

Title I Schoolwide Programs: A Synthesis of Findings From Recent Evaluation

Kenneth K. Wong
Stephen J. Meyer

The University of Chicago

Recent federal legislation, including the 1994 Improving America's Schools Act, has enabled broad expansion of Title I schoolwide programs to over 8,000 schools across the nation. These regulatory changes are intended to reduce the historically fragmented or categorical character of Title I programs and improve the effectiveness of entire schools rather than targeting services to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged subpopulations. Despite the dramatic increase in the number of schoolwide programs, there is little comprehensive information about them and their effectiveness relative to traditional Title I programming. This article presents a synthesis of what is known about Title I schoolwide programs, focusing on three aspects: characteristics of schools and districts implementing schoolwide programs, programmatic and organizational characteristics of schoolwide program schools and districts, and evidence of the effectiveness of schoolwide program schools, particularly in terms of student performance. In addition to reviewing these evaluation findings, we present several cautions related to their interpretation. Finally, we suggest implications for future evaluations and discuss policy implications for school improvement.

Since the Great Society era of the 1960s, the federal grants-in-aid system has been used as the primary tool to address equity issues in elementary and secondary education at the national level. One of the major federal categorical programs that survived partisan shifts is compensatory education, enacted as Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965.¹ Consistent with the redistributive purpose in the original act, Title I has provided supplementary resources to schools with large numbers of low-income students throughout the past three decades. For fiscal year 1998, the Clinton administration allocated \$7 billion in Title I funds to serve over six million students (Puma et al., 1997). Historically, Title I schools provided additional, targeted services only to those students who qualified to receive them (e.g., through pull-out or targeted in-class programs that offer supplementary classroom instruction during the school day). Since the publication of *A Nation at Risk* in 1983, there has been renewed interest in blending Title I with a core academic curriculum (Kirst, 1988).

Policy analysts have directed their attention to program redesign at the school level in ways that are intended to strengthen the schools' overall organizational capacity to develop more comprehensive (i.e., less fragmentary) strategies for helping disadvantaged children (Commission on Chapter 1, 1992; Millsap et al., 1992; Wong & Wang, 1994). Effective schools research indicates that successful schools develop and carry out comprehensive reform strategies and maintain high expectations for the achievement of all students (Committee on Education and Labor, 1992; Wang & Wong, 1997). Additionally, research has documented the stigmatizing impact of pull-out programs on students, their disruptive impact on classroom instruction, and the organizational complexity resulting from the targeting provision that only means-tested eligible children may be served (Glass & Smith, 1977; Leinhardt, Bickel, & Palley, 1982; Winfield & Hawkins, 1993).

In light of these concerns, the Title I legislation permits districts to use Title I funds to develop and

operate schoolwide programs. By establishing a schoolwide program, a school may develop instructional programs that coordinate resources between Title I and regular instructional programs for all students in schools that serve large numbers of disadvantaged students. Although the Title I legislation has permitted schoolwide programs since 1978, they were rarely implemented because of a requirement that school districts match federal grants with their own funds. In 1988, the U.S. Congress passed the Hawkins-Stafford Elementary and Secondary School Improvement Amendments to Chapter 1 (now Title I), which allowed schools in which at least 75% of the students come from low-income backgrounds to operate schoolwide programs (without asking for matching school district funds). The 1994 Improving America's Schools Act further encouraged the adoption of schoolwide programs by lowering the eligibility threshold for schoolwide programs to schools with 50% low-income students beginning in the 1996-1997 school year. In many large, urban districts, the lower threshold makes virtually all Title I schools eligible to operate schoolwide programs. These regulatory changes are intended to reduce the historically fragmented or categorical character of Title I programs and improve the effectiveness of entire schools rather than targeting services to meet the needs of the most disadvantaged subpopulations.

As a result of these federal legislative changes, the number of schoolwide programs grew from 1,200 in 1991 (of approximately 12,000 eligible schools) to over 8,000 in 1996 (of approximately 16,800 eligible schools), representing an increase from about 10 to 50% of the eligible schools in each of those years. Despite this rapid expansion, little is known about the nature of schoolwide programs and their effectiveness relative to traditional Title I programming.

The Need for a Synthesis of Title I Evaluation Findings

At the time of the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act, there were few empirical studies on the implementation of schoolwide programs. Nationwide evaluations of the first years of the Hawkins-Stafford reform suggest mixed effects of schoolwide programs and offer little information with respect to their impact on student performance (U.S. Department of Education, 1992, 1993a). Further, several evaluations were conducted within particular school districts, and their findings

have not previously been integrated. Thus, there is a need to develop a more systematic understanding of how schoolwide programs have worked during their initial years. As evaluation data continue to become available, it becomes increasingly important to integrate research findings and develop an informed picture of schoolwide program implementation.

This article synthesizes what is known, to date, about Title I schoolwide programs, focusing on three primary aspects:

- Characteristics of schools and districts with schoolwide programs,
- Programmatic and organizational characteristics of schoolwide program schools and districts, and
- Evidence of the effectiveness of schoolwide program schools, particularly in terms of student performance.

In addition to reviewing research findings, we present several cautions related to their interpretation. Finally, we suggest implications for future evaluation and discuss policy implications for school improvement.

Overview of Evaluation Studies

A total of 13 evaluative publications are reviewed in this analysis.² Studies were located via key word searches of computerized reference databases, citations in related documents, and consultation with authors of research reports. Their characteristics are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. All are based on data collected between 1985 and 1995 and were produced in the 1990s. Two reports—the interim and final reports of the national assessment of the Chapter 1 program—aggregate findings from a variety of related research studies (U.S. Department of Education, 1992, 1993a). The remaining 11 present analyses of schoolwide programs at either the national or district level conducted by school districts, independent research organizations, and universities.

The most detailed information about schoolwide program effectiveness in terms of student performance is from district-level studies of schoolwide program schools. The last six entries listed in Tables 1 and 2 describe these district-level studies. Some evaluation studies of Title I were excluded because reports to date rely on data collected before the passage of the Hawkins-Stafford amendments or because they present little or no information related specifically to schoolwide programs. Excluded, for

example, are early reports based on data from the *Prospects* database (Puma, Jones, Rock, & Fernandez, 1993) and those based on state performance reports (Sinclair & Gutmann, 1996).

Samples and Data Collection Methods

These studies used a variety of research designs, ranging, for example, from a nationally representative mail survey of nearly 2,000 schools to in-depth case studies of schoolwide program schools within a single school district (see Table 1). Thus, the generalizability of their findings varies widely. The primary focus of most studies was on elementary schools and, frequently, on a subset of grades between kindergarten and eighth grade. Studies either based findings on samples of schoolwide program schools or presented comparative analyses of schools with schoolwide programs and schools with traditional Title I programming. Similarly, the samples of schools or districts used in these studies were either drawn randomly (to provide regional representativeness) or purposefully (to reflect variation across particular programmatic or student characteristics).

Data collection methods included administration of mail questionnaires and on-site interviewing with individuals at the school, district, and state levels (e.g., principals, classroom teachers, instructional aides, state and district Title I coordinators, and parents); observation of classroom instruction and other school activities; use of extant data maintained by schools and districts; document review; and administration of student achievement tests. The studies used both cross-sectional and longitudinal designs. In many cases, however, longitudinal studies focused exclusively on standardized measures of student achievement.

Analytical Constructs and Data Analysis Methods

Table 2 summarizes the type of data collected and the data analysis methods used for each study. The majority of studies collected basic descriptive information about schoolwide program schools and their districts, including poverty characteristics, school and district size, and grades served. Several studies also collected information on the students and families served by schoolwide program schools, such as race/ethnicity, educational disadvantage, and limited English proficiency. These data, in most cases, were collected via questionnaire or interview of individuals at the school, district, or state levels

and through review of district data records.

Most studies devoted attention to the implementation process for schoolwide programs—in particular, the proposal and planning process and the specific elements added as components of the schoolwide program. Components included both those related to school organization, management, and governance (e.g., hiring of additional staff, the establishment of shared decision-making structures, and increased staff development or parent involvement activities) as well as those related to curriculum and instruction (e.g., the distinction of Title I services from those in the regular program, changes in classroom instruction, and the inclusion of components associated with effective schools). These data were collected via questionnaire and interview with individuals at the school, state, and district levels as well as through observation at the school site.

To assess schoolwide program effectiveness, studies used both qualitative assessments by principals or district staff (e.g., perceived advantages or disadvantages of schoolwide programs) and quantitative measures of student performance (e.g., test scores, measures of attendance). The majority of studies that compared student performance measures used normal curve equivalent (NCE) gain scores¹ on norm-referenced tests, and nearly all studies that compared test scores do so for both reading and math. Scores in all cases were drawn from widely used standardized tests, such as the California Achievement Test (CAT), Metropolitan Achievement Test (MAT), and the Comprehensive Test of Basic Skills (CTBS). Three studies also considered student attendance as an indicator of schoolwide program effectiveness. Finally, whether or not schools were identified for program improvement² was also used as an indicator of program effectiveness in three cases.

A variety of analytic techniques were used to generate findings from these data. Many findings were based on aggregation of results from questionnaires, interviews, and observations. These findings tended to be primarily descriptive, focusing on characteristics of schools and districts with schoolwide programs or providing inventories of components of schoolwide programs, for example. Analyses of student performance measures, in most cases, were longitudinal, comparing cohorts of students in schools with and without schoolwide programs that were matched on some other characteristics. Nearly all studies compared NCE gain scores.

TABLE 1

Overview of Evaluation Studies (Samples and Data Collection Methods/Sources Relevant to Findings About Schoolwide Programs)

Evaluative report	Organization/authors, date of publication	Sample	Data collection methods/sources
<i>National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program: The Interim Report</i>	U.S. Dept. of Education (1992)	n/a	Summary of findings from recent research studies.
<i>Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions</i>	U.S. Dept. of Education (1993a)	n/a	Summary of findings from recent research studies.
<i>Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project Study: Final Report</i>	RMC Research Corporation (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993)	Nationally representative sample of 431 districts and 1,889 schools operating schoolwide programs during the 1991-92 school year. 6 schoolwide program schools around the U.S. chosen to reflect geographic and demographic diversity during the 1991-92 school year.	Questionnaires mailed to Chapter 1 district coordinators and schools. Case study (interviews with individuals at the school and district level, classroom and informal observation, document review).
<i>The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report</i>	Abt Associates (Millsap, Turnbull, Moss, Brigham, Gamse, & Marks, 1992)	Nationally representative sample of 1,400 public school districts receiving Chapter 1 funds during the 1990-91 school year. 54 schools around the U.S. chosen to reflect diversity in geography, demography, and other school and district characteristics during the 1990-91 school year.	Questionnaires mailed to Chapter 1 district coordinators. Case study (interviews with individuals at the state, district, and school levels).
<i>The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Final Report</i>	Abt Associates (Millsap, Moss, & Gamse, 1993)	Nationally representative sample of 1,000 Chapter 1 schools (including 48 schoolwide program schools) during the 1991-92 school year.	Questionnaires mailed to principals, classroom teachers, and teachers' aides.
<i>Urban and Suburban/Rural Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children: Final Report</i>	Johns Hopkins University/ Abt Associates (Stringfield et al., 1977)	25 schools (including 6 with schoolwide programs), chosen to reflect diversity of programmatic "special strategies" during the 1990-91 through 1992-93 school years.	Case study (classroom and student observation, interviews and surveys of school staff, parents, district coordinators, and students); district data records (CTBS scores in reading and math, grades, absence records, student writing samples).
<i>Prospects: Final Report on Student Outcomes</i>	U.S. Dept. of Education, Planning and Evaluation Service (Puma et al., 1997)	5 schools (including 3 with schoolwide programs), chosen as examples of high-performing, high-poverty schools during the 1990-91 through 1993-94 school years.	Standardized tests (CTBS scores in reading and math); surveys of school staff, parents, district administrators, and students; district data records.

<i>Student Outcomes</i>	<i>Planning and Evaluation</i> Service (Puma et al., 1997)	<i>chosen as examples of high-performing, high-poverty schools during the 1990-91 through 1993-94 school years.</i>	<i>surveys of school staff, parents, district administrators, and students; district data records.</i>
<i>Longitudinal Effects of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students</i>	Johns Hopkins University (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993)	40 schoolwide program schools and 20 matched non-schoolwide program schools in an unidentified major urban school district for the school years 1986-87 through 1990-91. 40 schoolwide program schools in a major urban school district during the 1990-91 school year.	District data records (CTBS scores in reading). Questionnaires mailed to principals.
<i>A Continued Look at the Promise of Schoolwide Projects</i>	School District of Philadelphia (Davidoff & Pierson, 1991)	62 schoolwide program schools and 66 non-schoolwide schools in the Philadelphia School District for the school years 1985-86 through 1990-91.	District data records (citywide test scores in reading and math, student grades, and attendance).
<i>The Moment of Truth: Year Three Continuation for Schoolwide Projects</i>	Philadelphia School District (1992)	37 schoolwide program schools in the Philadelphia School District that operated during the school years 1985-86 through 1990-91.	District data records (citywide test and CTBS scores in reading and math).
<i>A Description of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects and Effects on Achievement in Six Case Study Schools</i>	Johns Hopkins University (Winfield, Hawkins, & Stringfield, 1992)	11 schoolwide program schools in the Philadelphia School District between 1998 and 1990, selected to reflect variation in instructional framework, length of time as a schoolwide program site, principal background, and school size. 6 schoolwide program schools in the Philadelphia School District that operated between the 1985-86 and 1989-90 school years; case study data collected during the 1989-90 school year.	Case study (interviews with principals, teachers, parents; classroom observation, observation of meetings at the school, district, and central office levels; analysis of school documents). Case study (interviews with principals, teachers, parents; classroom observation, observation of meetings at the school, district, and central office levels; document review) and district data records (CTBS scores in reading and math, attendance records).
<i>Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons From the Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects</i>	University of Chicago (Wong, Sunderman, & Lee, 1996)	35 Title I schools (including 4 schoolwide programs) in Minneapolis and 164 Title I schools (including 116 with schoolwide programs) in Houston for the school years 1989-90 through 1992-93 and 1993-94 through 1994-95, respectively. 12 schoolwide program schools and 10 non-schoolwide program schools in Minneapolis and Houston during 1993-94 and 1994-95 school years chosen to reflect diversity in race/ethnicity and student performance.	District data records (California Achievement Test scores in reading and math for Minneapolis, Texas Assessment of Academic Skills scores in reading and math for Houston). Case study (interviews with principals, Title I coordinators, teachers, and instructional aides; district Title I program staff).
<i>Chapter 1 Instructional Program Final Report 1989/90</i>	Houston Independent School District (Nechworth, Cisneros, & Sanchez, 1990)	42 schoolwide program schools and 68 non-schoolwide program schools in the Houston Independent School District during the 1989-90 school year.	District data records (Metropolitan Achievement Tests, Spanish Assessment of Basic Education in reading and math).

TABLE 2

Overview of Evaluation Studies (Analytical Constructs and Data Analysis Methods Relevant to Findings About Schoolwide Programs)

Evaluative report	Characteristics of schools and districts with schoolwide programs	Measures of schoolwide program implementation process		Measures of schoolwide program effectiveness	
		Elements of the proposal/planning process	Components of schoolwide programs	Perceptions of schoolwide program effectiveness	Student performance
<i>National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program: The Interim Report</i>	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Reinventing Chapter 1: The Current Chapter 1 Program and New Directions</i>		X	X	X	X
<i>Chapter 1 Schoolwide Project Study: Final Report</i>	X	X	X	X	
<i>The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Interim Report</i>	X	X	X	X	
<i>The Chapter 1 Implementation Study: Final Report</i>	X				
<i>Urban and Suburban/Rural Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children: Final Report</i>	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Prospects: Final Report on Student Outcomes</i>	X	X	X	X	X
<i>Longitudinal Effects of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students</i>	X		X		X
<i>A Continued Look at the Promise of Schoolwide Projects</i>					X
<i>The Moment of Truth: Year Three Continuation for Schoolwide Projects</i>					X
<i>A Description of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects and Effects on Achievement in Six Case Study Schools</i>	X	X	X		X
<i>Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons From the Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects</i>	X	X	X		X
<i>Chapter 1 Instructional Program Final Report 1989/90</i>	X				X

Data analysis methods

Synthesis of research findings across multiple studies.

Synthesis of research findings across multiple studies.

Descriptive analysis of questionnaire data; qualitative analysis of case study data.

Descriptive analysis of questionnaire data.

Descriptive analysis of questionnaire and interview data (few findings are presented for schoolwide programs).

Descriptive analysis of questionnaire, observation, and interview data; comparisons of average grade-level NCE scores, attendance rates, and teacher and student perceptions of student work habits and their school environment among schoolwide program schools and comparable schools from a national dataset (*Prospects*).

Descriptive analysis of questionnaire data (few findings are presented for schoolwide programs).

Regression analysis (schoolwide program status, prior achievement, programmatic components, student and family characteristics used as predictors of average NCE scores); descriptive analysis of questionnaire data.

Comparisons of percentages of schoolwide and non-schoolwide programs meeting state criteria for student achievement, average NCE gain scores for schoolwide and non-schoolwide programs, and report card marks and student attendance in schoolwide program schools before and after schoolwide program implementation.

Comparisons of schoolwide and non-schoolwide program schools using a variety of methods to make continuation decisions about schoolwide programs (using data from above study).

Qualitative analysis of case study data; comparison of NCE gain scores and student attendance rates for schoolwide and non-schoolwide program schools.

Comparisons in average NCE gain scores between schoolwide and non-schoolwide program schools using analysis of variance; hierarchical linear modeling of student and school-level effects on NCE gain scores; comparison of trends in achievement for students in schoolwide and non-schoolwide program schools; qualitative analysis of the impact of district policies, school organization, and instructional strategies on schoolwide program effectiveness.

Comparison of average grade-level NCE scores among schoolwide and non-schoolwide program schools using analysis of covariance; separate analyses for limited-English-proficiency (LEP) and non-LEP students.

which were averaged across grades within districts. In fewer cases, findings were based on performance measures from schoolwide program schools only, considering average grade-level test scores or measures of attendance before and after the point of schoolwide program implementation. Finally, in one case, findings were based only on a single-point-in-time analysis of test scores from schools with and without schoolwide programs.

Very few of the studies conducted analyses that link student performance measures to characteristics of schools or students. Two studies related school characteristics (e.g., school-level organization, instructional strategies) and three related student characteristics (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity, prior achievement) to student achievement scores.

Findings

Characteristics of Schools and Districts With Schoolwide Programs

A wealth of descriptive information about schools and districts with schoolwide programs derives from a survey of nearly 500 districts and nearly 2,000 schools with schoolwide programs conducted during the 1991–1992 school year (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Over half of the schoolwide programs operating in 1991–1992 were in districts with 25,000 or more students. Schoolwide program schools reported an average poverty level of 85% and served an average of 70% educationally disadvantaged students. Over half of schoolwide program schools served students from urban areas and nearly a quarter served students from rural areas. The remaining quarter of schoolwide program schools served small towns/communities and suburban areas.

Over three fourths of schoolwide program schools were elementary schools; another 12% served elementary grades in combination with one or more secondary grades; only 10% were secondary schools. Schoolwide program schools tended to have higher percentages of African-American and Hispanic students than the districts in which they operated, and nearly 20% of students enrolled in schoolwide program schools demonstrated limited English proficiency (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

The Implementation Process

Nearly all studies devoted some attention to the

implementation process of schoolwide program schools, endeavoring to describe the particular changes at the school level that occurred as a result of the schools' adoption of the schoolwide approach. Two general areas of implementation progress were considered: (a) elements of the proposal and planning process and (b) components of school organization, management, governance, and curriculum and instruction that have been initiated, strengthened, or modified as a result of schoolwide program implementation.

Elements of the proposal and planning process. According to the 1991–1992 survey of schools with schoolwide programs, "more flexibility in service delivery or instructional grouping" was cited most often (by 85% of principals) as a reason for establishing the schoolwide programs. "Better fit [of the Title I program] with the total school program," "more discretion in the use of [Title I] funds," and "access to additional funds" were also cited often—by 57%, 46%, and 21% of principals, respectively. Only 12% of principals selected "a response to being identified for Title I program improvement" as a reason for seeking schoolwide program status (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

The endorsement of and the dissemination of information about the schoolwide program option by state and district personnel appeared to substantially influence whether or not schools chose to implement schoolwide programs. For example, a survey of Title I district coordinators during the 1990–1991 school year indicated that, although only 28% of all districts with eligible schools had established schoolwide programs, 65% of districts with eligible schools established schoolwide programs in districts whose state education agencies had encouraged consideration of the option (Millsap et al., 1992). Indeed, there are several examples of school districts and state education agencies initiating the planning and application process to establish schoolwide programs (Stringfield et al., 1994; Winfield, Hawkins, & Stringfield, 1992; Wong, Sunderman, & Lee, 1996). Almost none of the schools indicated that the district played no role in applying for the schoolwide program; however, one fifth indicated that state department staff played no role (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Schools and districts reported "difficulty in planning how to meet the three-year accountability requirement" and "lack of resources for planning" as the most frequent obstacles to applying for schoolwide program status. Nearly half of schools

no planning

and districts, however, reported no obstacles, and the majority of schoolwide program schools spent little time in the process of planning and needs assessment. Nearly half reported spending less than six months and almost 90% reported spending less than a year. Schools encouraged by the district or state to apply for schoolwide program status spent less time planning. The relatively short planning period may be, in part, a result of district influence on the design of schoolwide programs, which was reported as a factor in three quarters of schoolwide program schools. Most schools, however, involved administrators, teachers, parents, and other individuals in the planning process, although there is evidence that parents' role in planning schoolwide programs has been limited (Millsap et al., 1992; Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Because a fundamental purpose of schoolwide programs is to provide schools with greater flexibility to use resources to meet the needs of all students at the school, a central question is how schools have taken advantage of this flexibility. In particular, what types of school organizational, management, and educational practices have been instituted, strengthened, or changed as a result of schoolwide program implementation. We focus on two general types of components of schoolwide programs: (a) components related to school organization, management, and governance and (b) components related to curriculum and instruction.

Components related to school organization, management, and governance. Schoolwide programs have allowed schools to introduce new activities or programs as well as strengthen existing ones. Evidence from the first few years of their operation shows that emphasis was placed primarily on strengthening existing programs and activities (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993; Stringfield et al., 1994). Further, preliminary evidence indicates that a shift to a schoolwide program was most frequently accompanied by changes in resource allocation such as a reduction of class size. Of those schools that introduced new programs or activities, the most frequently introduced were activities for "parent education/involvement" and "adoption/adaption of a generic instructional program or approach." Many other components were strengthened, however. During their first years, schools reported having introduced an average of one or two programs or activities and strengthened five or six existing ones (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Reduced class size/hiring of additional staff.

Reduced class size was identified as a component of schoolwide program implementation by principals in slightly more than half of schoolwide program schools. Schools reported that the average reduction in school class size was from 27 to 19 children. Despite the prevalence of this component, schools that reduced class size introduced and strengthened other activities to a similar extent as schools that did not reduce class size (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Teachers have expressed enthusiasm about this component, arguing that reductions in class size allow them to enhance their curricula and instruction. In fact, class size was reduced selectively in some cases, only for those grades in which teachers expressed a willingness to tie the reduction to a change in their instructional practice. Finally, addition of new staff has not been limited to teachers. Counselors, social workers, school-family coordinators, and schoolwide program coordinators have also been hired to support schoolwide program services in efforts to strengthen the relationship between the school and families, for example (Millsap, Moss, & Gamse, 1993).

Staff development. Case studies of schoolwide program schools indicate that successful implementation of a schoolwide program is linked, in part, to the provision of significant resources for staff inservice training—in particular, for the purpose of the schoolwide program and the associated roles of teachers (Stringfield et al., 1997). Principals reported that staff development activities had been implemented or significantly strengthened in over three fourths of schoolwide program schools. During the first years of implementation, a majority of districts reported that staff development at schoolwide program schools was more inclusive of teachers and involved more total hours than in regular Title I schools. Staff development activities in schoolwide program schools have included training in reading/language arts instruction, instruction for low-achieving students, and mathematics instruction (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). According to principal reports, a teacher at a schoolwide program school received an average of 29 hours of staff development, which is 6 hours more than that received by the average teacher in a Title I school without a schoolwide program (Millsap et al., 1993; Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Shared decision-making and teacher input. The schoolwide program option encourages increased teacher input into decisions affecting the school, emphasizing teacher input into decisions

about assessments. Based on reports by principals in a major urban school district, teachers indicated having only a moderate level of input into decisions affecting the school. The majority of teachers had some level of input into decisions about assigning students and teachers to classrooms, hiring staff, and selecting materials or purchasing hardware. Teachers, however, had the greatest input in decisions about selecting materials or purchasing hardware and had the least input in decisions about teacher assignment and replacement (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). In-depth case studies, however, suggested that a school's change to a schoolwide program tended to be accompanied by a high degree of teacher control and site-based management arrangements (Stringfield et al., 1997).

Parental involvement. Acknowledged as a key component of all Title I efforts, parental involvement has also been a component of many schoolwide programs. Parent education and involvement is reported to have been introduced or significantly strengthened in over three fourths of schoolwide program schools. The most common types of parent involvement activities mentioned were informal contact between parents and teachers, parent volunteering in the school, and parent help with student school work in the home. School-based adult education and family literacy programs were mentioned less frequently (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

Principal reports in a large urban school district indicated that, despite a range of parent involvement activities, small percentages of parents were actually involved with these activities. For example, only 5% to 10% of parents were reported as having been involved in volunteering in classrooms and attending workshops. Higher proportions of parents were involved in other school activities (e.g., receiving information from teachers or home demonstrators, monitoring homework, and attending PTA meetings), however, this occurred in relatively few schools (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). Case studies of Title I schools with particular programmatic "special strategies" indicated that, of several approaches, schoolwide programs were particularly well positioned to foster parent involvement such as outreach to parents and collaboration between parents and school staff (Stringfield et al., 1994).

Components of schoolwide programs related to curriculum and instruction. **Distinction of Title I services from the regular program.** A central component of the schoolwide program option is

the provision of Title I activities and services to all students in Title I schools. One indicator of a program's inclusiveness is the extent to which Title I services cannot be distinguished from services offered for all children (e.g., one that lacks pull-out programs that serve only a subset of students). Sixty percent of schoolwide program school principals reported that their schools operated programs in which Title I services are indistinguishable from services for all children. Among those schools in which Title I services were distinguishable from the regular program, the most common distinction was the provision of additional services to educationally disadvantaged students who would have received Title I services in a traditional targeted program. Only 12% of schools reported using a pull-out model (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Principal reports indicated that schoolwide program schools in an unidentified major urban district transitioned toward the provision of Title I services to all children during the first years of implementation, with higher percentages of schools reallocating resources to provide instruction to all students each year (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993).

Classroom instruction. Perhaps the most critical components of schoolwide programs are those that have the potential to directly influence what takes place in the classroom. Schoolwide program principals reported having introduced or significantly strengthened the following components related to curriculum and instruction: computer-assisted instruction (over three fourths), provision of a coordinated and integrated curriculum and supplemental instruction (two thirds), and provision of an extended school day (less than one fourth) (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Schoolwide program schools have adopted a range of programs or curricula, such as Reading Recovery or Success for All, as part of their schoolwide programs (Millsap et al., 1992; National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education, 1996). In fact, the majority of Success for All schools are Title I schoolwide programs (Slavin et al., 1996).

It is difficult, however, to obtain a clear picture of the particular ways in which the schoolwide program option actually affects classroom instruction. In-depth case-study analysis begins to inform this question, however. For example, case studies of schoolwide programs identified a common theme of individualizing instruction to the needs of particular students (Stringfield et al., 1997). Additional evidence indicates that schoolwide programs have

increased the capacity of schools and teachers to provide instructional services more flexibly, as particular student needs arise, whereas traditional Title I pull-out programs have typically required a more formal process of student selection (Millsap et al., 1992).

Components associated with effective schools.

Another important indicator of schoolwide program implementation progress is the inclusion of components associated with effective schools. State Title I coordinators reported that 62% of schoolwide programs in their states incorporated components of effective schools programs as a main feature of their programs (Turnbull, Zeldin, & Cain, 1990; U.S. Department of Education, 1992). Title I district coordinators reported that a number of effective schools components were implemented as part of schoolwide programs through activities such as needs assessment, staff development, changes in classroom instruction, and changes in school management (Millsap et al., 1992). The presence of characteristics associated with effective schools may, reciprocally, affect the successful implementation of schoolwide programs in that the factors that make good schools may also facilitate innovation and change. Case studies suggested that factors that facilitate innovation included strong principal leadership and management skills; meaningful, universally agreed on goals; a nurturing school culture; well-qualified staff; and organizational mechanisms to support schools' problem-solving (Stringfield et al., 1994).

These preliminary findings lend some insight into the components that have been included as part of schoolwide programs and also begin to form the basis for an understanding of what might constitute a successful implementation of the schoolwide program approach. For example, one assessment describes successful implementation as schools that have

implemented schoolwide decision making, created effective working plans for improvement, integrated other existing categorical programs into a coherent instructional program for all children, allocated available resources more effectively, provided ongoing support to classroom teachers, learned how to monitor program effectiveness better, and instituted instructional reforms for their disadvantaged student population. (U.S. Department of Education, 1993a, p. 111)

The larger remaining questions, however, are what effects schoolwide programs have had relative to

traditional Title I service delivery approaches and what their effectiveness has been in terms of improving student performance.

Schoolwide Program Effectiveness and Student Performance

Perceptions of schoolwide program effectiveness.

Preliminary indicators of program effectiveness are reflected in school and district staff perceptions of the advantages and disadvantages of schoolwide programs. Concerns have been raised, for example, that school principals and district coordinators emphasize factors related to administrative convenience as a primary focus of schoolwide programs (e.g., reductions in class size, better use of materials and equipment) rather than instructional reform or improvement of student outcomes (U.S. Department of Education, 1992). However, many principals and teachers consider schoolwide programs as a way to do away with what they perceive to have been negative features of their previous Title I services such as pull-out programs, formal or inflexible procedures for targeting Title I services, and an emphasis on remediation rather than prevention (Millsap et al., 1993). Principals and district coordinators also report a range of advantages, related primarily to instructional benefits for students and a simplification of administrative responsibilities through increased flexibility of programs and funds (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993).

The disadvantages of schoolwide programs reported most frequently by principals and district coordinators are additional paperwork; additional time for planning, evaluation, and teacher preparation; and the belief that Title I children receive fewer services (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). State and district Title I coordinators also have expressed the concerns that schoolwide programs may dilute the resources for Title I programs and that they do not adequately meet the needs of the lowest achieving students (Millsap et al., 1992).

Student performance. Information about the impact of schoolwide programs on student achievement is especially limited. Virtually all information available at the national level is based on generalized principal and Title I district coordinator reports of schoolwide program effectiveness and on aggregate information on the number of schools that have met their three-year accountability requirement. Seventy-eight percent of principals of schoolwide program schools that had been in op-

eration for at least three years during the 1991-1992 school year reported that evidence favored the schoolwide program (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Of those schools considered to constitute the first group of schoolwide programs after the enactment of the Hawkins-Stafford amendments and assessed at the end of three years, only 10% failed to show the achievement gains required to continue as a schoolwide program (Turnbull, Wechsler, & Rosenthal, 1992; U.S. Department of Education, 1993a). Further, of a total of 128 schools in the Philadelphia School District, 40% of schoolwide program sites and 55% of non-schoolwide program sites were required to participate in mandated program improvement (Davidoff & Pierson, 1991).

Two well-known national-level studies of educational programs for disadvantaged children provide some insight into the effectiveness of schoolwide programs; however, their data derive from very small, nonrepresentative samples. The *Special Strategies* studies considered student performance indicators for six schoolwide program schools (chosen to reflect particular programmatic "special strategies") and compared them with national averages on these indicators for comparable schools (Stringfield et al., 1997). Although the authors concluded that these schoolwide program schools and their students were benefiting from Title I support and that nearly all of the school faculty were supportive of the schoolwide program, they concluded that the schools were "not producing remarkable levels of student achievement" (p. 14-32). Documenting the positive impact of additional staff development programs, a focus on family involvement, and the freedom of principals to select teachers in two highly supported urban schoolwide programs, the authors argued that "the evidence seems to suggest that schoolwide programs produce academic gains only when accompanied by active, long-term, steady, focused academic support" (p. 14-32).

The *Final Report on Student Outcomes* generated from the nationally representative Prospects database also presents information suggestive of the effectiveness of schoolwide programs; however, this information is also based on a very small sample of schools (Puma et al., 1997). The authors identified a sample of five "high-performing" and "high-poverty" schools, three of which were schoolwide programs. Presenting the information only as "food for thought" and cautioning against

overinterpretation, the authors noted that the schoolwide programs differed from the other schools in the sample in that they concentrated decision-making authority at the school level and involved teachers, had fewer disciplinary actions per child, and had a lower student-teacher ratio (p. 60).

