

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. note	re: Conference Call with Hector Garza (3 pages)	07/13/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Caroline Chang
OA/Box Number: 21654

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

FOLDER TITLE:

Hispanic Educational Excellence

Racheal Carter

2010-1110-S

rc453

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

Notes From Conference Call With Hector Garza on July 13, 2000

Participants: Reynaldo Anaya Valencia
J.B. Buxton
Kendra Brooks

Maria:

Hector tells us that the funders for the 2010 Alliance want the effort to be an independent effort, and are nervous about it being tied too closely with the White House, particularly since this is an election year. These funders want to be sure that they are not mired in election law politics as a result of their participation and/or cooperation with the 2010 Alliance efforts. Because the funders and fellow Founding Partners are nervous about the White House's continued involvement with the 2010 Alliance's efforts, he asked that I send him an email wherein I described the purpose for the upcoming follow-up meeting with you and the Founding Partners: i.e. not to control their efforts, but to get their feedback on the Strategy Session, to hear more about the 2010 Alliance's plans and infrastructure, and finally, to see how the White House could be helpful toward these efforts.

Are you okay with my doing that, or would you prefer such a memorandum to go out under your signature?

General Feedback from the Strategy Session:

Although Hector did not attend the Strategy Session, he says that there are essentially two camps or schools of thought regarding the event: those inside the Beltway, and those outside the Beltway. Hector says that those outside of the Beltway were ecstatic and elated about the event and the outcome. Not unexpectedly, those inside of the Beltway were less so.

Hector says that the view of those outside of the Beltway is more optimistic and enthusiastic than those inside the Beltway. He believes that this group of outside individuals is an important constituency that he will not dismiss. Hector also believes that these attendees created natural allies and champions that he and the 2010 Alliance may call upon later, so he is generally positive about the Strategy Session. At base, Hector says that he believes people of color getting into the White House is always a good thing.

Hector notes that those in the other camp -- those who live and work in Washington -- tend to have greater expectations and higher standards for what gets done, and that they will always argue that the content could have been stronger and that the event could have produced more. In particular, he says that Arturo Vargas believes the second half of the Strategy Session's program could have been stronger. Hector says that in general, this more critical group expected much more from that session and that the largest criticism, even from those outside of the Beltway, was the lack of diversity of access to the President in this afternoon session. Many concluded that based upon who was sitting at the table with the President, it appeared that the

White House was rewarding white men such as CEOs, and suspected that perhaps these individuals were big donors being rewarded.

Hector asserts that he is such a big supporter of the President that he will never bad mouth the President, and irrespective of the impetus behind those seated at the table, Hector claims that he will continue to court the President and others who want to help the Hispanic cause.

Overall, Hector says that the event happened, he considers it successful, and he believes the 2010 Alliance participants need to frame their references to this event in that manner. Hector plans to take the lead with his colleagues by encouraging that they continue to talk positively about the Strategy Session -- he believes it does no good for them to suggest that it was less than what they wanted. Hector says he also believes that if you want people to do well, you do not trash them or their efforts. Hector concludes that we are turning over a new leaf here -- the Strategy Session was the beginning of a new initiative and now it is the 2010 Alliance's job to keep it going.

Goals:

Hector says that three of the of the "players" in the 2010 Alliance believe that the goals may become problematic for their efforts. Some believe that these are the goals from the White House and that the 2010 Alliance may or will have complementary goals. Hector believes you put a message out there that resonates with the public and creates public will. As a result, you will get greater results. Thus, he proposes to focus on the general message that he would like to see the 2010 Alliance use as a tag line: "working together to reduce the achievement gap for Latinos."

Hector believes it is too late in the game to try to wordsmith the goals at this point, and says that his response to those who are unhappy with the goals is "Get over it."

Hector says that if anyone, 2010 Alliance member or not, wants to utilize the goals, that is fine with him. He believes people are going to do whatever they want to do anyway. He believes the real work is actually concentrating on the overall goal of reducing the achievement gap. He is not interested in a debate about whether to re-visit the goal language and/or use the goals. He says that if you trust that getting to what reduces the achievement gap will touch the goals, then whether the goals are actually used or not is less important.

Hector also says that it would not be good politically if the White House tried to strong-arm use of the goals by others. He believes that the White House approach should not be to say, "these are the goals now deal with them." Rather, he suggests that the better approach would be to say, "listen, all of you were involved with the process, the intent of the goals was what we all agreed upon." That way no one would have to come in heavy-handed making sure that the White House "baton" was being used as an enforcement mechanism.

Strategy Session Report:

Hector believes it is key for the follow-up report to say that while the government cannot do everything, there is a role, no matter how small, that the government can and must play -- particularly in an election year and in a year in which the President has announced these goals. He believes that the new president and new White House need to be positioned to give some assurances that the next Administration will continue to commit and marshal resources toward reducing the Latino achievement gap in education, and will thereby assist the 2010 Alliance. Hector and some of the 2010 Alliance are nervous that that deliverables announced at the Strategy Session may not mean much with a new Administration. Hector and others believe that the 2010 Alliance does not have time to waste. He wants the follow-up report to say that it is expected that the next Administration should be fully committed to reducing the Latino educational achievement gap.

