

After School 21st Century Community Learning Centers

Why After School Is Important

- **Many kids are unsupervised.** An estimated 8 million, and possibly up to 15 million, children are generally unsupervised after school.
- **Afterschool hours are some of the most unsafe times for children.** Studies by the FBI and youth groups show that the peak hours for juvenile crime and victimization are from 2 to 8 p.m. on schools days – hours when youth are most often without supervision.
- **Research shows after-school programs work.** Recent research has found that effective schools use extended learning time in reading and math to improve student achievement.
- **Grant recipients report improvements both in student behavior and achievement.** For example, Highland Park reported a 40% drop in juvenile crime in neighborhoods around their after-school program, and in Brooklyn, nearly 3/4 of their program participants improved their grades by 5 points out of 100 in one or more of their classes.
- **There is tremendous community interest in the program.** The Department of Education received over 2,200 applications requesting \$1.34 billion in funding in FY 2000, but only 1 in 7 received funding. More than 1,000 unfunded applications were of high enough quality to warrant funding.
- **Grantees are targeting funds on needy areas.** Schools receiving 21st Century grants are far more likely to serve high-poverty students than the average school.
- **Grantees are providing academic and enrichment services linked with schoolday program.** 95% of the centers provide activities in reading, 91% in math, 76% in science, 72% in art or music, 70% in technology, and 64% in social studies.
- **The services supported are intensive.** Over half the centers operate for at least 15 hours a week during the school year. Two-thirds of the grantees operate summer programs in addition to their school-year programs.

The President's FY 2001 Request

- The President's request of \$1 billion, without the proposed matching requirement, would allow approximately 2,200 communities to establish 7,700 centers serving about 1.5 million children.
- The program currently supports 3,600 centers serving over 600,000 children and over 200,000 adults.

Internet Filtering

Why Internet Filtering Provisions Are Objectionable

- The Administration, in its SAPs for the House and Senate Labor/H Appropriations bills, has objected to three measures in the bills that would mandate Internet filtering technology.
 1. The House Labor/H bill contains language, added by Rep. Istook, in Section 304 of the general provisions that requires schools and libraries to use mandated filtering technology to protect children from inappropriate materials while online. If schools do not comply, they will not receive Title III funds provided for accessing the Internet and purchasing Internet-accessible computers
 2. Senator McCain introduced his Children's Internet Protection Act as Sections 601 and 602 of Title VI of the Senate Labor/H bill to require schools and libraries to use filtering software to protect student from "obscene" material. Failure to implement blocking or filtering software will prevent schools from receiving the Universal Service Discounts provided by the E-rate program
 3. Senator Santorum introduced his Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act as Title VII of the Senate Labor/H bill to require schools and libraries to implement blocking or filtering devices or to develop an Internet acceptable use policy to prevent student access to inappropriate material. Failure to comply with this Act would also prevent schools from receiving the Universal Services Discounts.
- Current conference language combines these three provisions without allowing schools and libraries the option of the acceptable use plan. Other objectionable components of the Conference language are:
 1. Required filtering software is an unfunded Federal mandate. Fairfax County Schools spent \$1 million to install filtering software and spends \$200,000 for its operation
 2. Mandating a particular software and a technological "solution" limits local control over what kind of Internet training and protection a Local Education Agency may provide
 3. Locals have already worked hard to protect their children from objectionable material on the Internet. 95 percent of public libraries already have in place a formal policy to regulate use of the Internet
 4. Internet filtering software is not foolproof. Filters routinely block out sites that

provide information on breast cancer, Planned Parenthood and NOW while failing to block up to 15 percent of “objectionable” sites

5. Language requires that schools and libraries hold at least one public hearing on their proposed Internet use policies, a requirement which is unnecessarily burdensome.

Administration Alternative

******No final decision has been reached but the ideal resolution would be the elimination of the conference language. Another possible alternative, not yet agreed to, is to allow the Santorum language from the Senate bill and attempt to strike the public meeting requirement for public comment on local acceptable Internet use plans.

Administration Alternative

- The alternative level of \$900 million would double funding for the program and support, without the proposed match, about 6,900 centers serving about 1.35 million students.

Class Size Reduction

Why Class Size Reduction Is Important

- **Research supports it.** Research shows that reducing class sizes in the primary grades improves student achievement and reduces discipline problems, and that improvements have a lasting impact through high school.

- Rigorously done evaluations, in particular of Tennessee's STAR program, have shown dramatic improvements in student achievement in classrooms with no more than 18 children, especially for low-income students. A recent Wisconsin study showed similar results.

- A recently released RAND study showed that scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP), the nation's report card, have been highest in States with the lowest student-teacher ratios.

- **Congress made a promise that schools hope it will keep.** Congress reached a bipartisan agreement the past two years to fund class size reduction, and districts have hired 29,000 teachers on that basis. Not guaranteeing continued funding now for the program would set back education reform in hundreds of struggling schools and thwart State class size reduction efforts already underway.