More detailed information about student performance, however, is available via localized studies of schoolwide programs that have been conducted within particular school districts (see Appendix for more detailed summaries of these district-level studies). Four studies, which used data from the school districts of Philadelphia, Houston, Minneapolis, and a fourth unspecified urban school district, are highlighted below because they provide comparative information on student academic achievement for schoolwide program schools and schools with traditional Title I programs. These studies focused primarily on comparison of NCE reading and math scores across schoolwide program and non-schoolwide program schools. Of those studies that conducted tests of statistical significance, most reported only a handful of significant differences in measures of student performance between schoolwide and non-schoolwide program schools. Further, where significant differences were apparent, they tended to be small (see Table 3 for a summary of findings from these four district-level studies).

A study conducted by the Houston Independent School District, for example, compared reading and math achievement gain scores for its first year of schoolwide program implementation (Nechworth, Cisneros, & Sanchez, 1990). A handful of significant differences were identified, indicating higher reading and math scores in non-schoolwide program schools. The differences were slight, however. Another study in an unidentified major urban school district presents a mixed picture of schoolwide program effectiveness (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). Following a cohort of first-grade students for five years, the study found mostly non-significant differences in reading and math scores of students from the two types of schools. Significant differences were found among reading scores of students for two of the five years, suggesting mixed (both positive and negative) and modest effects of schoolwide program status on reading achievement scores.

A study conducted by the School District of Philadelphia, on the other hand, presents evidence in favor of schoolwide programs (Davidoff &

Interpretative Cautions Regarding the Evaluation of Schoolwide Programs

Lessons from the Initial Phases of Implementation

The Hawkins-Stafford amendments were passed in 1988, and implementation of the schoolwide program option did not begin in earnest in a number of sites until 1989. Thus, many of these findings are based on the first experiences of schools implementing schoolwide programs and, because broad-based school change is a slow process, they should be regarded as preliminary. The Houston Independent School District study (Nechworth et al., 1990), for example, presents test score data from the district's first year of schoolwide program implementation and is based only on this single year. Indeed, there is evidence that the presence of components of schoolwide program implementation is related to the number of years the schoolwide program has operated. For example, the study of an unidentified major urban school district found that hours of staff development activities were directly related to the year in which the schoolwide program started (Winfield & Hawkins, 1993). This study also found that the percentage of schools that reallocated resources to provide instruction to all students was increasingly higher over a three-year period. As components of schoolwide programs become more integral to the life of schools beyond the initial phase, the likelihood that evaluation results will detect differences between schoolwide program and non-schoolwide program schools should be greater.

Methodological Issues Related to Schoolwide Program Evaluation

The nature of Title I schoolwide program implementation presents a number of challenges to evaluation. First, there is great variability within and across schoolwide program schools (Stringfield et al., 1997). The wide variation in the nature and degree of organizational and instructional change occurring in schoolwide programs creates difficulties in isolating the effects of schoolwide programs relative to other potential causes. Large numbers of students in schools with schoolwide programs are also, by definition, among the neediest in their districts in terms of poverty, which is often linked with educational disadvantage. Therefore, finding an adequate comparison group of students from

Pierson, 1991). Although no tests of statistical significance were reported, a variety of comparisons favored schoolwide programs. Comparing four measures of student achievement during the 1988–1989 school year, the study found that a higher percentage of schoolwide programs met the state-required measures of reading and math achievement than schools with traditional Title I programming. Further, following gain scores in reading and math across eight grades between the 1988–1989 and 1989–1990 school years, the study found that, for a majority of grades, a higher percentage of students from schoolwide program schools had higher posttest scores in reading and math than their counterparts in non-schoolwide program schools.

The Philadelphia study also compared student performance in schoolwide program schools before and after schoolwide program implementation, finding improved performance subsequent to implementation. The study showed that, for the majority of schoolwide program schools, the percentage of students who received report card marks of "A," "B," or "C" across four curricular areas increased after schoolwide program implementation. Comparing average achievement gains in reading and math for the period before and after the implementation of schoolwide programs, the study found that about half of schoolwide program schools had higher average gains in reading scores after implementation and about one fourth had higher average gains in math scores. Lastly, three fourths of schoolwide program schools showed improvement in student attendance after becoming schoolwide programs.

Finally, a study of student achievement in schoolwide and non-schoolwide program schools in Houston (for the 1993–1994 through 1994–1995 school years) and Minneapolis (for the 1989–1990 through 1992–1993 school years) found mostly nonsignificant differences in average NCE gain scores in reading and math for students from schoolwide and non-schoolwide programs (Wong et al., 1996). However, controlling for students' racial/ethnic and social backgrounds, the gap between the math scores of Title I-eligible and noneligible students in the Minneapolis School District was significantly smaller in schoolwide program schools.⁷ The same analysis, using data from Houston, indicated that the gap between the math scores of Title I-eligible and noneligible students was significantly smaller in non-schoolwide program schools.

TABLE 3

Summary of Findings From Four District-Level Studies of Student Performance

School district/ evaluative report	Summary of measures/analysis	Evidence that favors schoolwide programs
Houston School District <i>Chapter 1 Instructional Program Final Report 1989/90</i>	Average grade-level reading and math scores for students in grades 2 through 5 in 42 SWP and 68 non-SWP schools in the 1989-90 school year.	
Unidentified major urban school district <i>Longitudinal Effects of Chapter 1 Schoolwide Projects on the Achievement of Disadvantaged Students</i>	Average grade-level reading scores for a cohort of students beginning first grade in the 1986-87 school year (followed through grade 5) in 40 SWP and 20 non-SWP schools. Survey data about SWP components (during 1989-90 school year) linked to average grade-level reading scores for a cohort of students beginning 1st grade in the 1986-87 school year (followed through grade 5) in 40 SWP and 20 non-SWP schools.	Significant positive effect of a school's SWP status on average reading scores for grade 2. "District framework" components had a significant positive effect on reading scores in four of five grades; teacher involvement in selection of materials had a significant positive effect on reading scores in one of five grades. "Existing program" components had a significant positive effect in two of five grades.
School District of Philadelphia <i>A Continued Look at the Promise of Schoolwide Projects</i>	Percentage of schools meeting four state-established criteria for reading and math achievement (62 SWP and 66 non-SWP schools) for the school years 1985-86 through 1990-91. Percentage of students showing positive gains in reading and math scores and the average gain scores for each grade from 1 through 8 in 62 SWP and 66 non-SWP schools for the school years 1985-89 through 1990-91. End-of-year report card marks for the 1987-88 and 1989-90 school years in each of four curricular areas (reading, math, science, and social studies) for students in 37 SWP schools before and after SWP implementation. Achievement gains in reading and math for students in grades 2 through 8 for the period before and after the implementation of SWP for 37 SWPs for the 1985-86 through 1989-90 school years. Attendance rates for the period before and after the implementation of SWPs for 37 SWPs (between spring 1989 and spring 1990).	A higher percentage of SWP schools met the four state-established criteria for reading achievement than did non-SWP schools; a higher percentage of SWP schools met three out of the four criteria for math achievement. A higher percentage of students showed positive gains in SWP schools in six of eight grades for both reading and math; the average gain scores in reading and math were higher in SWP schools in five and seven of eight grades, respectively. The percentage of students receiving a grade of "A," "B," or "C" increased after SWP implementation in the majority of schools. 21 of the 37 SWP schools demonstrated reading achievement gains as an SWP that exceeded those during the three pre-program years; 9 of the 37 schools demonstrated such achievement gains in math. 28 of the 37 SWP schools improved their attendance since becoming schoolwide programs.

Evidence against schoolwide programs

Evidence suggesting mixed effects

(Non-limited-English-proficiency students) For grade 2, reading and math scores were significantly higher for students in non-SWP schools; for grade 4, one of two math scores was significantly higher for students in non-SWP schools; for grades 2-5, pooled, math scores for students in non-schoolwide program schools were significantly higher.

(Limited-English-proficiency students) For grade 2, one of two math scores was significantly higher for students in non-SWP schools; for grades 2-5, pooled, math scores for students in non-SWP schools were significantly higher.

Significant negative effect of a school's SWP status on average reading scores for grade 3.

"District framework" components had a significant negative effect on reading scores in grade 3.

"Resource allocation" components had mixed (significant positive and negative effects) on reading scores in two of five grades.

Teacher involvement in decisions about instructional resources, parent involvement, and parent conference attendance had mixed effects (significant positive and negative effects) on student reading scores in at least two of the five grades.

TABLE 3 (continued from previous page)

School district/ evaluative report	Summary of measures/analysis	Evidence that favors schoolwide programs
Houston and Minneapolis school districts	Average grade-level gain scores in reading and math for a cohort of Minneapolis students beginning the first grade in 1989-90 (followed through grade 3) in 4 SWP and 31 non-SWP schools; HLM analysis (controlling for school and student characteristics).	Controlling for racial/ethnic and social backgrounds, the gap between the math scores of Title I-eligible and non-eligible students was significantly smaller in schoolwide program schools.
<i>Redesigning the Federal Compensatory Education Program: Lessons From the Implementation of Title I Schoolwide Projects</i>	Average grade-level gain scores in reading and math for a cohort of Houston students beginning the third grade in 1993-94 (followed through grade 4) in 116 SWP and 48 non-SWP schools; HLM analysis (controlling for school and student characteristics).	

schools without schoolwide programs is increasingly difficult, and students from comparison schools may demonstrate achievement differences that are linked to other factors.⁸ High rates of student mobility in Title I schools also create complexities for comparisons across schools as well as for longitudinal studies of particular cohorts of students (U.S. General Accounting Office, 1992).

Further, as discussed earlier, these evaluations vary greatly in terms of their generalizability. Thus, study samples must be considered in the interpretation of findings. Because much of the information about the effectiveness of schoolwide programs in terms of student achievement is available via district-level studies, it is important to recognize that district policies or priorities may also have an impact on the success of newly implemented schoolwide programs. For example, at least two of the district-level studies rely on data from the school district of Philadelphia at a time when the district was actively supporting the expansion of schoolwide programs. Thus, the findings from these district-level studies may not generalize to the experiences of schoolwide programs in other districts.

The most generalizable findings are, of course, those based on nationally representative samples. However, data from these samples tend to be limited, particularly with respect to measures of student performance. Evidence of great variability in instructional strategies within and across schoolwide approaches suggests the need to collect detailed information, which is not often feasibly collected on a large scale (Stringfield et al., 1994, 1997). Therefore, although small or nonran-

dom samples may be particularly useful for understanding the components of schoolwide programs that affect student learning, their limited generalizability must be recognized.

School districts have a good deal of flexibility in the methods they use to meet schoolwide program accountability requirements, and consequently, the existing program evaluations reflect a variety of methods. An analysis of data from students in the Philadelphia School District highlights this flexibility, delineating the multiple ways a Philadelphia school could meet its accountability requirement. Although most measures yielded consistent decisions about continuation of schoolwide programs at particular schools, there were a number of inconsistencies across measures (Philadelphia School District, 1992). Thus, it should be noted that some methods may better detect certain aspects of the schoolwide program than others. Similarly, the variety of methods for data analysis should be noted. Some involve traditional quantitative methods for establishing statistical significance, while others rely on more qualitative assessments of data.

Implications for Future Evaluation

A number of implications follow from these cautions. Evaluations need to continue beyond the initial phase of schoolwide program implementation and should be longitudinal in order to capture effects that may not be fully apparent during the first years. Careful selection of comparison groups and thoughtful sampling procedures will also increase the utility of subsequent evaluations. The variety

is there a longitudinal study of schoolwide?

that favors
programs

l/ethnic and social
gap between the
le I-eligible and
nts was significantly
side program

Evidence against schoolwide programs

Evidence suggesting mixed effects

No significant differences were found in average gain scores in reading and math between SWP schools and non-SWP schools.

Controlling for racial/ethnic and social backgrounds, the gap between the math scores of Title I-eligible and non-eligible students was significantly smaller in non-SWP schools; the performance gap in math was significantly smaller in non-SWPs.

No significant differences were found in average gain scores in reading and math between SWP schools and non-SWP schools.

useful for under-
schoolwide programs
their limited
ed.
l of flexibility in
schoolwide program
consequently, the
lect a variety of
n students in the
lights this flex-
s a Philadelphia
ity requirement.
consistent deci-
schoolwide programs
a number of in-
Philadelphia School
noted that some
n aspects of the
imilarly, the va-
should be noted.
ive methods for
e, while others
nts of data.

of evaluation methodologies used thus far, however, is not necessarily a liability in that it provides a multifaceted picture of program effectiveness using a variety of methods. Methodological studies that review the various methods used to measure student performance and meet accountability requirements for schoolwide programs recommend the use of multiple measures (Philadelphia School District, 1992; U.S. Department of Education, 1993b). Further, as student achievement expectations continue to broaden—departing from an emphasis on basic skills—singular approaches to understanding student performance (e.g., standardized achievement tests) may become increasingly limiting.

A handful of evaluation studies devote attention to the role of the school district in the implementation of schoolwide programs. Case studies of schoolwide program schools indicate that school and classroom practices are shaped by district-level activities, such as encouragement and support for particular programs or for school-based management (Stringfield et al., 1994; Wong et al., 1996). Further, a national survey of school principals and Title I district coordinators indicates that the role of districts in the implementation of schoolwide programs varies greatly (Schenck & Beckstrom, 1993). Because schoolwide programs endeavor to support school-level, shared decision-making, the most appropriate role of the district is unclear. Evaluations should continue to explore the role of school districts and how they affect the implementation and effectiveness of schoolwide programs.

Because there is great flexibility afforded to

schools with schoolwide programs, more attention should be given to the process through which changes at the school level—resulting from schoolwide program implementation—affect student performance. Because case studies of schoolwide programs indicate great variability in program implementation both within programs and across programs (Stringfield et al., 1994), studies that aggregate findings across schools that use diverse strategies within their schoolwide programs may reveal relatively little about the specific components related to schoolwide program effectiveness. Evaluations need to pursue a better understanding of particular characteristics of schoolwide programs and the mechanisms through which they might lead to changes in educational outcomes.

Policy Implications for School Improvement

Schoolwide programs have the potential to address three interrelated challenges in the nation's most disadvantaged schools. First, schoolwide programs provide increased flexibility to school site professionals to address the concentration effects of disadvantaged pupils in poor neighborhoods. Second, schoolwide programs can reduce curricular and instructional fragmentation in the classroom. Third, and of immediate interest to national policymakers, schoolwide programs are designed to improve accountability at a time when there is growing public concern over the general quality of public education.

Federal legislative expectations for Title I programs have recently been expanded to include chal-

aluation

from these cau-
beyond the ini-
implementation
er to capture ef-
t during the first
ison groups and
ill also increase
ons. The variety

lenging state content and performance standards (U.S. Department of Education, 1996). States are expected to establish content and performance standards for Title I students that reflect the same knowledge, skill, and performance levels that are expected of all children. Title I program services need to also be aligned with the state content standards, and states are expected to develop or adopt student assessments that are aligned with their content and performance standards. Schoolwide programs offer one organizational mechanism through which these new legislative expectations can be met. Further, schoolwide program schools and districts can use the implementation of schoolwide programs and the associated accountability requirements as an opportunity to consider expanding the ways in which evaluation and assessment are used. For example, student assessment for Title I accountability purposes can also be used to guide instruction and improve teaching practice. Increased and alternative uses of student assessments can lead to more coordination at the district level and across units and departments within schools.

Schoolwide programs also create a context in which the roles of principals and district staff can be reevaluated. As discussed, most schoolwide program schools have spent relatively short periods of time planning before implementation and have received mixed levels of support from the district level. Further, there is evidence that schoolwide programs have increased staff development activities. Districts might use the transition to schoolwide programs as an opportunity to refine their support to schools for staff development, for example, by focusing on methods for phasing out pull-out programs or for integrating traditional Title I reading and math curricula with that of the whole school.

The opportunity to redefine decision-making roles at the school can also facilitate the creation of new structures that better serve students. For example, expanded teacher input into school decisions can be combined with efforts to create professional networks that encourage teachers to buy into aspects of the schoolwide program approach and cultivate changes at the classroom level. Similarly, schoolwide programs offer opportunities to explore broader governance issues. For example, alternative approaches to the functions of and relationships between the district, school, and classroom can be explored as well as particular types of parental involvement.

The research on the effectiveness of Title I

schoolwide programs in terms of student performance has yielded mixed and inconclusive results. It is clear that the adoption of Title I schoolwide programs by schools and districts has been much faster than the availability of evaluation findings about their effectiveness. Despite the fact that there were over 8,000 schoolwide programs operating in 1996, only a handful of sites have disseminated reliable evaluation data. Thus, although the data presented here do not offer compelling evidence for or against schoolwide programs, it should be noted that these reflect only a small subset of the schoolwide programs operating in the nation. It is therefore critical that reliable longitudinal evaluations continue to be conducted beyond this initial phase. As schoolwide programs continue to be developed and implemented and as state content and performance standards begin to be implemented more widely, they will offer continued opportunities to study how schoolwide programs affect schools and students.

APPENDIX

District-Level Studies of Program Effectiveness and Student Performance

Houston Independent School District (Nechworth et al., 1990)

The Houston Independent School District conducted an analysis of the effects of schoolwide programs on reading and math achievement gain scores using data from the 1989–1990 school year. Data from a total of 42 schoolwide programs and 68 non-schoolwide programs were analyzed. Scores from students in grades two through five in both schoolwide and non-schoolwide programs schools were compared. Few significant differences were found, and where they were apparent, they were small. For non-limited-English-proficiency (LEP) students, slight significant differences were found that favored the non-schoolwide programs. In grade two, both reading and math scores were significantly higher for students in non-schoolwide program schools. In grade four, one of the two math scores was significantly higher for students in non-schoolwide program schools. And when data from grades two through five were pooled, the math scores for students in non-schoolwide program schools were significantly higher. Using a different assessment tool for LEP students, the study found no significant differences in reading scores between students in the two types of schools and found only slight significant differences in math scores, which again favored non-schoolwide program schools.

*Unidentified Major Urban School District
(Winfield & Hawkins, 1993)*

Another analysis, based on student data records from 40 schoolwide program schools and 20 matched non-schoolwide program schools in a major urban school district, yielded mixed effects. Data were analyzed for students who entered the first grade in the 1986–1987 school year through their fifth-grade year (1990–1991). A regression analysis was conducted for each grade level using a school's status as either a schoolwide or a non-schoolwide program school as a predictor of student achievement scores in reading. The analysis showed a mixed effect of schoolwide program status, finding significant differences in reading scores only for two grade levels—positive and negative effects on reading achievement scores for grades two and three, respectively.

A second analysis, featured in the same report, was conducted using student data records for the school years 1986–1987 through 1990–1991 and survey data (collected during the 1989–1990 school year) from 40 schoolwide programs in a major urban school district. This study linked student characteristics and components of schoolwide programs to student reading achievement scores. Three general categories of schoolwide program components were identified: (a) "school district framework" (e.g., inclusion of a school community coordinator), (b) "resource allocation" (e.g., providing classroom assistants), and (c) "existing programs" (e.g., computer lab). The total number of components within each category was added to create a scale indicating the presence of these components in sample schools. Several other components of schoolwide programs were measured using scales constructed from items on a questionnaire completed by principals including degree of teacher involvement in decisions about how human resources are used, degree of teacher involvement in selecting basic material and purchasing instructional tools, degree of parent involvement in various types of activities, and percent of parents who attended parent-teacher conferences.

The variables were entered into a regression equation using average student reading achievement scores for grades one through five as a dependent variable. The analysis adjusted for length of schoolwide program implementation and for other contextual and demographic characteristics of students and schools. Although no effect sizes were large, there were a number of significant effects. The components that appear to have had the strongest effect are those included in the "district framework" category—having had significant positive effects in all five grades except grade three, in which the effect was significantly negative. The "resource allocation" and "existing programs" categories of components each also showed significant effects in at least two of the five grades: Effects were positive for "existing programs" and mixed for "resource allocation."

The effects of teacher involvement in decisions about instructional resources, parent involvement, and parent conference attendance on student reading achievement were also significant (indicating both negative and positive effects) for at least two of the five grades. Teacher involvement in selection of materials had a significant positive effect in only one of the five grades.

*School District of Philadelphia (Davidoff &
Pierson, 1991)*

The School District of Philadelphia conducted a number of analyses that consider the question of schoolwide program effectiveness. One study uses data from a sample of 62 schoolwide program schools and 66 non-schoolwide program schools for the school years 1985–1986 through 1990–1991. The study considers the impact of the schoolwide programs on student achievement in reading and math, report card marks, and average daily attendance.

These analyses indicated that, for both reading and math, most evidence favored the schoolwide program sites over other Title I schools. Four measures of student achievement were considered based on the statutory goals required of Title I schools by the state of Pennsylvania during the 1988–1989 school year. Comparing the four measures for both schoolwide and non-schoolwide program sites, the study found that a higher percentage of schoolwide program sites met each of the four state-established criteria for reading achievement than did non-schoolwide program sites. In mathematics, however, the percentage of schoolwide program sites was higher for only three out of the four criteria.

In another comparison, the percentage of students with higher posttest scores in reading and math (administered in spring 1989 and spring 1990) and the average NCE gain scores for each grade from one through eight were considered. These two indicators were compared for schoolwide programs versus all other Title I reading services. The comparison of the percentages of students with higher posttest scores in reading favored schoolwide programs in six of the eight grades. The comparison of average NCE gain scores in reading favored schoolwide programs in five of the eight grades. The results were similar for math, favoring schoolwide programs in six of the grades and seven of the grades for percent higher posttest scores and average NCE gain scores, respectively.

Other analyses that compared student performance in schoolwide program schools before and after schoolwide program implementation also supported schoolwide program effectiveness. Another analysis considered report card marks of students in schoolwide program schools, finding that in the majority of the 37 Cohort I schoolwide program schools in each curricular area (reading, math, science, and social studies) the percentage of students receiving a grade of "A," "B," or "C" increased

after schoolwide program implementation. Comparing achievement gains in reading and math for the period before and after the implementation schoolwide programs, however, yielded less compelling findings about their effectiveness. In reading, 21 of the 37 Cohort 1 schools (grades two through eight) demonstrated achievement gains as a schoolwide program that exceeded those during the three previous pre-program years. In math, only 9 of the 37 schools demonstrated such achievement gains. Finally, 28 of the 37 Cohort 1 schools had improved their attendance since becoming schoolwide programs.

Houston and Minneapolis School Districts (Wong et al., 1996)

This analysis compared the achievement scores of students in the school districts of Houston and Minneapolis. Data representing students from 35 schools (4 with schoolwide programs) in Minneapolis for the school years 1989–1990 through 1992–1993 were analyzed. A subsample was created that consisted of students who started the first grade in 1989 and remained in the same school until the third grade. Students were classified into six groups according to type of school (schoolwide program, advantaged Title I, or disadvantaged Title I) and student eligibility (Title I eligible or Title I ineligible). Average NCE gain scores for reading and math were compared across the six student groups for the years 1990–1993. An analysis of variance (ANOVA) found no significant differences between mean gain scores for students attending different types of schools. Comparison of trends in NCE test scores over a period of three years, however, suggested a narrowing of the gap between the performance of students in schoolwide programs and students in other types of schools over time.

Data from 164 schools (116 with schoolwide programs) in Houston for the school years 1993–1994 and 1994–1995 were also analyzed. A subsample was created that consisted of students who started the third grade in 1993 and remained in the same school until the fourth grade (1993 cohort). Again students were classified into six groups according to type of school (schoolwide program, advantaged Title I, or disadvantaged Title I) and student eligibility (Title I eligible or Title I ineligible). Average NCE gain scores for reading and math were compared across the six student groups for the years 1993–1994. An ANOVA found no significant differences in the rate of academic growth among the six groups of students in reading, however, there were significant differences in math.

A hierarchical linear model (HLM) was also used to analyze NCE test scores for the Minneapolis and Houston samples to determine the effects of schoolwide programs on student learning. At the student level, NCE gain scores were modeled as a function of starting scores, Title I

eligibility, race/ethnicity, and poverty. At the school level, the average gain scores, effect of starting scores, Title I gap, minority gap, and poverty gap were modeled as a function of schoolwide program status (i.e., whether or not a school has implemented a schoolwide program). For students in the Minneapolis School District, when the effect of school type on academic growth was considered, no significant differences in average gain scores between schoolwide programs and non-schoolwide programs were found. When controlling for racial/ethnic and social backgrounds, however, schoolwide program status contributed to equalizing differences in academic gains in math between Title I-eligible and ineligible students. In other words, the gap between the math gain scores of Title I-eligible students and ineligible students was significantly smaller in schoolwide program schools.

In the Houston School District, there were no significant differences in average gain scores between schoolwide programs and non-schoolwide programs when controlling for racial/ethnic and social backgrounds. The gap between the math gain scores of Title I-eligible and Title I-ineligible students, however, was significantly smaller in non-schoolwide program schools. In addition, the performance gap in math was significantly larger (i.e., the impact of starting scores on gain scores was greater) in schoolwide programs than in non-schoolwide program schools.

Notes

This research is supported in part by the Mid-Atlantic Regional Laboratory for Student Success at the Center for Research in Human Development and Education, Temple University, and by Grant No. SBR9515136 of the National Science Foundation.

¹The federal compensatory education program known as Title I was renamed in the 1980s as the Chapter I program before returning to its original name in 1994. For simplicity, this article refers to the program as Title I throughout.

²Several research studies related to Title I produced more than one report of their findings—some of which present little or no information related to schoolwide programs in particular. Thus, in some cases, findings are presented from a subset of a study's publications.

³Normal curve equivalent (NCE) scores are a type of standardized score, which range from 1 to 99, with a mean of 50 and a standard deviation of about 21. NCE scores allow for comparison across students and tests. The NCE gain scores used in these evaluations are computed by subtracting student pretest from student posttest scores. Although gain scores are frequently used to measure individual growth in student achievement, they reflect the measurement error of both the pretest and posttest scores and should be interpreted with caution.

"The Title I legislation requires that local education agencies and schools receiving Title I funds be reviewed annually to determine whether they are making "adequate yearly progress," defined as "continuous and substantial yearly improvement toward the goal of all students meeting the state's proficient and advanced levels of performance." Schools that fail to demonstrate adequate yearly progress for two consecutive years are identified for "program improvement" and then receive state and local support to improve their instructional programs.

⁵By the end of three years, schoolwide program schools are expected to demonstrate that they have improved the achievement of educationally disadvantaged students more effectively than a traditional Title I program.

"Components of effective schools include strong instructional leadership at the school level, high expectations for all students, a safe and orderly school climate, increased academic learning time, and frequent and consistent evaluation of student progress (see Committee on Education and Labor, 1992).

⁶"Title I-ineligible students in schoolwide program schools" refers to those students who would have been ineligible (according to the schools' eligibility criteria) for Title I services if the school were operating a traditional Title I program.

⁷Of the evaluation studies that compare student performance in schoolwide program schools to schools with traditional Title I programs, all but one (Wong et al. 1996) consider scores for all students in the school rather than for those students who would have been eligible to receive Title I services in a traditional program.

References

- Commission on Chapter I. (1992). *Making schools work for children in poverty*. Washington, DC: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives. (1992). *School Improvement Act of 1987, report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Davidoff, S. H., & Pierson, E. M. (1991, April). *A continued look at the promise of schoolwide projects*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago.
- Glass, G. V., & Smith, M. (1977). *Pullout in compensatory education*. Boulder, CO: University of Colorado, Laboratory of Educational Research.
- Kirst, M. (1988). The federal role and Chapter I: Rethinking some basic assumptions. In D. Doyle & B. Cooper (Eds.), *Federal aid to the disadvantaged: What future for Chapter I?* (pp. 97-115). London: Falmer Press.
- Leinhardt, G., Bickel, W., & Palley, A. (1982). Unlabeled but still entitled: Toward more effective remediation. *Teachers College Record*, 84(2), 129-151.
- Millsap, M. A., Moss, M., & Gamse, B. (1993). *The Chapter I implementation study: Final report*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- Millsap, M. A., Turnbull, B., Moss, M., Brigham, N., Gamse, B., & Marks, E. (1992). *The Chapter I implementation study: Interim report*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates.
- National Association of State Coordinators of Compensatory Education. (1996). *Distinguished schools report 1995-1996 school year: Title I schoolwide projects*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Nechworth, J., Cisneros, E., Sanchez, K. S. (1990). *Chapter I instructional program: Final report 1989/90*. Houston, TX: Houston Independent School District.
- Philadelphia School District. (1992, April). *The moment of truth: Year three continuation for schoolwide projects*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Puma, M. J., Jones, C., Rock, C. C., & Fernandez, R. (1993). *Prospects: The congressionally mandated study of educational growth and opportunity, the interim report*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.
- Puma, M. J., Karweit, N., Price, C., Ricciuti, A., Thompson, W., Vaden-Kiernan, M. (1997). *Prospects: Final report on student outcomes*. Bethesda, MD: Abt Associates.
- Schenck, E. A., & Beckstrom, S. (1993). *Chapter I schoolwide project study: Final report*. Hampton, NH: RMC Research Corporation.
- Sinclair, B., & Gutmann, B. (1996). *State Chapter I participation and achievement information 1993-94: Summary report*. Rockville, MD: Westat, Inc.
- Slavin, R. E., Madden, N. A., Dolan, L. J., Wasik, B. A., Ross, S., Smith, L., & Dianda, M. (1996). Success for all: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 1(1), 41-76.
- Stringfield, S., Millsap, M. A., Herman, R., Yoder, N., Brigham, N., Nesselrodt, P., Schaffer, E., Karweit, N., Levin, M., & Stevens, R. (1997). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: Final report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Stringfield, S., Winfield, L., Millsap, M. A., Puma, M. J., Gamse, B., & Randall, B. (1994). *Urban and suburban/rural special strategies for educating disadvantaged children: First year report*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.
- Turnbull, B. J., Wechsler, M. E., & Rosenthal, E. D. (1992). *Chapter I under the 1988 amendments: Implementation from the state vantage point*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.
- Turnbull, B. J., Zeldin, S., & Cain, T. (1990). *State administration of the amended Chapter I program*. Washington, DC: Policy Studies Associates.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1992). *National assess-*

- ment of the Chapter 1 program: The interim report. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1993a). *Reinventing Chapter 1: The current Chapter 1 program and new directions, final report of the national assessment of the chapter program*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1993b). *Reinforcing the promise, reforming the paradigm: Report of the Advisory Committee on Testing in Chapter 1*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. Department of Education. (1996). *Mapping out the assessment of Title I: The interim report*. Washington, DC: Author.
- U.S. General Accounting Office. (1992). *Remedial education: Modifying Chapter 1 formula would target more funds to those most in need*. Washington, DC: Author.
- Winfield, L. F., & Hawkins, R. (1993). *Longitudinal effects of Chapter 1 schoolwide projects on the achievement of disadvantaged students*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Winfield, L. F., Hawkins, R., & Stringfield, S. (1992). *A description of Chapter 1 schoolwide projects and effects on student achievement in six case study schools*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University.
- Wang, M. C., & Wong, K. K. (Eds.). (1997). *Implementing school reform: Practice and policy perspectives*. Philadelphia: Temple University Center for Research in Human Development and Education.
- Wong, K. K., Sunderman, G. L., & Lee, J. (1996). *Redesigning the federal compensatory education program:*

Lessons from the implementation of Title I schoolwide projects (Report submitted to the National Center on Education and the Inner Cities at Temple University). Chicago: University of Chicago. Department of Education.

Wong, K. K., & Wang, M. C., (Eds.). (1994). *Rethinking policy for at-risk students*. Berkeley, CA: McCutchan Publishing Corporation.

Authors

KENNETH K. WONG is an associate professor at the University of Chicago, Department of Education, 5835 S. Kimbark Avenue, Chicago, IL 60637. His primary interests are educational politics, policy, and reform in school governance. His current research projects examine educational reform in Birmingham (England) and Chicago as well as whole-school reforms in inner-city schools.

STEPHEN J. MEYER is a doctoral student at the University of Chicago, Department of Education, and a senior research analyst at the Chapin Hall Center for Children, 1313 E. 60th Street, Chicago, IL 60637. His areas of interest are education policy, evaluation methods, and the relationship between schools and communities.

Manuscript received June 26, 1997

Revision received January 26, 1998

Accepted February 3, 1998

Author: Ann O'Leary at Wdcb04
Date: 11/14/98 04:25 PM
Priority: Normal
TO: Wendy New at WDCJ02
CC: Susan Wilhelm at WDCJ03, Judith Johnson at WDCJ03
Subject: Re: schoolwide paper

Wendy Jo -

Thank you for passing this along. I have read it and am now passing it on to Mike to read. I will get back to you shortly with his comments.

