Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION	
001. memo	Bruce Reed and Gene Sperling to the President re: Themes and Proposals for the State of the Union (6 pages)	12/12/1999	P5	4183
002. paper	re: Working Ideas for State of the Union (6 pages)	n.d.	P5	

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Education)
OA/Box Number: 21293

FOLDER TITLE:

State of the Union Process Documents [1]

Racheal Carter
2011-0103-S
rc644

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]

December 12, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: BRUCE REED
GENE SPERLING

CC: JOHN PODESTA

SUBJECT: THEMES AND PROPOSALS FOR THE STATE OF THE UNION

This memo outlines three things: first, the overarching theme we propose for the State of the Union; second, the "big ideas" initiative that should be the centerpiece of the speech and the budget; third, the eight signature policies that comprise the "big ideas" package.

I. THEME: RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE FUTURE

The theme we recommend for the State of the Union is "Responsibility for the Future." This theme brings together all the major elements of your agenda: strengthening Medicare and Social Security, and reducing the debt; investing in and reforming public education; bridging the digital divide; investing in scientific research; protecting the environment; promoting peace around the world; and closing the opportunity gap.

"Responsibility for the Future" reinforces both liberal convictions about equity (leave no one behind) and Third Way sensibilities about accountability (let no one fail to do his part). It is consistent with your longstanding theme of "responsibility, opportunity, and community," and sets forth a powerful message that will resound long after we're gone. The country has come a long way these seven years, enabling us to turn even more to challenges of the next generation.

II. BIG IDEA: CLOSING THE OPPORTUNITY GAP

We believe your "big idea" for the budget and the State of the Union should be a "Closing the Opportunity Gap" initiative. It is a package of eight signature proposals described in the next section, and would highlight three or four major budget pieces. We had considered other labels for this initiative ("Leaving No One Behind," "Every Child's Initiative," and "Education First") but advocate "Closing the Opportunity Gap" because it shows continuity with your core philosophy and values, suggests a sweeping challenge worthy of a sweeping response, and provides a framework that will energize the entire economic and domestic team, from Summers and Herman to Shalala, Riley, and Cuomo.

III. EIGHT SIGNATURE ELEMENTS OF "CLOSING THE OPPORTUNITY GAP"

Your final State of the Union should be more than a laundry list of worthy ideas (although we provide, for reference, such a list in three longer memos which are attached). Here, we outline a package of signature "Opportunity Gap" proposals. These proposals represent the core of your domestic vision; they are ambitious ideas that will stick in the public mind. They are bold enough to show that your imperative is action, and appealing enough to stand a chance of enactment this year. Together, they give purpose and principle to your final year's agenda.

The "Opportunity Gap" initiative consists of eight proposals: 1) universal pre-school to give all poor children a smart start; 2) universal after-school to help kids meet high standards; 3) a plan to turn around every failing school over the next decade; 4) measures to bridge the digital divide; 5) a set of new steps to help low-income students get into college and complete a degree; 6) proposals to encourage absent fathers to take responsibility for the support and love they owe their children; 7) a new bargain of tax cuts and other measures to reward work and family; and 8) a major expansion of New Markets to help all communities share in economic prosperity.

1. Early Childhood/Universal Pre-School. With a significant down payment in the FY2001 budget, you can lay the groundwork for achieving a goal that you, the Vice President, and the First Lady have talked about for some time: *universal access to pre-school for every 4-year-old in America*. There are a number of ways to do this:

- *Dramatic increase in Head Start funding.* Could expand by $1 billion over FY '00, to expand Head Start from 880,000 children to nearly 1,000,000 in FY '01. A path for future fund increases to make Head Start universal could also be established.

- *Early Childhood Learning Fund.* A dramatic increase in the Early Childhood Learning Fund combined with a path for future increases. Could expand to $1 billion for FY 01 – a $400 million increase – and aim for $10-$20 billion over 10 years.

2. Universal After-School. By doubling after-school funding in the FY 2001 budget (from $453 million in FY 2000 to at least $1 billion in FY 2001), you can meet an urgent goal, which is to *provide after-school and summer school to every student in a failing school.* You called on states and districts to end social promotion in this past year's State of the Union; this initiative will enable you to say we're giving them the resources to end social promotion the right way, and give every student in our worst schools the extra help they need. Over a ten year period, we can make after-school and summer school universal for every Title I school – and with a sliding scale for students above 200% of poverty, we could eventually make after-school available to every student. (Cost: $20-30 billion over 10 years).