- **The impact has been immediate and far-reaching.** In the 90,000 classrooms that have already benefitted from this program, the average class size in the primary grades has dropped from 23 to 18. The program has helped an estimated 1.7 million students in the early grades receive instruction in smaller, more personalized classes; 90,000 teachers who now teach more manageable classes; and 23,000 schools – about one-third of the nation's elementary schools – that have hired one or more teachers.

- **Teachers are seeing results.** Teachers report a dramatic decrease in discipline problems and fewer students struggling with reading. In New York City – where 30% of students in grades K-3 are in smaller classes as a result of its class size reduction initiative – reported improvements include reduction in discipline referrals, improved teacher morale, increased emphasis on prevention rather than remediation, and increased classroom participation by students.

- **It's spurring State and local reform efforts.** Already two additional States have launched complementary class size reduction efforts, on top of the 20 underway. Districts receiving funds are spending the money on innovative reform efforts that are helping to turn around failing schools, improve achievement through early identification of reading problems, and increased individualized instruction.

The President's 2001 Budget

The President's Budget requests \$1.75 billion, enough to fund a total of about 46,000 teachers, coming close to the halfway mark in the goal to support 100,000 new, qualified teachers by 2005. (The number of teachers that could be hired has been revised downward by 3,000 teachers based on more recent State data on actual teacher costs.)

Administration Alternative

Funding

The alternative level for this program is \$1.65 billion, \$100 million below the request. This funding level, along with the proposed local match, would fund the hiring of approximately 14,000 new teachers (compared to about 16,700 at the President's request) and continue support for the 29,000 teachers already hired, for a total of 43,000 teachers. Without the proposed local match, over 10,000 new teachers could be hired at the alternative level, for a total of nearly 40,000 teachers.

Language

The Class Size Reduction Program requires authorization language, which should include language ensuring a dedicated funding stream for this program because last year's language applied only to FY 2000.

Last year's language, because it reflects several compromises agreed to by both Democrats and Republicans, would be acceptable as it is.

Language on the proposed local matching requirement would need to be added to last year's language in order to hire 46,000 teachers in FY 2001.

School Renovation

Why School Renovation Is Important

- **National Need for Repair.** According to the U.S. Department of Education, it would cost an estimated \$127 billion to bring America's schools into good overall condition. Three-quarters of schools reported needing to spend money on critical repairs, renovations, or modernizations.
- **Need Per School.** The same Department of Education study found that the average dollar amount needed per school was about \$2.2 million.
- **Plan for Repair.** According to the study, over half of the schools that reported one or more inadequate buildings indicated that they had no plans for renovations.
- **Age of Schools.** The latest available data shows that the average public school was built 42 years ago. Schools begin to deteriorate rapidly after 40 years.
- **Total Facilities Need.** According to the National Education Association, it would cost about \$300 billion for America's schools to address needs associated with rising enrollments, school repair, and technology infrastructure.
- **Students.** 3.5 million children attend schools where at least one building is nonoperational or significantly substandard. 11 million children attend schools where at least one building is in less than adequate condition.
- **Student Achievement.** School facilities are an important precondition for student learning. A number of studies have shown that students in over-crowded schools, schools with faulty heating and air conditioning, and schools in need of major repairs do not perform as well as students in well maintained schools.

The President's 2001 Budget

- **Spending Proposal.** Requests \$1.3 billion in budget authority to make about \$6.7 billion in grants and interest-free loans for emergency repairs in 5,000 schools per year. Over 5 years, this program would help 25,000 school repair items such as roofs, heating and cooling systems, and electrical wiring. This program included three components:
 - \$50 million in grants to help build and repair schools where half or more of the students live on Indian lands;
 - \$125 million in grants to high-need school districts with little or no capacity to borrow money for emergency repairs; and
 - \$1.125 billion in loan subsidies to fund about \$6.5 billion in interest-free, seven-year loans.
- **Tax Credit Proposal.** Requests authority to allocate nearly \$25 billion in interest-free, tax credit bonds to states and local education agencies for the construction and renovation of 6,000 public

schools. Tax credit authority would be provided as follows:

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

Administration Alternative

We are currently exploring options for administering the \$1.3 billion spending side proposal that would not involve a federal level competition for funds, or require the Department of Education to manage loans. There is, however, no internal agreement on a new structure. Currently we are considering the following:

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

Title I Accountability Fund

Why the Accountability Fund is Important

- **The Fund is a small investment with a big impact.** All Title I funds will be used more effectively if States, districts and schools are held accountable for raising student achievement.
- **The need for the Fund is great.** Over 8,000 Title I schools -- nearly 18% -- have been identified as failing. However, the most recent evaluation of Title I shows that over half of the schools identified as failing received no additional assistance to help turn them around simply because States did not have the resources to help them improve.
- **States and districts could use the funds to support a range of activities** including providing technical assistance and professional development services, requiring low-performing schools to implement a proven reform model, implementing alternative governance structures such as charter schools, or even taking over a failing school.
- **Research shows it works.** A RAND study to be released in July shows that States that have strong standards and accountability systems in place have made the most significant gains in student achievement in the past ten years, in particular among disadvantaged students. These are exactly the kinds of systems that the Accountability Fund support.
- **Current State plans are of high quality.** State plans for the use of the \$134 million appropriated for last year=s Accountability Fund show effective, high-quality approaches to turning around low-performing schools. While State plans vary, several States are ensuring that the worst schools are receiving on average \$50,000 to implement proven reforms, some are running competitions based on need and quality of applications, many are requiring that technical assistance be provided by proven experts, and many will evaluate their accountability program to assess its impact.