My comments:

I think it is a very good paper that raises the right issues. I still have some question about the capacity of States and external providers' ability/capacity to provide the type of technical assistance and support that schoolwides need, but I think this issue should be addressed in our technical assistance paper. I know you will be in Denver when we meet with the t.a. group, but I will raise this issue.

A couple of other brief comments:

(1) In the recent Wong/Meyer article on schoolwides, they cited research that over 50% of schoolwides take less than 6 months to plan.

Would it be possible/desirable to provide eligible schoolwides with funding for planning to conduct the needs assessment and develop the plan for a comprehensive research-based design with continuous improvement?

*ok but
in 6 mos. a
problem? -
How long
does it
take?*

Good

(2) They also cited that schools that received information from States and Districts on eligibility and initial information about implementation, were more likely to begin ~~and~~ schoolwide program and were more likely to demonstrate characteristics of successful schoolwides. I think it would be helpful to specifically require States to provide initial information to ALL eligible schoolwides.

(3) One question that I had was whether the option to create a Comprehensive School Reform Challenge Fund would replace and build upon CSRD or would be in addition to CSRD.

(4) On the issue of whether schoolwides are effectively serving special populations, e.g. LEP students, you mention that you are consulting with OBEMLA and OSERS. This issue is one that seems to be coming up consistently as we talk to folks and in articles that I have read. It also seems that with the political focus on how we serve LEP students that this issue will be a hot one. Is someone from OBEMLA/OSERS (and OERI) assigned to this issue? Although, I know the research is very limited, I think it would be helpful for us to read about/see models of schoolwides that are effectively serving special populations. Do we have such examples? And, if so, can we draw upon them to inform this issue?

*Co-ordinator
over 12 hrs -
Some real
disagreement,
however, with
don't
read
show?*

Thanks for all of your hard work. I will get back to you soon with Mike's comments. In the meantime, let me know if there is anything I can do to help.

-Ann

*Jo
for
with
CSRD
over
A*

SCHOOLWIDE PROGRAMS AS A STRATEGY FOR REFORM

Title I schools with at least 50% poverty are eligible to conduct schoolwide programs, as authorized in section 1114 of Title I. Schoolwide programs are intended to address the educational needs of children living in impoverished communities by supporting comprehensive strategies for improving the whole school so every student, including the lowest achieving students, achieves high levels of academic proficiency.

The 1994 reauthorization of ESEA gave schools serving low-income students greater flexibility to systematically assess the whole school's educational needs and design schoolwide solutions.

- This increase in flexibility was justified based on earlier findings that Chapter 1 was operating as an add-on program that worked on the margins; that as a supplementary program, Chapter 1 had little effect on the regular program of instruction; that Chapter 1 did not contribute to high-quality instruction; and that Chapter 1 was not tied to state and local reform efforts. [See IASA Prospectus, p. Title 1-4 and 5]
- This flexibility has also resulted in a remarkable growth in schoolwide programs. In 1994-95, 5,050 Title I schools operated schoolwide programs (projects) [Chapter 1 participation report]. By 1997-98 the total grew close to approximately 16,000 of all Title I schools [Follow-up School survey (draft)]. [Note: Some work is currently underway to get more accurate numbers for operating and eligible schoolwides.]

Finally, schoolwide programs may combine most Federal education program resources with state and local resources to upgrade the effectiveness of the entire school program. Schools are not required to identify children as eligible for particular services or track the combined federal resources to particular children or services. Rather, they may use the combined resources to improve the school's educational program while meeting the intent and purposes of the programs for which funds are allocated.

Overall assumptions and questions:

Schoolwide programs for high poverty schools are viewed as the option that will best allow for comprehensive school reform and better educate children attending such schools, particularly the targeted populations for whom Federal funds are allocated. We support the notion of challenging standards for all children. We support comprehensive school reform. How can the legislation strengthen schoolwide programs as a tool for reform? Is there some lever that can be incorporated in the legislation to encourage best (better) practice?

The current legislation on schoolwide programs incorporated what was learned about effective school practice and from the evaluation on past schoolwide projects. The schoolwide components and plan reflect these lessons and are attached for reference. [See section 1114 of

Title I]

Recent research supports an emphasis on schoolwide programs by demonstrating that the goal of academic success for all students requires special support that comes when resources, practices, and procedures are coordinated across an entire school. Common characteristics of effective schoolwide programs include: [all cited from Vol. 1 of the SWP Idea Book, pp. 9-11]

- Comprehensive planning, which reflects the priorities of the school community and is informed by data regarding student needs and achievement (SWP Idea Book, Vol.1),
- Attention to specific curriculum improvement in all academic subjects, which is coupled with comprehensive planning efforts and support for instructional staff (Fashola and Slavin, 1998 and Herman and Stringfield, 1997-CRESPAR, Johns Hopkins Univ.; and Wang, Haertel and Walberg, 1997, Mid-Atlantic Laboratory for Student Success, Temple University),
- A commitment to seeing that all students achieve at their fullest potential (Charles Dana Center/Joe Johnson, 1997), and
- Accountability and a process for continuous improvement (SWP Idea Book, Vol. 1).

The full potential for schoolwide programs to incorporate comprehensive strategies designed to support all students in reaching high standards has not been fully realized. [93% of principals report using Title I funds to improve the entire educational program in a school yet we do not yet have evidence that they are implementing the strategies for school reform, and 83% use funds to provide professional development. Schoolwide programs also use Title I funds for more traditional strategies, including: serving targeted children in a pull-out setting--51%; serve targeted children in an in-class setting--81% (same % as TAS); use Title I funds to support extended time learning--49%. (Draft tabulations, Follow-up Survey of Schools--school year 1997-98)]

1 Issue: Should schoolwide program eligibility be availed only to schools above a certain poverty threshold, or should all Title I schools be eligible?

Status: Under Chapter 1, schools that had at least 75% poverty were allowed to conduct schoolwide projects. By the end of the Chapter 1 authorization, approximately 8,000 schools were operating schoolwide projects. Under the current law, the poverty threshold for eligibility was lowered to 60% for the 1995-95 school year and to 50% for subsequent years. According to our latest information, there are approximately 22,000 Title I schools now eligible to conduct schoolwide programs with approximately 16,000 of those that have chosen to operate them.

In 1997-98, 80% of the highest poverty schools (w/75 or >% children eligible for free/reduced lunch) and 66% of schools (w/50-74.9% of children eligible for free/reduced lunch) operated

schoolwide programs.

RECOMMENDATION: Maintain the current schoolwide eligibility threshold at 50% poverty. [Although Core Group agreed with this recommendation, it still warrants a conversation with Mike and Mary Jean at the table.]

Pro: Schoolwide programs were intended for very high poverty schools with the rationale that the higher the concentration of poverty, the higher the likelihood of a high degree of educational deprivation. Therefore, it seems to make less sense to target funds and separate services on a very large population of students rather than improving the entire educational program in a school for the entire population, including low-achieving students.

Pro: Concentrating on making existing schoolwide programs successful can have a positive influence on other Title I and non-Title I schools by interesting them to become part of a comprehensive reform effort.

Pro: There is not enough evidence to demonstrate that the number of schoolwide programs currently operating are having the intended impact—increased student achievement for our neediest population.

Pro: The existing capacity to provide meaningful assistance and support to schools currently operating schoolwide programs is inadequate.

Con: 35% is considered a poverty cut-off for Title I general eligibility purposes so some could argue that it should be considered so for schoolwide programs, as well.

Con: Schoolwide programs provide the most flexible opportunity for schools to use Federal education funds with state and local resources to comprehensively reform a school.

Con: By moving to a schoolwide approach, more schools will do comprehensive needs assessments and develop programs that address those needs. Presumably, special strategies would have to be identified for students with the greatest needs. Allowing funds to be used in schoolwide programs gives schools the greatest flexibility to target their funds in ways that make the most sense for addressing the needs of the school.

2 Issue: Are there ways in which the legislation can be improved by building on some of the promising aspects of the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration (CSRD) Program legislation?

Status: The CSRD program is authorized by Public Law 105-78, the FY 1998 Department of Education Appropriations Act. The purpose of the program is to provide financial incentives for schools that need to substantially improve student achievement, particularly Title I schools, to implement comprehensive school reform programs that are based on reliable research and

effective practices. CSRD programs are intended to stimulate schoolwide change covering virtually all aspects of school operations, rather than a piecemeal, fragmented approach to reform. Likewise, schoolwide program legislation is also intended for Title I high poverty schools to comprehensively upgrade the effectiveness of the entire school program to raise the achievement of each student, particularly low achieving students, to reach the challenging standards. CSRD legislation builds on the schoolwide program concept currently authorized in ESEA. In fact, most of the components included in schoolwide program legislation and CSRD are very similar. The following recommendation builds on both pieces of legislation to provide an approach that will better produce the intended impact of schoolwide programs.

RECOMMENDATION: Along with the other recommendations in this paper, this recommendation focuses on central themes of schoolwide programs and presents key elements to comprise the body of the schoolwide program legislation.

Central Themes of the Schoolwide Proposal

1. Clarifying that schoolwide programs are for overall comprehensive reform, particularly for improving the achievement of our lowest-achieving students in high poverty schools. This proposal emphasizes the need for the schoolwide plan to cover the whole school operation, not just a particular grade, subject, or teacher. The plan would be the guiding document the school would use in articulating its vision for short-term and long-term operation. oh

2. Upgrading the quality of schoolwide programs through emphasizing data-based decision-making, research-based programs with evidence of effectiveness, ensuring that schoolwide plans will improve the core academic program for the entire school, ongoing external assistance for every school, evaluation as a tool for continuous improvement, and peer review and approval. yu

3. More clearly focusing the SEA role as one of providing technical assistance in data-based needs assessment and program evaluation, dissemination of information on research-based approaches to improving teaching and learning, and approval of schoolwide program plans. also to disseminate info. to potential eligible schoolwide schools

4. Strengthening the district role of assisting schools to adopt research-based strategies that match the needs of the school, allocating district resources to support schoolwide programs, and working with schools to ensure continuous improvement.

5. Ensuring that schoolwide programs will receive ongoing support and assistance from external sources and networks, rather than relying as heavily on the SEA school support team structure.

Key Elements of Schoolwide Proposal

PLAN: Plan Requirements – 3 Parts (Needs Assessment; Comprehensive Research-Based design; Continuous improvement) Time for planning?

- Within two years of the passage of the legislation, these requirements must be met by all schoolwide programs, including new schoolwide programs and those currently operating*:

I. Comprehensive Data-Based Needs Assessment: A school will conduct a comprehensive data-based needs assessment reflective of the entire school's impact on student achievement, including factors such as:

- Academic performance of students in relation to the state standards, including the needs of special populations in the school such as children with limited English proficiency and children with disabilities;
- First graders' reading skills as assessed through a diagnostic evaluation;
- Attendance; Dropout rate; Mobility of student population;
- Staff quality and training related to student needs;
- Classroom and school management.
- School climate; Environment; Safety and discipline;
- Class size;
- Financial and other resources;
- Technology;
- Parent and community involvement and characteristics.

Public plan - summarize to all parents - hand out all new parents

mostly this is a paper exercise! this is not the need?

II. Comprehensive, Research-Based Design With Aligned Components

- The plan must have a comprehensive design, based on the results of the school's comprehensive needs assessment, to improve teaching and learning throughout the school including, but not limited to, curriculum, instruction, assessment, classroom management, continuous professional development, parental involvement, technology and school management.
- The elements of the program must be aligned into a schoolwide reform plan designed to enable each student in the school -- including students from low-income families, students with limited English proficiency, and students with disabilities -- to meet challenging State content and student performance standards.
- The plan must:
 1. ^{Use} Utilize effective, research-based, methods and strategies*, based on data-based needs assessment, aligned with challenging state standards.
 2. Strengthen the core academic program in the school, and may include high quality extended learning opportunities beyond the regular school day or year.
 3. Address the transition of students to and from the gradespan the schoolwide program serves.
- The design for each plan shall include:

This all should be given -- not legislation

Effective, research-based methods and strategies: The plan must describe how the schoolwide program employs methods for student learning, teaching, and school management that are based on reliable research and effective practices and are appropriate for the grade span served.

Instruction by highly qualified professional staff: The plan must demonstrate that the school will employ professional staff that are most qualified to teach the skills and subjects required for all students, particularly low-achieving students, to meet the state's standards.

Professional development: The plan must describe the high-quality and continuous staff development and training, including leadership training for the principal. Such professional development will be aligned with the needs of the school determined through the needs assessment.

School support: The plan provides evidence that the schoolwide program has the informed support of the principal, school faculty, and other administrators.

Parent and community involvement: The plan must describe the meaningful involvement of all groups of parents and the local community in the planning and implementation of the schoolwide program activities. ***[Suggestion to make the language in law consistent in this and the school support component above—meaningful inv. v. informed]***

Ongoing external assistance: The plan must describe how the school, in the development and implementation of its plan, will utilize ongoing high-quality external support and assistance from educators or educational organizations with experience in schoolwide improvement, which may include universities.

Use of resources: The plan must describe how all significant resources available to the school (local, State, Federal, and private, if applicable) will be used to support and sustain the school's comprehensive improvement effort.

III. Continuous Improvement:

The plan must include measurable goals and benchmarks that include timelines against which progress will be measured in the annual review under (1116) in order to continually improve the program design and its implementation. (Law might include examples of what these would be.)

IV. Peer Review and Approval

Each schoolwide plan must be peer reviewed by a (advisory) panel of persons who are external to the school including persons independent of the LEA or SEA but may include persons from the LEA or SEA, and who are knowledgeable about school reform and successful schoolwide programs, including strategies for working with low-achieving students and the different types

of students to be served by the program. It is expected that the peer review would be distinctly separate from the ongoing technical assistance that a school should receive (see components).

Schoolwide program plans for schools identified as in need of improvement must be approved by the SEA (see State Role).

STATE ROLE: To prepare schools for becoming effective schoolwide programs, the state will:

Initial information dissemination to eligible schools
Assist schools with conducting and using a data-based needs assessment.

Disseminate information and research on effective practices and improving high-poverty and low-performing schools.

For those schools that have been identified as in need of improvement, approve schoolwide plans, taking into account feedback from the peer review and after schools have had an opportunity to make any necessary adjustments suggested by the peer review. [States have claimed that without specific authority to approve schoolwide plans, they are not easily able to require schools to upgrade their plans and programs when necessary. Furthermore, States are required to ensure proper and efficient administration of Title I funds. With such a flexible strategy, States must ensure that a schoolwide program's purpose is realized. Finally, a more formal State role will help to build a stronger, linked system—of schools, districts, and states—of support for schoolwide programs. However, State capacity is not adequate in many states to carry out an effective approval process for all schoolwide plans. Furthermore, presumably, schools that are making adequate yearly progress and that have gone through the process of developing a plan in consultation with the LEA, and have gone through a peer review process will more likely have a promising schoolwide program if implemented as designed. Therefore, this proposal now limits state approval to those schools identified for improvement.

Provide sustained intervention for schoolwide programs most in need of improvement consistent with the accountability section in the law.

DISTRICT ROLE:

The schoolwide program plan must be developed (in consultation) with the LEA.

To prepare schools for becoming effective schoolwide programs, for all schoolwide eligible schools, the district shall:

Provide information and research on effective strategies for strengthening entire schools (including rigorous curriculum and instructional and organizational practices);

Assist schools with matching research-based school reform strategies with the specific identified needs of the school (based on school and student achievement and other data), and with state standards and district goals and objectives;

Assist schools in identifying and securing appropriate, high-quality external assistance;

Support schools in allocating and using financial, personnel, and other resources available to the schoolwide program school that will enable the school to successfully implement the schoolwide plan.

Assist schools in carrying out ongoing evaluation and continuous improvement of schoolwide plans for raising student achievement.

[LEA CONSOLIDATED PLAN] This is presented here to be read with this proposal yet will be placed in an appropriate legislative section and title.

In its consolidated plan, the district must describe how it will serve as a support to schools in the development of school improvement plans, including how it will:

Assist schools with conducting and using a data-based needs assessment.

Disseminate information and research on effective practices and improving high-poverty and low-performing schools.

Assist schools with matching instructional strategies with identified needs.

Assist schools with using evaluation as a tool for continuous improvement.

Allocate federal program resources, including and in addition to Title I.]

[NOTE: PER OCTOBER 8 CORE TEAM MEETING

Overall approach/vision is acceptable. More specific items to be discussed in more depth are: Should there be a distinction in law between already existing (about 16,000) v. new (a potential of about 6,000+or – more schoolwides in terms of how much of this would apply to them?

How can the law be structured to more deliberately address the notion of “ongoing improvement” v. the perception that schools have to continually “overhaul” their school operations? We have proposed a lot of front end stuff but perhaps need to focus more on what happens once schoolwide are operating.

We refer to research-based effective practices. A potential problem could arise when the various research findings conflict.

Peer review—How to address the capacity (possible cost) problems that might arise? Structured to be a body of people that at least includes some outsiders. What if a school board wants to be that body? OK? Big authority/role issue.]

2a Issue: What incentives and assistance will be provided to schoolwide program schools to fully address the new, more rigorous requirements proposed for schoolwides.?

INCENTIVES AND START-UP ASSISTANCE

Proposal: As a companion to the new schoolwide requirements, establish a **Comprehensive School Reform Challenge Fund** that will assist up to 10,000 schools over 5 years to initiate research-based comprehensive reform efforts. The fund will play a role very similar to that currently played by the CSRD demonstration – providing an extra incentive and start-up assistance to schools that need to raise achievement and that commit to implementing genuinely high-quality, comprehensive schoolwide reform programs based on evidence of effectiveness.

Rationale: This paper proposes changes in the requirements for all schoolwide programs that reflect the more rigorous requirements of CSRD. Further incentives and support should be provided, however:

- Based on anecdotal reports from States and local school officials, the \$50,000+ per school award (per year, for up to three years) in the existing CSRD legislation appears to be serving as a surprisingly potent inducement for many districts and schools to take a fresh, methodical look at research-based, comprehensive school reform – and at what they are doing with the resources they already receive. In fact, some states are finding the approach so useful that they are developing state school improvement programs or awarding Goals 2000 funds using the CSRD criteria. Relative to the existing level of Federal investment in schoolwide programs, the leveraging impact of this additional \$50,000+ per year is a bargain, and, given its success to date, should be continued in some fashion in the reauthorization.
- Many schools will accept the new, more rigorous schoolwide requirements simply in order to retain (or obtain, for the first time) enhanced flexibility in use of funds at the building level. However, many other schools will need an extra to fully embrace the more stringent provisions. The Comprehensive School Reform Challenge Fund would hold out the promise of extra help for those that need it and develop the most rigorous proposals for improvement.
- RAND research indicates that, while the costs of designs vary considerably, “assuming effective resource allocation, the addition of \$50,000 in Obey-Porter funds will allow most Title I schools to implement comprehensive reform without needing additional resources.” Consistent with other objectives, we should continue to provide supplemental

to 100
with
1,000 schools
center
50 million

1.5 billion over
5 years

9				
200	200	200		
	200	200	200	
		100	100	100

10,000 schools

funding to assist schools with start-up costs.

- Given the Department's overall emphasis on encouraging comprehensive reform based on evidence of effectiveness, it is important to include a funding initiative that devotes substantial resources to this strategy.

Method of Distribution; Selection Criteria

As with CSRD, Comprehensive School Reform Challenge funds would be provided to states on a formula basis, with subgrants awarded by the State, in a competitive process. Awards would go to districts on behalf of specific schools proposing to implement specific comprehensive reform programs.

A critical feature of this initiative is that funds would be provided competitively, rather than to all schoolwide programs. This feature is necessary in order to motivate schools and their districts to do a rigorous job in developing their reform proposal for strengthening the entire school and for using other resources available to the school. The funds should not be viewed as an entitlement, or as a part of the base funding available to the school.

Finalists would be recommended based on the peer review process to be established by the State for all schoolwide programs, with final selections made in a process to be determined by the SEA.

Selections would be made based on the quality and coherence of the school's reform proposal, as related to the new criteria for all schoolwide programs, together with:

- The school's need for reform (focusing on student achievement in core subjects under the state's assessment/accountability system).
- Evidence of the district's commitment to provide ongoing support for comprehensive reform.
- Preference for schools that propose to work together to implement the same or similar reform efforts.

Amount of Funding, Allowable Uses

Schools (or consortia of very small schools) would receive a minimum of \$50,000 per year, up to a total of \$100,000 per year, renewable for up to three years if the school is making substantial progress in implementing its reform effort, based on implementation benchmarks described in the school's reform plan and agreed to by the State.

Schools would be allowed to use funds for the initial implementation of a comprehensive reform

program, including reform programs that the school has begun to implement within the academic year that the award is made. The state and district may not reduce their commitment of funds to support the school's reform effort as a result of the school's award.

Structure; Eligibility and Distribution of Awards:

The main part of the program (part A) would be authorized under Title I, with eligibility limited to schools that are eligible to be schoolwide programs under Title I, and that have been approved by the state to operate as schoolwides. (Schools below 50% poverty that are operating as schoolwide programs under a waiver are not eligible for Part A, but would be eligible for part B).

A parallel authority (part B) would be established under the reauthorization proposal's new reform and innovation authority or teacher quality authority. The funds under part B would be open to other Title I eligible and non-Title I schools, in order to encourage districts to support entire-school reform for schools that need it across entire districts. The basic requirements and selection process and criteria would be the same.

As with current provisions for CSRD, LEAs (or consortia of LEAs) could apply on behalf of individual schools or consortia of schools. For a consortia involving multiple very small schools, the \$50,000 minimum would apply to the consortium so long as it serves no more than 500 students.

Additional features

[Option -- The **Comprehensive School Reform Challenge Fund** could include a national leadership section, providing funding for such things as the development of state and local networks around comprehensive school reform, and funding for ongoing research and development to address the need for more and better models serve the needs of all grade levels and student populations. This could be placed in Title I or in the research and innovation portion of the proposal.]

[Option -- The **Comprehensive School Reform Challenge Fund** could also include a national competition for [10-20] **school districts** with substantial numbers/percentages of low-achieving students that want to assist their entire district, or large clusters of schools within the district, to implement research-based school reform programs. This competition would acknowledge and model the district leadership role in helping move comprehensive reform beyond "victory gardens" to more systemic improvements in local school systems. This could go in the Title I or research and innovation portion of the proposal]

3 Issue: Should persistently low-performing targeted assistance Title I schools that are eligible to conduct schoolwide programs be required to use the approach in Recommendation 2?

[Will continue to be discussed in the context of general Title I accountability.]

Pro: This would require low-performing schools to undergo a comprehensive needs assessment and get appropriate technical assistance to redesign the school by incorporating strategies that will better educate the students.

Con: Requiring this effort without adequate buy-in from the staff and community and commitment to implement the schoolwide plan will not necessarily improve the school. Without this, it could, in fact, even result in Title I having a worse impact on low-achieving students.

4 Issue: How should the ESEA legislation put more emphasis on encouraging LEA personnel and/or schoolwide programs to combine most of the Federal education program resources administered by ED with their local and State resources for the purpose of more effectively educating all students through a comprehensive design?

Status: The underlying rationale for combining resources in schoolwide programs has been that it gives schools more flexibility to operate coherent educational programs and also reduces Federal reporting burden by removing requirements that apply to individual Federal programs. Although some schoolwides have combined Federal resources to some extent and there is some indication that more are considering it (based on verbal comments made by State and district coordinators), the majority of schoolwide programs are primarily relying on Federal Title I, Part A resources. Not only does the law provide the authority combining most Federal education funds with state and local resources, but we have issued regulations, a Federal Register Notice, lengthy nonregulatory guidance that is easy to read and contains some examples, Crosscutting ESEA Guidance: Companion Document (all of this is on the Internet), are issuing Schoolwide Idea Books, and have had many conferences throughout the country that included schoolwide programs as a topic, etc. Furthermore, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act Amendments of 1997 (IDEA 97) specifically authorized the use of a proportionate amount of IDEA funds for schoolwide programs.

Despite these efforts, a survey of schoolwide programs serving migrant children found that only about one-third combined Migrant Education Program funds with other federal, state, and local resources. Schools that combined MEP funds in their schoolwide programs were much more likely to address the needs of migrant students specifically in their schoolwide program plans. Key reasons identified by schools for not combining MEP funds in their schoolwide programs include:

- Most MEP funds were spent at the district level and were not available to individual school;
- The amount of MEP money available to schools was too small to make much of a difference in the overall educational program of the school;
- Migrant program staff and school administrators were concerned about maintaining

accountability for MEP funds; and

- Migrant program, district and school staff were hesitant to eliminate all categorical “separate” services for students in need because they were concerned that their needs might be overlooked. [Meeting the Needs of Migrant Students in Schoolwide Programs, draft.]

The above identified issues are not necessarily unique to the Migrant program. The same finding could be true for Titles II, IV, and VI. Later this Fall, we will have data to inform us of this.

Maybe it is OK for special pops - LEP, MEP - anecdotal evidence & research synthesis by Wong & Meyer suggest that student not in need to address immediate might not be getting involved

Obstacles to reform:

Combining resources in schoolwide programs continues to be perceived as a Title I program feature, rather than as a general mechanism for using Federal funds more effectively.

Perception/fear that special needs of specific populations will not be addressed within schoolwide programs. *OK*
→ how can we address this problem?

Perception that needs of students with few or no Federal program funds need not be included in comprehensive schoolwide planning.

Lack of a consistent message from ED to the field.

Fear of audits even though the audit compliance supplement is very clear about what auditors will look at with respect to schoolwide programs.

Independent auditors (and otherwise) not using the audit compliance supplement.

State and local laws, regulations, and policies that impede implementation of schoolwide programs.

The flexibility argument for combining funds is sometimes outweighed by other aspects; i.e., perception that amounts of Federal funds to combine are too small.

State and/or district accounting systems that have not been updated to accommodate schoolwide programs.

Lack of leadership in some states and districts to support schoolwide programs.

Perception that schoolwide programs serve a useful purpose as only an administrative convenience.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

Maintain current legislation with the suggested refinements. Additionally, give schoolwide programs more visibility in ESEA legislation by including complementary provisions (beyond a cite) referencing schoolwide programs in other program legislation besides Title I (e.g., stating that the different program funds may be combined with local and state resources for the schoolwide program effort). Include in the purpose statement of the legislation a strong statement supporting schoolwide programs.

- Pro:** The legislation is sound--based on research and past schoolwide project practice--and in terms of provisions, this would better balance the entire legislation to comprehensively support comprehensive reform.
- Pro:** From initial findings, implementation-not legislation-appears to warrant additional effort.
- Pro:** Efficiency of scale is realized when many pots of money are used collectively for an overall program and purpose.
- Pro:** The placement of authority to conduct schoolwide programs will make clear that they are a strategy option for Title I schools.
- Con:** Because most of the legislative provisions are placed in Title I, the programs are viewed only as Title I-funded programs.
- Con:** Without altering more of the legislation, the risk is high that progress will remain status quo.
- Con:** Depending on one's role at an SEA or LEA (or ED), the entire law is not necessarily read and understood which is necessary when complementary provisions are placed throughout the law.

5 Issue: Should there be an accountability requirement for schoolwide programs separate from the State's accountability system linked with standards and assessments?

Status: Under Chapter 1, section 1015(e) required schoolwide project schools to meet a specific accountability requirement at the end of a three-year period in order to continue as schoolwide projects for another three-year period.

Under Title I, section 1114(c) states, "A schoolwide program under this section shall be subject to the school improvement provisions of section 1116." Therefore, schoolwide programs are currently subject to the same accountability requirements that apply to Title I targeted assistance schools, not to a separate schoolwide program requirement. The current law removed the

separate schoolwide accountability provision anticipating that schools in need of improvement would receive sufficient support to design and implement a program that would best meet the needs of the children. Therefore, rather than having a low-performing schoolwide program revert to a targeted assistance strategy, States and districts (and other outside technical assistance providers) are to help low-performing schoolwide program schools to improve their schoolwide design.

- 50% of principals in schoolwide programs reported that they utilize assessments to a great extent that are used for school accountability and continuous improvement. This compares with 38% of principals in targeted assistance schools. [Follow-up school Survey]

Obstacles to reform:

State systems of support, required under section 1117, have not been sufficiently established to carry out their role--to provide information and assistance to schoolwide programs and to assist them in providing an opportunity to all students to meet the State's student performance standards.

States that have fully established systems of support do not have the capacity--funds, time, people-- to provide full assistance to all schoolwide programs. *> with extreme penalties*

Many schoolwide programs are poorly designed and have little promise of producing improved student achievement. In theory, school support teams will have helped the school design a "schoolwide" plan. In reality, this is not always possible and there is no direct plan approval authority in the legislation.

State and local laws, regulations, and policies that are more restrictive than the flexibilities provided to schoolwide programs through federal legislation have impeded schools' ability to fully implement schoolwide programs.

RECOMMENDATION:

Maintain the general applicability of the Title I accountability requirements for schoolwide programs.

Pro: This will support the standards, assessment, and accountability approach established in the law while helping to ensure a schoolwide program plan is designed to better assist the lowest achieving students.

Pro: This supports a single standards, assessment, and accountability system established by the State for all schools, including those that operate schoolwide programs.

Con: Without specified targeted support for particular targeted populations, it has not been simple to demonstrate schoolwide programs are having a positive impact on the intended beneficiaries.

6 Issue: How can the legislation be improved to better ensure that schoolwide programs more specifically address the needs of special populations--e.g., LEP and special education students? ✓

Note: By the time this law is enacted, states are to have final assessment systems in place. Therefore, disaggregation of achievement data by various targeted groups of children will (should) be available since it will be a requirement.] [In 1997-98, 68% of principals in schoolwide programs reported that their schools' reading results are disaggregated by race/ethnicity; 54% reported that they are disaggregated by poverty; 57% reported disaggregation by LEP status; and 53% reported disaggregation by disabling condition. [Follow-up Survey]] and build in an improved process for ensuring quality schoolwide program plans.

Title I serves approximately 1.2 million (94-95 data) LEP children, most of whom are Hispanic. The second largest LEP group being served through Title I are Asians/Pacific Islanders. LEP students represented almost 1/3 of Title I participants and the number is rising.

Information on services provided to LEP students (as well as others) in schoolwide programs is limited because disaggregation requirements have not yet kicked in. However, preliminary information from some advocacy groups indicates that services to LEP students in schoolwide programs are not necessarily meeting their needs.

Legislative Options: We are discussing with OBEMLA and OSEP if legislative language is necessary or if this is a technical assistance issue.

7 Issue: Should a maintenance of effort requirement be included for schoolwide programs?

Status: Currently, there is no schoolwide program school maintenance of effort requirement. Under Chapter 1, there was a 100% maintenance of effort requirement that applied to schoolwide project schools. This requirement was included to ensure that from year to year, schoolwide projects received at least 100% of the funds they received in the previous year for providing free public education to children. There have been reports (yet no evidence) that districts are shifting some local/State funds from schoolwide program schools to other schools because the districts believe the schoolwide schools are getting enough federal resources and flexibility and other schools are not.

RECOMMENDATION:

Do not include a maintenance of effort requirement for schoolwide programs.

Pro: ED does not have evidence that schoolwide program schools are being provided less resources than nonschoolwide schools.

Pro: The comparability and supplement, not supplant provisions in Title I are designed to address this issues.

Pro: A maintenance of effort requirement for schoolwide programs would not necessarily ensure that schoolwide program schools are provided the same level of resources as other schools from year to year if the school got too few resources the prior year compared to other schools.

Con: Although no evidence has been provided to us, some State Title I Coordinators have indicated that a maintenance of effort is needed.

8 Issue: Should Title I targeting provisions be revised to allow LEAs to allocate more funds to schoolwide program schools if warranted by the needs assessment and schoolwide plan?

Status: Under Chapter 1, LEAs allocated Title I funds to schools based on the number and needs of educationally deprived children. This provision resulted in schoolwides receiving more funds than targeted assistance schools because all educationally deprived children in the schoolwide schools were counted. Currently, LEAs allocate Title I funds to all Title I schools on the basis of the number of poor children in the school. As a result, the funding formula treats targeted assistance schools and schoolwide program schools the same. This formula may disadvantage schoolwide programs, however, that need more funds to implement schoolwide reforms.

Legislative Option:

Allow LEAs to allocate more funds to schoolwide program schools if warranted by the needs assessment and schoolwide plan.

Pro: In order for schoolwide programs to be effective, they must have sufficient funding. Because they are reforming the whole school, they need more than targeted assistance programs.

Con: Title I alone should not be considered as the only funding source of the schoolwide program. The schoolwide program must be willing to commit other state and local resources as well in order to truly upgrade the school's program for all of its students.

[Decision was made to keep targeting as is and have this allowable through waiver.]