3. Turning Around Every Failing School. To close the opportunity gap, we must close the achievement gap by focusing our efforts on the worst-performing schools. With a series of accountability and performance initiatives in the FY 2001 budget (and the after-school pledge outlined above), you can credibly set forth an ambitious, defining goal for strengthening public education: *turning around or shutting down every failing school in America over the next decade*. In addition to doubling after-school funding, the key steps include: expanding your accountability fund; reaching your goal of 3,000 charter schools before you leave office; funding a new performance bonus to reward states and school districts for increasing their percentage of qualified teachers, adopting statewide accountability systems and school report card; and requiring universal public school choice for students in failing schools. We could also reintroduce a version of education opportunity zones. (Cost: $3-5 billion over 10 years).

4. Closing the Digital Divide. If we are to close the opportunity gap in the next century, we must do all we can to *address the emerging digital divide*. Key elements could include:

- *Community Technology Centers.* A more than four-fold increase in funding – from $32.5 million in FY 2000 to $132.5 million in FY 2001 – as part of a major challenge to have Internet centers in all poor communities. We could challenge the private sector to contribute hardware, software and man-hours – and possibly give them tax incentives to donate used equipment.

- *Develop Universal Internet Access.* Reserve a $100 million fund for public-private partnerships to bring affordable Internet access to poor families.

- *Teacher Training for the Internet.* We could dedicate $100 million – perhaps from the existing technology literacy challenge initiative – to ensure all new teachers, or all middle-school teachers, receive training in how to use computers as a learning device.

- *School Internet Modernization Fund.* A discretionary counterpart to our school construction proposal to modernize schools for new teachers and Internet access.

5. Closing the Opportunity Gap for College. This element would focus on different aspects of closing the opportunity gap for college: helping more students aspire to and prepare for college, continuing to make college more affordable, and starting to address America's quiet crisis of declining college completion rates.

- *Keeping Students on Track to College.* We could increase access for impoverished young people through Youth Opportunity Grants, TRIO, GEAR UP, and Youth Build, increasing funding to a total of $500 million.

- *AP Courses Online.* Small and poor schools often lack the resources and teachers to offer challenging courses. This distance learning initiative aims to ensure that students in underserved areas get access to Advanced Placement and other high-quality academic courses and ESL programs online. Total funding for the initiative would be $225 million, including $50 million for grants, $25 million for course development, and $125 million in increases in existing programs.

- *Test Prep for Poor Kids.* This program would support partnerships among high schools, proven providers of college test prep courses (like Kaplan, Princeton Review), and community-based organizations to offer high-need students SAT/ACT preparation and other services related to college admissions. Grants of $30 million would serve approximately 50,000 students.

- *Refundable Hope Scholarship and Pell Grant Increase.* Expanding the maximum Pell Grant from $3,300 to $3,500 would cost $766 million in FY 2001. A complementary proposal would be to make the Hope Scholarship refundable.

- *Challenging Students to Complete College.* The above initiatives could also be organized to promote not just going to college, but also completing college. In addition, a new initiative of College Completion Challenge Grants would provide grants to deal with college completion with a comprehensive program including, pre-freshman summer programs, support services and increased grant aid to students.

6. Demanding Responsible Fatherhood. If we are going to close the opportunity gap, we must close the responsibility gap. Demanding and promoting responsible fatherhood is the critical next stage of welfare reform and one of the most important things we can do to reduce child poverty. Mothers should not bear the whole burden of welfare reform; *now we must make sure that every unemployed father who owes child support goes to work and provides that support.* To achieve this goal, we can: 1) focus the Welfare-to-Work program on putting low-income fathers to work, and propose that states use their welfare surpluses to require deadbeat fathers to work and pay the child support they owe; 2) propose new measures to collect more child support from parents who can afford to pay; 3) restore the child-support pass-through and revise outdated rules to ensure mothers and children receive more of the support the father pays; and 4) promote efforts to ensure fathers returning from prison become responsible fathers and responsible members of society. (Cost: $100 million in discretionary costs in FY 2001 plus mandatory costs of $1.2 billion over 5 years and $2.6 billion over 10 years).

7. Rewarding Work and Family. You could propose *a new social contract for the working poor.* This element could be the organizing principle for further initiatives in housing, expanding health care coverage, and rewarding work through EITC expansion.

- *Expanding Housing Vouchers.* Expand to 100,000 housing vouchers in FY 2001, with a goal of 500,000 vouchers by the fifth year. With such a plan, you could realistically propose that within a decade, no poor family will be trapped in the projects. (Cost: $3-6 billion over five years, $10-15 billion over ten).