The President's 2001 Request

- The FY 2001 Budget includes appropriations language that would set-aside \$250 million within Title I Grants to LEAs to help States and districts put accountability systems in place and turn around failing schools.
- Priority is placed on helping the worst schools (those in "corrective action"), and secondly on schools in need of improvement.
- States may keep 30% of funds to build statewide systems and to provide technical assistance; the remaining 70% would go to school districts.

In addition, students in the worst schools (Acorrective action@ schools) would be given the option to transfer to a better school.

Administration Alternative

The alternative to the language in the President's request is last year's appropriations language on the Accountability Fund, possibly with some changes. The key provisions in last year's language are:

States can place an equal priority on any school in need of improvement, as opposed to placing a higher priority on the worst schools (those in corrective action). Nonetheless, in practice, States have tended to target last year's funds on the worst schools.

School districts do not have to provide a choice option if they do not have slots to place students from failing schools in or if they have an open enrollment policy (the open enrollment provision is in guidance). The President's budget requires choice options for all students in corrective action schools; therefore, it offers an "out" for districts, but applies the requirement to a smaller set of schools.

There is no limit on transportation costs for the implementation of choice provisions. If last year's language is retained, we may want to limit transportation costs to 10%, as in the year's Budget language

All funds go to LEAs, and none to State administration of the Accountability Fund. Last year, this was at the insistence of Goodling's staff. However, States have indicated that they have limited capacity to administer these funds, and so could benefit from keeping 10-15% at the State level for administration and the provision of technical assistance.

Title II – Teaching to High Standards

Why Title II Is Important

- More than 2.2 million public elementary and secondary school teachers must be hired over the next decade. This need must be met with qualified, well-prepared teachers who are properly certified and will teach in their field of study.
- 66 percent of high school teachers have either an undergraduate or graduate major in an academic field, compared with 44 percent of middle school teachers and only 22 percent of elementary teachers.
- More than one-fourth of teachers enter the profession without having fully met state licensing standards.
- A 1999 NCES study on the Preparation and Qualification of Public School Teachers reported the following findings about teachers' lack of confidence in their preparation:
 - Only 20 percent of teachers who limited English proficient or culturally diverse students, and/or students with disabilities felt very well prepared to meet their needs.
 - Only 28 percent of teachers felt very well prepared to use student performance assessment techniques; 41 percent reported feeling very well prepared to implement new teaching methods, and 36 percent reported feeling very well prepared to implement state or district curriculum and performance standards.

The President's 2001 Budget

- The President's budget meets these important challenges with a significant \$1 billion investment in teacher preparation and quality to ensure that a talented and dedicated teacher is in every classroom in America.

Title II-Teacher Quality State Grants

- The President's FY2001 budget requests \$690 million for Teacher Quality State Grants, more than double the FY2000 appropriation of \$335 million. This funding level would dramatically strengthen the quality and frequency of teacher preparation.
- Grants would provide funds for approximately **1,250,000** teacher participations in high-quality professional development activities.

- At least \$300 million of program funds would be set aside specifically for math and science professional development, a high-need area for teacher preparation. This would help States and school districts take full advantage of new research and curricular materials aimed at improving the teaching and learning of mathematics.

Title II-Teacher Quality National Activities

- The President's FY2001 budget requests \$310 million for Teacher Quality National Activities, a \$272 million increase from the \$38 million FY2000 appropriation. The President's proposal features a series of targeted initiatives designed to address particular professional development deficiencies, particularly in economically disadvantaged, low-performing school districts:

- *Transition to Teaching: Troops to Teachers (FY2001 request: \$25 million)*- Initiative would support the existing Troops to Teachers program by continuing to train former military personnel to become classroom teachers in high-need communities and subject areas. It would also provide funding to help other mid-career professionals to become teachers, creating over **4,000** new teachers.

- *School Leadership Initiative (FY2001 request: \$40 million)*- This new program would provide superintendents, principals, and prospective principals – particularly those who serve in high-poverty, low-performing schools and districts – with professional development opportunities to improve their ability to function as leaders. It would fund approximately 20 training centers to train approximately **10,000** principals.

- *Early Childhood Educator Professional Development (FY2001 request: \$30 million)*- This new program would create high-quality professional development opportunities to improve the knowledge and skills of early childhood educators and caregivers who work in communities with high concentrations of young children living in poverty. Competitive grants would be awarded to 60 Centers to train approximately **15,000** educators.

