading and mathematics. These tests would provide teachers and parents the opportunity to know how the performance of individual students compares with a common set of challenging academic standards in those subjects.

FY1999 appropriations language amended the General Education Provisions Act to indefinitely prohibit the Department of Education from using any funds provided "to pilot test, field test, implement, administer, or distribute in any way any federally sponsored national test..." without explicit authorization. There is no specific authorization for America's Tests and authorization language is supposed to be included in a forthcoming proposal to reauthorize the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

House Action: The House bill does not provide any language authorizing further development of national tests or any of the \$5 million requested for America's Tests. The House bill also includes language in the FY2001 Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill, section 305 in the Department of Education general provisions, that strengthens the national testing restrictions of the General Education Provisions Act by preventing the Department from using any funds from the FY2001 appropriations bill to carry out any activities related to any federally sponsored national test that is not specifically authorized.

Senate Action: Appropriations language authorizing further development of national tests was not provided in the Senate-passed bill. It did not contain the House provision prohibiting "any activities related to federally sponsored national test(s)".

Preliminary Conference Action: Preliminary conference notes provide no indication that the restrictive House bill language has been removed. The notes show that the issue is still open.

Solution/Options: Delete any language restricting test activity. If not, ensure that language does not restrict test development activity.

Justification:

The national tests will (1) for the first time provide students, along with their parents and teachers, an opportunity to measure how well they are performing relative to other students nationally and internationally; (2) help states and schools adopt high academic standards that all students must meet; and (3) help hold schools accountable for student performance

The Department's ability to close out preexisting contracts related to national testing may be prohibited by the House's provision. Strict interpretation of the General Condition would prevent any Department staff from any national-test related activity in FY2001.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: No specific funding for America's Tests was appropriated in FY2000 and, contrary to previous practice, the Department suspended its practice of using funds from the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) to develop voluntary national tests.

Prepared By/Date: Craig Wacker (5-1192), 8/28/00, I_National Tests

TITLE I -- ACCOUNTABILITY

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High X Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 Budget includes appropriations language that would set aside \$250 million within Title I Grants to LEAs (please see "Title I Grants to LEAs" funding one-pager for details) to help States and districts put accountability systems in place and turn around failing schools. For example, schools might receive technical assistance and professional development services, be required to implement a proven reform model, or even be taken over by the district. In addition, as part of the Administration's commitment to public school choice, students at a specified portion of the failing schools would be given the option to transfer to a better school. States receive funds based on their share of Title I Grants to LEAs. States then distribute the funds competitively to districts. This year's proposed language was changed from last year's – the first year of the Accountability Fund – in several ways. States may retain some funds to implement accountability systems; last year 100% of the funds went to LEAs. Funds are targeted on the worst schools (those in "corrective action"), while last year all low-performing schools were on equal footing. And the public school choice provision was changed so that all students in corrective action schools have the option to transfer to a better school, while last year's language gave students in all low-performing schools the transfer option, unless the district did not have room to place them in other schools. Under the FY 2001 Budget Proposal, about 80% of the 8,000 schools identified as needing improvement could receive extra help to turn themselves around.

House Action: The House does not include language for the Accountability Fund.

Senate Action: The Senate does not include language for the Accountability Fund.

Preliminary Conference Action: Conference notes do not indicate that language setting aside funds for the Accountability Fund has been included in the bill.

Solution/Options: Adopt the appropriations language for the Title I Accountability Fund in the FY 2001 Budget. Alternatively, last year's language could be retained, except the funding level would need to be increased from \$134 million to \$250 million.

Justification:

- The President has placed a high priority on holding schools, districts, and States accountable for raising student achievement and believes that this Fund helps do that.
- Studies of Title I show that States and districts need additional funds to implement accountability systems, and failing schools are not currently receiving the help they need to improve.
- Winning support for this Fund was a key fight in appropriations last year, and not retaining it would have a negative impact on implementing Title I accountability provisions at the local level.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The Administration fought hard for, and won support for, this Accountability Fund for the first time last year. House Republicans, in particular, were especially interested in the school choice language.

TITLE II: TEACHING TO HIGH STANDARDS—OTHER NATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The FY 2001 budget requests appropriations for the President's Teaching to High Standards proposal. Teaching to High Standards is the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and requests funding for eight different National Programs. Four of the programs can be funded through the existing broad Title II Federal Activities authority. The other four programs are not allowed under existing law and require new authorizing language. These initiatives are:

- Early Childhood Educator Professional Development
- Transition to Teaching (currently Troops to Teachers)
- Higher Standards, Higher Pay
- Teacher Quality Incentives

House Action: The House funded none of the four National Programs needing authorizing language.

Senate Action: The Senate funded none of the four National Programs needing authorizing language.

Preliminary Conference Action: Preliminary conference notes indicate that none of these four programs have been funded.

Solution/Options: The alternative funding level and its composition are still in play. Thus, at this time the Administration should continue to fight for all of the President's initiatives, seeking funding and authorizing language for programs that are not funded in conference.