- *Expanding Health Coverage.*

    - *Extend CHIP to Parents.* Would provide states with the same incentives to cover parents as children under Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Costs range from $5 to $18 billion over 5 years.
    - *Outreach to Enroll Uninsured Children in Medicaid.* This could be done through school-based outreach at a cost of about $3 billion over 10 years. Another idea would be to simplify and unify the eligibility rules for Medicaid and CHIP, at a cost that is likely to be less than $500 million over 5 years.

- *Restore Option to Cover Legal Immigrants.* This proposal would restore state benefits for certain pregnant women, children, and SSI-recipient legal immigrants. The cost is about $3 billion over 10 years.
- *Progressive Savings Accounts.*

- *Rewarding Work and Family Through the EITC and Child Care.*

  - *Making the EITC Even More Pro-Work.* The EITC could be expanded by (1) increasing the phaseout so that more families get the maximum amount; (2) lowering the phaseout rate so that marginal tax rates are reduced; and (3) easing the marriage penalty by making these phaseouts more favorable for married couples. The third component would cost $11 billion over 10 years.
  - *EITC Increase for Three Children.* Alternately, the EITC could be expanded by raising the maximum EITC with families with three or more children (which would benefit all families with three children), at $8 billion/10 years.
  - *Child Care Block Grant in Discretionary Budget.* We stand a better chance of increasing child care subsidies poor if we move it to the discretionary side.
  - *Making the Dependent Care Tax Credit Refundable.* Our child care tax package provides significant relief for families earning $30-60,000. But working poor families who need help the most earn too little (under $18,000) to be eligible. Making the DCTC refundable costs $4 billion over 5 years.

8. New Markets Initiative and Empowerment Zones. Help include communities that have not fully shared in our prosperity by expanding the New Markets initiative and including empowerment zones within the initiative.

- *Expanded New Markets Tax Credit.* Double the new markets tax credit, costing $4 billion over 10 years.

- *Expanded Empowerment Zones Credit.* The goal would be to increase existing incentives, include empowerment zones in the new markets framework, and compromise with Talent-Watts' American Community Renewal Act.

- *Expanded Low-Income Housing Tax Credit.* The FY 2000 budget proposed expanding the Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) from $1.25 per capita to $1.75 per capita at a cost of $1.6 billion over 5 years. In light of housing shortages in many parts of the country, we may want to expand this credit even further.

- *Making Homeownership More Affordable.* A new homeownership tax credit could help boost homeownership rates for lower income families by subsidizing the interest rate for income-qualified, first-time homebuyers at 15 to 30 percent below conventional rates. The cost of this proposal could be scaled to the desired level.

- *Expanding Faith-Based Involvement.* Propose to allow federal substance abuse treatment, juvenile justice, and after-school funds to be used by faith-based organizations.

PRELIMINARY COST OF THE "CLOSING THE OPPORTUNITY GAP INITIATIVE"
(billions of dollars above passback)

	FY 2001	2001-10
Early Childhood / Universal Pre-School	**0.8**	**30-40**
Increase in Head Start	0.4	
Early Childhood Learning Fund	0.4	
Universal After-School for Poor Children	**0.55**	**20-30**
Turning Around Failing Schools	**0.3**	**3-5**
Closing the Digital Divide	**0.77**	**10**
Community Technology Centers	0.07	
Universal Internet Access	0.1	
Teacher Training for the Internet	0.1	
School Internet Modernization Fund	0.5	
Closing the Opportunity Gap for College	**0.42**	**10**
Keeping Students on Track to College	0.25	
Stanley Kaplan and AP Online for Poor Kids	0.07	
Refundable Hope Scholarship and Pell Grant Increase	??	
Challenging Students to Complete College	0.1	
Fathers Responsibility	**0.25**	**5**
Rewarding Work and Family	**1**	**10-15**
Expanding Housing Vouchers	0	
Expanding Health Coverage		
Extend CHIP to Parents	??	*10-35*
Outreach to Enroll Uninsured	0.2	??
Restore Benefits for Certain Legal Immigrants	??	3
Make the EITC More Pro-Work	??	??
EITC Increase for Three Children	??	*8*
Progressive Savings Account	??	??
Move CCDBG to Discretionary	0.8	
Making DCTC Refundable	??	*8*
New Markets Initiative and Empowerment Zones		
Expanded New Markets Tax Credit	??	*4*
Expanded Empowerment Zone Credit	??	??
Expanded Low-Income Housing Tax Credit	??	*3.2+*
Making Homeownership More Affordable	??	??
DISCRETIONARY TOTAL	**4.09**	**88-113**