- *Hometown Teachers (FY2001 request: \$75 million)*- This new program would help school districts to create comprehensive systems for recruiting and retaining talented teachers. Competitive grants would be awarded to 100 high-poverty school districts, enabling them to train and recruit approximately **10,000** teachers.

- *Higher Standards, Higher Pay (FY2001 request: \$50 million)*- This new program would award competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to help them attract and retain high-quality teachers and principals through better pay. Each district would provide pay increases to 800 teachers for a total of **8,000** to **9,600** teachers.

- *Teacher Quality Incentive Awards (FY2001 request: \$50 million)*- This new program would provide reward money to high-poverty school districts that demonstrate significant progress in improving teacher quality by increasing the percentage of certified teachers

and decreasing the percentage of secondary teachers who are teaching out of field. Awards would be granted to between **30** and **200** districts of varying sizes with each district receiving between \$250,000 and \$1.6 million depending on its size.

- *Improvement of Teaching and School Leadership (FY2001 request: \$25 million)*- This new program would strengthen the preexisting Eisenhower Professional Development Federal Activities program by supporting innovative professional efforts in States and local school districts. It would provide level funding of \$18.5 million for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards so it can continue efforts to reach the goal of certifying 105,000 teachers by the year 2006, one for every school in the country.

- *Eisenhower Regional Math & Science Consortia (FY2001 request: \$15 million)*- This existing program provides funding for regional consortia that disseminate exemplary mathematics and science education instructional materials and provide technical assistance in the use of improved teaching methods.

Administration Alternative

Title II-Teacher Quality State Grants

- While a potential compromise level of \$635 million does not fully fund the President's recommended increase in Teacher Quality State Grants, this funding level would represent a \$300 million increase over the FY2000 Eisenhower State Grants appropriation.

- At the alternative funding level, State Grants would provide funds for more than **1,100,000** teacher participations in high-quality professional development activities. The alternative funding level would result in **150,000** less teacher participations than the President's request.

- The authorization for Goals 2000 expires on September 30, 2000, ending this Federal support for States to work on standards, assessments and alignment of curricula. The Administration should seek language in Title II-Eisenhower State Grants that would provide a \$50 million set-aside to allow States to continue improving these important reform tools.

- To improve local accountability, language should be included that would require Local Education Agencies to spend any Title II-State Grants funding increases they receive to reduce the percentage of uncertified teachers teaching in their classrooms. This provision should apply to districts with more than 10% of staff teaching without the proper certification and would require these districts to report these percentages at the beginning and end of the fiscal year.

Title II-Teacher Quality National Activities

- An alternative level of funding has been set at \$138 million, \$100 million more than the tentative conference level that only funds Eisenhower Regional Math & Science Consortia and Eisenhower Professional Development Activities.
- The following four programs have been identified as priorities for the remaining \$100 million:
 1. Transition to Teaching (formerly Troops to Teachers)-FY01 request \$25 million
 2. School Leadership Initiative-FY01 request \$40 million
 3. Early Childhood Educator Professional Development-FY01 request \$30 million
 4. Hometown Teachers (or related recruitment proposal)-FY01 request \$75 million

GEAR UP

Why GEAR UP Is Important

- Low-income and minority children are significantly less likely to enroll in and complete postsecondary education programs than other students.
 - In 1998, 46% of low-income high school graduates enrolled in college the following fall, compared to 77% of high-income graduates.
 - In 1998, 69% of white high school graduates – but only 62% of black and 47% of Hispanic graduates – enrolled in college the next fall.
- Research has shown that this gap is due largely to inadequate academic preparation for college, as well as a lack of information among low-income families about the requisite steps in preparing for college and the availability of financial aid.
- GEAR-UP provides counseling, tutoring, mentoring, and scholarships to disadvantaged students to raise their educational expectations and assure them that college is both attainable and affordable.
- GEAR-UP supports partnerships between colleges, high-poverty elementary and secondary schools, and national and community-based organizations and businesses to provide intensive services to students from the 7th through the 12th grade.
- The need for GEAR UP services is evident from the flood of applications that ED has received from schools, colleges, communities, and States.
 - In both FY 1999 and FY 2000, only 27% of GEAR UP applicants were awarded grants.
 - In 2000, 73 of 258 partnerships (28%) who applied for GEAR UP, and 7 of 21 States (33%), received funding.
 - Nearly 1,000 applications have been received in the first two years of the program.

The President's 2001 Budget

- The FY 2001 President's Budget requested \$325 million for GEAR-UP. At this level, 1.4 million disadvantaged students would receive comprehensive college-preparation services.

Administration Alternative

- At the alternative level of \$300 million, 1.3 million students would receive services.

Research, Statistics, and Assessment

Why Research, Statistics, and Assessment Are Important

OERI is a national resource in educational research, reform, demonstration, statistical analysis, and assessment. The President's Budget would allow OERI to expand proven research and dissemination strategies as well as provide timely investigation of pressing national issues, like education for language minority students.