Justification:

While action was not completed on ESEA reauthorization, teacher quality has been a priority of the Administration and all of the unauthorized programs respond to pressing professional development and teacher recruitment needs.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The four unauthorized programs were not proposed in FY2000.

TITLE II: TEACHING TO HIGH STANDARDS--STATE GRANTS

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: Teaching to High Standards is the Administration's reauthorization proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). For this proposal, the President's FY 2001 budget requests \$690 million for funds to consolidate the Eisenhower State Grants and Goals 2000 programs into one program that would support improvement in class room achievement primarily through standards-based, high-quality professional development.

The preliminary conference level of \$435 million for Teacher Quality State Grants provides funding for the existing Eisenhower program and not the President's Teaching to High Standards proposal. By not incorporating the Teaching to High Standards language, the conference agreement requires less local accountability than the Administration proposal. It also fails to address the problem of uncertified teachers.

In addition, the expiration of Goals 2000 authority on September 30, 2000 could stymie the crucial leadership of the Federal government in promoting the development of standards and assessments integral to school reform. The Teaching to High Standards proposal would have continued support for these activities. In FY2000, States received approximately \$50 million from the Goals 2000 program to improve standards, assessments and to align curricula to those standards.

House Action: The House failed to fund the President's proposed Teaching to High Standards State Grants program or the existing Eisenhower State Grants program. Instead, it provided funding for the House's ESEA proposal, the Teacher Empowerment Act (TEA). TEA has not been funded in the Senate bill or the preliminary Conference language.

Senate Action: The Senate failed to fund the President's proposed Teaching to High Standards State Grants program but provided \$435 million (\$100 million more than the FY2000 appropriation) for the current Eisenhower program. The Senate bill did not incorporate any language for accountability or standards.

Preliminary Conference Action: Preliminary conference notes indicate that Congress would provide \$435 million for the current Eisenhower program and none of the accountability or standards language from the Teaching to High Standards proposal.

Solution/Options: Accept funding through the Eisenhower authority, but the Administration should also fight for the following two language changes:

- A \$50 million set-aside in Title II State Grants to enable States to continue work on standards, assessments and linking curricula to these standards.
- To improve local accountability, language should be included to ensure Local Education Agencies (LEAs) with large numbers of uncertified teachers receive additional funds under Title II to address this problem.

Justification:

- Current law does not authorize the targeting of Eisenhower State Grants money for the improvement of standards and for reducing the percentage of uncertified teachers.
- Language changes are necessary to improve the quality of the Eisenhower program in a manner consistent with the intent of the President's reauthorization proposal.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: The Eisenhower State Grants program was funded at \$335 million in FY2000.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ONE-PERCENT TRANSFER AUTHORITY

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: Consistent with preceding years, the FY 2001 Budget included appropriations language that authorizes the Department of Education to transfer up to one percent of any discretionary funds between appropriations under the bill, so long as no appropriation is increased by more than three percent.

House Action: As a result of Congressional dissatisfaction with the Department of Education's FY 1999 audit results ("qualified" opinion) and concern with ED's general financial management capacity, the House fails to provide transfer authority for the Department of Education.

Senate Action: Appropriations language authorizing transfer authority is provided in the Senate-passed bill.

Preliminary Conference Action: The preliminary conference notes indicate that the House language with amendments will be included in the conference agreement.

Solution/Options: Include authorizing language for transfer authority for the Department of Education in the bill.

Justification:

- Transfer authority provides the Department with flexibility to respond to unanticipated funding emergencies.
- During the last 10 years, the Department of Education has only utilized this authority one time, after properly notifying both Houses of Congress. As evidenced by this restraint, the Department does not anticipate using this authority unless there exists exceptional circumstances.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: FY 2000 appropriations language provided the Department with the standard authority to transfer funds between appropriations.

PROJECT SERV

Subcommittee: Labor/HHS/Education

Ranking: High Medium Low

2001 Budget Policy: The Budget requests \$10 for Project SERV to address needs associated with school crises. Within the last year, numerous schools and districts across the nation have suffered homicides and other traumatic events. No state or local funds exist to address the immediate needs of communities that must divert funds in order to handle the aftermath of a crisis.

There is no specific authorization for Project SERV since authorization language was intended for ESEA reauthorization. In order to fund Project SERV, authorization would need to occur through the appropriations process.

House Action: The House bill does not provide authorizing language for Project SERV.

Senate Action: The Senate bill does not provide authorizing language for Project SERV.

Preliminary Conference Action: Preliminary conference notes do not suggest that authorizing language for Project SERV has been placed in the bill.

Solution/Options: Provide authorizing language for Project SERV. Our preferred option would be to fund Project SERV with \$10 million from State Grants. An alternative option would be to support Project SERV from National Program funds.

Justification:

- The absence of authorization language does not permit the administration to fund Project SERV.
- Failure to fund Project SERV would prevent the provision of crisis assistance, mental health counseling, training, and increased security for affected schools.

FY 2000 Appropriations Action: No specific funding for Project SERV was appropriated in FY2000.