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Bruce Reed and Andrew Rotherham re: Lieberman/New Democratic Education Proposal in the Senate (4 pages)	02/03/2000	P5 8020
002. paper	re: draft DPC weekly on Lieberman (2 pages)	n.d.	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Education)
OA/Box Number: 21294

FOLDER TITLE:

Lieberman's Education Bill

Racheal Carter
2011-0103-S
rc645

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]

DRAFT

February 3, 2000

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

From: Bruce Reed
Andrew Rotherham

Subject: Lieberman/New Democratic Education Proposal in the Senate

Kohl

Senator Lieberman and eight to ten New Democratic senators including senators Landrieu, Lincoln, Breaux and Bayh are planning to introduce a New Democratic Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization Proposal on February 22nd. While Senator Lieberman would ultimately like to have bipartisan support for this proposal, he wishes to "brand" it New Democratic first and so will have only Democratic cosponsors initially. Senators Collins and Lugar apparently are among Republicans interested in the bill.

Policy Background:

The bill is based on a framework laid out in a paper from the Progressive Policy Institute last spring. In short, the bill would consolidate the 60 existing ESEA programs into performance-based grants for compensatory education, teacher professional development, limited-English proficient students, and innovative strategies. The bill also preserves your class size initiative and includes a substantial public school choice title including charter schools, school report cards, and large-scale public school choice demonstration projects. The bill would increase federal funding for elementary and secondary education and target this funding much more to disadvantaged students than current programs do and would move from a process-based accountability system to a results-based system where accountability is measured by student performance. Like your ESEA proposal the Lieberman bill includes fiscal sanctions for states and ultimately school districts that fail to improve student achievement, fix failing schools, and help limited-English proficient students become English speakers and rewards for states making exceptional progress.

The compensatory education title is similar to the Title I reauthorization proposal the House passed last fall but it includes your accountability provision to fix failing schools. The professional development title differs from your ESEA proposal because the money is entirely sent to school districts based on formulas rather some through competitive grants although it is tied to student performance and teacher quality. The limited-English proficient student title is entirely new and increases funding for these students by 40 percent while giving local school districts complete discretion over methodology and curriculum so long as students are learning English. The innovative strategies title provides funding for technology, after-school programs, and other activities currently allowed under ESEA but does not direct local school districts as to what to spend the funding on specifically so long as it supplements local efforts and increases student achievement on state assessments.

Senate Politics:

There is currently considerable disagreement among Senate Democrats about this bill. Senator Kennedy and other Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions committee Democrats are strongly opposed to the Lieberman bill because of both the program consolidation and the performance-based accountability including fiscal sanctions and rewards.

Senate Republicans have been silent on the bill thus far; however, while the consolidation provisions would appeal to them, it is unlikely they would endorse either the targeting provisions or the accountability provisions. In addition, it is unlikely that they would like to hand Lieberman a big victory on this issue.

Senator Kennedy and Secretary Riley are concerned that support for this bill by any Democrats leaves them vulnerable on the issue of block grants—a key Republican priority. They are concerned that once a Democratic senator has voiced support for this bill it would be difficult to vote against Republican block grant provisions. Senator Lieberman and the senators he is working with believe otherwise. They state that they would not support consolidation if it were not coupled with an increase in funding, an emphasis on national priorities (compensatory education, teacher quality, and limited-English proficient students, etc.), better targeting to disadvantaged students and strong accountability. Basically, Lieberman is willing to trade the panoply of programs that now comprise ESEA for a focus on disadvantaged students, student achievement, and accountability.

Legislative Outlook:

Because of opposition in the Senate Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions (HELP) committee from Democrats and likely from Senator Jeffords as well, the Lieberman bill will most likely not be taken up in committee. There is a possibility that the bill could be brought up on the Senate floor, although it is questionable whether the votes would exist to pass it. Liberal Democrats oppose the consolidation and conservative Republicans oppose the targeting and the accountability measures.

If the HELP committee considers an ESEA bill, it is likely that Lieberman and the cosponsors of his bill would engage in that process and try to incorporate as many of their ideas as possible into that bill. The prospects of HELP committee action are uncertain because there is considerable partisan disagreement among committee members and it is unclear how much support Chairman Jeffords currently enjoys.

There is also a possibility that the Lieberman bill could become a distraction and an excuse for inaction by the committee and substantive education activity in the Senate could stall as a result.