The President's 2001 Budget

The President's Budget provides \$198.5 million for Research, Development, and Dissemination, \$65 million for Regional Educational Laboratories, \$84 million for Statistics, and \$42.5 million for Assessment. The President's Budget provides a total of \$325 million for Research, Statistics, and Assessment.

Administration Alternative

The alternative level (1) accepts conference committee language that provides \$113.5 million for research, \$65 million for Regional Educational Laboratories, \$68 million for Statistics, and \$40 million for Assessment; and (2) adds \$23 million for a total Research, Statistics, and Assessment budget of \$310 million. Research would receive an additional \$7 million, and Statistics would receive an additional \$16 million.

Research. Of the \$7 million in additional funds:

- \$6 million would support the **Initiative on Improving Schooling for Language-Minority Students**. This funding level would allow \$3.2 million for new research and \$2.8 million for continuation costs. The funds would support an interagency effort to determine the dynamics of effective instruction for language minority students.
- \$1 million would support **Field-Initiated Studies**, bringing total funding for this activity to \$13.7 million (same as FY 2000, but \$2.3 million below the President's request). The program provides grants to organizations like colleges, universities, and hospitals to help bring a local perspective to national education research. The request maintains funding for new initiatives while covering growth in continuation costs.

Statistics. The increase of \$16 million under the alternative funding level is the same as the President's request (\$84 million). The request funds several activities mandated in the Higher Education Act and an expansion of longitudinal studies involving early childhood education. The additional funds above the conference level are needed to support these essential programs:

- The Institutional Census Surveys program (\$20.7 million total) in order to continue with the redesign of the Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System (IPEDS), an HEA-mandated study of expenditures at institutions of higher education, and various activities intended to expand current data collection efforts;
- The Longitudinal Surveys program (\$20 million total) in order to expand the Birth Cohort of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study and the Kindergarten Cohort of the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study; and
- The Statistical Standards and Reporting program (\$11.7 million total) in order to help streamline data collections, including the well-known *Condition of Education*, *Digest of Education Statistics*, and *Projections of Education Statistics*.

Community Technology Centers

Why Community Technology Centers Are Important

- The "digital divide" has increased between 1994 and 1997: there is now an even greater disparity in computer access for economically-disadvantaged individuals
- Between 1997 and 1998, the divide between those at the highest and lowest education levels increased 25 percent, and the divide between those at the highest and lowest income levels grew 29 percent
- People in urban areas are more than twice as likely to have Internet access than those earning the same income in rural areas
- Community technology centers (CTCs) provide computer access and educational services using information technology. In general, people who visit CTCs do not own computers, and many do not have access at work or school
- The Commerce Department issued a 1998 report that showed community technology centers are particularly well used by those groups who lack access at home or work. These groups are also using the Internet at higher rates to search for jobs or take courses

The President's 2001 Budget

- The FY2001 request of \$100 million would support continuation costs for approximately 120 grants awarded in 1999 and 2000 and approximately 280 new grants in 2001. A fully funded request would **create community technology centers in 1,000 communities.**

Administration Alternative

- The only acceptable level is the Administration's FY2001 request of \$100 million. About 500 new centers would be cut at the current conference level of \$53 million.

Special Education National Activities

Why Special Education National Activities Are Important

- Even though Federal appropriations for IDEA State Grants have more than doubled in during this Administration, challenges remain.
- **There is a shortage of certified, highly qualified teachers and other personnel to work with children with disabilities.** This shortage is even more acute than the shortage of regular education teachers.
- **State and Federal monitoring shows chronic problems at State and local levels in meeting the IDEA's requirements (e.g., child find, assessment).** While the 1997 IDEA reauthorization increased the State's responsibility in administering and enforcing the IDEA, it did not provide a corresponding increase in set aside funds for the States.
- **Schools are struggling with how to educate children with disabilities who exhibit developmental delays which could lead to discipline problems as they get older.**

The President's 2001 Budget

- **A \$10 million increase for the IDEA State Improvement program (\$45.2 million total),** to help States improve their systems for providing education and related services to children with disabilities, primarily by improving their teacher training and professional development activities for both regular education and special education teachers. The Budget would increase the number of State awards from 30 to 45.
- **An \$8 million increase for Technical Assistance (TA) and Dissemination (\$53.5 million total).** The entire increase would support grants to States so they have the necessary resources to help schools comply with special education laws and correct deficiencies found through Federal and State monitoring.
- **A \$10 million increase for Research and Innovation (\$74.4 million total).** The entire increase would be devoted toward implementing research-based practices to serve children with disabilities who have reading problems and/or exhibit behaviors that may lead to discipline problems as they get older.