OUTLINE OF TEACHER QUALITY OPTION

WHY SHOULD ESEA INCLUDE A MAJOR PROVISION ADDRESSING TEACHER QUALITY?

- ❑ **STANDARDS INTO THE CLASSROOM**
 - ❑ REPORTS FROM THE FIELD SHOW THAT STANDARDS HAVE NOT YET (OR ONLY TO A MINIMAL DEGREE) REACHED THE CLASSROOM TO INFORM INSTRUCTIONAL PRACTICE
 - ❑ TEACHERS NEED TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT TO IMPLEMENT STANDARDS IN THE CLASSROOM
- ❑ **CURRENT STATE OF TEACHER QUALITY**
 - ❑ TEACHER SHORTAGES
 - ❑ UNQUALIFIED TEACHERS
 - ❑ TEACHERS TEACHING OUT-OF-FIELD
 - ❑ PARAPROFESSIONALS RESPONSIBLE FOR INSTRUCTION
 - ❑ PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT DISCONNECTED FROM INSTRUCTION
 - ❑ MINIMAL USE OF TECHNOLOGY AS A TOOL FOR IMPROVED TEACHING, PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT, AND SOLUTION TO TEACHER SHORTAGES
- ❑ **ORGANIZATIONAL BARRIERS TO TEACHER QUALITY**
 - ❑ TOO FEW PRINCIPALS WHO GUIDE SCHOOL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERS
 - ❑ SCHOOLS NOT ORGANIZED TO GIVE TEACHERS TIME FOR COLLABORATION AND SHARED ADULT LEARNING

HOW CAN ESEA BUILD ON HEA?

HEA ADDRESSED

- ❑ RECRUITMENT OF TEACHERS INTO HIGH-NEED AREAS
- ❑ BUILDING STRONGER PRE-SERVICE PROGRAMS WITH STRONG LINKAGES TO SCHOOL DISTRICTS
- ❑ STATE FUNDING FOR REFORMING LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION STANDARDS, IMPROVING ACCOUNTABILITY OF SCHOOLS OF ED, AND CREATING ALTERNATIVE PATHWAYS TO TEACHING

ESEA CAN

- ❑ REINFORCE GOALS OF HEA BY GIVING PRIORITY TO STATES THAT ARE REFORMING THEIR TEACHER EDUCATION AND LICENSURE/CERTIFICATION STANDARDS
- ❑ BUILD ON PARTNERSHIPS BY ENCOURAGING STRONG TRANSITION/INDUCTION PROGRAM WITH FUNDS FOR LEAs TO LINK WITH IHEs

WHAT ARE THE GOALS OF AN ESEA TEACHER QUALITY COMPONENT?

- ❑ ELIMINATE THE HIRING OF UNQUALIFIED TEACHERS
- ❑ ELIMINATE THE PRACTICE OF TEACHERS TEACHING OUT-OF-FIELD
- ❑ REDUCE ATTRITION RATE BY SUPPORTING TRANSITION/INDUCTION PROGRAMS
- ❑ IMPROVE PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE CORE SUBJECTS TO PROVIDE HIGH-QUALITY STANDARDS-BASED PROFESSIONAL LEARNING OPPORTUNITIES
- ❑ PROMOTE USE OF TECHNOLOGY AS A TOOL FOR PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND FOR SOLUTIONS TO FILLING SHORTAGES THROUGH DISTANCE LEARNING
- ❑ ELIMINATE THE USE OF PARAPROFESSIONALS IN INSTRUCTIONAL

WHAT UNDERLYING ASSUMPTIONS GUIDE THE ESEA TEACHER QUALITY PROPOSAL?

- ❑ ESEA SHOULD NOT DUPLICATE HEA – SUPPLEMENT NOT SUPPLANT
- ❑ RESEARCH ON TEACHER QUALITY ISSUES WILL BE DRIVEN FROM OERI, BUT STRONGER LINKAGES NEED TO BE MADE TO DISSEMINATE BEST PRACTICES TO THE FIELD

UNRESOLVED QUESTIONS:

- ❑ SHOULD ESEA PROPOSAL INCLUDE A RECRUITMENT COMPONENT?
- ❑ CAN ESEA IMPACT TEACHER SALARIES OR IS IT BEST USING THE BULLYPULPIT TO ENCOURAGE INCREASED TEACHER SALARIES?

@state grants

*② going rd to poor trans/
relating good trans*

OPTIONS FOR TEACHER QUALITY PROPOSAL

OPTION FOR ELIMINATING UNQUALIFIED TEACHERS

Problem: Nationwide, 30% of new public school teachers are hired without full certification. In addition, 28% of secondary school teachers do not have at least a minor in their main assignment field.

(Note: The term "unqualified," as used in this paper, refers to one or both of the following problems: lack of full certification or teaching out of field.)

OPTION A

No federal funds may be used to hire uncertified teachers.

exemption of teachers who are very hard to come across

Pro: (1) This requirement sends a strong message that training to become a teacher is important. (2) This would force school systems to change their policies and practices that serve as barriers to recruiting and retaining qualified teachers.

Con: (1) This requirement could be burdensome and simply lead to superficial changes and the shuffling of funds on paper – and no real change in practices. (2) It would have an adverse impact on high-poverty districts, which are most in need of federal dollars but also have the most difficult time finding qualified teachers.

Set goals for setting percentages of qualified teachers

OPTION B: ACCOUNTABILITY PROVISION

All school districts and states receiving Title I funds must publish "report cards" on teacher quality that include the percentages of uncertified and "out of field" teachers. Report cards must show the distribution of these teachers across schools and districts and be broken down by poverty level.

Pro: This requirement is one way to highlight the issue of unqualified teachers and to push states and districts to take action as people pay more attention to the issue, and as people take note of the disparities of resources within districts and states.

Con: (1) Collecting this information could be seen as burdensome. (2) This requirement could lead to further "bashing" of high-poverty districts, many of which are already under heavy criticism.

OPTION C: STATE GRANTS

Grants to states, in partnership with districts, to build the infrastructure to enable them to eliminate the hiring of unqualified teachers.

Possible uses of funds:

- Developing performance-based assessments for initial licensing of teachers that create a flexible but demanding certification process
- Creating rigorous alternative pathways into teaching such as apprenticeships
- Providing the infrastructure to use technology as a distance learning tool to bring qualified teachers into the classroom (e.g., by electronically linking a classroom that has a qualified physics teacher to a classroom without a teacher qualified to teach physics, and by providing training through technology to individuals so they can become fully qualified teachers.)
- Providing incentives for Nationally-Board certified teachers to teach in high-poverty communities
- Providing housing supplements or reducing the tax burden for teachers in high-need areas
- Implementing reforms that create more flexible schedules and promote part-time teaching (by providing medical and retirement benefits)
- Reforming hiring practices
- Improving school leadership and working conditions (creating environments conducive to teaching and learning)
- Providing incentives for teachers to become certified in a second field in which there are shortages
- Recruiting people into the profession – young people, paraprofessionals, retired military personnel, minorities, returned Peace Corps volunteers
- Providing incentives (or remove the disincentives) for good, experienced teachers to stay longer

OPTION C1

Competitive grants to states to:

- keep a portion of the funds for state-level activities; and
- provide competitive grants to districts in the state. States must serve districts with the highest needs (greatest percentage of unqualified teachers) first.

To remain eligible, states must show they are reducing the number of unqualified teachers.

Pro: Not all states are ready and willing to do the things supported by the grant, so a competitive process will allow those who are serious to apply. States would apply with a comprehensive plan that incorporates some of the allowable uses of funds.

Con: Competitive grants will not have an impact on all states. Some districts may be ready to use these funds even though their state is not.

OPTION C2

Formula grants to states to:

- keep a portion of the funds for state-level activities; and
- provide competitive grants to districts in the state. States must serve districts with the highest needs (greatest percentage of unqualified teachers) first.

To remain eligible, states must show they are reducing the number of unqualified teachers.

Pro: Formula grants will reach all states.

Con: There would be little accountability for the way states choose to use the funds.
(States wouldn't have to apply, showing their comprehensive plan.) We have never withdrawn funding from a state.

Issues to consider:

1. How can we hold states accountable for working with school districts to improve teacher quality? Since most of the funds will go to districts, there is no real incentive for states to help districts reduce their numbers of unqualified teachers.
2. There is some overlap with the new Higher Education Act, which authorizes Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants to states on a competitive basis. Strengthening teacher certification requirements and recruiting teachers are possible uses of funds. However, the focus is *not* on comprehensive plans to eliminate the hiring of unqualified teachers.

[Strengthen response
teaching force]

Can't hire

to transition

How much will it to make this work?

Timeline

Negative incentive structure
(penalty more to lower incentives - standards)

Unqualified more middle & high school?

Where is the real shortage?

In high paying, even doing is a problem

elementary - unable to pass certification

5th - suggest specific

high 20% making them not cut pass

- Does forcing as top-down as this proposal affect labor market?
Can't force the market

- difficult to implement a 5% teacher in pools still uncertain

OPTION FOR ELIMINATING THE PRACTICE OF USING PARAPROFESSIONALS AS INSTRUCTORS

Problem: The use of paraprofessionals to provide instruction to low achieving students in Title I schools when these students require instruction by the most skilled teachers in order to meet challenging standards.

Even though Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) as amended by the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) requires that Title I program use highly qualified professional staff. This particularly supports the need for the most skilled and qualified staff to work with the lowest achieving students in the most impoverished schools so those children meet challenging standards. The Final Report of the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 Program (February, 1993) reported that instructional aides accounted for about half of all Chapter 1 staff. The Final Report further revealed that most Chapter 1 aides in elementary schools have only a high school diploma. Only 13 percent have a BA or BS and just 4 percent have more advanced formal education.

During the 1997-98 school year, 69 percent of Title I schools employed aides paid (at least partially) by Title I. Fifty-nine percent of targeted assistance schools employed aides paid by Title I and 80 percent of schoolwide programs employed aides paid for by Title I. (The amount of time aides spend working directly with students (either singly or as a group) ranges from 0 to 75 percent. Ninety percent of Title I schools report that aides spend one-quarter of their time on clerical tasks and 94 percent report that aides spend one-quarter of their time working with parents.

Ninety-six percent of Title I schools that employ aides report that all aides have either a high school diploma or GED. One percent of the schools reported that 75-100 percent of their aides lacked these credentials.

Existing Title I policy encourages that instructional aides be included in Title I professional development and permits Title I funds to be used to create career ladder programs for Title I instructional aides to obtain the education necessary to become licensed and/or certified teachers.

Twenty-four percent of Title I schools report that their districts offered a career ladder for aides; fourteen percent report that their district offer release time for higher education courses; and twenty percent report that their districts offer funding for higher education. (All data (except otherwise noted from draft tabulations from the Follow-up Survey of Schools, which reports from surveys of principals regarding the 1997-98 school year.)

OPTION A:

Prohibit the use of paraprofessionals for instructional purposes in Title I schools after a specified future time. During the interim period, require Title I schools to establish career ladders systems whereby the paraprofessionals would be prepared to become

certified professional staff that can benefit the school system, particularly Title I participants. During (?) and after the phase-out period, permit the use of paraprofessionals only for administrative tasks, working with parents, or when needed for translating for students and parents who do not speak English(?) (Look at time period in class-size reduction bill and check with districts currently operating programs to see how long it takes to complete BA/certification requirements.)

Pros:

- (1) Research indicates that good instruction is key to improved student achievement. Certification, while is not the perfect solution, is basically all we have at this point for determining minimum teacher quality. (Linda Darling-Hammond)
- (2) Early findings from the Pathways to Teaching Careers Program which supports the recruitment and training of non-traditional teaching candidates, including paraprofessionals, indicates that such individuals are better teachers because of their prior classroom experience and their knowledge of the student population. They also are better able to communicate with parents. (Conversation with Beatriz Chu (Toni) Clewell, Pathways Evaluator, Urban Institute, Fall, 1997))
- (3) While some sites had difficulty getting applicants to meet traditional entrance requirements to the university generally and the teacher education program in particular, as a group, the 27 Pathways programs serving paraprofessionals and emergency-certified teachers had no problem recruiting participants for their program. Recruitment goals were exceeded by 10 percent. (Clewell, Villegas; March 1997).

Cons:

- (1) Some schools have experienced success through the use of paraprofessionals from the Title I program. *- new answer*
- (2) Restricting the use of paraprofessionals to non-instructional purposes may be viewed as limiting local flexibility and districts that receive small Title I grants may have insufficient resources to operate their Title I program and also pay for all or part of a career ladder program.
- (3) Since only four percent of the 87 percent of paraprofessionals without BA degrees, have any advance training beyond high school, the time period required for these individuals to become certified teachers could be many years.

Note: The HEA authorizes competitive grants to States for recruitment partnerships that could be used to help paraprofessionals become fully certified teachers. However, it appears that appropriations may be limited and not all states may choose to use HEA recruitment funds for these purposes.

ADDITIONAL ISSUES IF THE ANSWER TO OPTION A IS YES

(1) Should the Title I statute specify that career ladder programs contain the components which research indicates contribute to the success of these programs

Pro: The Pathways evaluation to date found that there are certain key elements that lead to the success of career ladder programs: (1) The way in which recruits are selected; (2) district-university partnerships which enable classes that address appropriate content and be offered at times that accommodate paraprofessional work hours; and (3) the availability of support services.

Cons: Could be viewed as overly prescriptive. Career ladders might not be the only strategy for helping paraprofessionals become fully certified teachers.

Question: If there is a general requirement to use research-based approaches throughout Title I or ESEA, could this be handled through guidance?

(2) If Title I institute a phase-out period after which persons employed for Title I instructional purposes must be certified staff, what funds should be used to pay for this?

OPTION 2A

Title I through current policy permits Title I funds to be used for this purpose. This policy can be continued with no changes.

Pro: Helps to support getting the most qualified staff for Title I participants.

Con: Could be seen as diverting Title I resources from direct services to Title I participants. Also, with the large number of aides currently employed (50 percent of Title I instructional staff), it would take a large amount of Title I resources to pay for college courses for all these people.

OPTION 2B

Authorize career ladders as an allowable use of funds in multiple Federal education programs (Title I, Title II, Title VII, IDEA, etc) as all such program participants would benefit from such an investment.

Pros: Helps to support getting the most qualified staff in all Federally-supported education programs.

Con: Could be seen as diverting resources from direct services to participants in each of the Federal education programs where paying for career ladders is an allowable use of funds.

OPTION 2C

Require a LEA match to be used in addition to the Federal resources to help support getting qualified staff into the LEA's most needy schools.

Pro: This supports the notion that the school district, with some support from Federal resources, is working to establish effective instructional programs for their neediest students.

Con: This could be viewed as overly burdensome since it would be a Federal requirement for a federally funded program.

(3) If the career ladder is paid for with Federal program resources (Title I, Title II), should the employee commit to working for a Federally funded program for a set number of years. (Pathways requires a three-year commitment. Need data on what other existing career ladder programs require. Is three years the commitment required for medical school loans?)

Pro: Such a commitment would be consistent with the requirement in the Perkins Loan program that offers loan forgiveness for teachers working in high poverty schools.

Con: None, particularly if the career ladder program provided the option for participants to pay the program back if he/she left earlier than the three year time period.

Option B

Require that all paraprofessionals be included in all pertinent professional development provided to teachers and all other professional staff. While Title I policy encourages paraprofessionals to be included in all professional development, the statute says that that paraprofessional are to be included in professional development to the extent feasible." The final report of the National Assessment of the Chapter 1 program found that most Title I aides received less than 35 hours of staff development in a 12-month period. (February 1993) (Check performance reports to see if there is data on paraprofessionals participating in professional development)

Pro: This option would ensure that paraprofessionals get some professional development that would enable them to better help students meet challenging State standards.

Con: Depending on the duties paraprofessionals perform, some professional development activities might not be applicable and potentially result in a waste of money and time.

OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING QUALITY OF TITLE I PROFESSIONAL STAFF

Background: The final assessment of Chapter 1 indicated that Chapter 1 teachers, at least at the elementary grades, have higher academic credentials than their regular classroom counterparts. However, teachers and aides providing Chapter 1 English as a Second Language (ESL) services are less likely to have specialist credentials in either ESL or bilingual education.

> D this
still the

Option A

Require that staff hired to teach in a Title I program are certified to teach the content areas in which the Title I participants have greatest needs.

Special education

Pro: This would help to ensure that those students performing poorly in particular content areas would receive assistance from teachers with the content knowledge necessary to provide instruction in that area.

Con: Many high poverty school districts are having problems filling teaching positions generally. Additionally, many teachers, although certified in a different content area, may be just as good at teaching a different content area.

Option B

Include a provision that allows Title I (and other--Title II?) funds to be used for signing bonuses and incentives to lure the best staff into Title I schools, including staff with ESL certification.

incentive to
lure
specialists

Pro: Often, salaries and working conditions are major reasons why staff do not choose to working in Title I schools. Additional money might sway some to agree to work in Title I schools. Ongoing incentives can help maintain the same staff at a school where they otherwise might leave after 2 or 3 years.

Con: Bonuses may be insufficient motivation to attract teachers to high poverty schools. Even incentives, if not increasingly attractive, will not keep teachers in a particular school. Also, this could be an extremely costly option over time.

OPTION C

Establish a staffing comparability requirement to ensure Title I schools are assigned the same level of staff in terms of years of teaching experience, content area specialties, college background, and performance appraisals that non-Title I schools are.

Pro: Supports highly qualified staff in all schools. Promotes a more stringent implementation of the requirement that Title I services “supplement, not supplant” other educational services.

Con: Could be viewed as Federal intrusion.

OPTION D

Require all teachers in Title I programs to receive on-going professional development in the analysis and use of assessment and evaluation data for making classroom decisions (strategies, techniques, curriculum).

Note: What ever decisions are made generally on the issue of whether professional development should be targeted to specific content areas should also apply to Title I.

OPTIONS FOR IMPROVED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING STANDARDS-BASED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN HIGH-NEED AREAS

(NEED TO ADD OPTIONS FOR DEVELOPING A NATIONAL PROGRAM BASED
ON NSF'S SSIs and USIs)

(NEED TO ADD TECHNOLOGY GRANTS TO SUPPORT PD)

OPTIONS FOR SUPPORTING NEW TEACHERS

Problem: 22% of all new teachers leave the profession in the first three years, and the rates of attrition in urban areas can reach 30% to 50% in the first five years of teaching. Many new teachers are consistently given the toughest assignments with little support or assistance. Even in those districts that do offer “induction” programs, the duration and quality can vary widely among districts, and some “programs” last only one day. Poor support for new teachers can lead to high attrition rates -- or to teachers who remain in the profession and “get by” but do not develop to their potential.

What kinds of transition programs do we want to encourage? *A high-quality transition program provides ongoing assistance and support for beginning teachers for at least one year as they assume the responsibilities of their new profession. It could include such things as extra time to plan lessons, time to observe and consult with experienced colleagues, team teaching with experienced teachers, lighter workloads, and year-long mentoring and coaching. Supporting new teachers can be built into the life of a school; it does not have to be a separate, formal “induction” program in which experienced teachers are given lighter workloads to mentor new teachers.*

OPTION A

Competitive grants to LEAs to partner with IHEs in order to create strong transition programs for new teachers

Pro: (1) helps to build the bridge between higher education and K-12 schools; (2) pushes higher education institutions to keep track of their graduates; (3) provides feedback on the quality of the teacher preparation program

Con: Slight overlap with partnerships in HEA, which can conduct induction activities. (However, induction is only a minor part of these partnerships.)

OPTION B

Competitive grants to states to do such things as:

- Develop and implement statewide transition programs that help beginning teachers develop portfolios for performance-based assessments (such as INTASC)
- Develop and implement statewide transition programs
- Provide competitive grants to districts
- Provide grants to partnerships between IHEs and LEAs

Pro: (1) These grants would be flexible and allow states to choose the best way to address the issue of support for new teachers; (2) Competitive grants would allow the Department to fund those states that have strong plans for addressing induction.

Con: Allowing statewide programs could encourage just one type of induction: the mentoring of new teachers. There are many other (perhaps better) ways to support new teachers that are much more effective at the local level.

OPTION C

(SAME AS OPTION B, EXCEPT FORMULA GRANTS)

OPTION D

Competitive grants straight to districts to:

- Restructure schools to support new teachers (e.g., by reducing beginning teachers' workloads, rewarding accomplished teachers for teaching the most challenging classes, or implementing a team-teaching structure)
- Provide for the mentoring of new teachers by master teachers

Pro: This could encourage the kind of transitioning of new teachers that works best because it is implemented at the local level and is built into the structure of schools.

Con: The Department's capacity to run competitive grant programs on a large scale to districts is questionable.

OPTIONS FOR IMPROVING PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE CORE SUBJECT AREAS FOR TEACHERS ALREADY IN THE CLASSROOM

Options for a State Formula Grant Program

Purpose and justification: The options presented here would support a State formula-grant program for professional development in the core academic subjects (math, English/reading, science, history/social studies/civics, and possibly foreign languages and art, and technology as it supports the teaching and learning of the other core subjects). The purpose of the program would be to provide highly quality, standards-based professional learning opportunities to teachers, especially to teams of teachers from Title I schools or high poverty schools. The program would seek to improve the skills and knowledge of teachers, as well as the culture and norms of schools. The program aims to do the latter by providing school-based professional development for whole schools or for subgroups of teachers within schools. The justification for having a state formula grant program is that the stability and reliability that accompanies a formula-grant program can foster long-term planning and the leveraging of other resources for professional development. (There is some evidence of this from some of the Eisenhower case studies conducted by AIR.)

Outline of Options:

I. How many programs should have authorization for professional development activities?

***Option A* (*Recommended option*): Multiple programs.** This option would continue the professional development authority for ESEA programs that currently have a professional development component, such as Title I, Title VII, Safe and Drug-Free Schools, etc. A certain percentage of each program's funds could be used for professional development activities unique to that program. There would also be a separate teacher quality program that focuses on professional development in the core academic subjects. States, districts and schools could pool funds from Title I and other programs with funds from the separate teacher quality program.

Option B: Single program. All professional development activities would be authorized in a single teacher quality program that focuses on the core academic subjects. This program could be viewed as a support for the other programs; States, districts and schools could use the funds from the teacher quality program to support professional development for teachers in Title I schools and schools that receive funds from the other Titles (programs).

Option C: Predominant program with professional development authority in a few other programs. Most professional development activities would be authorized into a single teacher quality program that focuses on the core

academic subjects. However, a few programs with professional development needs outside of the core academic subjects (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and possibly Bilingual Education) would be able to set aside a certain percentage of their funds for professional development.

II. Teacher quality professional development funds are distributed to all states through a formula.

Option A: **Formula like current Eisenhower formula.** The formula looks much like the current Eisenhower formula: 50% of the funds are distributed on the basis of the Title I funding for the previous fiscal year and 50% on the school-aged population, with no State receiving less than one-half of one percent of the total.

***Option B* (Recommended option): Formula that is more targeted to high-poverty States.** The formula is targeted more to States with more poor children: For example 60% (or so) of the funds could be distributed on the basis of the Title I funding for the previous fiscal year and 40% on the school-aged population, with no State receiving less than one-half of one percent of the total.

7 do a run

III. Should any funds be retained at the State level for administration and State-level activities?

***Option A* (Recommended option): Small % of funds allocated for State administration and small % of funds allocated for State-level activities (like current Eisenhower program).** A small proportion of funds would be available for State-level activities that would be tied to State standards and reform efforts. These funds could be used for a combination of "awareness-building" activities (statewide conferences) on state standards (and other statewide efforts), for statewide networks of teachers who could communicate regularly and work together on standards, new curriculum, and other reform efforts, or for building a state infrastructure to support professional development. We could also require that the federal funds be partly matched by other sources of funding in order to leverage State legislatures and others to support statewide professional development efforts. (The funds wouldn't necessarily have to be targeted at teachers from Title I schools, but they would have to be used in one or two of the core academic subjects. Funds would not have to remain in the same combination of subject areas for more than one program year.)

Option B: **Small percentage of funds for State-level administration, no funds for State-level activities.**

IV. After the State set aside for State administration and State-level activities, how should the remaining funds be distributed within States for the LEA and IHE parts of the program?

- Option A:** Like the current Eisenhower program, 84% of the funds would be distributed to SEAs for State- and district-level (and school-level) activities, and 16% would be distributed State Agency for Higher Education (SAHEs) (or other agency) for professional development programs offered by IHEs and NPOs.
- Option B:** Eighty percent of the appropriated funds would be distributed to SEAs for State- and district-level (and school-level) activities and 20% would be distributed to SEAs or to SAHEs (or any other agency) for distribution to IHEs and NPOs through a competitive process. (Most of us think the SEA would be the better entity to run the IHE/NPO part of the program because SEAs determine teacher certification requirements and may be in a position to better understand the needs of LEAs.)
- Option C:** Instead of allocating money to the States for them to distribute to IHEs and NPOs, ED could administer a competitive grant program where the grantees consist of IHEs and NPOs.

Under any of the options above (A, B or C) the following could hold:

SEA, SAHE or ED would award grants to IHES and/or NPOs that propose to work on an ongoing basis with neighboring districts and schools in the following areas: assisting the schools/districts in conducting needs assessment for professional development and learning how to conduct needs assessment without outside assistance; assisting schools in developing school-improvement plans that include coherent and high-quality professional development opportunities for teachers and teams of school staff; offering high-quality professional development opportunities for teachers or professional development specialists (or subject area specialists) who can work with teachers to help them improve their knowledge, skills and instructional practices.

Priorities: The legislation could give priority to grantees in rural areas (e.g. for distance learning projects), urban areas, or consortia of LEAs.

Targeting: Grantees in the program would be required to work with teams of teachers (not just individual teachers) from schools that receive Title I funds. Each grantee would have to have a formal agreement with a school, a department within a school, or a district.

Kinds of activities. The allowable activities would only include the following: Same as the districts in the formula grant program plus workshops or special courses during the school year as long as they take place over the course of at least 3 months.

Pros:

Pro: IHEs and NPOs have expertise to offer districts and funding a IHE/NPO part of the program would directly stimulate part of the “supply side” of the professional development market, not just the “demand side” (districts and schools).

Pro: The 1991 SRI evaluation of Eisenhower found that the IHEs generally offered higher quality professional development programs than did the districts. Preliminary information from AIR’s current evaluation of Eisenhower reveals that the IHEs tend to offer professional development opportunities that are longer in duration and intensity.

Pro (for Option C) : By having ED administer the program, ED would relieve State Education Agencies and State Agencies for Higher Education from the burden of administering a discretionary grant program, and would eliminate competition or turf battles between the two state agencies.

V. How are funds distributed to districts by State Education Agencies (SEAs)?

***Option A* (*Recommended options*):** States distribute funds to districts using same *formula* that ED uses to distribute funds to States.

Option B: States distribute funds to districts through *discretionary grant* process; *all districts* eligible to apply for funds.

Option C: States distribute funds to districts through *discretionary grant* process; *only districts above a certain poverty level* would be eligible.

Option D: Give States the option to distribute 80% of the funds it receives (for district/school activities) through a formula (same formula that ED uses to distribute funds to States), and up to 20% through a discretionary grant program (only districts above a certain level of poverty would be eligible for the discretionary grants).

VI. Once in the district, how are formula-grant funds used?

Option A: Targeting. Districts must use at least half of the funds for activities that take place at schools that have 50% or more of their students eligible for free or reduced price lunch. (The activities would literally take place in the schools, hopefully during the regular school week.)

Planning. LEAs would submit two-year professional development plans to the SEA, based on input from required participants, including principals, teachers, parents, labor organizations, and community representatives, and possibly business representatives. The plans would have to describe how the LEA will involve all eligible schools in the district in professional development activities and how the activities funded with the federal funds would be directly linked to the rest of the professional development offered to teachers. (Or, the district could submit its overall professional development plan and within that plan, specify how the federal funds were supporting the overall plan. Involve the parties described above in developing the plan.) In addition, give LEAs the option to use up to 3%(? or more?) Of their allocation for conducting needs assessment and evaluation of the professional development.

Kinds of activities*. The allowable activities would only include the following:

- (1) Study groups;
- (2) Networks or collaboratives;
- (3) Standards/curriculum/assessment workgroups, task forces or committees;
- (4) Mentoring or coaching;
- (5) Opportunities to observe other teachers as they teach;
- (6) The cost of bringing in an expert/specialist to work with teachers over some period of time (at least 3 weeks) to improve instruction in a core subject;
- (7) Summer institutes, summer workshops or summer immersion activities that last for more than one day and are focused in one or more of the four core academic subjects.
- (8) Team research projects.
- (9) Guidance on how to use data to drive teaching practice

Question: Is the above list complete? Is it the right mixture of activities we should promote?

Option B: **Targeting.** Districts must use at least half of the funds for activities that take place at schools that have 35% or more of their students eligible for free or reduced price lunch.

Planning. Same as in option A above.

Kinds of activities*. Same as in Option A above.

Option C: **Targeting.** Districts must use at least half of the funds for activities that take place at schools that receive Title I funds.

Planning. Same as in option A above.

Kinds of activities*. Same as in Option A above.

IX. Content areas for LEA and IHE grants

Option A: In any two-year period, only 2 of the following four content areas (unless each pd experience is intended to be interdisciplinary): (1) Mathematics; (2) science; (3) English/reading; (4) history/social studies/civics & government. Districts and IHEs should use funds in only two of the four content areas and must use the funds in those two areas for a minimum of two years.

Option B: Districts and IHEs could use funds in mathematics, science, and reading only.

Option C: Districts and IHEs could use funds in any 2 of the following subject areas for a two-year period: (1) mathematics; (2) science; (3) English/reading; (4) history/social studies/civics & government; (5) foreign languages; and (6) arts.

(LEA and IHE grants could have different requirements.)

Poor teachers - learner testing
performance-based learning
principal leadership - suspension

Titus II - incentives

plan to phase-out

Goal - positive not negative

Requirement for testing
→ natural test for learners

5-year plan to phase out
not certified, out of teacher, paraprofessionals

**MEMBERS ONLY**

- THE BUZZ
- POLL TRACK
- EARLYBIRDS
- DAYBOOK
- BACK BENCH
- AD SPOTLIGHT
- CAMPAIGNS
- ALMANAC
- CAPITAL SOURCE
- HOTLINE WEEKLY
- NEWS ARCHIVE
- SEARCH

**National
Journal**

MARKUP REPORT: House Education and the Workforce House Panel Begins "Title I" Reauthorization

By Molly Peterson
National Journal News Service

WASHINGTON (Oct. 5, 1999) -- [NOTE: This is an interim FLASH report that will be replaced with a comprehensive version as soon as it is available.]

Members of the House Education and the Workforce Committee on Tuesday began work on a massive bill to reauthorize the nation's largest federal grant program for disadvantaged elementary and secondary public school students.

Sponsors said the "Student Results Act" [H.R. 2] would not change the current formulas for allocating so-called Title I grants, but would enable schools to make better use of the funds and require them to be more accountable for student achievement.

"No longer will we allow low-performing schools to continue to fail our children," said Rep. Michael N. Castle, R-Del., who chairs the Early Childhood, Youth and Families Subcommittee.

Members spent hours debating amendments to the legislation, but were unable to finish their work by day's end. They planned to complete action on the bill Wednesday.

The bill would provide a five-year reauthorization for Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Title I channels about \$8 billion annually into programs for about 10 million disadvantaged students.

The committee draft of the legislation -- unveiled Tuesday as an amendment in the nature of a substitute by Committee Chairman William Goodling, R-Pa. -- is several hundred pages in length and includes significant compromises by both Republicans and Democrats.

Republicans, for example, opted not to include a voucher provision that would enable poor students to use public

dollars to attend private schools. And Democrats agreed to a GOP-favored provision that limits the number of teacher aides that can be hired with Title I funds.

"Both sides gave something and both sides got something in the negotiations," said Rep. Dale Kildee, D-Mich., who serves as the subcommittee's ranking member.

Although Kildee and other Democrats said they generally were pleased with the bill and planned to vote in favor of it, they still had a few glaring concerns.

They complained, for example, that a provision to lower the threshold for Title I-funded school-wide projects could undermine the targeting of Title I resources to poor areas. They also opposed a provision that would require schools to try to obtain parental consent before enrolling students with limited English proficiency in classes taught in their native language.

Rep. Matthew Martinez, D-Calif., unsuccessfully offered an amendment to Goodling's substitute, which would have eliminated the parental consent provision. Martinez said the provision could limit access to Title I services for students with limited English proficiency and place them in "educational limbo."

"I believe they should be treated the same as all Title I students," Martinez said, noting that more than 3.5 million such students currently are enrolled in U.S. public schools -- a 50 percent increase since the 1990-1991 school year.