National Politics:

You should be aware that Governor Bush endorsed the framework laid out by the Progressive Policy Institute during a speech last fall. While not naming PPI by name he proposed consolidating federal education programs into 5 grants based on student achievement and the media picked up on the similarities. Bush did not get into specifics such as how accountability would work or how the money would be targeted but it is unlikely that he would adopt the proposal as put forward by PPI. Some analysts believe that it is likely that he adopted the idea more to burnish his "centrist" credentials than out of any affinity for the policy specifics.

Options:

Secretary Riley and Senator Kennedy would like you to get involved in the Senate dialogue about the Lieberman bill and oppose it. Ideally, they would like for you to lobby senators to stay off the bill and forcefully state your opposition to it. There are several drawbacks to this sort of direct engagement most notably the prospect of a high-profile split with the DLC and New Democrats on education during an election year. This split would highlight Bush's "adoption" of this proposal at the expense of the Vice President could leave the "center" on education entirely to Bush in the view of the media. Also, it is unclear if this sort of engagement would have an effect on the cosponsors of the bill at this point.

Short of directly engaging, there are a number of options to consider:

- Your FY2001 Budget Request highlights your ESEA reauthorization proposal and we could use this as a peg for a series of events to highlight that proposal and support Senate committee Democrats without directly engaging Lieberman at all. By emphasizing flexibility and accountability in your bill we could highlight areas of agreement while drawing distinctions in a constructive manner.

- We could arrange an interview with a large publication to discuss your philosophy on education and your thoughts on likely legislation this year and use this as an opportunity to highlight your ESEA proposal and also highlight differences between your proposal and the Lieberman proposal.

Also, you could elect not to engage at all. The Lieberman bill has not even been introduced yet, and certainly won't be in play legislatively until at least mid-March. You could state that this is an issue for Senate Democrats to resolve and not become involved directly.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. note	re: meeting (2 pages)	10/11/1999	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Events)
OA/Box Number: 17351

FOLDER TITLE:

White House Initiative on Hispanic [1]

Racheal Carter
2011-0103-S
rc646

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]

- BLUE AND
- SIDE BY
- [illegible] / [illegible]

10/11/99 Mtg
Roosevelt Room

NCCL -

o TITLE I TARGETING
- with several more
African - Americans

Mike - Targeting

4 FORMULAS

30% ON LOSS

TARGETING

LIVED [illegible]

RESIDENTIAL PATTERNS

o Poll's HISP. CALLS MEETING:

o WERE GONNA PUSH FOR $ IN THE END THIS TIME

o ALLAN - TAX -

- 4 ISSUES - EDUCATION
HEALTH
ECONOMIC

MEMBER - TITLE I
TITLE II

- LANGUAGE IS THE EQUIVALENT OF RACE

- OPT-IN BAD - ASKED FOR OPT-OUT

- BILINGUAL ED IS BAD

Hisp. USA - TAX FOR HEAD $ 524 MILLION

- RACE LETTERS

COPY

[illegible]

POTUS MEETING CONT'D ~~[illegible]~~

POTUS: - We will fight for Head $
- Senate $ is better than House
- I read Paul's letter
- W.H. is on it "like a wet blanket"
"I was appalled"

Hinojosa - R's want to drop scholarships to 25%
- No Title VII bill, R's are jammin' us

POTUS: - I'll hang in
We'll do better in Senate

→ Meeting moves to Health

POTUS: - moving back to [illegible] for a study
- Clinton Gore - [illegible] as a [illegible] change of process
- drop-out rate

→ Back to Healthcare

Becerra - [illegible]

→ Last issue:

Hispanic [illegible] highest in [illegible] include

[illegible] uninsured

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. paper	21st Century Program Examples (partial) (3 pages)	n.d.	P6/b(6)
002. memo	Leslie T. Thornton to Cabinet Affairs (1 page)	n.d.	P5

COLLECTION:
Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Education)
OA/Box Number: 21294

FOLDER TITLE:
After-School Examples

Racheal Carter
2011-0103-S
rc158

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]

TO: Cabinet Affairs
FROM: Leslie T. Thornton
THROUGH: Terry K. Peterson

RE: Suggestion for First Lady's Box for the State of the Union Address

BILL WHITE, C.S. MOTT FOUNDATION and/or
EDITH JENKINS, PRINCIPAL

I would like to suggest that we strongly consider inviting Bill White, CEO of the C.S. Mott Foundation, and Edith Jenkins, Principal of PS-123 in New York City to sit in the First Lady's box. These two individuals would serve as a strong symbol of what might be the largest public-private partnership in the federal government's history which was created under President Clinton's presidency due to the Mott Foundation's commitment to help expand after-school programs, alongside a real life example of a principal, Edith Jenkins, that was enrolled in an after-school program herself as a young girl and is now demonstrating tremendous leadership by paying back her community as a principal now running an after-school program.