Administration Alternative

- The Administration's alternative level is to continue to push for the \$8 million increase for TA and Dissemination, but accept the preliminary conference level's increases for State Improvement (+\$5 million) and Research and Innovation (+\$6 million).
- ED will still be able to award 10 new State Improvement grants to States, and provide a smaller investment to its Research and Innovation initiative.
- **IDEA National Activities will still fare relatively well this year.** In recent years, Congress routinely ignored the President's requested increases to these programs, and provided little or no increase to them.

Internet Filtering

Why Internet Filtering Provisions Are Objectionable

The Administration, in its SAPs for the House and Senate Labor/H Appropriations bills, has objected to three measures in the bills that would mandate Internet filtering technology.

1. The House Labor/H bill contains language, added by Rep. Istook, in Section 304 of the general provisions that requires schools and libraries to use mandated filtering technology to protect children from inappropriate materials while online. If schools do not comply, they will not receive Title III funds provided for accessing the Internet and purchasing Internet-accessible computers
2. Senator McCain introduced his Children's Internet Protection Act as Sections 601 and 602 of Title VI of the Senate Labor/H bill to require schools and libraries to use filtering software to protect student from "obscene" material. Failure to implement blocking or filtering software will prevent schools from receiving the Universal Service Discounts provided by the E-rate program
3. Senator Santorum introduced his Neighborhood Children's Internet Protection Act as Title VII of the Senate Labor/H bill to require schools and libraries to implement blocking or filtering devices or to develop an Internet acceptable use policy to prevent student access to inappropriate material. Failure to comply with this Act would also prevent schools from receiving the Universal Services Discounts.

Current conference language combines these three provisions without allowing schools and libraries the option of the acceptable use plan. Other objectionable components of the Conference language are:

1. Required filtering software is an unfunded Federal mandate. Fairfax County Schools spent \$1 million to install filtering software and spends \$200,000 for its operation
2. Mandating a particular software and a technological "solution" limits local control over what kind of Internet training and protection a Local Education Agency may provide
3. Locals have already worked hard to protect their children from objectionable material on the Internet. 95 percent of public libraries already have in place a formal policy to regulate use of the Internet

4. Internet filtering software is not foolproof. Filters routinely block out sites that provide information on breast cancer, Planned Parenthood and NOW while failing to block up to 15 percent of “objectionable” sites
5. Language requires that schools and libraries hold at least one public hearing on their proposed Internet use policies, a requirement which is unnecessarily burdensome.

Administration Alternative

**No final decision has been reached but the ideal resolution would be the elimination of the conference language. Another possible alternative, not yet agreed to, is to allow the Santorum language from the Senate bill and attempt to strike the public meeting requirement for public comment on local acceptable Internet use plans.

Funding and Language for America's Tests

Why America's Tests Is Important

- Although states have developed standards and assessments, no system exists to measure collective and individual student performance against national achievement goals.
- America's tests weigh student performance at two critical levels, the fourth grade and the eighth grade. Studies indicate that in order to be academically successful, students must be able to read independently by the fourth grade, and master the mathematical underpinnings of algebra and geometry by the eighth grade.
- The National Academy of Sciences is conducting an evaluation of the development process for America's Tests and has determined that:
 - The questions for America's Tests are comparable in quality to those of the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP); and
 - The questions are ready to be pilot-tested.

The President's 2001 Budget

- The FY 2001 President's Budget requested \$5 million for America's Tests. The funds would help complete the testing development process and move the program into pilot testing, field testing, and administration. In order to allow for these activities, prohibitive language must be removed from the appropriations bill.

Administration Alternative (Funding and Language)

- The alternative level for America's Tests provides no specific funding earmark for the program, but assumes that prohibitive testing language must be removed.
- The language alternative for America's Test is to maintain the current language in the 2000 appropriation, which permits limited development and evaluation activities. Under the current language, the National Assessment Governing Board could (and has expressed interest in) sponsoring two studies of America's Tests. The studies are:
 - An investigation of validity concerns as they relate to testing accommodations made for students with special needs (\$900,000); and
 - A study that weighs the importance of assessment reporting in the parent/teacher dialogue (\$100,000).
- The studies could be supported with money from the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE).

Adult Education: EL/Civics Initiative

Why the EL/Civics Initiative is Important

- Funds for “Common Ground Partnerships” would support projects in states and localities with a significant number of recent U.S. immigrants that address the following critical areas:
 - Acquisition of English literacy skills;
 - Knowledge about the rights and responsibilities of citizenship (e.g., voting rights); and
 - Key skills necessary to effectively navigate the American government and public education systems, the workplace, and other key institutions.
- Comparisons of the educational attainment and employment outcomes of recent immigrants versus the rest of the population show extreme differences:
 - One-third of recent immigrants do not have a high school diploma or its equivalent, compared to 17% of the general population;
 - Recent immigrants are less likely to enroll in and complete college;
 - The median income of recent immigrants is about half that of the general population; and
 - The unemployment rate for recent immigrants is about double that of the rest of the population.
- English Literacy instruction is the fastest growing component of Adult Education. Enrollment in these programs has increased 105% over the past ten years. During the program year 1998, English language instruction accounted for 48 percent or 1.9 million of the four million adults enrolled in Adult Education programs.
- Many immigrants aspire to achieve U.S. citizenship; however, the lack of availability of English literacy and civics instruction is preventing many from becoming American citizens. For example, Los Angeles currently has a waiting list of 50,000 people for English as a second language (ESL) classes, Chicago’s ESL programs are filled to capacity as soon as they open their doors, and New York state has resorted to a lottery system to select individuals who wish to learn English.
- Since the program’s inception in FY 1999, several states have implemented exemplary programs, including:
 - **Project Shine, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:** Immigrant and refugee adults over the age of fifty constitute the most rapidly growing segment of the foreign-born population. This multi-site initiative utilizes college students throughout its national network to provide individualized instruction in overcrowded ESL and