Concern about NCCEP:

Hector says that he read media accounts of the Strategy Session and understands why NCCEP was not included in the President's remarks, presumably because it is not a Hispanic organization, while NCLR and NABE which are Hispanic organizations, were included in these remarks. However, he points out that NCCEP is the "fiduciary" for the 2010 Alliance (by which he means the fundraising arm), and serves as "Convening Partner," in the sense that the group meets at Hector's NCCEP offices, and will continue to do so for the immediate future. In short, it concerns him that that the mention of NCLR and NABE and exclusion of NCCEP have caused some confusion within the Hispanic and greater community as to who is heading up the 2010 Alliance effort.

2010 Alliance Structure and Upcoming Plans:

The individuals involved in the 2010 Alliance are not creating a new, legal animal. In fact, their funders refuse to fund a new organization, but instead want to fund the existing organizations more fully and efficiently. It is anticipated that the Founding Partners of the 2010 Alliance will govern and direct whatever the resulting 2010 Alliance efforts produce. Hector reiterated what we had heard before, that the Alliance's plans for full-time staff are still not crystallized. Some believe in the need for an Executive Director, others disagree and believe that all Founding Partners should be the Executive Director. The group does agree, however, that the immediate need is for a small staff.

Importantly, according to Hector, the upcoming 2010 Alliance's October "retreat," will **NOT** be a practitioners' retreat. Rather, this meeting, with approximately 50 invited participants, is designed to reach a consensus on the structure and long term plan for the Alliance. The 2010 Alliance Founding Partners plan to have a concept paper that they will vet with the constituency of 50 participants at the retreat. The concept paper is designed to help this group reach consensus on the infrastructure of the Alliance -- including how funding will be distributed among the participants.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Caroling Chang and Bethany Little to Barbara Chow (2 pages)	09/13/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Caroline Chang
OA/Box Number: 21655

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

FOLDER TITLE:

Internet Filtering: Internet Filtering Background [1]

Racheal Carter
2010-1110-S
rc454

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

MEMORANDUM

TO: Barbara Chow
FROM: Caroline Chang
Bethany Little
RE: Internet Filtering Background
DATE: September 13, 2000

OUTSTANDING ISSUES / PROBLEMS:

1) The provision that allows Universal Service Fund discounts to be used to purchase filtering software is extremely problematic given the history of the program with the telecommunications companies. First of all, using the funds for anything other than Internet service and internal connections could re-surface legal battles about the USF being an unfair tax; second, and what ought to be highlighted, is the issue of program integrity. Evidently when the program was established there was a lot of contentious debate, and the GAO was brought in to determine the terms of program integrity; currently, applications are screened for a number of things, including use of funds for software, which is not permitted. There is a slippery slope argument here too – if USF funds can be used for filtering software, what if the filtering software companies build other applications into their software packages and how do you draw the line between filtering software and other enhanced services? This provision would likely yield major complaints from the telecommunications industry about fraud. On the flip side, if schools and libraries are allowed to use USF funds to purchase software at up to a 90 percent discount, this presents possible issues with inflated bids and pricing from potential providers. It would be difficult for schools and libraries to know what appropriate prices are; for instance, the state of West Virginia recently ran an RFP process for filtering software and bids ranged from \$0 to \$2.3 million.

2) Cost and implementation pose burdens to schools and libraries that could amplify the Digital Divide and undercut the intent of the E-rate. Though we are not aware of any comprehensive studies on the cost issue, Fairfax County Schools, for instance, spent \$1 million to implement its Internet filtering system and must spend \$200,000 annually just to operate it.

3) Internet filtering technology is by no means a panacea – first of all, it does nothing to prevent children from engaging in inappropriate e-mail or chat-room activities; and second of all, because the Internet is so rapidly evolving, it is nearly impossible for software to screen out all inappropriate content while it does screen out some perfectly appropriate content.

4) Local norms and local control seem to make the most sense on this issue, and nowhere does the language acknowledge that the vast majority of schools districts and libraries already have 'acceptable use' policies and Internet training courses.

HILL DYNAMICS:

- We do not know yet what members will be negotiating for the Democrats, though if it is either Senators Harkin or Hollings we need to be alert -- Hollings was a co-sponsor of previous McCain filtering legislation, and evidently neither Harkins nor Hollings have been among the strongest E-Rate supporters.

- There are no easy allies for us to pick off in the Senate; McCain may dig in his heels and no members are jumping at the opportunity to sound like they don't support Internet safety for kids. Senator Burns had come out earlier advocating acceptable use policies, but has since bought into McCain's proposal. One possible avenue is to try to appeal to Senator Santorum through the NAIS – it was suggested that he listens to the private schools.
- On the House Side Representative Bobby Rush was mentioned as a visible supporter of the E-Rate and a possible office to approach.