Bill White and the Mott Foundation's commitment, as gone from an initial $2 million stemming from the White House Summit on Child Care, to a commitment of $50 million, and is now at $85 million with a potential now double the $100 million if the federal after-school funding for the 21st Century Learning Centers continues to increase to $1 billion. Bill White could sit as America's Best Example of Public-Private Education Partnerships and as a challenge to other businesses and foundations to help expand quality after-school programs. This also reinforces the President's 2001 budget request, which might get up $1 billion.

EDITH JENKINS, PRINCIPAL. Edith Jenkins is an African American principal of PS 123 in New York City. Ms. Jenkins credits her participation is a Police Athletic League after-school program as a young girl, and her working in the program for pay during high school, as providing the emotional and financial stability she and her family needed to keep them on the right track. Thus, Ms. Jenkins jumped at the opportunity to participate in The After-School Corporation's after-school initiative. PS123, a predominantly African-American school, is in partnership with the New York University (NYU) School of Education to offer after-school activities. Activities include modern and African dance, chess, web page design and technology, and academic assistance. The Coordinator of the program is a former Teach for America teacher.

CONTACT: Edith Jenkins, Principal
PS 123
301 W. 140th Street

COPY

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Bruce Reed and Andrew Rotherham re: Lieberman/New Democratic Education Proposal in the Senate (4 pages)	02/03/2000	P5
002. paper	re: draft DPC weekly on Lieberman (2 pages)	n.d.	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Education)
OA/Box Number: 21294

FOLDER TITLE:

Lieberman's Education Bill

2011-0103-S
rc645

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]

DPC Weekly on Lieberman

Education –Lieberman Education Bill On February 22nd Senator Lieberman and eight to ten other moderate Democrats including Senators Bayh, Landrieu, Lincoln, and Breaux plan to introduce a New Democratic Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization proposal. The bill consolidates the 60 ESEA programs into four targeted, formula driven grants for compensatory education, professional development, limited-English proficient students, and innovative strategies for example technology, after-school programs, and other activities currently allowed under ESEA although the bill does not direct local school districts as to what to spend the funding on specifically so long as it supplements local efforts and increases student achievement on state assessments. It also includes a title to support charter schools and increase support for public school choice and contains your class size initiative. The bill does not contain vouchers for private or parochial schools. The bill increases federal funding substantially and it targets federal money to impoverished students much more effectively than current law or other proposals and includes accountability based on improving student achievement, closing the achievement gap, and fixing failing schools rather than on how the money is specifically spent. The bill includes fiscal penalties for states and school districts that fail to increase student achievement. The bill is largely based on a framework of better targeting, greater accountability, and greater flexibility proposed by the Progressive Policy Institute last Spring.

There is considerable disagreement among Senate Democrats about this bill and Senator Kennedy and Secretary Riley are concerned that support for this bill by any Democrats leaves them vulnerable on the issue of block grants—a key Republican priority. They are concerned that because this bill includes consolidation, once a Democratic senator has voiced supported it, it would be difficult to vote against Republican block grant provisions. Senator Lieberman and the senators he is working with believe otherwise. They state that they would not support consolidation if it were not coupled with an increase in funding, an emphasis on national priorities (compensatory education, teacher quality, and limited-English proficient students, etc.), better targeting to disadvantaged students and strong accountability. Basically, Lieberman is willing to trade the panoply of programs that now comprise ESEA for a focus on disadvantaged students, student achievement, and accountability.

Secretary Riley and Senator Kennedy would like you to get involved in the Senate dialogue about the Lieberman bill and oppose it. Ideally, they would like for you to lobby senators to stay off the bill and forcefully state your opposition to it. There are several drawbacks to this sort of direct engagement most notably the prospect of a high-profile split with the DLC and New Democrats on education during an election year. This split would highlight Bush's "adoption" of this proposal at the expense of the Vice President could leave the "center" on education entirely to Bush in the view of the media. Also, it is unclear if this sort of engagement would have an effect on the cosponsors of the bill at this point. Short of directly engaging, there are a number of options to consider including doing several events or press opportunities to highlight your ESEA proposal and support Senate committee Democrats without directly engaging Lieberman at all. Also, you could elect not to engage at all. The Lieberman bill has not even been introduced yet, and certainly won't be in play legislatively until at least mid-March. You could state that this is an issue for Senate Democrats to resolve and not become involved directly.