But most Republicans opposed Martinez' amendment, saying parents should be able to choose whether to have their children educated in their native language or in English. The amendment failed on a 22-25 vote. [Vote 1]

The committee also rejected an amendment by Rep. Bob Schaffer, R-Colo., to eliminate a provision from the bill that would require states to set aside 25 percent of new Title I funds to provide cash rewards to schools that reduce "achievement gaps" between low-performing and high-performing students.

Predicting that those funds could add up to hundreds of millions of dollars nationwide, Schaffer argued that rewards programs should be left up to local districts using local dollars.

But supporters of the rewards provision said it would give schools important incentive to improve student achievement, and Schaffer's amendment failed by a 17-30 vote. [Vote 2]

Schaffer then offered another amendment that would have made the reward program optional for states, but that

amendment failed by a 23-25 vote.[Vote 3]

The panel also defeated, by an 8-40 vote, [Vote 5] a Schaffer amendment to eliminate the bill's requirements regarding teacher assistants. The bill would freeze the number of teacher aides, or "paraprofessionals," that can be hired with Title I funds. It also would require, within three years of enactment, that all teacher aides hired with Title I funds meet certain educational requirements or locally-set performance standards.

The committee also rejected, by a 21-26 vote, [Vote 7] an amendment by Rep. Chaka Fattah, D-Pa., that would have required states to make their funding allocations to local school districts more equitable in order to qualify for federal Title I funds.

But the committee did approve, by voice vote, an en bloc amendment by Castle and Kildee making several technical and substantive changes to Goodling's amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The en bloc amendment would ensure that a progress report provision in the bill would pertain only to states, local education agencies and schools that receive Title I funds. The amendment also would clarify that if a school district is unable to obtain parental consent to enroll a child in a bilingual education program, the school may provide the services to the child after 10 days.

Committee members expected to vote on Goodling's substitute, and any remaining amendments, during Wednesday's debate.

Recorded Votes

House Committee on Education and the Workforce
 Bill: H.R. 2 Vote: 1
 Martinez amendment.
 Tally: 22 Yes 25 No 2 Not Voting

Republicans	Democrats
N GOODLING (R-Pa.)	Y CLAY (D-Mo.)
N PETRI (R-Wis.)	Y MILLER (D-Calif.)
	Y KILDEE (D-Mich.)
N ROUKEMA (R-N.J.)	Y MARTINEZ (D-Calif.)
N BALLENGER (R-N.C.)	Y OWENS (D-N.Y.)
N BARRETT, BILL (R-Neb.)	Y PAYNE (D-N.J.)
NV BOEHNER (R-Ohio)	Y MINK (D-Hawaii)
N HOEKSTRA (R-Mich.)	Y ANDREWS (D-N.J.)
N MCKEON (R-Calif.)	Y ROEMER (D-Ind.)
N CASTLE (R-Del.)	Y SCOTT (D-Va.)
N JOHNSON, SAM (R-Texas)	Y WOOLSEY (D-Calif.)
N TALENT (R-Mo.)	NV ROMERO-BARCELO (D-PR)
N GREENWOOD (R-Pa.)	Y FATTAH (D-Pa.)
N GRAHAM (R-S.C.)	Y HINOJOSA (D-Texas)
Y SOUDER (R-Ind.)	Y MCCARTHY (D-N.Y.)

N	MCINTOSH (R-Ind.)	Y	TIERNEY (D-Mass.)
N	NORWOOD (R-Ga.)	Y	KIND (D-Wis.)
N	PAUL (R-Texas)	Y	SANCHEZ (D-Calif.)
N	SCHAFFER (R-Colo.)	Y	FORD (D-Tenn.)
N	UPTON (R-Mich.)	Y	KUCINICH (D-Ohio)
N	DEAL (R-Ga.)	Y	WU (D-Ore.)
N	HILLEARY (R-Tenn.)	Y	HOLT (D-N.J.)
N	EHLERS (R-Mich.)		
N	SALMON (R-Ariz.)		
N	TANCRED0 (R-Colo.)		
N	FLETCHER (R-Ky.)		
N	DEMINT (R-S.C.)		
N	ISAKSON (R-Ga.)		

House Committee on Education and the Workforce
 Bill: H.R. 2 Vote: 2

Schaffer amendment to strike academic awards
 program.

Tally: 17 Yes 30 No 2 Not Voting

Republicans	Democrats		
N	GOODLING (R-Pa.)	N	CLAY (D-Mo.)
Y	PETRI (R-Wis.)	N	MILLER (D-Calif.)
		N	KILDEE (D-Mich.)
N	ROUKEMA (R-N.J.)	N	MARTINEZ (D-Calif.)
N	BALLENGER (R-N.C.)	Y	OWENS (D-N.Y.)
Y	BARRETT, BILL (R-Neb.)	N	PAYNE (D-N.J.)
NV	BOEHNER (R-Ohio)	N	MINK (D-Hawaii)
Y	HOEKSTRA (R-Mich.)	N	ANDREWS (D-N.J.)
Y	MCKEON (R-Calif.)	N	ROEMER (D-Ind.)
N	CASTLE (R-Del.)	Y	SCOTT (D-Va.)
Y	JOHNSON, SAM (R-Texas)	N	WOOLSEY (D-Calif.)
Y	TALENT (R-Mo.)	NV	ROMERO-BARCELO (D-PR)
N	GREENWOOD (R-Pa.)	N	FATTAH (D-Pa.)
N	GRAHAM (R-S.C.)	N	HINOJOSA (D-Texas)
Y	SOUDER (R-Ind.)	Y	MCCARTHY (D-N.Y.)
N	MCINTOSH (R-Ind.)	N	TIERNEY (D-Mass.)
Y	NORWOOD (R-Ga.)	N	KIND (D-Wis.)
Y	PAUL (R-Texas)	N	SANCHEZ (D-Calif.)
Y	SCHAFFER (R-Colo.)	Y	FORD (D-Tenn.)
N	UPTON (R-Mich.)	N	KUCINICH (D-Ohio)
N	DEAL (R-Ga.)	N	WU (D-Ore.)
N	HILLEARY (R-Tenn.)	N	HOLT (D-N.J.)
N	EHLERS (R-Mich.)		
Y	SALMON (R-Ariz.)		
Y	TANCRED0 (R-Colo.)		
Y	FLETCHER (R-Ky.)		
N	DEMINT (R-S.C.)		
N	ISAKSON (R-Ga.)		

House Committee on Education and the Workforce
 Bill: H.R. 2 Vote: 3

Schaffer amendment on academic rewards program.

Tally: 23 Yes 25 No X Not Voting

Republicans	Democrats		
N	GOODLING (R-Pa.)	N	CLAY (D-Mo.)
Y	PETRI (R-Wis.)	N	MILLER (D-Calif.)
		N	KILDEE (D-Mich.)
N	ROUKEMA (R-N.J.)	N	MARTINEZ (D-Calif.)
N	BALLENGER (R-N.C.)	N	OWENS (D-N.Y.)
Y	BARRETT, BILL (R-Neb.)	N	PAYNE (D-N.J.)
Y	BOEHNER (R-Ohio)	N	MINK (D-Hawaii)
Y	HOEKSTRA (R-Mich.)	N	ANDREWS (D-N.J.)

Y MCKEON (R-Calif.)	N ROEMER (D-Ind.)
N CASTLE (R-Del.)	Y SCOTT (D-Va.)
Y JOHNSON, SAM (R-Texas)	N WOOLSEY (D-Calif.)
Y TALENT (R-Mo.)	NV ROMERO-BARCELO (D-PR)
N GREENWOOD (R-Pa.)	Y FATTAH (D-Pa.)
Y GRAHAM (R-S.C.)	N HINOJOSA (D-Texas)
Y SOUDER (R-Ind.)	N MCCARTHY (D-N.Y.)
Y MCINTOSH (R-Ind.)	N TIERNEY (D-Mass.)
Y NORWOOD (R-Ga.)	N KIND (D-Wis.)
Y PAUL (R-Texas)	N SANCHEZ (D-Calif.)
Y SCHAFFER (R-Colo.)	Y FORD (D-Tenn.)
Y UPTON (R-Mich.)	N KUCINICH (D-Ohio)
Y DEAL (R-Ga.)	N WU (D-Ore.)
Y HILLEARY (R-Tenn.)	N HOLT (D-N.J.)
N EHLERS (R-Mich.)	
Y SALMON (R-Ariz.)	
Y TANCREDO (R-Colo.)	
Y FLETCHER (R-Ky.)	
Y DEMINT (R-S.C.)	
N ISAKSON (R-Ga.)	

House Committee on Education and the Workforce

Bill: H.R. 2 Vote: 4

Fattah amendment on state equalization of funding.

Tally: 21 Yes 27 No 1 Not Voting

Republicans

N GOODLING (R-Pa.)
 N PETRI (R-Wis.)

 N ROUKEMA (R-N.J.)
 N BALLENGER (R-N.C.)
 N BARRETT, BILL (R-Neb.)
 N BOEHNER (R-Ohio)
 N HOEKSTRA (R-Mich.)
 N MCKEON (R-Calif.)
 N CASTLE (R-Del.)
 N JOHNSON, SAM (R-Texas)
 N TALENT (R-Mo.)
 N GREENWOOD (R-Pa.)
 N GRAHAM (R-S.C.)
 N SOUDER (R-Ind.)
 N MCINTOSH (R-Ind.)
 N NORWOOD (R-Ga.)
 N PAUL (R-Texas)
 N SCHAFFER (R-Colo.)
 N UPTON (R-Mich.)
 N DEAL (R-Ga.)
 N HILLEARY (R-Tenn.)
 N EHLERS (R-Mich.)
 N SALMON (R-Ariz.)
 N TANCREDO (R-Colo.)
 N FLETCHER (R-Ky.)
 N DEMINT (R-S.C.)
 N ISAKSON (R-Ga.)

Democrats

Y CLAY (D-Mo.)
 Y MILLER (D-Calif.)
 Y KILDEE (D-Mich.)
 Y MARTINEZ (D-Calif.)
 Y OWENS (D-N.Y.)
 Y PAYNE (D-N.J.)
 Y MINK (D-Hawaii)
 Y ANDREWS (D-N.J.)
 Y ROEMER (D-Ind.)
 Y SCOTT (D-Va.)
 Y WOOLSEY (D-Calif.)
 NV ROMERO-BARCELO (D-PR)
 Y FATTAH (D-Pa.)
 Y HINOJOSA (D-Texas)
 Y MCCARTHY (D-N.Y.)
 Y TIERNEY (D-Mass.)
 Y KIND (D-Wis.)
 Y SANCHEZ (D-Calif.)
 Y FORD (D-Tenn.)
 Y KUCINICH (D-Ohio)
 Y WU (D-Ore.)
 Y HOLT (D-N.J.)

House Committee on Education and the Workforce

Bill: H.R. 2 Vote: 5

Schaffer amendment on paraprofessionals.

Tally: 8 Yes 40 No 1 Not Voting

Republicans

Democrats

N GOODLING (R-Pa.)	N CLAY (D-Mo.)
N PETRI (R-Wis.)	N MILLER (D-Calif.)
	N KILDEE (D-Mich.)
N ROUKEMA (R-N.J.)	N MARTINEZ (D-Calif.)
N BALLENGER (R-N.C.)	N OWENS (D-N.Y.)
N BARRETT, BILL (R-Neb.)	N PAYNE (D-N.J.)
N BOEHNER (R-Ohio)	N MINK (D-Hawaii)
Y HOEKSTRA (R-Mich.)	N ANDREWS (D-N.J.)
N MCKEON (R-Calif.)	N ROEMER (D-Ind.)
N CASTLE (R-Del.)	Y SCOTT (D-Va.)
N JOHNSON, SAM (R-Texas)	N WOOLSEY (D-Calif.)
N TALENT (R-Mo.)	NV ROMERO-BARCELO (D-PR)
N GREENWOOD (R-Pa.)	N FATTAH (D-Pa.)
N GRAHAM (R-S.C.)	N HINOJOSA (D-Texas)
Y SOUDER (R-Ind.)	N MCCARTHY (D-N.Y.)
N MCINTOSH (R-Ind.)	N TIERNEY (D-Mass.)
N NORWOOD (R-Ga.)	N KIND (D-Wis.)
Y PAUL (R-Texas)	N SANCHEZ (D-Calif.)
Y SCHAFFER (R-Colo.)	N FORD (D-Tenn.)
N UPTON (R-Mich.)	N KUCINICH (D-Ohio)
N DEAL (R-Ga.)	Y WU (D-Ore.)
N HILLEARY (R-Tenn.)	N HOLT (D-N.J.)
Y EHLERS (R-Mich.)	
Y SALMON (R-Ariz.)	
Y TANCREDO (R-Colo.)	
N FLETCHER (R-Ky.)	
N DEMINT (R-S.C.)	
N ISAKSON (R-Ga.)	

House Committee on Education and the Workforce

Bill: H.R. 2 Vote: 6

Owens' amendments en bloc.

Tally: 21 Yes 27 No 1 Not Voting

Republicans	Democrats
N GOODLING (R-Pa.)	Y CLAY (D-Mo.)
N PETRI (R-Wis.)	Y MILLER (D-Calif.)
	Y KILDEE (D-Mich.)
N ROUKEMA (R-N.J.)	Y MARTINEZ (D-Calif.)
N BALLENGER (R-N.C.)	Y OWENS (D-N.Y.)
N BARRETT, BILL (R-Neb.)	Y PAYNE (D-N.J.)
N BOEHNER (R-Ohio)	Y MINK (D-Hawaii)
N HOEKSTRA (R-Mich.)	Y ANDREWS (D-N.J.)
N MCKEON (R-Calif.)	Y ROEMER (D-Ind.)
N CASTLE (R-Del.)	Y SCOTT (D-Va.)
N JOHNSON, SAM (R-Texas)	Y WOOLSEY (D-Calif.)
N TALENT (R-Mo.)	NV ROMERO-BARCELO (D-PR)
N GREENWOOD (R-Pa.)	Y FATTAH (D-Pa.)
N GRAHAM (R-S.C.)	Y HINOJOSA (D-Texas)
N SOUDER (R-Ind.)	Y MCCARTHY (D-N.Y.)
N MCINTOSH (R-Ind.)	Y TIERNEY (D-Mass.)
N NORWOOD (R-Ga.)	Y KIND (D-Wis.)
N PAUL (R-Texas)	Y SANCHEZ (D-Calif.)
N SCHAFFER (R-Colo.)	Y FORD (D-Tenn.)
N UPTON (R-Mich.)	Y KUCINICH (D-Ohio)
N DEAL (R-Ga.)	Y WU (D-Ore.)
N HILLEARY (R-Tenn.)	Y HOLT (D-N.J.)
N EHLERS (R-Mich.)	
N SALMON (R-Ariz.)	
N TANCREDO (R-Colo.)	
N FLETCHER (R-Ky.)	
N DEMINT (R-S.C.)	
N ISAKSON (R-Ga.)	

House Committee on Education and the Workforce
 Bill: H.R. 2 Vote: 7
 Fattah amendment on state equalization of
 funding.
 Tally: 21 Yes 26 No 2 Not Voting

Republicans	Democrats
N GOODLING (R-Pa.)	Y CLAY (D-Mo.)
N PETRI (R-Wis.)	Y MILLER (D-Calif.)
	Y KILDEE (D-Mich.)
N ROUKEMA (R-N.J.)	Y MARTINEZ (D-Calif.)
N BALLENGER (R-N.C.)	Y OWENS (D-N.Y.)
N BARRETT, BILL (R-Neb.)	Y PAYNE (D-N.J.)
N BOEHNER (R-Ohio)	Y MINK (D-Hawaii)
N HOEKSTRA (R-Mich.)	Y ANDREWS (D-N.J.)
N MCKEON (R-Calif.)	Y ROEMER (D-Ind.)
N CASTLE (R-Del.)	Y SCOTT (D-Va.)
N JOHNSON, SAM (R-Texas)	Y WOOLSEY (D-Calif.)
N TALENT (R-Mo.)	NV ROMERO-BARCELO (D-PR)
N GREENWOOD (R-Pa.)	Y FATTAH (D-Pa.)
N GRAHAM (R-S.C.)	Y HINOJOSA (D-Texas)
N SOUDER (R-Ind.)	Y MCCARTHY (D-N.Y.)
N MCINTOSH (R-Ind.)	Y TIERNEY (D-Mass.)
N NORWOOD (R-Ga.)	Y KIND (D-Wis.)
N PAUL (R-Texas)	Y SANCHEZ (D-Calif.)
N SCHAFFER (R-Colo.)	Y FORD (D-Tenn.)
N UPTON (R-Mich.)	Y KUCINICH (D-Ohio)
N DEAL (R-Ga.)	Y WU (D-Ore.)
N HILLEARY (R-Tenn.)	Y HOLT (D-N.J.)
N EHLERS (R-Mich.)	
N SALMON (R-Ariz.)	
N TANCREDO (R-Colo.)	
N FLETCHER (R-Ky.)	
N DEMINT (R-S.C.)	
N ISAKSON (R-Ga.)	

Latest Markups And Searchable Archives

Complete access to the Markup Report archives and all the latest updates is available to **CongressDaily** and **National Journal** subscribers only.

Selected Markup Reports are available to all Cloakroom members, and issue-specific archives for *Greenwire* and *Technology Daily* will soon be available.

[[E-mail Cloakroom](#)]
 [[Site Index](#) | [Cloakroom Staff](#) | [Search](#)]
 [[Make Cloakroom Your Homepage](#)]
 [[Sign Up For E-Mail Alerts](#)]
 [[Privacy Policy](#) | [About National Journal Group Inc.](#)]

[Direct Links To Daily Publications](#)  

Copyright 1999 by National Journal Group Inc.

Clinton Presidential Records Digital Records Marker

This is not a presidential record. This is used as an administrative marker by the William J. Clinton Presidential Library Staff.

This marker identifies the place of a publication.

Publications have not been scanned in their entirety for the purpose of digitization. To see the full publication please search online or visit the Clinton Presidential Library's Research Room.

CongressDailyAM

MONDAY

TUESDAY

WEDNESDAY

THURSDAY

FRIDAY

OCT. 6, 1999

Managed Care Debate To Center On Degree Of Liability

HEALTH

THE HOUSE TODAY WILL LAUNCH a two-day debate on health care in which the key question is no longer whether members will vote to expand the ability of patients to sue their health plans over care denials, but to what extent liability will be expanded. In approving the blueprint to govern the debate Tuesday night, the House Rules Committee effectively cemented the process by which members will sort through three possible levels of expanded liability.

As expected, the rule first calls for a day of debate, scheduled for today, on a healthcare "access" bill unveiled last week by **Reps. James Talent**, R-Mo., and **John Shadegg**, R-Ariz. That bill includes several broadly supported tax

changes, as well as more controversial provisions to expand medical savings accounts and allow creation of small business pooling mechanisms known as HealthMarts and association health plans.

Assuming it passes, that bill will be automatically attached to whatever managed care bill prevails in the debate on Thursday. In tying the bills together, "We've taken the position that the ability to get healthcare insurance is as important as the quality of that insurance," said **Rules Committee member Porter Goss**, R-Fla., who has been coordinating the debate on behalf of the leadership.

The bills, however, will not be at- *continued on page 11*

Roth Unveils Limited Tax Plan

TAXES

SENATE FINANCE
Chairman Roth

late Tuesday unveiled a 10-year bill worth roughly \$75 billion to renew the business tax breaks known as the extenders and to permanently shield individuals from the alternative minimum tax. The measure is expected to be marked up Friday by the Finance panel.

In many ways, the bill is similar to the \$23 billion, five-year bill approved by the Ways and Means Committee two weeks ago. The higher price tag of Roth's bill is due in a significant way to the cost of permanent AMT relief over a decade.

But Roth's package also would renew the work opportunity tax credit and the welfare-to-work tax credit for a full four years where the House bill provides only a 30-month extension.

Also, unlike the House bill, Roth's bill would make permanent the research and experimentation tax credit. Like the Ways and Means bill, it includes a hike in the rates for the alternative research credit and uses a delayed credit mechanism to minimize the first year cost.

It would also renew the tax credit for employer-provided educational assistance for graduate and undergraduate courses on a permanent basis. That provision was omitted from **Ways and Means Chairman Archer's** bill because the credit will not expire until next year.

As expected, Roth included a tax credit for closed-loop biomass facilities as well as a tax break for investors in marginal oil and gas wells. The House package omitted that provision. Roth's bill also extends the so-called Subpart F provision and addresses brownfields.

To pay for the measure, Roth would make an adjustment in a safe harbor available to people who pay estimated income taxes but it would apply only to FY2000 when the cost of the bill is expected to be approximately \$1.8 billion. For the most part, the bill would be paid for with non-Social Security surplus funds projected in the years ahead.

President Clinton and congressional Democrats say they are opposed to any tax cuts that are not paid for — even in the out years. **Senate Ma-**

▼ TODAY'S HIGHLIGHTS

Floor Schedule

Senate

Convenes at 9:30 a.m. to consider FY2000 Labor-HHS appropriations, with roll call votes expected throughout the session. The Senate also may consider the FY2000 Agriculture appropriations conference report.

House

Convenes at 10 a.m. to consider the Quality Care for the Uninsured Act and to debate the Bipartisan Consensus Managed Care Improvement Act. (Committee schedules begin on page 14.)

Inside Stories

Outside Influences

■ BIPAC prepares its own campaign for 2000, page 5.

Majority Leader Lott Tuesday challenged Clinton to block the measure, saying, "If he wants to veto [these credits] go right ahead. His days are numbered anyway."

— BY STEPHEN NORTON



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Office of the Deputy Secretary
400 Maryland Avenue, SW
Washington, DC 20202

Telephone Number: (202) _____

Fax Number: (202) 401-9027

FAX COVER SHEET

TO: Ahn O'Leary

ORGANIZATION: _____

PHONE: _____ FAX: _____

FROM: K. Bunch

COMMENTS:

TOTAL PAGES (Including Cover): _____



*Budget
Examiner
at OMB*

401-6269

456-2878

Wei-Min C. Wang

10/04/99 12:40:34 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP@EOP

cc: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

Subject: Re: LRM CJB111 - - EDUCATION Report on (Committee substitute to) HR2 Students Results Act of 1999



Connie, here are the ED branch comments on the Riley letter.

Page 1, Introduction. Some of the language in the introduction is worded too negatively (e.g., "disappointed" and "wrong direction"). We recommend striking the second paragraph in the introduction and replacing it with language along the lines of the following:

Insert
A,
p. 1
The bill's proposals to increase public accountability through school report cards, to recognize and reward the teachers, schools, and districts that are making a difference with disadvantaged children, and to raise the qualifications of teachers and paraprofessionals in our schools are certainly steps in the right direction, and the Administration looks forward to working with the Committee to better these and other provisions in the bill.

In the meantime, however, I would like to point out several key areas in the pending substitute that could be significantly improved. I urge the Committee to correct these problems in the bill at the upcoming mark-up. My major concerns with the bill are as follows:

*agree to
some
extent -
replace
1 Ann's
subs*
Page 1, Accountability. This comment is too vague. It is not clear what the criticism is directed at. If the goal is to criticize the Committee bill's prescriptiveness and rigidity with respect to State plan requirements on standards, assessments, and accountability, that should be made clearer. The Administration's focus, then, of unified systems for Title I and non-Title students should be mentioned, as well as our more flexible parameters for State accountability systems.

Pages 1-2, School Improvement. While acknowledging the need for the bill to include increased State resources for accountability, we should also compliment the Committee for recognizing the need to prioritize State resources for improvement to those schools furthest from reaching State standards, something we advocated for in our own bill.

disagree
disagree
Page 2, LEP children. The first sentence of this section is worded too harshly. The bill's proponents would certainly argue that requiring States to monitor LEP children's performance on State assessments and to use this data to identify schools for improvement is not a "failure" to address the needs of LEP kids. The bill is also sensitive to making school-parent communications comprehensible to LEP families. A better sentence might say, "While the Committee bill is properly concerned with ensuring that limited-English proficient (LEP) children receive the full benefit of Title I services and achieve to high academic standards, the bill could be significantly improved by addressing the following concerns."

Insert
B
The objection to the one-year case-by-case exception to the three-year English testing requirement seems unnecessary. Although it is not Administration policy, it is not unreasonable and certainly does not represent an attempt by the Committee to prevent LEP children from learning English. We should be careful about saying anything that would criticize the Committee for not wanting LEP children to learn English quickly, since we know this is not the case and that there is a great divide between how each side

would address this issue. Rather than highlight it in the letter, we should resolve it in later discussions.

Page 3, Schoolwide programs. We urge the Department to object to lowering the schoolwide threshold to 40 percent and diluting services to the neediest children. *> fine*

Message Copied To:

Barry White/OMB/EOP@EOP
Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mary I. Cassell/OMB/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weber/OMB/EOP@EOP
Quirina J. Orozco/OMB/EOP@EOP
Naomi Barry/OMB/EOP@EOP

DRAFT
OCTOBER 4, 1999
2:00 PM

Honorable William F. Goodling
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr.Chairman:

I am writing to express my strong objections to H.R. 2300, the "Academic Achievement for All Act (Straight A's Act)," which I understand your committee will soon mark up. This bill would convert a wide array of Federal education programs, including many of the very same programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) that the Committee is separately considering under H.R. 2, into a single block grant program, with no meaningful standards or accountability for results. If this bill were presented to the President in its current form, I would recommend that he veto it.

The issue here is not about who controls public education -- we all agree that that responsibility rests at the local and State levels. At stake, rather, is whether the Federal Government will maintain its long-standing, bipartisan commitment to helping local communities strengthen accountability, raise standards, and improve student achievement, by providing assistance that focuses on our neediest children and schools and on activities in which national leadership can play a critical role.

WFG
10/4/99
10/4/99
10/4/99
The American people rightly look to the Federal Government to focus its efforts not on general aid to school districts, which H.R. 2300 would provide, but for leadership on national priorities. These include helping States and school districts raise educational standards and educational achievement for all students, improving the quality of teaching, bringing the benefits of technology to our Nation's students, and increasing the availability of after-school programs. Block grants would replace these worthy efforts with general aid, providing no focus, no meaningful accountability for results, and no rationale for ongoing support.

I urge the Committee to reject the block-grant approach and to work with the Administration to improve and reauthorize the ESEA as proposed by the President in his Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999, which he transmitted to the Congress earlier this year.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report, and that enactment of H.R. 2300 would not be accord with the President's program.

Page - Honorable William F. Goodling

Yours sincerely,

Richard W. Riley

HR 2300 IH

106th CONGRESS

1st Session

H. R. 2300

To allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

June 22, 1999

Mr. GOODLING (for himself, Mr. HASTERT, Mr. ARMEY, Mr. DELAY, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. CASTLE, Mr. HOEKSTRA, Mr. BALLENGER, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. BOEHNER, Mr. SCHAFFER, Mr. NORWOOD, Mr. HILLEARY, Mr. DEAL of Georgia, Mr. FLETCHER, Mr. TANCREDO, Mr. DEMINT, Mr. TALENT, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. SALMON, Mr. PETRI, Mr. MCINTOSH, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. NORTHUP, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey, Ms. DUNN, Mrs. MYRICK, Mr. BAKER, Mr. METCALF, Mr. HILL of Montana, Mr. PITTS, Mr. SUNUNU, Mr. HERGER, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mr. BARTLETT of Maryland, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. BLILEY, Mr. GARY MILLER of California, Mr. MCINNIS, Mr. BACHUS, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. STUMP, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SMITH of Michigan, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, Mr. HALL of Texas, Mr. HAYES, Mr. CANNON, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. PORTMAN, Mr. PACKARD, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. KNOLLENBERG, Mr. EWING, Mr. COOK, Mr. POMBO, Mr. TERRY, Mr. CHAMBLISS, and Mr. HOSTETTLER) introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Education and the Workforce

A BILL

To allow a State to combine certain funds to improve the academic achievement of all its students.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the 'Academic Achievement for All Act (Straight A's Act)'.

SEC. 2. PURPOSE.

The purpose of this Act is to create options for States and communities--

- (1) to improve the academic achievement of all students, and to focus the resources of the Federal Government upon such achievement;
- (2) to give States and communities maximum freedom in determining how to boost academic

achievement and implement education reforms;

(3) to hold States and communities accountable for boosting the academic achievement of all students, especially disadvantaged children; and

(4) to narrow achievement gaps between the lowest and highest performing groups of students so that no child is left behind.

SEC. 3. PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.

(a) PROGRAM AUTHORIZED- A State may at its option execute a performance agreement with the Secretary under which the provisions of law described in section 4(a) shall not apply to such State except as otherwise provided in this Act.

(b) APPROVAL OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT- A performance agreement submitted to the Secretary under this section shall be approved by the Secretary unless the Secretary makes a written determination within 60 days after receiving the performance agreement, that the performance agreement is in violation of the provisions of this Act.

(c) TERMS OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT- Each performance agreement executed pursuant to this Act shall include the following provisions:

(1) TERM- A statement that the term of the performance agreement shall be 5 years.

(2) APPLICATION OF PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS- A statement that no program requirements of any program included by the State in the performance agreement shall apply, except as otherwise provided in this Act.

(3) LIST- A list provided by the State of the programs that it wishes to include in the performance agreement.

(4) USE OF FUNDS TO IMPROVE STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT- Include a 5-year plan describing how the State intends to combine and use the funds from programs included in the performance agreement to advance the education priorities of the State, improve student achievement, and narrow achievement gaps between students.

(5) ACCOUNTABILITY SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS- If a State includes part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in its performance agreement, the State shall include a certification that the State has done the following:

(A)(i) developed and implemented the challenging State content standards, challenging State student performance standards, and aligned assessments described in section 1111(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, and for which local educational agencies in the State are producing the individual school performance profiles required by section 1116(a)(3) of such Act; or

(ii) developed and implemented a system to measure the degree of change from 1 school year to the next in student performance on such assessments;

(B) established a system under which assessment information is disaggregated by race, ethnicity, sex, English proficiency status, and socioeconomic status for the State, each

local educational agency, and each school, except that such disaggregation shall not be required in cases in which the number of students in any such group is insufficient to yield statistically reliable information or would reveal the identity of an individual student;

(C) established specific, measurable, numerical performance objectives for student achievement, including--

(i) a definition of performance considered to be satisfactory by the State on the assessment instruments described under subparagraphs (A) and (B) with performance objectives established for all students and for specific student groups, including groups for which data is disaggregated under subparagraph (B); and

(ii) the objective of improving the performance of all groups and narrowing gaps in performance between those groups; and

(D) developed and implemented a statewide system for holding its local educational agencies and schools accountable for student performance that includes--

(i) a procedure for identifying local educational agencies and schools in need of improvement;

(ii) assisting and building capacity in local educational agencies and schools identified as in need of improvement to improve teaching and learning; and

(iii) implementing corrective actions if the assistance and capacity building under clause (ii) is not effective.

(6) PERFORMANCE GOALS-

(A) STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT DATA- Each State shall establish student performance goals for the 5-year term of the performance agreement that, at a minimum--

(i) establish a single high standard of performance for all students;

(ii) take into account the progress of students from every local educational agency and school in the State;

(iii) measure changes in the percentages of students at selected grade levels meeting specified proficiency levels of achievement (established by the State) in the final year of the performance agreement, compared to such percentages in the baseline year (as described in subparagraph (C));

(iv) set numerical goals to attain by the end of the term of the performance agreement to--

(I) improve the performance of the groups specified in paragraph (5)(B); and

(II) reduce achievement gaps between the highest and lowest performing groups of students by raising the achievement levels of the lowest performing students in mathematics and reading, at a minimum; and

(v) require all students in the State to make substantial gains in achievement.

(B) ADDITIONAL INDICATORS OF PERFORMANCE- A State may identify in the performance agreement any additional indicators of performance such as graduation, dropout, or attendance rates.

(C) BASELINE PERFORMANCE DATA- To determine student achievement levels for the baseline year, the State shall use its most recent achievement data when executing the performance agreement.

(D) CONSISTENCY OF PERFORMANCE MEASURES- A State shall maintain, at a minimum, the same challenging State student performance standards and assessments throughout the term of the performance agreement.

(7) FISCAL RESPONSIBILITIES- An assurance that the State will use fiscal control and fund accounting procedures that will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under this Act.

(8) CIVIL RIGHTS- An assurance that the State will meet the requirements of applicable Federal civil rights laws.

(9) PRIVATE SCHOOL PARTICIPATION- An assurance that the State will provide for the equitable participation of students and professional staff in private schools in accordance with section 14503 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8893).

(10) STATE FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION- An assurance that the State will not reduce the level of spending of State funds for education during the term of the performance agreement.

(11) ANNUAL REPORT- An assurance that not later than 1 year after the execution of the performance agreement, and annually thereafter, each State shall disseminate widely to the general public, submit to the Secretary, distribute to print and broadcast media, and post on the Internet, a report that includes--

(A) student performance data, disaggregated as provided in paragraph (5)(A)(ii); and

(B) a detailed description of how the State has used Federal funds to improve student performance and reduce achievement gaps to meet the terms of the performance agreement.