ACTION AND POSITIONS OF ADMINISTRATION:

- The Administration issued a SAP on S. 1619 (May 8, 1998) which read, "The Administration strongly supports Senate passage of legislation that would require every school and library that receives assistance from the Universal Service Fund to develop a plan to protect school children from inappropriate Internet content. This will empower schools to protect children from inappropriate Internet content. This will empower schools to protect children from inappropriate material while also protecting our First Amendment values."
- The Department of Education developed the *Parent's Guide to the Internet*, available on the Web and also in Spanish through Ed Pubs, which provides information on how to help children use the technology safely. Vice President Gore worked with a coalition of industry leaders which led to the online resource 'GetNetWise,' and the Department of Justice put together 'Cruise Control' and 'Internet Do's and Don'ts.'
- The Commission on Online Child Protection (COPA), a Congressionally appointed and mandated panel, has been tasked to "identify technological or other methods that will help reduce access by minors to material that is harmful to minors on the Internet." COPA's report to Congress is due October 21, 2000.

GROUPS OPPOSED TO THE FILTERING LANGUAGE:

- The American Association of School Administrators, American Association of University Women, American Library Association, Association of Educational Service Agencies, Council of Chief State School Officers, Council of the Great City Schools, Consortium for School Networking, International Society for Technology in Education, National Association of Elementary School Principals, National Association of Independent Schools, National Association of Secondary School Principals, National Education Association, National PTA, National Rural Education Association, National School Boards Association, People for the American Way, and the Rural School and Community Trust, the American Civil Liberties Union, and the Center for Democracy and Technology

LANGUAGE SUMMARY:

The Act as outlined in the July 28th staff discussion draft consists of four Titles that are an amalgam of previously proposed language from McCain, Santorum, and Istook. Title III, for instance, takes much of the language from Santorum's amendment on what schools and libraries shall include in Internet use policies, including a provision on local determination of content that precludes the U.S. Government from establishing such criteria or reviewing the determination of the local decision makers.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet

Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Caroline Chang and Bethany Little to Barbara Chow re: Options on Internet Filtering Language (1 page)	10/13/2000	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Caroline Chang
OA/Box Number: 21655

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

FOLDER TITLE:

[Internet Filtering: Drafts and Edits]

Racheal Carter
2010-1110-S
rc455

RESTRICTION CODES

Presidential Records Act - [44 U.S.C. 2204(a)]

Freedom of Information Act - [5 U.S.C. 552(b)]

- P1 National Security Classified Information [(a)(1) of the PRA]
- P2 Relating to the appointment to Federal office [(a)(2) of the PRA]
- P3 Release would violate a Federal statute [(a)(3) of the PRA]
- P4 Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential commercial or financial information [(a)(4) of the PRA]
- P5 Release would disclose confidential advice between the President and his advisors, or between such advisors [(a)(5) of the PRA]
- P6 Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(a)(6) of the PRA]

C. Closed in accordance with restrictions contained in donor's deed of gift.

PRM. Personal record misfile defined in accordance with 44 U.S.C. 2201(3).

RR. Document will be reviewed upon request.

- b(1) National security classified information [(b)(1) of the FOIA]
- b(2) Release would disclose internal personnel rules and practices of an agency [(b)(2) of the FOIA]
- b(3) Release would violate a Federal statute [(b)(3) of the FOIA]
- b(4) Release would disclose trade secrets or confidential or financial information [(b)(4) of the FOIA]
- b(6) Release would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy [(b)(6) of the FOIA]
- b(7) Release would disclose information compiled for law enforcement purposes [(b)(7) of the FOIA]
- b(8) Release would disclose information concerning the regulation of financial institutions [(b)(8) of the FOIA]
- b(9) Release would disclose geological or geophysical information concerning wells [(b)(9) of the FOIA]

MEMORANDUM TO BARBARA CHOW

RE: Options on Internet Filtering Language

FROM: Caroline Chang
Bethany Little

CC: Larry Matlack, Kathy Stack, Brian Matteson

DATE: 10/13/00

We have tried to figure out what the Republican motivations / priorities are on the Internet filtering and blocking language, but have been unable to get solid intelligence even from the Hill. As we have stated before, our preference assuming we must have Internet Filtering language in the conference is to require filtering OR an acceptable use policy – while staying silent on funding.

We are most comfortable with the original Santorum amendment passed in the Senate, though we could also support the alternative language the groups and Alex Knock have put together (attached). However, on the groups proposal, there is an understanding that we won't object to the authorization of additional funds, but will not advocate for their appropriation, especially if the \$100 million would be played against any of our established funding priorities.

If it appears that we will be forced to concede to mandatory filtering for all schools and libraries receiving federal technology monies, there are a few key principles that would make the provision more palatable:

- The effective date by which technology must be in place should be no earlier than July, 2002 (the Republican proposal mandates July, 2001).
- Any language on funding authorization should not come out of existing federal programs, especially not out of the e-rate funds. The Republican proposal would open up e-rate funds to be used to buy and maintain filtering software, which is completely unacceptable. If we were forced to use existing funds, we would prefer they be taken from the ESEA Title III "Technology Literacy Challenge Fund" program.