Withdrawal/Redaction Sheet
Clinton Library

DOCUMENT NO. AND TYPE	SUBJECT/TITLE	DATE	RESTRICTION
001. memo	Bruce Reed and Gene Sperling to the President re: Themes and Proposals for the State of the Union (6 pages)	12/12/1999	P5
002. paper	re: Working Ideas for State of the Union (6 pages)	n.d.	P5

COLLECTION:

Clinton Presidential Records
Domestic Policy Council
Andrew Rotherham (Education)
OA/Box Number: 21293

FOLDER TITLE:

State of the Union Process Documents [1]

Racheal Carter
2011-0103-S
rc644

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]

Working Ideas for State of the Union Initiatives

Distance Learning Initiatives to Support Access to Challenging High School Coursework
<u>Total Budget Amount (excluding E-Rate)</u>: $665 million

This would be a package of initiatives which would endeavor to help every state develop a Virtual High School kind of entity in order to harness the power of technology to ensure students everywhere access to a challenging high school curriculum. The package would: 1) ramp up existing programs in technology and 2) create a new partnership program with software companies to spur the development of high quality course content for web-based delivery in areas such as AP, "honors," English as a Second Language, and remedial reading and writing courses.

We have had initial discussions with APEX, which creates and sells web-based AP courses, about subsidizing the cost of R&D in return for cutting in half the cost of their software for poor districts. They are sending along some paper on their commitment.

Program	FY2000	FY2001 Proposed
E-Rate	$2.25 billion	Maintain
Teacher Technology Training	$75 million	$125 million
Technology Literacy Challenge Fund	$425 million	$525 million
Partnership Program with Industry	--	$15 million

***

Venture Capital Fund to Improve America's Schools
<u>Budget Amount</u>: $200 million

The Venture Capital Fund would provide 3-5 year grants to schools and school districts that want to implement innovative educational initiatives. The grant money would come with little to few strings attached and would support such efforts as extended days and years; teacher recruitment, support and training, and other innovative teacher quality initiatives; pioneering district governance initiatives; school leadership development; high quality alternative schools; and novel partnerships with community resources.

All schools would be eligible with preference given to high quality applications from schools and school districts identified as in need of improvement and to those schools that have initiated innovative efforts but require additional seed money. Grants could be renewed contingent upon progress in student achievement and other selected indicators. Grant renewals would entail a step-down process for funding that would gradually transfer the program to fully state and local funding. Programs that don't make progress would not receive "step-down" funding.

Big question: can't this essentially be done with Title I money right now?

***

Extended School Year Challenge Grants
<u>Budget Amount</u>: $200 million for 1,000 schools

Given that America has one of the shortest school years in the industrialized world (180 versus an average of 207), that schools and students could benefit from extended time to meet higher

National Activities for Principals

~~More New Initiatives~~

→ Something on Teacher Quality

→ Minority-serving institutions

Hopkins 3+2 (BA/BS + Masters in Tech degree)

→ Front-loaded PELL

— School Construction — pull it onto spending side and off of tax side — tie it to an offset.

↓ fight on school construction prior to election

what are the "wins" at the end of the year + what are the "losses" that we want to point to as what we are fighting for

Also, dollar

— Consolidate Idea/Goals for political constituency

Schedule

→ First full week in December, OMB will put together budget list.

→ Close out by the 22nd – 24th.

standards and accountability goals, and that the cost of supporting extra school days is prohibitive—especially for poorer and low-performing school districts—this initiative would provide a set number of schools with a matching grant to support 20 additional days of schooling.

The grant would be given directly to schools and would be used to defray the cost of personnel and facilities for the additional days of schooling. To be eligible, schools would have to be identified as in need of improvement or corrective action by the federal government.

Schools would have flexibility in how they chose to use the 20 additional days. Schools could choose to use extra days for such things as additional days for all students, summer school for selected students, and teacher professional development.

***

Public School Choice OPTIONS Proposal
<u>Budget Amount</u>: $25-50 million
(I am unsure of this budget number amd have a call in to get a better read on what this number represents given our current choice program)

The OPTIONS initiative is part of the Administration's current ESEA reauthorization proposal. The initiative would create a grant program that would fund the demonstration, development, implementation, evaluation and dissemination of information of innovative public school choice projects. Funded projects would focus on areas such as new choice options for students within districts, partnering choice schools with other schools to disseminate information and stimulate improvement, and overcome barriers to choice.