(d) SPECIAL RULE- If a State does not include part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in its performance agreement, the State shall--

(1) certify that it has developed a system to measure the academic performance of all students; and

(2) establish performance goals in accordance with subsection (c)(6) for such other programs.

(e) AMENDMENT TO PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT- A State may submit an amendment to the performance agreement to the Secretary under the following circumstances:

(1) REDUCE SCOPE OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT- Not later than 1 year after the execution of the performance agreement, a State may amend the

performance agreement through a request to withdraw a program from such agreement. If the Secretary approves the amendment, the requirements of existing law shall apply for any program withdrawn from the performance agreement.

(2) EXPAND SCOPE OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT- Not later than 1 year after the execution of the performance agreement, a State may amend its performance agreement to include additional programs and performance indicators for which it will be held accountable.

SEC. 4. ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS.

(a) ELIGIBLE PROGRAMS- The provisions of law referred to in section 3(a) except as otherwise provided in subsection (b), are as follows:

- (1) Part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (2) Part B of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (3) Part C of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (4) Part D of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (5) Section 1502, part E of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (6) Part B of title II of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (7) Section 3132 of title III of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (8) Title IV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (9) Title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (10) Section 307 of the Department of Education Appropriation Act of 1999.
- (11) Comprehensive school reform programs as authorized under section 1502 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and described on pages 96-99 of the Joint Explanatory Statement of the Committee of Conference included in House Report 105-390 (Conference Report on the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1998)'.
(12) Part C of title VII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.
- (13) Title III of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.
- (14) Sections 115 and 116, and parts B and C of title I of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational Technical Education Act.

(15) Subtitle B of title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

(b) **ALLOCATION AMOUNTS-** A State may choose to combine funds from any or all of the programs described in subsection (a) without regard to the program requirements of such provisions, except as otherwise provided in this Act and except that allocation ratios provided under the provisions referred to in subsection (a) shall remain in effect unless otherwise provided.

(c) **USES OF FUNDS-** Funds made available under this Act to a State shall be used for any educational purpose permitted by State law of the participating State.

SEC. 5. WITHIN-STATE DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS.

(a) **IN GENERAL-** The distribution of funds from programs included in the performance agreement from a State to a local educational agency within the State shall be determined by the State legislature and the Governor of the State. In a State in which the constitution or State law designates another individual, entity, or agency to be responsible for education, such other individual, entity, or agency shall work in consultation with the Governor and State legislature to determine the local distribution of funds.

(b) **LOCAL HOLD HARMLESS OF PART A TITLE 1 FUNDS-**

(1) **IN GENERAL-** In the case of a State that includes part A of title I in the performance agreement, the agreement shall provide an assurance that each local educational agency shall receive an amount equal to or greater than the amount such agency received under part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which the performance agreement is executed.

(2) **PROPORTIONATE REDUCTION-** If the amount made available to the State from the Secretary for a fiscal year is insufficient to pay to each local educational agency the amount made available to such agency for the preceding fiscal year, the State shall reduce the amount each local educational agency receives by a uniform percentage.

SEC. 6. LOCAL PARTICIPATION.

(a) **NONPARTICIPATING STATE-**

(1) **IN GENERAL-** If a State chooses not to submit a performance agreement under this Act, any local educational agency in such State is eligible, at its option, to submit to the Secretary a performance agreement in accordance with this section.

(2) **AGREEMENT-** The terms of a performance agreement between an eligible local educational agency and the Secretary shall specify the programs to be included in the performance agreement, as agreed upon by the State and the agency, from the list under section 4(a).

(b) **STATE APPROVAL-** When submitting a performance agreement to the Secretary, an eligible local educational agency described in subsection (a) shall provide written documentation from the State in which such agency is located that it has no objection to the agency's proposal for a performance agreement.

(c) **APPLICATION-**

(1) IN GENERAL- Except as provided in this section, and to the extent applicable, the requirements of this Act shall apply to an eligible local educational agency that submits a performance agreement in the same manner as the requirements apply to a State.

(2) EXCEPTIONS- The following provisions shall not apply to an eligible local educational agency:

(A) WITHIN STATE DISTRIBUTION FORMULA NOT APPLICABLE- The formula for the

allocation of funds under section 5 shall not apply.

(B) STATE SET ASIDE SHALL NOT APPLY- The State set aside for administrative funds in section 7 shall not apply.

SEC. 7. SET-ASIDE FOR STATE ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENDITURES.

(a) IN GENERAL- Except as otherwise provided under subsection (b), a State that includes part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the performance agreement may use not more than 1 percent of such total amount of funds allocated to such State under the programs included in the performance agreement for administrative purposes.

(b) EXCEPTION- A State that does not include part A of title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 in the performance agreement may use not more than 3 percent of the total amount of funds allocated to such State under the programs included in the performance agreement for administrative purposes.

SEC. 8. PERFORMANCE REVIEW.

(a) FAILURE TO MEET ~~TERMS~~- If at the end of the 5-year term of the performance agreement a State has failed to meet at least 80 percent of the performance goals submitted in the performance agreement, the Secretary shall terminate the performance agreement and the State shall be required to comply with the program requirement, in effect at the time of termination, of each program included in the performance agreement.

(b) PENALTY FOR FAILURE TO IMPROVE STUDENT PERFORMANCE- If a State has made little or no progress toward achieving its performance goals by the end of the term of the agreement, the Secretary shall reduce funds for State administrative costs for each program included in the performance agreement by 50 percent for the 2-year period following the end of the term of the performance agreement.

SEC. 9. RENEWAL OF PERFORMANCE AGREEMENT.

(a) NOTIFICATION- A State that wishes to renew its performance agreement shall notify the Secretary of its renewal request not less than 6 months prior to the end of the term of the performance agreement.

(b) RENEWAL REQUIREMENTS- A State that has met at least 80 percent of its performance goals submitted in the performance agreement at the end of the 5-year term may reapply to the Secretary to renew its performance agreement for an additional 5-year period. Upon the completion of the 5-year

term of the performance agreement or as soon thereafter as the State submits data required under the agreement, the Secretary shall renew, for an additional 5-year term, the performance agreement of any State that has met at least 80 percent of its performance goals.

SEC. 10. ACHIEVEMENT GAP REDUCTION REWARDS.

(a) CLOSING THE GAP REWARD FUND-

(1) **IN GENERAL-** To reward States that make significant progress in eliminating achievement gaps by raising the achievement levels of the lowest performing students, the Secretary shall annually set aside sufficient funds from the Fund for the Improvement of Education under part A of title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to grant a reward to States that meet the conditions set forth in subsection (b) by the end of their 5-year performance agreement.

(2) **REWARD AMOUNT-** The amount of the reward referred to in paragraph (1) shall be not less than 5 percent of funds allocated to the State during the first year of the performance agreement for programs included in the agreement.

(b) **CONDITIONS OF PERFORMANCE REWARD-** A State is eligible to receive a reward under this section if the State reduces by not less than 25 percent, over the 5-year term of the performance agreement, the difference between the percentage of highest and lowest performing groups of students that meet the State's definition of 'proficient' as referenced in section 1111(b)(1)(D)(i)(II) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, for the following:

(A) **CONTENT AREAS-** The reduction in the achievement gap shall include not less than 2 content areas, one of which shall be mathematics or reading.

(B) **GRADES TESTED-** The reduction shall occur in at least 1 grade level.

SEC. 11. STRAIGHT A'S PERFORMANCE REPORT.

The Secretary shall make the annual State reports described in section 3 available to the House Committee on Education and the Workforce and the Senate Committee on Health, Education, Labor and Pensions not later than 60 days after the Secretary receives the report.

SEC. 12. CONSTRUCTION.

To the extent that provisions of title XIV of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 are inconsistent with this Act, this Act shall be construed as superseding such provisions.

SEC. 13. DEFINITIONS.

For the purpose of this Act:

(1) **LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCY-** The term 'local educational agency' has the same meaning given such term in section 14101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 8801).

(2) **SECRETARY-** The term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of Education.

(3) STATE- The term 'State' means each of the 50 States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa.

SEC. 14. EFFECT ON STATE LAW.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to supersede or modify any provision of a State constitution or State law that prohibits the expenditure of public funds in or by sectarian institutions.

END

DRAFT
OCTOBER 4, 1999
7:30 PM

Honorable William F. Goodling
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce
U. S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing to express my views on the "Students Results Act of 1999," your pending substitute for H.R. 2, which I understand your committee will soon mark up as you continue work on reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA). I am pleased that the substitute focuses on some of the same themes, such as high standards for our schools and children, accountability for results, and increased quality of teachers, that shaped the President's ESEA proposal, the Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999. These are the right issues on which to focus our attention as we help States and local school districts translate the promising work of standards-based reform into increased student achievement in the classroom for all our students.

I am disappointed, however, that in several key areas, the pending substitute heads in the wrong direction. I urge the committee to correct these flaws in the bill at the upcoming mark-up. My major concerns with the bill are as follows:

**ESEA, TITLE I - HELPING DISADVANTAGED
CHILDREN MEET HIGH STANDARDS**

Accountability. The Administration has consistently urged each State to develop and timely implement a single statewide accountability system for ensuring that all schools help students learn to the same high standards. Although the bill contains several accountability provisions that purport to strengthen Title I accountability, their rigidity and inconsistency with current State practices will actually weaken accountability for Title I schools.

States are currently making progress toward developing accountability systems that identify and provide assistance to low-performing districts and schools. However, no State in the nation has developed an accountability system with performance requirements for districts, schools, and student subgroups as specific and rigid as those prescribed in the pending bill. Thus, the bill would effectively compel every State to reinvent its accountability system, thereby further delaying the implementation of effective district and school accountability for several years.

Moreover, instead of encouraging States to develop single statewide accountability systems, the bill's accountability and public reporting provisions will do exactly the

opposite: They will lead States to develop dual accountability systems—one for Title I schools and another for all other schools. **[Evaluations of Title I show that when schools and districts are subject to dual (and sometimes competing) accountability systems, expectations and goals for Title I students are lower than for other students. IS THAT WHAT WE WANT TO SAY?]** As a result, students in Title I schools lose out on resources and attention. For this reason, the bill should discourage dual systems while encouraging the development of workable accountability policies that build on States' current good practices and ensuring progress in helping all children achieve to high standards.

Finally, an accountability system will be effective only if sufficient resources are quickly made available to help turn around low-performing schools. We know, for example, that less than half the Title I schools identified as in need of improvement ever receive additional assistance to help them turn around. The President's bill would ensure that States and districts provide necessary leadership and guidance to failing schools by requiring each State to reserve 2.5 percent of its annual Title I allocation (increasing to 3.5 percent in fiscal year 2003) for this purpose, including a requirement to allocate at least 70 percent of these funds directly to districts and schools that need them most, with the remainder used to fund State activities to improve individual schools and districts. This provision, which should be added to the pending bill, would provide the resources for swift, intensive intervention, such as expert consultation and in-depth teacher training in schools and districts identified as in need of improvement, and for stronger corrective actions where initial interventions fail to show improvement.

Public school choice. This Administration strongly supports public school choice and the President has consistently been a leader on this issue. However, public school choice must be coupled with, rather than be a substitute for, meaningful accountability. Unfortunately, this bill fails to adequately address accountability and school improvement.

Treatment of children with limited English proficiency. The bill fails, in several respects, to ensure that limited-English-proficient (LEP) children receive the full benefit of Title I services and achieve to high academic standards. Proposed section 1112(g), for example, would prohibit a school district from providing a LEP child any "English language instruction" using Title I funds until it obtains the parent's consent for that instruction. While I am a strong supporter of parental involvement and decision-making, this provision will result in delay and denial of critical services in cases where parents, for a variety of reasons, simply don't respond to requests for their consent.

The bill should include language from the President's proposal to require the use of tests written in Spanish when testing Spanish-speaking LEP children, if Spanish-language tests are more likely than English-language tests to yield accurate and reliable information on what those students know and can do in subjects other than English (such as math and science), in order to ensure that these children are actually being assessed on their knowledge of the subject matter. On the other hand, given the importance of learning

English quickly, I object to the bill's provision that would provide a 1-year grace period for the use of English-language tests to assess the reading or language-arts skills of students who have attended schools in the United States for three consecutive years. After three years, schools should be held accountable for these students' achievement in English.

For similar reasons, each school district's Title I plan should include an assurance, as proposed by the Administration, that the district will annually assess the English proficiency of all LEP children served in its Title I program, so that it can use the results to improve instruction and to provide helpful information to parents.

Finally, I am pleased that the substitute incorporates our proposal that, in describing any student assessments that it uses (other than those required by the State) in its Title I plan, a school district must describe any tests it will use to determine the literacy level of first graders, and how it will ensure that any such tests are developmentally appropriate and use multiple measures. However, the bill should also include the Administration's proposal that any such tests be administered in the language most likely to yield valid results, to ensure that the district is obtaining an accurate measure of the child's level of literacy.

Targeting. The President's proposal calls for improved targeting to concentrate Title I funds more intensively on the high-poverty districts and schools that have the farthest to go to raise student achievement and the greatest need for funds. Currently, most Title I funds are allocated as Basic Grants under section 1124 of the ESEA, which spreads funds thinly across school districts with both high and low rates of poverty. Weak targeting leaves the poorest districts with insufficient funds to serve all of their high-poverty schools, while other, lower-poverty, districts can serve schools with much smaller percentages of children from poor families.

To address this problem, the President's bill proposes to allocate substantial funding through the Targeted Grants formula under section 1125 of the ESEA, which distributes a larger share of Title I funds to higher-poverty districts than occurs with Basic Grants. In contrast, the pending substitute would undermine targeting to the poorer districts by authorizing substantial annual increases in Basic Grants.

Moreover, the House bill would prevent the needed retargeting of Title I funds to districts that, because of increases in poverty, are newly eligible for Concentration Grant funds under section 1124A of the ESEA, because it would guarantee that other districts continue to receive their Concentration Grant allocation for four years after they lose their eligibility. Title I funds should flow to where the poor children are now, not to where they were several years ago.

Finally, I am encouraged that the bill recognizes the need to improve the treatment of needy children in Puerto Rico, by modifying the formula under which the Commonwealth's Basic Grant allocation is calculated, but I urge the Committee to go a

step further and adopt the President's proposal to determine that allocation on the same basis as is used for the 50 States.

Paraprofessionals. It is an unfortunate fact that our most educationally disadvantaged children are often taught by the least qualified teachers, and that paraprofessionals are extensively used in Title I programs to perform instructional duties for which they are not qualified. In light of the critical importance of good teachers, particularly for our low-performing children, the President's bill proposes that most instructional duties be carried out by qualified teachers. It accordingly proposes that Title I paraprofessionals not carry out instructional duties, except for one-on-one tutoring, classroom management, and assisting in a computer lab, and even then only if they have completed at least two years of college. The bill should incorporate these provisions.

Schoolwide programs. I am pleased that the bill would incorporate some of the Administration's proposals to strengthen schoolwide programs under Title I, which can be a highly effective way to help students in high-poverty schools meet high performance standards. I do not believe, however, that we should lower, from 50 percent to 40 percent, the proportion of school's students who are from low-income families in order to qualify to conduct a schoolwide program, as the bill would do. Research shows that school poverty levels above 50 percent are associated with declines in student achievement for all students in the school, not just disadvantaged students. But using funds from Title I and other programs for schoolwide programs in schools with lower percentages of poor children is likely to dilute the effect of the services for those children.

I also support retaining current section 1114(b)(4)(A) of the ESEA, which permits the Secretary of Education to exempt schoolwide programs from statutory and regulatory requirements of the programs we administer. This flexible authority makes it easier to use funds from a variety of Federal programs to carry out a schoolwide program. That provision, however, expressly bars exempting requirements under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA), although the 1997 amendments to the IDEA permit a limited amount of IDEA funds to be used to support schoolwide programs in schools attended by children with disabilities. I strongly object to the bill's removal of the current language relating to the IDEA in section 1114, because it would permit waivers of IDEA requirements as they apply to those children. Children with disabilities should not risk losing vital IDEA protections, such as their statutory right to individualized education programs and due process, because they attend a Title I school with a schoolwide program.

Comparability of services between Title I and non-Title I schools. Children in Title I schools are treated unfairly when school districts put more, or better, resources into their non-Title I schools. Section 1120A(c) of the ESEA is designed to prevent that by requiring "comparability" between Title I and non-Title I schools, but that section needs to focus on the quality of these resources as well as their mere quantity. That's why we propose that, by July 1, 2002, districts ensure that there is comparability with respect to teacher qualifications, curriculum and course offerings, and the condition and safety of

school buildings. These factors would capture the concept of comparability more fairly and thoroughly than current law, and are important if we are to be serious about helping all children, including children in high-poverty schools, meet challenging State standards. The bill should include this proposal.

Private school bypass. I object to proposed section 1120(d)(2) of the ESEA, which would permit a private school to request the Department of Education to step in and replace a local school district's provision of Title I services if a child in that school fails to make satisfactory progress in subjects in which he or she is receiving those services. This approach falsely assumes that the primary responsibility for the child's educational performance rests with the school district, rather than with the private school the child attends. It should be deleted.

INDIAN EDUCATION

Proposed section 9116 of the ESEA would permit school districts that receive Indian education formula grants under Title IX-A of the ESEA to consolidate all Federal funding that they receive on a formula basis, from any Federal agency, into a single program, subject to several pages of conditions and requirements at both the local and Federal levels. While I support flexibility and the integration of services, this particular approach is unduly cumbersome and ill-conceived. Current law provides adequate authority for these districts to integrate their Title IX-A funds with other programs, in order to address the needs of their Indian students in a comprehensive fashion. Current section 9114(b), for example, which the bill would retain, already requires school districts applying for these funds to include in their applications a comprehensive program for meeting the needs of Indian children that explains how Federal, State, and local programs, especially under Title I, will meet those needs.

MAGNET SCHOOLS

While I am pleased that the bill would extend the authority for the magnet schools program, I am troubled that the bill would delete current section 5106(c) of the ESEA, which requires the Department's Office for Civil Rights (OCR) to determine, before a grant can be made to a school district, that the district will, in fact, meet the civil rights assurances included in its application. I believe that OCR review of these assurances is important for this particular program, which assists school districts that are desegregating.

RURAL EDUCATION

I applaud the committee for recognizing the special needs of, and challenges facing, our rural communities and their schools. I do not believe, however, that we need new ESEA programs that are exclusively focused on rural areas, particularly like the overly complicated proposal for a new Part J of Title X proposed in the bill. It's unlikely that this block-grant proposal would achieve its apparent objective of reducing administrative burdens or increasing flexibility for rural districts, especially in light of past experience

with block grants. Moreover, children in rural areas fully benefit from the programs already in place, such as Title I Basic Grants, the Title I program for migratory children, and the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund. Several of these programs include specific provisions, such as those on geographic distribution of funds, designed to address the needs of rural areas. The President's proposal would also target rural areas in a variety of ways, such as by giving special consideration to rural and isolated school districts for education technical assistance centers.

I urge the Committee to work with the Administration to address the concerns I have expressed and to approve a bill that more closely reflects the President's proposal for reauthorizing the ESEA. I also look forward to reviewing other portions of the Committee's ESEA reauthorization effort, such as those relating to the Women's Educational Equity Act and the ESEA general provisions, that are not included in the pending substitute. I have significant concerns with amendments to the Bilingual Education Act that I understand were prepared for the Committee's consideration, and I expect to offer my views on that program as you get closer to marking it up.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report from the standpoint of the Administration's program.

Yours sincerely,

Richard W. Riley

John B. Buxton

10/01/99 04:48:17 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc: Bethany Little/OPD/EOP@EOP, Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP

Subject: targeted assistance



Targeted Assistance.doc

for the OMB letter: includes school-wide programs, grant allocation formulas and the hold harmless provision.

JB

Targeted Assistance. Current law—which is consistent with Ed-Flex and Title 14 waiver authority—allows schools with 50% or more of its students in poverty to operate schoolwide Title I programs. Section 1114(a)(1) of the House bill would reduce the poverty threshold for schoolwide programs to 40%. Research on the level of poverty that negatively affects student achievement does not support this reduction. The Administration believes/the DPC advises (which is appropriate for this letter?) that the threshold should be retained at 50% in order to ensure that Title I funds are most equitably and effectively used to support those schools with a poverty level that puts the school and its students most at-risk of academic failure.

The Administration is opposed also to the House bill's proposal to increase the amount of Title I funds allocated as Basic Grants and decrease funds allocated as Targeted Grants. Targeted grants provide proportionately higher payments to districts with higher percentages of poor children, while Basic Grants allocate dollars evenly across virtually all districts. Under current law, 86% of funds flow through Basic Grants. The Administration proposal includes a requirement that at least 20% of the Title I, Part A appropriation would flow through Targeted Grants. The House bill, however, moves in the opposite direction. The Administration's believes that Targeted Grants should be increased, not decreased, and schools with the greatest share of students in poverty should receive a greater share of federal resources than present law provides.

Finally, the Administration objects to the Republican proposal to guarantee Title I funds to local education agencies (LEAs) that are no longer eligible for an additional four years. The proposal would provide funding on a sliding scale dependent upon the new share of students in poverty—down to a guarantee of 85% of the previous year's funds for schools with fewer than 15% of its student population in poverty. For 1999, 1,732 LEAs are no longer eligible for funding, while 1,626 are newly eligible. To continue to fund those LEAs now ineligible for another four years would undercut the ability and purpose of this program to serve those students and those schools most in need of assistance.



"Ramirez, Heidi" <Heidi_Ramirez@ed.gov>

10/02/99 10:43:40 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: "Bunce, Kristin" <Kristin_Bunce@ed.gov>, "Liu, Goodwin" <Goodwin_Liu@ed.gov>, "Fleming, Jennifer" <Jennifer_Fleming@ed.gov>

Subject: House proposal Title VII

As some of you may know by now, we received the "bipartisan" House proposal on Title VII late this afternoon. As expected, it presents a variety of problems, and yet is expected to be marked up w/ Title I and other special populations proposals on Tuesday. There was some rumor that it may be taken up separately, but then I'm even more afraid of what would happen to bilingual ed.

Here are the big ideas:

* Clear shift away from supporting native language instruction-any references to bilingual education or native language instruction (even tracking students' native languages) have either been deleted or replaced by "English language instruction"

* As anticipated, a strong "Parental Rights and Notification" section that 1) seems to provide less specific information to parents than current law (e.g. information on available programs, reasons for the child's selection for bilingual education, implications of the child's educational strengths); 2) requires informed parental consent PRIOR to the placement of the child in any "English language instruction program." (the description of what happens if consent is not obtained is poorly written, but seems to suggest that this is not an option.); and 3) deletes language that would require information to parents be in the native language when appropriate and feasible.

* The House proposal does not include any of the administration's language supporting LEP student's inclusion in systemic reform, assessment, or accountability systems. In addition, language from Title I on the assessment of children in English after three years (on the ELA assessment) is poorly written, but like Title I, seems to include the additional 1 year exemption on a year to year basis.

* Creates a very loose block grant formula program for Part A programs if Part A reaches \$210,000,000 appropriations. (I think its at about \$160 now.)

- The Secretary would make formula based awards to SEAs. The formula is base on the State's share of the country's LEP students (not including Puerto Rico). (We have no good measure for this as each state has a different definition of LEP, states don't report regularly on this and

some, because the dollars were so few for them, don't bother reporting at all. In addition, it could lead to over-identification of LEP students.)

- The State does submit an application to the Secretary that generally describes process for making subgrants and agreements that it will report to the Secretary, consideration to the priorities (under the discretionary grant program), and monitor grantee progress. (The proposal would continue to support already awarded bilingual ed grants.)

- 95% of the SEA funds be used to make subgrants to eligible entities (half to eligible entities w/ large LEP populations, half to entities w/ growing LEP populations). Its not clear to me if these are formula or competitive.

- SEA uses its share for PD, TA, and bonuses to successful grantees.

- LEA would only need to agree to general commitment to the purposes of the current comprehensive and systemwide grant programs. It must also provide, among other things, a description of "how students enrolled in the programs and activities proposed in the application will be fluent in English after 3 academic years of enrollment." State determines size and duration of awards,

* Rather than follow the Administration proposal that would require very specific application data (to ensure a clear and aggregate baseline) the proposal seems to require slightly less than current law. As written, we would never be able to truly evaluate the effectiveness of these programs, and certainly not track the progress of participating children in either learning English or meeting academic standards. We may know the percent of students being retained in grade and transitioning out of programs. Similarly, there were no changes made to the evaluation or reporting requirements...meaning no accountability (and no way to ever be able to make a data-driven argument for these programs). (They may have actually deleted all evaluation; its not yet clear to me.)

* Despite the failure to create an accountability or clear data collection/evaluation system, the proposal would require a report from the Director to the Secretary and the education committees of both the House and the Senate on program effectiveness, including the number of programs terminated for failure to meet the goals.

* Unlike our proposal, the House option does not provide any priority for applicants:

- 1) w/ dramatic increases of LEP students;
- 2) that have a proven track record; or
- 3) teach 2 languages to all participating students (current law)

Other places (sec. 7113) , it does maintain the special consideration for applicants w/ either large or growing LEP populations (like sec. 7120).

* The research authority is reduced to about 10 lines, pointing to OERI to conduct research limited to "identify successful models for teaching children English and distribution of research results to States for dissemination to schools w/ populations of students who are limited English proficient."

* The proposal leaves out the National Clearinghouse, professional development grants, graduate fellowships, academic excellence awards,

career ladder program, and training for all teachers, or teachers and personnel grants.

* The Foreign language assistance program is not included. I assume/hope that it will be included in Title X like our proposal.

* Immigrant Ed looks exactly the same...

I'm asking John Chapman and Randy Hansen to also take a look at this over the weekend, and have let Art C. know about the parental opt-in. (Art, this is also in Title I for LEP children.)

I think we will definitely need to meet and discuss these issues as well as next steps.

Thanks,
Heidi

Message Sent To:

"Smith, Mike" <Mike_Smith@ed.gov>
"Cohen, Mike" <Mike_Cohen@ed.gov>
"Rogers, Diane" <Diane_Rogers@ed.gov>
"Cook, Sandra" <Sandra_Cook@ed.gov>
"Chapman, John G" <John_G_Chapman@ed.gov>
"Hansen, Randy" <Randy_Hansen@ed.gov>
"Riddle, Paul" <Paul_Riddle@ed.gov>
"Love, Art" <Art_Love@ed.gov>
"Te, Bouy" <Bouy_Te@ed.gov>
"Mike Cohen (E-mail)" <mikec_20904@yahoo.com>
Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP
"Andy Rotherham (E-mail)" <arotherham@netzero.net>

Technical Assistance on Title I Proposal
September 25, 1999
DRAFT

Recognition of Need and Findings

- Recognition 3 (p.3) could be read to argue for school choice
- "(3) too many students must attend local school that fail to provide them with a quality education, and are given no alternatives to enable them to receive a quality education"

Authorization of Appropriations

- In providing specific appropriations for year 2000, rather than "such sums," there is some obvious decrease in funding for particular efforts.
 - Considering the ongoing need to evaluate the effectiveness of Title I and strategies used in its implementation, support for evaluation as authorized under federal activities (p.5, line 14) should be increased \$10 million.
 - Support for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program (p.5, line 17) should be increased to at least \$200 million, the FY2000 request.
 - Changes (p.6, lines 2-3) indicate that that support for state administration will be equal to 1% of only the state's Title I-Part A allocation (rather than Parts A, C, and D), which could mean a drop as great as \$4.5 million in FY2000.
 - There is no provision for reserving more than 1% for small states as in Sec. 1603(c)(2) of current law.
- Dollars in support of school improvement include only a share of Title I-Part A funds, not including migrant education or N or D (p.6, line 17). In addition, it is recommended that this share be increased to 2.5% to build capacity for and turn around low-performing schools.

Standards and Assessments

- Proposed assessment requirements call for tests at four grade spans, including, "(iii) grades 7 through 9, if applicable; and (iv) grades 10 through 12, if applicable." The term "if applicable" is not necessary and may be misleading; it should be deleted.
- The proposed language renames the third proficiency level (from partially proficient to basic) and adds a fourth level of proficiency (below basic) (p.9, lines 10-21). This could frustrate the efforts of states that have already or are in the process of developing performance standards and assessments. Will this new requirement affect the degree to which they are considered to be in compliance with the law? Will it relax the pace of assessment and accountability implementation?
- Assessment development language specifically allows for a waiver of the assessment development timeline (p.26, lines 20-22). This language is unnecessary (such waivers are already allowed) and would only encourage increased application for waiver of the requirements; it should be deleted.
- Consistent with the Administration's proposal, language on the assessment of LEP students in the assessment should include, at a minimum, that states have available, a native language assessment in Spanish. (THIS WAS IN THE PREVIOUS VERSION).

- The rationale for adding the exception to requirement on the testing of students in English (after they have been in US schools for three years) (p.18, lines 15-22) is unclear. As written, the provision seems to contradict the intent of the requirement, which is to ensure institutional accountability for helping students to learn English. The testing provisions in (iii) focus on ensuring assessment results yield accurate information in other content areas.
- The intent of the language on student proficiency and assessment (p.20, lines 3-8) is unclear.

Withholding of State Administrative Funds

- IS THIS NOW CLEAR? (p.26)

Yearly Progress

- While we agree that the effort to ensure accountability for improved student performance among all groups is important, the formulation described (p.11, line 14) would cause significant burden and would likely include dramatic, and potentially misleading, year to year changes in scores. The Administration's proposal is preferred.
- In describing the use of multiple measures in defining AYP, the proposal's exception to using such data in identifying schools for improvement or corrective action is unclear (p.12, lines 16-17). The exception should prohibit such measures from enabling a specific school to avoid being identified, not from affecting the overall number or proportion of such schools.
- The requirement that at least 90% of students in each group take the assessment may set too low a benchmark for including students from all populations (p.14, line 2). To account for this, while still accounting for different school compositions (e.g. a school may have a significant population of students with severe disabilities), this provision should also require that 95% of students overall in the school be included in the assessment.

LEA Plans

- Consistent with the purpose of the Title I law, the proposal would add "low-achieving" to modify "children" (p.27, line 15). However, such a change might be read to suggest different standards for low-achieving children. The amendment should read, "all children, particularly low-achieving children."
- Specific requirements for the assessment of first grader literacy (p.27-8) do not ensure that such assessments provide the most accurate data on the literacy of LEP students. Consistent with the Administration's proposal should require that such assessments "(D)(iii) administered to students in the language most likely to yield valid results."
- There is no mention of the peer review of either LEA or schoolwide plans (p.33 and p.53). Implementation of current Title I plan requirements, as well as reviews of state standards requirements, and Goals 2000 state plans indicate that review by teams of outside experts of teachers, parents, administrators, etc. improves the quality (and perceived legitimacy) of feedback and dramatically improves program implementation. Consistent with the Administration's proposal, peer review of local

and school plans should be required.

Pre-school Education

- **I THINK WE'RE OK ON THESE ISSUES NOW:**

"The proposed cross-reference to Head Start standards is more difficult for LEAs to use (p.30, line 6 and p. 32, line 4). We strongly recommend deleting these provisions and, instead, including the Administration's preschool provisions in §1120B(d), which incorporate the Head Start standards; moreover, our proposal gives greater prominence to this very important area. The Administration language also clarifies the option for jointly funded programs which is not in current law. " from previous version

Targeting: Eligible Attendance Areas and Local Allocations

- As described in the Administration's proposal, the allocation of local Title I funds should include a grandfather clause to ensure some continuity and fiscal stability in funding from year to year (p.37-8). Language should be added to allow an LEA to "designate and serve a school attendance area or school that is not eligible under subsection (a)(2), but that was eligible and that was served in the preceding fiscal year, but only for one additional fiscal year."
- **DRAMATIC CORRECTIONS/REVISIONS HERE...IS THE RANKING OK NOW?** (p.36-7)
 - In order to better ensure that homeless children are served by Title I, the clause "where appropriate" should be deleted from Sec. 1113(g)(2)(A) (p.43, line 14).

Comparability

- The proposal maintains the current comparability requirements (Sec. 1120A) without providing amendments to strengthen the quality of inputs to be examined in ensuring intra-district school comparability. It should be amended to include, among other things, teacher qualifications, school safety conditions, and accessibility to technology.

Parental Notification

- In the case of both schools identified for improvement and corrective action, as well as schoolwides, LEAs are required to provide considerable information to parents. (p.51, line 15; p.61; p.69, lines 14-20; p. 73, lines 15-18; p.131, line 18-19). To be sure that the intent to better inform parents and the community is met, the language should be clear and consistent in ensuring that information is provided in a manner, language, and format that parents can understand. This should include broad distribution efforts.