citizenship classes. Students are also able to meet the needs of older individuals who cannot attend classes by tutoring one-on-one and in small groups throughout their communities.

Literacy and Civics Education, Elmsford, New York: Includes a consortium of immigrant learning centers in the White Plains and New Rochelle public libraries. Centers consist of classrooms with adjoining technology labs with five computer workstations. By June 2003, the centers will admit approximately 1,560 mostly Latino adults and teach them ESL (taught at four different proficiency levels), civics, citizenship, life skills, job readiness, and basic computer literacy.

Process of English and Civics Education (PEACE) Curriculum Project, Pasadena, California: This project will utilize a statewide network of 150 literacy programs and more than 300 learning centers to develop, field test, revise, and distribute an English and Civics Literacy curriculum. The content of the lesson plans will stress English literacy skills and civics education topics to cover the rights and responsibilities of active daily participation as a resident and citizen.

Prior to implementation of the EL/Civics Initiative, only two states had supported integrated English as a second language and civics education programs. Today, a total of thirty-three states have since integrated this program into their state plans.

The President's 2001 Budget

Funding. The President's FY 2001 Budget supports an \$89 million increase for Adult Education National Leadership Activities, including \$75 million to support the English Literacy/Civics Initiative. Full funding will provide about 250,000 recent immigrants and LEP (limited English proficient) adults with EL/Civics services and will help States and communities improve education for immigrants and individuals with LEP, including a large percentage of Hispanic Americans.

Language. The Administration requested that this program be administered through the National Activities authority within the Adult Education program. In FY 2000, it was administered through the Adult Education State Grants authority with priority given to States with the highest absolute need and most recent growth in need for such services.

Administration Alternative

Funding. The alternative level is \$75 million, the same as the President's request.

Language. The Administration is willing to accept appropriations language under which the program would continue to be administered through the Adult Education State Grants

authority.

Fund for the Improvement of Education: Community Coaches

The President has transmitted to Congress a Budget Amendment that will transfer \$5 million from the Corporation for National Service to the Fund for the Improvement of Education in the Department of Education. As stated in the Budget Amendment, this funding would be used to support programs such as Community Coaches.

Why Community Coaches Are Important

- **Community Coaches** Community Coaches are school-wide coordinators for community service activities that help students to build a connection to their community and develop personal, civic and academic skills. Community Coaches are usually teachers or guidance counselors.
- **Do Something.** The Community Coaches program is currently sponsored by Do Something, a national youth leadership non-profit organization. Do Something supports over 100 Community Coaches in 75 communities. Community Coaches programs are particularly strong in Wisconsin, New Jersey, Texas and Los Angeles.
- **Skills.** By allowing students to take the lead in developing and implementing community service projects, Community Coaches programs help students develop skills in leadership, organization and civic awareness.
- **Benefits to the Community.** Communities benefit from the community service projects that Community Coaches and their students help to organize. Community Coaches have already started work on projects such as turning an empty field in Compton, California into a community center and cleaning neighborhood streets in Guilford, Connecticut.
- **Benefits to the Student.** Community service projects sponsored by Community Coaches help to create positive, constructive connections between students and others in their communities. They can have a telling impact on strengthening character and creating safe learning environments and strong communities.
- **Coaches as Role Models.** Community Coaches serve as role models for students in the school. They create an environment where students can connect with each other, connect with adults and connect with their community.

The President's 2001 Budget

- **Cost.** The request of \$5 million will support Community Coaches in about 1,000 schools. Funding of \$5,000 per coach will support training activities, curriculum materials, web-based resources and evaluation of the Community Coaches program.

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

October 11, 2000

Bethany
217R

MEMORANDUM FOR JOHN PODESTA

FROM: Barbara Chow 
CC: Jack Lew
Sylvia Mathews
Chuck Brain
Karen Tramontano
SUBJECT: DPC Legislative and Budgetary Priorities

Attached for your review and consideration is an outline of the Domestic Policy Council's key legislative and budget priorities for this final phase of end game negotiations.