***

School Leadership for Next Century's Schools Proposals
<u>Budget Amount</u>: $ 20+ million

Recognizing that without high quality school leadership, school reform is dead in the water, the Administration proposes a series of initiatives aimed at enhancing the quality of administrator preparation and support. Possible initiatives for the package could include:

- ***Administrator Training Institutes***. Provide grants to nonprofit partnerships composed of alliances of business groups, education stakeholders (need to decide whom/which to include), and other relevant partners (other nonprofits, armed services) to run principal institutes focused on current superintendents and principals and all in the pipeline (assistant principals, superintendents and select teachers with administrator degrees). Institutes could also be in the business of recruiting and pushing alternative rewards systems for administrators. **<u>Amount: $20 million.</u>**
- ***Require Principals of Schools in Schools identified as low-performing to attend administrator institutes***. Principals and assistant principals of schools that receive federal funds and are identified as low-performing could be required to attend a two week/one month/ongoing institute on school leadership. **<u>Amount: $0.</u>**
- ***Administration would partner with/ask the Carnegie Commission to put together a National Commission on School Leadership***. There is a lot of disconnected work being done in the field and this could help bring it together, serve as a think tank for the next administration, and focus national attention on this issue. **<u>Amount: $1 million</u>**

Other Key Areas: Political Requirements "Tithing + Tolling"

COPY

- After School. $453 → $700-900 million
- HBCUs, Tribal Colleges –
- Pell (no increase in state grants)
- Special Ed
- Trio ~~[illegible]~~

where we are being outflanked by Republicans

Legacy Programs

- America Reads
- Troops
- GEAR-UP
- possibly Direct Lending (increase discounting – take a pt. off) in ~~[illegible]~~ or industry ave. in non-budget fashion

Other Core Initiatives

- ED Research (DoED is very interested)

New Initiatives / ESEA Proposals

- HS Reform (Obey's Small School initiative) ↳ folded in or separate piece?
- Early Childhood PD
- OPTIONS Choice Program
- TA Capacity Grants

- *Administrator Tests*. Federal funding to school districts and states could carry with it the requirement that new administrators hired in districts/schools that receive federal funds must have passed comprehensive exams for administrators that are in use in roughly 6 states (exams have been developed by the Intrastate School Leaders Consortium working out of the Council of Chief State School Officers). **Amount: $0 (or $1 million to contribute to test development)**

***

Teacher Recruitment and Alternative Licensing Proposal

In public education like medicine, rural and inner city school systems have great difficulty finding quality teachers. Here are two possible programs we could look at as ways to support the critical need for poor and low-performing areas to access higher-quality teachers.

- **Alternative Licensure Fellows Program**. Grants would be made to states to set up programs to bring mid career professionals and recent college grads without teaching certificates into classrooms in hard to serve areas. Participants would attend an intensive summer program of coursework, receive a full salary while involved in a year-long internship/apprenticeship with a teacher in a public school, and take 2 courses during the school year. In the Fellow's first year of teaching, he or she would be guaranteed a mentor in his/her field and access to ongoing professional development. **Amount: $25 million for 1000 Fellows nationwide** (if the federal government picked up the whole salary. The numbers go up as you share more costs).

- **Demonstration Program for Teacher Recruitment to Under-served Areas**. Competitive grant program which would support efforts in poor and under-served rural and urban areas to attract high quality teachers. School districts could use the funds for bonuses at key career points, recruitment programs, providing professional development or mentoring guarantees, etc. **Amount: $20 million**

***

Agency pass-back w/ ED & HHS

Effects v. funding freeze

↳ allows a healthy ED budget

TARGETED CUTS

- Eliminate Title VI Block grant
- School to work phases out completely in '01
- Impact Aid takes a hit
- Eliminate Congressional Earmarks
- Cuts in Voc Ed

Targeted Increases / Committed "Paths"

→ TLCF → $2 Billion by 2001. Increase by $100 million for FY01 budget

→ Class Size → $1.8 billion (minimum of $1.5 B to stay on track)

→ Work study → committed to 1 million by 2000. We've achieved,

→ Charters → Committed to 3000 charters by '01
→ $150 million in '01 budget

→ Head Start: 1 million by '02. $800 million in FY budget

COPY

→ Americorps: 100,000 trained volunteers

→ Universal Reemployment