Schoolwides

- The proposal drops the poverty threshold necessary to operate a schoolwide program to 40% (p.44, line 9). To ensure appropriate targeting of Title I funds consistent with the statute's intent, the current threshold of 50% should be maintained.

School Choice

DO WE WANT SAY SOMETHING...IT IS NOW ALMOST CURRENT LAW...

- Missing from the choice plan language is a description of how the school will provide individual student assessment data to parents (p.58). As written in current law, the provision supports the continued accountability for the achievement of disadvantaged students, regardless of which schools they attend.

School Improvement and Corrective Action

- PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE OPTION (p.62, line 20) needs clarification.
- The exception for LEAs to delay implementation of corrective action (p.69, lines 9-13 and p.79, lines 3-8) should be deleted.
- In addition, the proposal would require states and districts to take corrective "after the end of the second year"(p.67, line 7; p.76, line 17). Consistent with recent research on the time it takes to turn around low-performing schools, ED has proposed that action be required three years after school or LEA identification. This change should be considered.

Professional Development

- The proposal makes a clear commitment to ensuring the provision of high-quality professional development. Consistent with this notion, the language should more clearly include activities that involve collaborative groups of teachers and administrators from the same school or district and, to the greatest extent possible, include follow-up and school-based support such as coaching or study groups (p.90).
- Instruction in the use of technology has been omitted from professional development activities suggested (p.91). What was the rationale for this?
- In order to ensure that children most at risk of educational failure have well-trained and qualified teachers, the proposal should ensure that LEAs reserve 5-10% of their Title I allocation to specifically support on-going professional development. IN CONTRAST TO OUR SUGGESTION, SEE PAGE 93, LINES 9-14. ARE THERE ANY IMPLICATIONS

Private Schools

KAY, et al, I'M NOT SURE WHICH OF THESE STILL APPLY?

- By its placement in the ranking portion of Sec.1113(d)(2) (p.94), allocation for equitable service to private school students would appear to *require* an LEA to count poor private school children in identifying and ranking eligible schools. Although this practice may be desirable, it would require the LEA to have income data on all private school children in the LEA, rather than only those who reside in participating public school attendance areas. These same provisions are repeated in Sec.1120(a)(6), which may be a more appropriate placement.
- In Sec.1113(d)(2)(A)(ii) (p.94, lines 9-13), before *requiring* extrapolation of survey data, there should be some safeguards to ensure that the resulting number would be reliable: e.g., a reasonable number of surveys were returned from which to extrapolate to the whole and assurance that the surveys returned represent the population of the school as a whole. Otherwise, the count of low-income children may be artificially high or artificially low.

- The exception in Sec. 1113(e) is misplaced. It should only apply to ranking, not the whole section which includes counting private school children, etc.

Amounts for Grants (Title I formulas) I DIDN'T EVEN REVIEW...TOM and LONNA?

- Title I provides funds to high-poverty LEAs, which have the furthest to go to help children meet high standards. Two provisions would drastically reduce targeting to these LEAs:
 - Changes to Sec. 1122(a) (p. 98) would significantly decrease the amount of funds allocated as Targeted Grants. As written, only 50% of any increase in appropriations above the FY 99 level, which at the 2000 level in their bill language would mean only about \$309 million would be distributed through this formula. In contrast, the Administration's proposal would distribute all of the increase in appropriations above the FY 95 level or 20% of the annual Title I LEA Grants appropriation, through Targeted Grants (about \$1.6 billion at the 2000 level). The Targeted Grants formula is designed to provide higher per-child amounts to high-poverty LEAs, and lower per-child amounts to the less poor LEAs.
 - Proposed language on p. 101 would guarantee Title I funds for 5 years to ineligible LEAs that received FY 1999 Title I funds. Only after 5 consecutive years of ineligibility, would those LEAs lose their hold-harmless. This prevents money from flowing to high-poverty LEAs.
- The proposal creates a hold harmless for Concentration Grants (p. 100, line 21-24). The current law and the Administration's proposal do not contain a hold harmless, allowing funds to be accurately targeted to the highest-poverty LEAs (with at least 6,500 poor children or 15% poverty).
- Line 23 on p. 100 indicates that the hold harmless is 895 percent of the previous year's amount. Is the hold harmless supposed to be 89.5%?
- The Administration's bill would phase in changes to ensure that, by 2005, Puerto Rico receives Title I allocations on the same basis as States. The proposed language maintains current law, which caps Puerto Rico's allocation at a much lower level (p. 106); this should be reconsidered.

School Report Cards

- The proposal requires state, district, and school reporting only on student performance in schools and districts served by Title I. Thus, there is no way to compare Title I schools with others in the state or district (p.131, lines 6-8).
- The proposal requires reporting on performance in math and reading only, even where states have standards and require assessments in other subjects (p.132). This is inconsistent with the goal of achieving a single accountability system for each state.
- The proposal only suggests reporting of school safety, this should be required (p.133, line 124); this should be required.

IT LOOKS LIKE THEY TOOK MORE OUT FROM THE LAST VERSION....WHAT ARE WE MISSING?

Scientifically-based Research

- The term scientifically-based research is broadly used in this proposal; in some places it is inappropriate or impossible to implement.
 - On p. 1, finding 1
 - On p.30, line 17 it refers to model programs for the education of disadvantaged children in the early years. Are there such programs that would meet the criteria of this term (as described in CSRD)?
 - On p.46, line 16, the reference would require that each individual method or strategy would be based on scientific research, not just the comprehensive model. We expect that none would meet this requirement, but would suggest broadening the reference to describe a "scientifically-based reform."
 - Page 54, same problem as above.
 - Page 64, line 1, and p. 74, line 5 again describe individual methods and instructional strategies.
 - Page 65, line 23 and p. 66, line 14 refers to technical assistance, are there any such models?
 - On P.69, lines 6-7, the reference is to curriculum, which could, because so few would meet this criteria, inadvertently lead to a national curriculum.
 - Page 89 presents a capacity issue as there are very few, if any, professional development models that meet this standard.

Other

- References to the comprehensive technical assistance centers (p.43, line 18 and p.66, lines 8-9) should be deleted. The Administration has not recommended the reauthorization of the centers, which are currently authorized in Title XIII.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING
INITIALS: RCR DATE: 08/07/13
2013 -0436-5

MEMORANDUM

TO: Alex Nock

RE: Republican proposal to amend Title I

DATE: September 20, 1999

Upon comparing the Republican proposal to amend Title I with the Administration's reauthorization proposal, we have developed the attached list of concerns. The list does not place items in order of substantive priority. Instead, it comments on the Republican proposal page by page. Here we wish to highlight seven major areas of concern:

- 1. The proposal erodes targeting of Title I funds to high-poverty schools.** Missing from the proposal (pp. 38-42) is any requirement that each local educational agency provide at least the same amount of dollars per child to its highest poverty schools as it provides to its lower poverty schools. For schools below 75% poverty, LEAs have total discretion in allocating funds. Depending on the allocation criteria that LEAs choose, Title I funds could flow disproportionately to the lowest poverty schools. We support the within-district allocation provisions under current law. In addition, the proposal (p. 99) would result in only small sums of money (\$150 million) flowing through the targeted grants formula, in contrast to the estimated \$1.6 billion that would reach the highest poverty schools under the Administration's proposal. Moreover, unlike our proposal, the Republican proposal does nothing to strengthen the intra-district school comparability provisions in current law.
- 2. The school choice provisions present many unanswered questions.** The proposed requirement that LEAs provide students an intra-district transfer option immediately after a school has been identified for improvement (p. 63) will be difficult to implement, especially in districts where as much as a majority of schools have been identified for improvement. Furthermore, the intent behind the supplemental assistance grants for developing and implementing school choice plans (p. 60) is unclear. Would this allow the appropriations process to divert virtually all Title I funds to school choice plans? Is there any requirement that school choice plans benefit students in Title I schools? Our proposal makes clear that we support public school choice, especially when schools have been identified for corrective action. We are willing to help develop additional school choice provisions that not only give students options to transfer out of failing schools but also include strategies and

resources to turn around failing schools.

3. **The proposal does not adequately encourage each State to develop a single, integrated accountability system.** Under the proposal, “adequate yearly progress” must “take[] into account the progress of all students in the States” (p. 11). Without any provisions specifying what it means to “take into account” the progress of students statewide, each State could develop an accountability system for Title I schools that is separate from the system applicable to all other schools. Our proposal contains stronger language explicitly encouraging States to develop and implement “a *statewide system* for holding local educational agencies and schools accountable for student performance.” Similarly, unlike our proposed Title XI provisions requiring education report cards that contain information on educational progress in all districts and schools statewide, the Republican proposal requires report cards only on schools and districts served by Title I (p. 129), thus precluding comparisons between Title I schools and other schools in a district or state.
4. **The proposal does not require States to reserve enough funds for school improvement.** The provision allowing States to reserve 0.5% of Title I funds for school improvement (p. 6) does not reflect a realistic view of the amount of resources required to provide swift, effective assistance to low-performing schools. Our proposal requires each State to reserve 2.5% of Title I funds for building state and local capacity to turn around failing schools.
5. **The proposal does not require LEAs to set aside enough funds for professional development.** While listing a variety of mandatory and optional professional development activities, the Republican proposal (pp. 86-90) nowhere provides LEAs the resources needed to implement such activities. Our proposal requires LEAs to reserve 5% (and 10% after 2002) of Title I funds for professional development.
6. **The proposal does not ensure timely implementation of State assessment systems.** Through the provision allowing States to seek a one-year waiver (apparently for any reason) to complete their assessment systems (p. 21), the proposal effectively invites waivers. This provision should be deleted. At the same time, the proposal’s requirement for standards and assessments applicable to grades K-2 (p. 8, 18) should be accompanied by a reasonable timeline for phase-in, since most states currently do not have such standards and assessments.
7. **The proposal appears to make LEAs wholly responsible for meeting the educational needs of children who attend private schools.** By making an LEA’s failure “to meet the educational needs of [private school] children” a standard for bypassing the LEA in providing services to such children, the proposal (p. 97) presents a standard that raises difficult questions about where an LEA’s obligation ends and where the private school’s begins. Because an LEA cannot be wholly responsible for meeting the educational needs of private school children, we oppose this

provision.

Technical Assistance on Title I Proposal
September 19, 1999
DRAFT

Recognition of Need and Findings

- Recognition 3 (p.2) could be read to argue for school choice
- "(3) too many students must attend local school that fail to provide them with a quality education, and are given no alternatives to enable them to receive a quality education"
- Finding 4 (p.3) makes an illogical argument for increased flexibility
- "(4) Congress and the public would benefit from additional data in order to evaluate the efficacy of changes made to Title I ...[in IASA], and therefore States, local educational agencies and schools should be given as much flexibility as possible in exchange for greater accountability for improving student achievement."

Authorization of Appropriations

- In providing specific appropriations for year 2000, rather than "such sums," there is some obvious decrease in funding for particular efforts.
 - Considering the ongoing need to evaluate the effectiveness of Title I and strategies used in its implementation, support for evaluation as authorized under federal activities (p.5, line 8) should be increased \$10 million.
 - Support for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program (p.5, line 11) should be increased to at least \$200 million, the FY2000 request.
 - Current statute does not require a separate appropriation for state administrative funds; the existing language should be substituted here.
 - Changes (p.5, line 14) indicate that that support for state administration will be equal to 1% of only the state's Title I-Part A allocation (rather than Parts A, C, and D), which could mean a drop as great as \$4.5 million in FY2000.
 - There is no provision for reserving more than 1% for small states as in Sec. 1603(c)(2) of current law.
- The intent of the special rule as described on p. 6 and referred to on p.26 is unclear.
- Dollars in support of school improvement include only a share of Title I-Part A funds, not including migrant education or N or D (p.6, line 7). In addition, it is recommended that this share be increased to 2.5% to build capacity for and turn around low-performing schools.

Standards and Assessments

- The Department favors the bracketed language on page 7, lines 5-7.
- The proposal requires standards in kindergarten through grade 12 (p.8, line 10) as well as the administration of assessments during grades K-2 (p. 18, line 8). While the focus on standards and achievement in the early years is important, it should be clear that 1) states that do not currently have K-2 standards will have a reasonable timeline for phasing them in, but 2) will still be required to have standards and assessments in other grades by 2000-2001.
- Proposed assessment requirements call for tests at four grade spans, including, "(iii) grades 7 through 9, if applicable; and (iv) grades 10 through 12, if applicable." The

term "if applicable" is not necessary and may be misleading; it should be deleted.

- The proposed language renames the third proficiency level (from partially proficient to basic) and adds a fourth level of proficiency (below basic) (p.9, lines 10-21). This could frustrate the efforts of states that have already or are in the process of developing performance standards and assessments. Will this new requirement affect the degree to which they are considered to be in compliance with the law? Will it relax the pace of assessment and accountability implementation?
- Assessment development language specifically allows for a waiver of the assessment development timeline (p.21, lines 12-19). This language is unnecessary (such waivers are already allowed) and would only encourage increased application for waiver of the requirements; it should be deleted.

Withholding of State Administrative Funds

- In general, penalties provisions need clarification (p. 22, line 9). Should the word "by" on line 17 be "from"? Moreover, how does this fit with the withholding provisions (p.10, line 5)?

Yearly Progress

- The effort to compare student performance data across groups (in measuring AYP) does not include disaggregation by gender (p.11, (B)(iv)), although this cut is included in assessment requirements (p.20, line 12 and current law). IS THIS OK?
- While we agree that the effort to ensure accountability for improved student performance among all groups is important, the formulation described (p.13, lines 1-12) would cause significant burden and would likely include dramatic, and potentially misleading, year to year changes in scores. The Administration's proposal is preferred.
- In describing the use of multiple measures in defining AYP, the proposal's exception to using such data in identifying schools for improvement or corrective action is unclear (p.12, line 19). The exception should prohibit such measures from enabling a specific school to avoid being identified, not from affecting the overall number or proportion of such schools.
- The requirement that at least 90% of students in each group take the assessment may set too low a benchmark for including students from all populations (p.14, line 9). To account for this, while still accounting for different school compositions (e.g. a school may have a significant population of students with severe disabilities), this provision should also require that 95% of students overall in the school be included in the assessment.
- The language on regulation and review of state plans (p.15, lines 11-24), particularly in regard to the timing and sequencing of required activities, is unclear. Must the Secretary both issue regulations and finish reviewing plans within six months? If so, is the Department to be drafting regulations and reviewing plans at the same time? Is it reviewing new or current plans? Why should a state be expected to submit a definition of AYP before regulations are issued?

LEA Plans

Now to explain why we must comply from AYP

- Consistent with the purpose of the Title I law, the proposal would add "low-achieving" to modify "children" (p.28, line 25). However, such a change might be read to suggest different standards for low-achieving children. The amendment should read, "all children, particularly low-achieving children."
- Specific requirements for the assessment of first grader literacy (p.29, lines 7-16) do not ensure that such assessments provide the most accurate data on the literacy of LEP students. Consistent with the Administration's proposal should require that such assessments "(D)(iii) administered to students in the language most likely to yield valid results."
- There is no mention of the peer review of either LEA or schoolwide plans (p.34, line 21 and p.53). Implementation of current title I plan requirements, as well as reviews of state standards requirements, and Goals 2000 state plans indicate that review by teams of outside experts of teachers, parents, administrators, etc. improves the quality (and perceived legitimacy) of feedback and dramatically improves program implementation. Consistent with the Administration's proposal, peer review of local and school plans should be required.

Pre-school Education

- The proposed cross-reference to Head Start standards is more difficult for LEAs to use (p.30, line 6 and p. 32, line 4). We strongly recommend deleting these provisions and, instead, including the Administration's preschool provisions in §1120B(d), which incorporate the Head Start standards; moreover, our proposal gives greater prominence to this very important area. The Administration language also clarifies the option for jointly funded programs which is not in current law.

Targeting: Eligible Attendance Areas and Local Allocations

- Page 35, line 22 appears to require a technical correction. Shouldn't it read, "...or in the case of a public charter school that *does not* constitute a local educational agency under State law."
- As described in the Administration's proposal, the allocation of local title I funds should include a grandfather clause to ensure some continuity and fiscal stability in funding from year to year (p.38). Language should be added to allow an LEA to "designate and serve a school attendance area or school that is not eligible under subsection (a)(2), but that was eligible and that was served in the preceding fiscal year, but only for one additional fiscal year."
- The proposal includes several measures and omits others that collectively, significantly threaten Title I's ability to target and serve those students and schools most in need.
 - Sec. 1113(g), allocations, would totally defeat targeting of resources to the highest poverty schools. As written, it requires an LEA to allocate funds to K-6 schools above 75% poverty, in rank order, based on numbers of low-income children. There is no mention of 7-12 schools above 75% poverty. The 1994 reauthorization strengthened targeting provisions to include the highest-poverty high schools. Currently Title I serves approximately 14,000 high poverty high schools. The Department continues to believe that targeting funds to high schools is critical to continuing support for students at risk of failure and ensuring a

comprehensive and continuous approach to improving their education. While focusing on the early grades is important, this focus should not be at the expense of high poverty high schools. Line 7 on page 38 should read, "schools that serve children in grades kindergarten through 12." Lines 11-13 should be deleted.

- Over the last four years, Title I has been increasingly targeted to the highest-poverty schools. However, as written, the proposal would allow such broad discretion on the part of LEAs in making allocations to schools that Title I funds might not be targeted on children in the poorest schools. For schools below 75% poverty, the LEA has complete discretion in allocating funds. As a result, there would be no requirement to provide at least the same amount of dollars per child to the highest poverty schools as the LEA provides to its lower poverty schools. Moreover, the LEA could presumably use any criteria it wishes for allocating funds to schools (p.38-42).
- In order to better ensure that homeless children are served by Title I, the clause "where appropriate" should be deleted from Sec. 1113(g)(2)(A) (p.43, line 14).

Comparability

The proposal maintains the current comparability requirements (Sec. 1120A) without providing amendments to strengthen the quality of inputs to be examined in ensuring intra-district school comparability. It should be amended to include, among other things, teacher qualifications, school safety conditions, and accessibility to technology.

Schoolwides

- The proposal drops the poverty threshold necessary to operate a schoolwide program to 40% (p.44, line 9). To ensure appropriate targeting of Title I funds consistent with the statute's intent, the current threshold of 50% should be maintained.
- Schoolwides are not required to meet many of the statutory and regulatory requirements of the federal programs whose funds are combined, as long as they meet the intent and purposes of those programs through activities in the schoolwide. The proposal would make specific that a school is not required to keep separate accounts for each federal program and would require only an assurance that the intent and purposes were met (p.46, line 22). We recommend deleting this provision because it suggests that schoolwides would no longer be accountable for demonstrating that activities meet the intent and purpose of the programs.

School Choice

- The intent and implementation of supplemental assistance grants is unclear (p.60, line 10).
 - Why would this effort require a separate appropriation authority? It seems to leave open the possibility that all Title I funds could be appropriated to pursue through this approach.
 - As written, the grants program seems to allow for broad distribution of Title I funds within a LEA. The uses of such funds, particularly since this is a one-time award, are not clear. Are there any restrictions? Must they benefit Title I schools primarily or exclusively? What is the desired effect?

- Implementation would require a uniform definition of an eligible child.
- The school choice option, as written (p.63, line 17) is both very unclear and seems impossible to effectively implement particularly given the potentially high number identified for improvement under the AYP criteria specified in the proposal. However, the Department would be willing to provide technical assistance in regard to developing such an option for corrective action schools.

School Improvement and Corrective Action

- In the case of both schools identified for improvement and corrective action, LEAs are required to provide considerable information to parents. (p.62, line 19; p.73, line 4; p.81, line 21). To be sure that the intent to better inform parents and the community is met, without adding considerable burden to the schools or districts, the language should be clear that such notification may be made through broad dissemination efforts like local newspapers, as well as electronic means.
- The exception for LEAs to delay implementation of corrective action (p.69, lines 13-20) should be deleted.
- Neither school improvement nor corrective action language provides a description of how identified schools or LEAs are removed from identified categories. The proposal should add a special rule to each section consistent with the Administration's proposal. For example, "Special rule. A state educational agency may remove from improvement status under this subsection any local educational agency that, for at least two of the three years following identification under paragraph (3), makes substantial gains toward meeting the state's standards."
- In addition, the proposal would require states and districts to take corrective "after the end of the second year"(p.67, line 13; p.75, line 23). Consistent with recent research on the time it takes to turn around low-performing schools, ED has proposed that action be required three years after school or LEA identification. This change should be considered.

Parental Involvement

- The proposed cap on Title I funds used in support of parental involvement (p. 81, line 5) should be deleted and current law maintained.

Professional Development

- The proposal makes a clear commitment to ensuring the provision of high-quality professional development. Consistent with this notion, the language should more clearly include activities that involve collaborative groups of teachers and administrators from the same school or district and, to the greatest extent possible, include follow-up and school-based support such as coaching or study groups.
- In order to ensure that children most at risk of educational failure have well-trained and qualified teachers, the proposal should ensure that LEAs reserve 5-10% of their Title I allocation to specifically support on-going professional development.

Private Schools

- By its placement in the ranking portion of Sec.1113(d)(2) (p.94), allocation for equitable

service to private school students would appear to *require* an LEA to count poor private school children in identifying and ranking eligible schools. Although this practice may be desirable, it would require the LEA to have income data on all private school children in the LEA, rather than only those who reside in participating public school attendance areas. These same provisions are repeated in Sec. 1120(a)(6), which may be a more appropriate placement.

- In Sec. 1113(d)(2)(A)(ii) (p.94, lines 9-13), before *requiring* extrapolation of survey data, there should be some safeguards to ensure that the resulting number would be reliable: e.g., a reasonable number of surveys were returned from which to extrapolate to the whole and assurance that the surveys returned represent the population of the school as a whole. Otherwise, the count of low-income children may be artificially high or artificially low.
- In (B) complaint process (p.94, line 21), there is no way that a Department survey could be reliable *per se*. It would always depend on the number and characteristics of the families returning the survey.
- The exception in Sec. 1113(e) is misplaced. It should only apply to ranking, not the whole section which includes counting private school children, etc.

Amounts for Grants (Title I formulas)

- Title I provides funds to high-poverty LEAs, which have the furthest to go to help children meet high standards. Two provisions would drastically reduce targeting to these LEAs:
 - Changes to Sec. 1122(a) (p. 98) would significantly decrease the amount of funds allocated as Targeted Grants. As written, only 50% of any increase in appropriations above the FY 99 level, which at the 2000 level in their bill language would mean only about \$309 million would be distributed through this formula. In contrast, the Administration's proposal would distribute all of the increase in appropriations above the FY 95 level or 20% of the annual Title I LEA Grants appropriation, through Targeted Grants (about \$1.6 billion at the 2000 level). The Targeted Grants formula is designed to provide higher per-child amounts to high-poverty LEAs, and lower per-child amounts to the less poor LEAs.
 - Proposed language on p. 101 would guarantee Title I funds for 5 years to ineligible LEAs that received FY 1999 Title I funds. Only after 5 consecutive years of ineligibility, would those LEAs lose their hold-harmless. This prevents money from flowing to high-poverty LEAs.
- The proposal creates a hold harmless for Concentration Grants (p. 100, line 21-24). The current law and the Administration's proposal do not contain a hold harmless, allowing funds to be accurately targeted to the highest-poverty LEAs (with at least 6,500 poor children or 15% poverty).
- Line 23 on p. 100 indicates that the hold harmless is 895 percent of the previous year's amount. Is the hold harmless supposed to be 89.5%?
- The Administration's bill would phase in changes to ensure that, by 2005, Puerto Rico receives Title I allocations on the same basis as States. The proposed language maintains current law, which caps Puerto Rico's allocation at a much lower level (p.

106); this should be reconsidered.

School Report Cards

- The proposal requires state, district, and school reporting only on student performance in schools and districts served by Title I. Thus, there is no way to compare Title I schools with others in the state or district (p.129, line 19).
- The proposal requires reporting on performance in math and reading only, even where states have standards and require assessments in other subjects (p.130, line 16). This is inconsistent with the goal of achieving a single accountability system for each state.
- The proposal requires reporting of school safety information only "where such information is otherwise collected" (p.131, line 12). This qualifying language should be deleted.

Scientifically-based Research

- The term scientifically-based research is broadly used in this proposal; in some places it is inappropriate or impossible to implement.
 - On p.31, it refers to model programs for the education of disadvantaged children in the early years. Are there such programs that would meet the criteria of this term (as described in CSRD)?
 - On p.47, the reference would require that each individual method or strategy would be based on scientific research, not just the comprehensive model. We expect that none would meet this requirement, but would suggest broadening the reference to describe a "scientifically-based reform."
 - Page 56, same problem as above.
 - Page 66, lines 6-7 again describes individual methods and instructional strategies.
 - Page 66, line 23 refers to technical assistance, we do not know of any such models.
 - On P.69, lines 6-7, the reference is to curriculum, which could, because so few would meet this criteria, inadvertently lead to a national curriculum.
 - Page 87 presents a capacity issue as there are very few, if any, professional development models that meet this standard.

Other

- References to the comprehensive technical assistance centers (p.45, line 1) should be deleted. The Administration has not recommended the reauthorization of the centers, which are currently authorized in Title XIII.



"Liu, Goodwin" <Goodwin_Liu@ed.gov>

10/04/99 07:49:06 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc:

Subject: FW: Revised letter on H.R. 2

Comments on accountability section:

In the sentence: "Thus, the bill would effectively compel every State to reinvent its accountability system, thereby further delaying the implementation of effective district and school accountability for several years."

I'm not sure we need the word "further" -- unless we want to imply that implementation of accountability systems under current law is already being delayed.

1/11/00

As for the "Evaluations of Title I shows...." sentence, I don't think the language in the letter is what the research supports. I had suggested the following language: "Evaluations of Title I show that when schools and districts are subject to dual (and sometimes competing) accountability systems, it is the State-defined system -- not the Title I system -- that motivates school and district improvement efforts." I think this is more accurate. The point is not that lower standards apply to Title I kids in dual systems; it's that Title I schools don't respond to the Title I accountability system when there's a state system operating simultaneously.

1/11/00

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Riddle, Paul

> Sent: Monday, October 04, 1999 7:33 PM

> To: 'Bowers, Connie'; 'O'Leary, Ann'

> Cc: Bunce, Kristin; Ramirez, Heidi; Liu, Goodwin

> Subject: Revised letter on H.R. 2

>

> Here's our revised letter. There's still one wrinkle I'm trying to smooth out on accountability (noted on p. 2).

>

> <<letter.doc>>



- letter.doc

Message Sent To:

"Riddle, Paul" <Paul_Riddle@ed.gov>
"Bunce, Kristin" <Kristin_Bunce@ed.gov>
"Ramirez, Heidi" <Heidi_Ramirez@ed.gov>
"Cook, Sandra" <Sandra_Cook@ed.gov>
Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP

By requiring every school district to implement public school choice within 18 months after identifying a school for improvement, the bill imposes a sweeping unfunded mandate that will be unworkable, will divert attention and resources from fixing truly failing schools, and will generate momentum to “voucherize” Title I.

The bill requires *all* school districts to provide *all* students enrolled in *any* school identified for school improvement with an option to transfer to *any* other public school within the district not identified for improvement. As a result:

- Most school districts in the nation will face an unfunded mandate to implement district-wide public school choice. School districts must identify for improvement any school that does not demonstrate “adequate yearly progress” for two consecutive years. The bill defines “adequate yearly progress” to require each school annually both to improve the performance of *every* subgroup (e.g., by race, class, gender, LEP status, disability status) and to narrow *every* performance gap between subgroups. Thus, any school that for two years fails to raise the performance of just *one* subgroup or fails to narrow just *one* performance gap must be identified for improvement—triggering the district’s obligation to design and implement a district-wide choice plan. Because schools can easily fall into improvement status under the bill’s criteria for adequate progress, the bill effectively mandates public school choice in most school districts. Yet the bill nowhere provides funds specifically for the design and operation of choice plans.
- Designing and implementing choice plans will divert attention and resources from fixing truly failing schools. The bill requires every choice plan to be district-wide, since such plans must allow students in schools identified for improvement to transfer to “*any* other public school” within the district not identified for improvement. The experiences of Cambridge and Seattle, among others, indicate that designing a workable choice plan requires significant time (perhaps more than 18 months), broad outreach and consultation, and considerable expense. This can only be more true for larger districts such as New York, Los Angeles, and Houston. Because the bill nowhere provides specific funds for designing and operating choice plans, districts presumably must satisfy the choice mandate by using Title I funds that they might otherwise use to improve low-performing schools—a prospect made more likely by the bill’s failure to require states to reserve any funds for school improvement.
- In many districts, under-capacity of “receiver” schools will make public school choice a non-starter and will increase pressure to make Title I funds portable to private schools. In school districts with a substantial percentage of schools identified for improvement, public school choice will not be a meaningful option simply because schools not identified for improvement will not have enough seats to accommodate all students wishing to transfer. For those who favor the concept of choice, this reality makes Title I portability to private schools a logical next step.
- The mandatory choice provision cannot reasonably be explained as a response to “school failure.” A two-year inability to narrow a single performance gap or to raise the performance of a single subgroup does not necessarily indicate “school failure.” Indeed, the bill appears to be designed simply to require choice on a broad scale, not

to provide options to students in genuinely failing schools.

TITLE I / PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE

Internal use only

	CURRENT LAW	ADMINISTRATION PROPOSAL	HOUSE BILL
What are the indicators of school failure?	- defined by yearly gains on state assessments —> school improvement - additional years —> corrective action	- Adequate yearly progress, primarily student performance on state assessments, both overall and among lowest-performing students - Failure to achieve AYP for 2 years - school improvement - Failure to achieve AYP for 2 years —> corrective action	(among other things) yearly gains on state assessments <i>by every subgroup</i> - school improvement - years —> corrective action
What assistance is provided to failing schools?	- set aside 0.5% Title I funds - funds must reserve at least \$200,000	- Allows, but does not require, states to I funds 2000-01 and 3.5% thereafter - States that choose to reserve such - priority, then schools identified for improvement	set aside 0.5% Title I funds (no minimum)
At what point does school failure trigger a district's obligation to provide choice?	support choice programs	- Generally allows Title I funds to support choice programs - No mandatory public school choice students in corrective action schools (?)	- support choice programs - students in schools identified for improvement - option for at least 2 years after school is removed from improvement status

Continuoi

Failure to

Failure to

Requires

70% of fu

Correctiv

Generally

Districts 1

From: Constance J. Bowers on 10/05/99 11:45:20 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Broderick Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP, Mickey Ibarra/WHO/EOP@EOP, John B. Buxton/OPD/EOP@EOP, Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP

cc:

Subject: ED letter on HR 2300 (Block Grant bill) w/possible veto threat

Please let me know ASAP if you have any problems with ED's letter on HR 2300. It now contains a "senior advisers" veto threat, per recommendation of DPC (Andy Rotherham), OMB (Barbara Chow), and ED. Attached below is a note containing some background information. Sandra Yamin is now circulating this for final EOP approval. Markup is tomorrow. Thanks.

click here for ED's letter:



- BR.doc

----- Forwarded by Constance J. Bowers/OMB/EOP on 10/05/99 11:42 AM -----

Constance J. Bowers

10/04/99 02:25:31 PM

Record Type: Record

To: See the distribution list at the bottom of this message

cc: Janet R. Forsgren/OMB/EOP@EOP, James J. Jukes/OMB/EOP@EOP

Subject: HEADS UP: ED letter on HR 2300 (Block Grant bill) w/possible veto threat

ED is drafting a letter for the House Education and Workforce Committee's Wednesday markup of HR 2300, that **is likely to contain a veto threat**. The bill, "Academic Achievement for All Act" (known as the "Straight A's Act") would essentially allow for a single block grant in lieu of all separate Federal education grants. The bill is similar to a major component of HR 3248 ("Dollars to the Classroom") from the 105th Congress. The Statement of Administration Policy (and previous ED letter to the Committee) contained a **senior advisers veto threat on HR 3248** on the basis of the block grant title, and other, i.e., very weak ed-flex provisions. As you may recall, Sec. Riley's letter stated "**...the President stated previously that he would 'use his veto power to prevent this [block grant] approach from becoming law'.**"

ED's expects to get me their draft letter this evening. This will allow only a short time for clearance for Wednesday's markup. Please give me your thoughts as to whether a veto threat is the correct approach at this time and, if so, what level of threat (secretarial or senior advisers) you recommend.

Note: We are also in the process of clearing ED's letter for Tuesday's markup of HR 2, which reauthorizes Title I and other parts of ESEA. HR 2, as introduced, was originally titled "Dollars to the Classroom"; however, the block grant portion was subsequently reintroduced as HR 2300.