DPC PRIORITIES

I. Mandatory Spending Items	(in millions)	
	<u>01</u>	<u>5 yrs.</u>
1. Food Stamps (vehicles, shelter) 1/	41	1,201
2. Food Stamps (immigrants) 1/	25	565
3. Medicaid/SCHIP immigrant benefits	63	696
4. Child Support Enforcement (House-Passed HR 4678) 2/	38	1,333

II. Appropriations

1. Education
(class size, school construction, after school, accountability, teacher quality, ESL/Civics)
2. COPS
(50,000 new officers, law enforcement technology, community prosecutors, community crime prevention including police integrity funding)
3. Nat'l Gun Enforcement Initiative
(1000 state and local gun prosecutors, 100 Federal gun prosecutors, smart gun research, ballistics, anti-gun violence media campaigns)
4. Reentry/Youth Offenders
(75m for DOL in Labor/H; \$60m for DOJ in CJS)
5. Fathers Work/Families Win
(Fatherhood grants included in HR4678. If legislation does not succeed, will fall back on appropriations)
6. IDAs
(25m in Labor/H)
7. Tobacco Litigation
(23M direct funding (CJS) and/or reimbursements)
8. Second Chance Homes
(25M in Transitional Living Program funding (Labor/H))
9. SSBG
(1.775B in Labor/H; additional 700M for FY 01 in Roth New Markets Bill)

III. Authorizations

1. Corporation for Community and National Service(CNCS)
Status: The Senate Health and Education Committee passed the CNCS reauthorization bill out of committee in July. The Senate is expected to consider the bill under a UC vote this week and send it to the House where we expect it to be considered under suspension of rules.
2. Older Americans Act (OAA)
Status: It is our understanding that a deal has been struck on OAA legislation and it is likely to be taken up this week in the Senate.
3. Violence Against Women Act (VAWA)
Status: Attached to Trafficking Conference Report, which passed the House on Friday and is to be taken up in the Senate on Wednesday.
4. Breast and Cervical Cancer Act
Status: The bill has passed both the House and Senate and the House should soon be taking up the Senate passed bill.
5. Violent Crime Reduction
Status: VCRTF reauthorization provisions dropped out of VAWA conference report. Bill currently pending in Senate Judiciary Committee
6. COPS Reauthorization
Status: Pending before House and Senate Judiciary Committees.

IV. Language Needed

1. **IDA amendment language(including cars). Cars as an allowable use could be** in the Assets for Independence Act, TANF or New Markets. We have language for all three.

1/ Food Stamps pricing for vehicles and legal immigrant restoration is consistent with FY01 P.B. Pricing for shelter deduction is CBO scoring.

2/ CBO scoring.

DRAFT: Administration FY 2001 (MSR) Provisions

ADMINISTRATION	5 Year Score	10 Year Score
Hospitals full market basket in 2001, 2002	\$4.0	\$16.0
Hospitals IME Freeze at 6.5% for two years	\$0.6	\$0.6
Medicare DSH Removal of 3% in 2001	\$0.2	\$0.2
Hospitals Puerto Rico permanent adjustment to 75/25	\$0.0	\$0.1
Rural reserve fund	\$0.5	\$1.0
HHA 15% cut delay two years to 2002, 2003	\$2.5	\$2.5
HHA full update in 2001	\$1.0	\$2.0
SNF full update in 2001	\$0.6	\$1.0
Therapy cap moratorium in 2002	\$1.0	\$1.0
ESRD increase to 2.4% in 2001	\$0.2	\$0.5
Extension of mandatory funding of diabetes research	\$0.2	\$0.3
Mandatory funding of Ricky Ray Trust Fund	\$0.6	\$0.6
MiCASSA long-term care systems grant	\$0.05	\$0.05
Medicaid DSH – Increase state allotments and raise hospital caps to 175%	\$5.0	\$10.0
Nursing Home Grants for staffing ratios	\$1.0	\$1.0
Amend homebound definition for adult day care for purposes of HHA services	\$0.3	\$1.4
Full market basket for hospice	\$0.7	\$1.6
Waive 24 month waiting period for Lou Gehrig's Disease	\$0.3	\$0.7
Make permanent Medicare coverage of working disabled	\$0.0	\$0.3
Extend immunosuppressive coverage	\$0.3	\$0.3
Waiver of cost-sharing and deductibles for preventive services	\$1.0	\$3.3
Permanent extension of QI-1 program	\$0.2	\$0.9
Extension of Medicaid and CHIP state option to legal immigrant pregnant women and children and SSI	\$1.2	\$6.5
Family Opportunity Act	\$2.0	\$5.7
State option for Medicaid coverage of low-income women with breast and cervical cancer	\$0.2	\$0.8
CHIP/Medicaid Alignment	\$1.6	\$4.0
Presumptive eligibility for Medicaid/CHIP	\$1.6	\$4.3
Extend transitional medical assistance	\$0.3	\$1.2
Medicaid 300% SSI expansion	\$0.2	\$0.4
Medicaid and CHIP state option for children 19 and 20	\$0.7	\$1.9
Homeless initiative	\$0.01	\$0.01
Medicaid coverage of smoking cessation drugs	\$0.07	\$0.15