Message Sent To:

Barbara Chow/OMB/EOP@EOP
Jennifer E. McGee/OMB/EOP@EOP
Eric P. Liu/OPD/EOP@EOP
Anna Richter/OPD/EOP@EOP
Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP@EOP
Bethany Little
Barry White/OMB/EOP@EOP
Wayne Upshaw/OMB/EOP@EOP
Wei-Min C. Wang/OMB/EOP@EOP
Mary I. Cassell/OMB/EOP@EOP
Naomi Barry/OMB/EOP@EOP
Peter A. Weber/OMB/EOP@EOP
Quirina J. Orozco/OMB/EOP@EOP
Broderick Johnson/WHO/EOP@EOP
Ann O'Leary/OPD/EOP@EOP
Sandra Yamin/OMB/EOP@EOP
Ted Zegers/OMB/EOP@EOP

Page - Honorable William F. Goodling

DRAFT
OCTOBER 5, 1999
11:15 AM

Honorable William F. Goodling
Chairman, Committee on Education and the Workforce
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am writing to express my strong objections to H.R. 2300, the "Academic Achievement for All Act (Straight A's Act)," which I understand your committee will soon mark up. This bill would permit States to effectively convert a wide array of Federal education programs, including many of the very same programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) that the Committee is separately considering under H.R. 2, into a single block grant program, with no meaningful standards or accountability for results. While the bill purports to address accountability, it would, in reality, allow States to delay implementing accountability systems and encourage them to adopt low standards of educational performance. Accordingly, if this bill were presented to the President in its current form, his senior advisors would recommend that he veto it.

The issue here is not about who controls public education -- we all agree that that responsibility rests at the local and State levels. At stake, rather, is whether the Federal Government will maintain its long-standing, bipartisan commitment to helping local communities strengthen accountability, raise standards, and improve student achievement, by providing assistance that focuses on our neediest children and schools and on activities in which national leadership can play a critical role.

The American people rightly look to the Federal Government to focus its efforts not on general aid to school districts, which H.R. 2300 would provide, but for leadership on national priorities. These include helping States and school districts raise educational standards and educational achievement for all students, improving the quality of teaching, bringing the benefits of technology to our Nation's students, and promoting family literacy.

Block grants would replace these worthy efforts with general aid, providing no focus, no meaningful accountability for results, and no rationale for ongoing support. This bill would undo much of the ESEA reauthorization work that the Committee has just undertaken, resulting in no accountability for 5 years, and with no targeting of funds to school districts and schools, or for educational services, that most warrant Federal assistance. Nor, for that matter, does the bill

Page - Honorable William F. Goodling

ensure that funds actually end up in the Nation's classrooms or to pay for instructional services for the Nation's children.

I urge the Committee to reject the block-grant approach and to work with the Administration to improve and reauthorize the ESEA as proposed by the President in his Educational Excellence for All Children Act of 1999, which he transmitted to the Congress earlier this year.

The Office of Management and Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this report, and that enactment of H.R. 2300 would not be in accord with the President's program.

Yours sincerely,

Richard W. Riley

K. Le Title I

								(.3*527)	Eligible	Eligible	Eligible
	TAS Schools	% of TAS		TAS	TAS Kids in	TAS Kids Per	% of Kids	Eligible	Unserved	Unserved	Unserved
	TAS Schools in Improvement	Improvement		Participants	Failing Schools	Failing School	Served	Kids	Per Sch.	in TAS	in Failing TAS
1997-98	28,450	4,644	16.3%	3,186,893	520,208	112	21.3%	158	46	1,311,052	214,008
1996-97	31,763	4,592	14.5%	3,520,622	508,979	111	21.0%				

	Public Elem. Enrollment	Public Elem. Schools	Average Enrollment
1997-98	33,073,000	62,739	527

% of TAS Kids Most at Risk of Not Meeting State Standards
Grade 4 Grade 8
(Data is limited to States that include assessment results of all students in Title I Schools)

	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6		4th Grade		8th Grade			
	Reading/Math	Reading/Math				Reading	Math	Reading	Math	
Alabama	12.9/13.4	19.7/19.8		12.9/13.4	19.7/19.8	12.9	13.4	19.7	19.8	
Alaska	24.2/18.7	32.2/37		24.2/18.7	32.2/37	24.2	18.7	32.2	37	
Connecticut	23.3/9.2	14.2/6.8		23.3/9.2	14.2/6.8	23.2	9.2	14.2	6.8	
Illinois	24/6	29/10		24/6	29/10	24	6	29	10	
Florida	44/35	47/43		44/35	47/43	44	35	47	43	
Hawaii	53.1/37.8	61.8/55.3		53.1/37.8	61.8/55.3	53.1	37.8	61.8	55.3	
Kansas	18.4/22.2	20.7/31.2		18.4/22.2	20.7/31.2	18.4	22.2	20.7	31.2	
Maine	8/29	22/26		8/29	22/26	8	29	22	26	
Maryland	64.9/66.8	90.5/81.3		64.9/66.8	90.5/81.3	64.9	66.8	90.5	81.3	
Michigan	15.9/7.6	25.9/14.6		15.9/7.6	25.9/14.6	15.9	7.6	25.9	14.6	
Montana	28.1/29.9	25.1/26.4		28.1/29.9	25.1/26.4	28.1	29.9	25.1	26.4	
Nebraska	42/39.3	38.8/34.2		42/39.3	38.8/34.2	42	39.3	38.8	34.2	
New York	15.6/4.5	17.5/5		15.6/4.5	17.5/5	15.6	4.5	17.5	5	
North Carolina	61.8/42	50.2/57.7		61.8/42	50.2/57.7	61.8	42	50.2	57.7	
Ohio	46/51	45/59		46/51	45/59	46	51	45	59	
Oregon	22.8/33.8	52.9/56.8		22.8/33.8	52.9/56.8	22.8	33.8	52.9	56.8	
Texas	8.6/11.9	12.2/13.4		8.6/11.9	12.2/13.4	8.6	11.9	12.2	13.4	
Utah	36.2/37.5	48.6/60.3		36.2/37.5	48.6/60.3	36.2	37.5	48.6	60.3	
Washington	23/27	24/27		23/27	24/27	23	27	24	27	
Wyoming	46.1/39.8	53.3/51.5		46.1/39.8	53.3/51.5	46.1	39.8	53.3	51.5	
						618.8	562.4	730.6	716.3	
				Average		30.94	28.12	36.53	35.815	131.405 32.85125

CONFIDENTIAL

DETERMINED TO BE AN
ADMINISTRATIVE MARKING

INITIALS: RLR DATE: 03/29/13
2013-0436-5

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ON HOUSE BILL REAUTHORIZING
THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT

DRAFT / September 30, 1999

TITLE I: PART A
BASIC PROGRAM

Recognition of Need

- Page I-3, lines 13-16: This provision could be read to support private school choice. We suggest that line 15 read "and should be given public school alternatives"

Authorization of Appropriations

- In providing specific appropriations for fiscal year 2000, rather than "such sums," the bill would lower funding for several initiatives. [*** Is this still relevant?? ***]

[*** not sure where evaluation \$\$ went ***] Because of the ongoing need to evaluate the effectiveness of Title I and strategies used to implement it, support for evaluation should be increased to \$10 million for fiscal year 2000.

- Page I-6, lines 15, 24: [*** State admin: what is Part C now? ***]
- Page I-7, lines 6-9: A 0.5% reservation for school improvement does not realistically reflect the level of resources needed to turn around failing schools. As the Administration has proposed, the bill should require states to reserve 2.5% of Title I funds for this purpose. At least 70% of the reserved funds would flow to LEAs, with first priority given to LEAs with schools identified for corrective action and second priority given to LEAs with schools identified for improvement. Alternatively [*** ? ***], we are willing to provide technical assistance on a policy that would allow states to reserve up to 0.5% for developing statewide systems of technical assistance, while requiring each state to provide LEAs with an amount of Title I funds sufficient to turn around low-performing schools. With state consultation, LEAs would identify such schools and would develop intervention strategies consistent with Title I school improvement and corrective action requirements. Moreover, school improvement funds should be defined as a share of not only Title I, Part A funds, but also funds for migrant education and neglected or delinquent youth programs.

Standards and Assessments

- Page I-9, line 22page I-10, line 8: The bill renames the third level of proficiency "basic"

Red flag -
→ School improvement
→ POMO
→ trying
→ accounting
→ set rules (law)
→ summary - 11 mo.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

instead of “partially proficient” and introduces a fourth level of proficiency, “below basic.” This threatens to frustrate Title I implementation in states that have developed or are developing assessments aligned with the three-tier performance standards prescribed by current law. New performance standards will force many states to redesign their assessment systems and, in turn, their accountability systems. If the intent is to classify student performance into four categories, then no departure from current law is needed. The Department and the States have interpreted the three performance levels under current law as thresholds, each of which defines a group of students above and below the threshold. Massachusetts, for example, has developed a comprehensive assessment system with three performance levels that classify students into four categories: “advanced,” “proficient,” “needs improvement,” and “failing.”

- Page I-19, lines 4-18: The exception to the three-year rule (beginning on line 15) should be deleted because it undermines institutional accountability for helping students learn English. Moreover, this section should include the Administration’s proposed requirement that states provide tests in Spanish to Spanish-speaking students with limited English proficiency, if such tests are more likely than tests written in English to yield accurate performance data in content areas other than English.
- Page I-27, lines 1-20: These provisions prescribing penalties for failure to implement standards, assessments, and accountability systems on time are more specific than the general withholding authority given to the Secretary on page I-10, lines 17-22. The approach on page I-27 is sensible. To eliminate confusion, the provision on page I-10 should be deleted, or the words “under subsection (g)” should be added after “determines” on line 22.
- Page I-27, line 24page I-28, line 2: States may already seek waivers through the general waiver provisions of current law. This provision would only increase applications for waiver, thus delaying Title I implementation. It should be deleted.

Adequate Yearly Progress

- Page I-10, line 24page I-11, line 16: This provision requires state plans to demonstrate what constitutes adequate yearly progress of schools, LEAs, and states. But pages I-11 to I-14 go on to clearly and specifically define what constitutes adequate yearly progress of schools, LEAs, and states. Apart from what the statute explicitly requires, what more must state plans demonstrate?
- Page I-13, lines 15: Because “promotion” may include social promotion, and because several states are developing accountability systems that end social promotion, “promotion” should not be included in the list of “other academic measures.” Alternatively, the term should be rephrased as “promotion based on learning to state standards.”
- Page I-13, lines 7-13: This exception should be deleted. It unnecessarily constrains states in their development of single statewide accountability systems for Title I and non-Title I schools. While making clear that statewide assessments are the primary basis

for evaluating adequate yearly progress, the bill should give states the flexibility to take "other academic measures" into account, even if this alters the number or percentage of schools or LEAs subject to improvement or corrective action. Moreover, how is the exception supposed to work? If a state decides, based on "other academic measures," that a school or LEA otherwise subject to improvement or corrective action has made adequate progress, must the state identify another school or LEA *not* otherwise subject to improvement or corrective action in order to preserve "the number or percentage" of schools or LEAs otherwise subject to improvement or corrective action?

- Page I-13, lines 14-18: This provision requires schools to show improvement every year in the performance of every subgroup specified on page I-12, lines 8-14 and to narrow performance gaps between subgroups every year. While we agree that accountability for improved performance among all groups is important, this approach is problematic for three reasons. First, as a statistical matter, year-to-year fluctuations in student performance data do not necessarily reflect true fluctuations in performance. To account for this, adequate progress should be defined more flexibly in terms of "continuous and substantial gains," as the Administration has proposed. Second, because it is somewhat draconian to identify schools for improvement or corrective action if they fail to narrow performance gaps and to demonstrate improvement by *every* subgroup *every* year, this provision will lead many states to develop dual accountability systems—one for Title I schools, another for non-Title I schools. It makes more sense to define adequate progress by reference to gains in both overall student performance and the performance of low-achieving students, consistent with the Administration's proposal. Third, this provision will cause thousands of schools to be identified for improvement, thus triggering mandatory public school choice on a massive scale (page I-75, line 6) and inevitably diverting attention and resources from turning around failing schools.
- Page I-12, line 8; page I-13, lines 16-18: Must schools narrow performance gaps between boys and girls every year? This requirement may have unintended consequences, given the evidence that in math, for example, girls out-perform boys until middle school, after which boys typically out-perform girls. Although schools should track gender-based performance gaps, the bill should focus efforts to narrow performance gaps on gaps attributable to curricular or instructional inadequacies.
- Page I-14, line 13: The 90% requirement means that any LEA with less than 10 schools cannot demonstrate adequate yearly progress unless 100% of its schools demonstrate adequate yearly progress. Again, this will lead many states to develop dual accountability systems. The bill should incorporate the more flexible accountability provisions proposed by the Administration.
- Page I-14, line 19: The 90% requirement sets too low a benchmark for the overall percentage of students from all populations who should take the assessments. In addition to the 90% requirement, this provision should specify that 95% of students overall must take the assessments. The 95% figure provides sufficient flexibility for schools with substantial numbers of students (e.g., severely disabled students) for

whom the assessments may not yield accurate or reliable performance data.

School Report Cards

- Page I-28, lines 10-11; page I-29, lines 14-15; page I-31, line 24page 32, line 1: The bill requires state, district, and school reporting on student performance only in Title I schools and districts. Such a limited requirement provides no way to compare Title I schools with other schools in the state or district, and does not encourage states to develop single statewide accountability systems. The bill should require reporting for all schools in the state.
- Page I-29, lines 18-19: To ensure that all children are held to the same high academic standards, the bill should require reporting on student performance in content areas other than math and reading, if states have standards and assessments in other areas.
- Page I-31, lines 16-17: The bill should require schools to report data on school safety and class size, since these are among the items parents most want to see on school report cards.

LEA Plans

- Page I-36, lines 24-25; page I-37, lines 4-5: Focusing on “low-achieving children” might be read to suggest different standards for low-achieving children. These amendments should read: “all children, particularly low-achieving children.” [* ? *]
- Page I-37, lines 12-22: Requirements for assessing first grader literacy do not ensure that such assessments provide the most accurate data on the literacy of LEP students. After line 22, the following language proposed by the Administration should be inserted: “(iii) administered to students in the language most likely to yield valid results.”
- Page I-43, lines 11-20: The bill nowhere requires peer review for state approval of LEA plans. Implementation of current Title I plan requirements and reviews of state standards and Goals 2000 state plans indicate that review by teams of teachers, parents, administrators, and other education experts improves the quality and perceived legitimacy of feedback, and dramatically improves program implementation. Consistent with the Administration’s proposal, the bill should require peer review of LEA plans.

Targeting: Eligible Attendance Areas and Local Allocations

- Page I-48, line 10: After this line, the bill should include a grandfather clause to ensure continuity and fiscal stability for schools that had received Title I funds the previous year. The following language proposed by the Administration should be added: “designate and serve a school attendance area or school that is not eligible under

subsection (b), but that was eligible and that was served in the preceding fiscal year, but only for one additional fiscal year.”

- Page I-49, line 12page I-50, line 11: [*** Bill now follows current law below 75%. Wouldn't a middle threshold target better? Above 75%, we had proposed strict rank ordering without regard to grade span. ***]
- Page I-53, lines 10-14: This provision should make clear that funds must be allocated “in rank order” and that no higher poverty school may receive a lower per-pupil allocation than a lower poverty school.
 - Page I-54, line 13: To ensure that homeless children are served by Title I, the clause “where appropriate” should be deleted.

Schoolwide Programs

- Page I-55, line 2: The bill omits improvements proposed by the Administration to clarify the purposes of schoolwide programs—namely, to enable high-poverty schools to upgrade their entire educational program and to help ensure that all children in such schools, particularly those most at risk of educational failure, meet challenging state standards.
- Page I-55, line 9: The bill reduces the poverty threshold for schoolwides to 40%. To ensure that Title I funds support schoolwide programs specifically in schools where, according to educational research, the level of poverty negatively affects the educational achievement of all students, the threshold should remain at 50%.
- Page I-55, lines 13-20: The bill should require LEAs to subject schoolwide plans to peer review, consistent with the Administration's proposal.
- Page I-57, line 22page I-62, line 10: The bill omits modifications proposed by the Administration to clarify the three essential components of effective schoolwide programs—a comprehensive needs assessment, a coherent design to improve teaching and learning throughout the school based on the needs assessment, and regular review for purposes of improvement.

Page I-58, line 5: The comprehensive needs assessment should include other factors that affect teaching and learning in the school. These lines should read: “. . . that is based on information including, but not limited to, the performance of children”

Page I-59, line 18: The words “high-quality and ongoing” should be added before “professional development.”

Page I-60, lines 15-23: This provision should also provide for teacher-parent conferences to discuss student difficulties, and it should suggest what interventions (e.g., one-on-one tutoring, before- or after-school programs, summer school) schools and parents should undertake to address difficulties.

Page I-63, lines 12-14: Instead of requiring “review[] . . . as necessary” of schoolwide plans, this provision should include a clear requirement for *regular* review of each school’s progress toward implementing schoolwide programs and achieving student achievement goals.

School Choice

- Page I-70, lines 2-9: We read this language to confine choice programs to pupil transfer among public schools only. If congressional intent is ambiguous on this point, the following language should be added: “A local educational agency may not use funds under this part to develop or implement school choice programs that encourage, facilitate, or otherwise provide for pupil transfer from public schools to private schools.”
- Page I-70, line 10: The choice plan should include the provision (section 1115A(b)(4)) in current law requiring LEAs to describe how schools will provide individual student assessment results to parents. This provision promotes accountability for the achievement of disadvantaged students, whatever school they attend.
- Page I-70, line 13: Who are “eligible students”? Do LEAs have total discretion to define eligibility?

School Improvement and Corrective Action

- Page I-75, line 7; page I-76, line 4: Requiring LEAs to develop public school choice options for students in schools identified for improvement seems impracticable given the large number of schools that will be identified under the bill’s rigorous definition of adequate yearly progress. Moreover, this requirement would divert the attention and resources of LEAs from assisting low-performing schools—at precisely the time (within 18-months) when school improvement efforts are most needed and may begin to show results. A more sensible approach is to require school choice when a school has been identified for corrective action.
- Page I-78, line 12: This provision should require LEAs to subject plans for school improvement to peer review.
- Page I-80, line 7; page I-89, line 9: Consistent with emerging research on the time it takes to turn around low-performing schools, the bill should require corrective action after the end of three, not two, years following school or LEA identification for improvement, as the Administration has proposed.
- Page I-82, lines 6-14; page I-91, lines 18-25: These exceptions allowing for delay of corrective action should be deleted.
- Page I-91, line 25: After this line, there should be a provision specifying when states may remove LEAs from improvement status—presumably when an LEA, for at least

CONFIDENTIAL

two out of three years following its identification for improvement, has made adequate yearly progress.

Paraprofessionals

- Page I-104, lines 5-6: Paras only need to meet “a rigorous standard of quality.” Not sure what this means, except that it requires more than a high school diploma or GED. They deleted state or local certification. Not sure who defines “a rigorous standard of quality,” but based on the language, it looks like LEAs get to define. Suggests that there won’t be uniformity in rigor within each state.
- Page I-106, lines 13-14: Allows paras to provide “instructional services.”
- Page I-106, line 19: Direct teacher supervision is required only when paras provide instructional services. Our proposal requires such supervision when paras provide one-on-one tutoring, assist with classroom management, or provide assistance in a computer laboratory.
- Page I-106, lines 21-25: Why is only reading subject to this stricter requirement? Shouldn't math or writing instruction also be included?

Professional Development

- Page __, lines __: This section should more clearly endorse activities that involve collaborative groups of teachers and administrators from the same school or district and, to the greatest extent possible, include follow-up and school-based support such as coaching or study groups.
- Page __, lines __: To ensure that children most at risk of educational failure have high-quality teachers, the bill should require LEAs to reserve 5% to 10% of their Title I funds for on-going professional development, as the Administration has proposed.

Private Schools

- Page I-52, line 1: Before requiring extrapolation of survey data, there should be some safeguards to ensure that the resulting number would be reliable (e.g., the number of surveys returned was sufficient to permit extrapolation, the surveys returned represent the school population as a whole). Otherwise, the count of low-income children may be artificially high or artificially low.
- Page __, line __: Requiring consultation with entities “by whom” the services to private school children will be provided implies that an LEA must discuss the specific employees who will provide services.
- Page __, lines __: This provision would require private school officials to sign a written affirmation that consultation has occurred. It could be construed as giving private

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

school officials a veto over the services to be provided if they are in any way dissatisfied.

- Page __, lines __: By authorizing a bypass if a single private school child has “failed to make satisfactory progress in those subjects for which the child receives title I services,” the bill makes LEAs wholly responsible for meeting the educational needs of children who attend private schools. Given the difficult questions this raises concerning where an LEA’s obligation ends and where the private school’s begins, we oppose this provision.

Comparability of Services

- Pages __: The bill proposes no amendments to the comparability of services requirement in section 1120A of current law. As the Administration has proposed, this section should be amended to strengthen the quality of inputs to be examined in ensuring intra-district school comparability. Such inputs should include teacher qualifications, school safety conditions, and accessibility to technology, among others.

Amounts for Grants (Title I formulas)

Outlying Areas and the Secretary of the Interior: Pages 101-03 set out instructions for allocating a 1% set-aside from Title I LEA Grants for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas. These provisions also include a \$5 million reservation from the Outlying Areas share for islands that are not U.S. territories but are “freely-associated states.”

- Page __, lines __: After September 30, 2001, the number of entities that would be eligible to receive funding under the 1% set-aside drops from seven entities to the four Outlying Areas (American Samoa, Guam, Northern Marianas, and the Virgin Islands). The Outlying Areas should not receive the resulting windfall, since they are already well-provided for under the 1% set aside. Therefore, language on line 7 should be changed to reserve a total of *up to* 1%.
- Page __, lines __: Since the bill terminates eligibility to the freely associated states after September 30, 2001, the four Outlying Areas would be the sole eligible entities for competitive grants. The competitive grant program should be repealed as of that date, since having two different funding mechanisms (formula grants and competitive grants) for the same four entities makes no sense and creates unnecessary burden.
- Page __, lines __: Unlike current law, the bill would not allow the Outlying Areas to consolidate Title I funds, and it would require funds to be used for Title I purposes, not for broader purposes under ESEA. Is the intent to have the Outlying Areas, some of which receive only small amounts of funds, meet all Title I accountability requirements?

Amounts for Basic Grants, Concentration Grants, and Targeted Grants: Title I provides funds to high-poverty LEAs, which have the furthest to go to help children meet high

CONFIDENTIAL

standards.

- Page __, lines __: Because this provision would significantly decrease the amount of funds allocated as Targeted Grants, it should be reconsidered. The proposed allocation formula would authorize substantial annual increases in Basic Grants, which spread funds thinly across high- and low-poverty LEAs. Meanwhile, Targeted Grants would receive only 50% of any increase in Title I LEA Grants above the FY 1999 level. In contrast, the Administration's proposal would allocate substantial funds through the Targeted Grants formula, which distributes funds more fairly by providing higher per-child amounts to higher-poverty LEAs and lower per-child amounts to less poor LEAs.
- Page __, lines __: By guaranteeing Title I funds to LEAs that do not meet the eligibility thresholds for four additional years under the Basic, Concentration, and Targeted formulas, this provision would drastically reduce increases in funding to all eligible LEAs. It would prevent retargeting of Title I funds to LEAs that are newly eligible for funds or that are experiencing substantial increases in poverty. For example, with the use of new 1999 poverty data, 1,626 LEAs were newly eligible for Title I funding, and 1,732 LEAs had insufficient poverty to meet the criteria for eligibility. Continuing funding to the 1,732 ineligible LEAs for four additional years severely reduces funding to the newly eligible LEAs and could leave them with nothing at all in the event that the Title I appropriation is not substantially increased each year. Moreover, the provision circumvents targeting under the Concentration and Targeted formulas that are specifically designed to provide money to the highest poverty LEAs. Although funding for each formula is typically earmarked in appropriations language, this authorizing language undermines targeting of funds where the needs are greatest.

“Scientifically based research”

- The term “scientifically based research” is broadly used in this bill. This term has a specific definition in the provisions authorizing Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration programs and in the provisions of current law authorizing reading and literacy grants (Title II, Part C). In particular, research qualifies as “scientifically based” only if, among other things, it “has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review.” This definition would render virtually impossible the implementation of many Title I provisions. In the following areas where the term “scientifically based research” occurs, the bill should require or encourage (as appropriate) that programs, plans, reforms, or strategies simply be “research-based.”
 - Page I-1, lines 16-17 (effective educational strategies).
 - Page I-37, line 20; page I-40, lines 8-9 (LEA plans).
 - Page I-58, line 16 (schoolwide reform strategies).
 - Page I-67, lines 5-6 (targeted assistance programs).

CONFIDENTIAL

- Page I-77, lines 4-5 (school improvement plans).
- Page I-78, lines 22-23; page I-79, lines 14-15 (LEA-provided technical assistance to schools identified for improvement).
- Page I-82, lines 2-3 (LEA-prescribed corrective action for schools).
- Page I-87, lines 1-2 (LEA improvement plans).
- Page I-109, lines 14-15; page I-110, line 1 (required professional development activities).

Comprehensive Technical Assistance Centers

- Page 43, line 18; page 66, lines 8-9: References to these centers should be deleted. These centers should not be reauthorized because [* **why?** *]

Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Programs

- Page I-D-11, line 13: Support should be increased to \$200 million, the fiscal year 2000 request.

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~

TITLE I: PART D
NEGLECTED OR DELINQUENT YOUTH

TITLE III
INDIAN EDUCATION

“Indian Flex” Authority

- Page 17, lines 3-13: This provision creates a new “Indian Flex” authority that could open a back door to bigger consolidation and that could create a substantial administrative and reporting burden for the Department of Education [* ? *]. The proposal permits integration of services for programs serving Indian students in *any* LEA that receives funds under the Indian Education program. [*** How many schools? ***] Thus, a small amount of money under the Indian Education program could trigger a consolidation involving much larger programs such as Title I. [*** specific ways that consolidation produces less accountability? ***] In BIA schools, Indian Education formula money may already be consolidated.

TITLE IV
MAGNET SCHOOLS

- 
- Page 8, line 3: This changes section 5106(b)(2)(B) from “State certified or licensed teachers” to “fully qualified teachers (as described in section 1119).” The current statutory language—“State certified or licensed teachers”—should be retained because it is more specific and answers the question of what “fully qualified” means without the awkward reference to another title.
 - Page 9, line 8: This retains the statutory priority for need for assistance in section 5107. This priority should be eliminated, as the Administration has proposed, because [* ??? *]. However, if the provision is retained, it should be amended by striking the words “the expense or” after the words “based on” (line 9). This change would invite discussion of other difficulties inherent in implementing approved desegregation plans, while still permitting applicants to raise expense as an issue, where appropriate.

CONFIDENTIAL

**TITLE VII
GIFTED AND TALENTED**

**TITLE VIII
RURAL EDUCATION**

Subpart 1 – Small and Rural School Program

Alternative Uses of Funds: Section 10961 would authorize small, rural LEAs, upon notifying SEAs of their intent, to consolidate funds from the Class Size Reduction, Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and Innovative Education Program Strategies programs. Without much accountability [* ?? *], LEAs could use these funds for local or statewide education reform efforts to improve academic achievement and the quality of instruction in elementary and secondary schools.

- Page 2, lines 19-25: The language allows eligible LEAs to use applicable funds to support State and local education reform efforts, but does not make clear whether LEAs would be able (1) to consolidate the funds from the four applicable programs or (2) to use those funds for activities that are not otherwise authorized. The proposal also does not require LEAs to provide SEAs with plans for how they would use funds to improve student achievement or the quality of instruction.
- Page 3, lines 9-21: This provision would make eligible an LEA that (1) serves fewer than 600 students, (2) serves only schools in communities with a United States Department of Agriculture Rural-Urban Continuum Code of 6, 7, 8, or 9, or (3) receives a waiver of the criteria from the Secretary to use applicable funding to support State or local reform efforts. The language regarding a “community” is problematic because the Rural-Urban Continuum Code applies to counties not towns, and an estimated 2,600 LEAs would be eligible [* compared to what # currently? *]. In addition, determining which schools served by the LEA are in communities with the appropriate code would be confusing and burdensome on States.

Formula Grants to Small, Rural Districts: Section 10962 would authorize grants of \$100 per student or \$20,000, whichever is greater, to LEAs that meet the same criteria for using applicable funding.

- Page 5, lines 17-23: The Secretary would award an eligible LEA an amount equal to \$100 per student or \$20,000, whichever is greater, minus the amount the LEA receives from the Class Size Reduction, Eisenhower State Grants, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and Innovative Education Program Strategies programs in that fiscal year. This provision would be impossible for the Department to implement without collecting substate allocation data from the states, since the Department does not make the allocations for the affected programs directly to LEAs. To implement the formula, states would have to provide the Department with substate allocation amounts within a timeframe that may not be possible. In addition, the proposal would reduce the amount of awards to LEAs that did not use their applicable funding for

alternative uses.

- Page 6, lines 7-14: In any fiscal year in which the amount of the appropriation is not sufficient to provide LEAs with their full award, the Secretary would be required to ratably reduce the amount of awards. As drafted, it is unclear whether all LEAs would have their amount of award reduced, or only those LEAs that receive an amount above the minimum.
- Page 6, lines 21-25: An LEA desiring to receive an award would have to conduct a census, by December 1, of the average daily attendance in grades K-12. The language is unclear as to whether the intent is to determine the average daily attendance for the LEA over a period of time, or to determine the attendance on one particular day before December 1.
- Page 8, lines 6-20: An LEA that receives or uses funds under this subpart would have to administer the test used statewide to assess the academic achievement of students in the LEA. In the absence of a statewide test, the LEA would have to select a test to assess student achievement. An LEA also would be required to use the same test in each year it participated in the program. The language does not contain any references to the tests or performance standards required under Title I. The language regarding the use of the same test for all five years of participation would seem to mean that an LEA in a state that adopted a statewide assessment after its first year of participation in the program would have to relinquish its award under this section in order to be in compliance with Title I.
- Page 9, lines 5-21: An SEA would be required to determine whether, after five years of participating in the program, the academic achievement of students in the LEAs had increased. An LEA that demonstrated increased academic achievement would be eligible to continue to participate in the program for an additional five years. An LEA that failed to demonstrate gains in academic achievement would be unable to participate in the program over the ensuing five years. These accountability provisions are considerably weaker than those contained in Title I. For example, there are no provisions for disaggregating data, closing the achievement gap between high- and low-achieving students, and reporting the data publicly. Even though the Secretary would be making awards to districts, it would be states that determine continued participation.

Subpart 2 – Low-Income and Rural School Program

Subpart 2 would authorize a state formula grant program to provide subgrants to poor, rural districts. In states that choose not to participate, the Secretary would be authorized to make awards directly to eligible LEAs.

- Page 10, lines 15-24: The Secretary would allocate to each state its share of funds based

on the number of children served by eligible districts within the state. An eligible district is one with: (1) at least 20 percent of the children it serves residing in households with incomes below the poverty line, and (2) a Rural-Urban Continuum Code of 6, 7, 8, or 9. The language contained in the bill describing the method of allocation is poorly drafted. As written, Connecticut, Rhode Island, and New Jersey would not receive any funds under this program, and the language does not address allocations for rural areas in Hawaii and Puerto Rico. Moreover, it would be difficult and burdensome for SEAs to determine LEA eligibility. Many LEAs serve students from more than one county; the proposal contains no means for States to adjust poverty counts in LEAs to account for this.

Furthermore, this subpart contains no real accountability provisions. States desiring to receive a grant must apply to the Secretary and provide such information as the Secretary may require. States must also provide specific measurable goals and objectives, and report annually on the method they used to allocate funds, how LEAs used the funds, and progress made within the state toward meeting the goals and objectives contained in the application. However, as with Subpart I, the proposal contains no requirements to disaggregate data or close the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students; no provision allowing states to terminate awards to districts that fail to make significant progress toward their goals or objectives; and no provisions authorizing the Department to withhold funds from states or districts that receive awards directly from the Department that fail to make sufficient progress.

**TITLE IX
HOMELESS EDUCATION**

- Page 5, line 18: The bill would require the Secretary to transfer 1% of the appropriation to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA). At the FY 1999 level of funding, this would require the Department to reserve \$288,000 for the BIA, nearly tripling the BIA's award. (In the last few years the Department has given BIA \$100,000, which is the minimum allocation.) The bill should simply authorize the Secretary to reserve up to 1%.
- Page 8, line 20: States that established segregated schools for homeless children prior to enactment of this bill would remain eligible to receive funds for those schools. This would, potentially, have the impact of "grandfathering" in segregated schools that are already in operation. This section should be deleted. The Department is opposed to providing assistance to schools that separate homeless students from the mainstream school environment.