



Performance-Based Pay

Background:

As part of the 1999 National Education Summit in Palisades, New York, the governors and assembled business leaders pledged to sponsor “pay for performance” initiatives for teacher salary in 10 locations as a strategy to make teacher pay more competitive with other professions. Despite considerable attention to the issue of teacher quality, teacher pay still remains far below other professions with the national average starting salary only approximately \$25,000, average teacher salary overall only approximately \$38,000, and the average maximum teacher salary in any state only about \$51,000.

In addition, the Vice President and others have called for developing more equitable and expeditious ways to reward good teachers and get low-performing teachers out of the classroom. Specifically, in his May 16th speech at Graceland College, the Vice President called for teacher evaluations by experienced peers and administrators every 5 years to ensure, “faster but fair ways to identify, improve, and when necessary remove low performing teachers. California in addition to several large school districts have programs similar to what the Vice President proposed.

At the time of the education summit, Denver, Colorado was receiving considerable attention for its pay for performance pilot and Governor Ridge of Pennsylvania had set-aside \$1 million for school districts to establish pay-for-performance programs (which has sparked a pay-for-performance discussion in Philadelphia). The Denver program evaluates teacher performance on three-different measures with teachers electing which measure to use. The first is student performance on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills (ITBS) a nationally normed standardized test. The second is student performance on teacher-developed criterion-referenced measures. The final measure is net student progress after the teacher receives some sort of professional development related to their teaching.

12 elementary schools will participate in the first year of the Denver program. In order to participate, 85 percent of teachers at a school site had to affirmatively vote to participate. As a result, only 12 of the 82 elementary schools in Denver qualified to participate with a total participation of approximately 450 teachers. All teachers receive a \$500 bonus for participating and an additional \$1000 if they meet two (self-determined) goals for raising student achievement in one of the three categories.

During the DPC’s discussions with local school officials this fall the issue of teacher salary structure was raised on two fronts. First, local officials complained that because teacher pay was not competitive, particularly in high need areas such as math and science, they were having trouble attracting qualified candidates. Second, local officials pointed out that because teachers compensation systems are so rigid and based on input measures rather than output measures they felt that it hurt motivation and incentive to perform in the long run. They also highlighted the problems that they have dismissing poor performing teachers and acknowledged that often they simply assign these teachers

where they can do the least damage rather than attempting to get them out of the school district.

England is now introducing pay for performance for teachers as well. This Spring the first component of the Blair proposal will be put in place. In the “Green Book” published in December of 1998 outlining school improvement strategies, the Blair Administration proposed rewarding teachers for high performance as a way to reward successful teachers.

While teachers’ unions remain opposed to merit pay, they are open to the idea of rewards for effective teaching. One of the main complaints about merit pay schemes is that they are too subjective and based more on relationships with supervisors than performance. Conversely, even testing experts in favor of merit pay agree that basing teacher pay on student test scores alone is an unfair and unreliable base for compensation. This argues for a hybrid approach such as Denver’s that incorporates multiple measures for evaluation.

A second complaint about performance rewards for teaching is that the resources for compensation rarely exist. For example, several New York school districts that experimented with merit pay had to suspend the program after it became fiscally impossible to reward all eligible teachers. A common complaint from teachers about reform efforts is a lack of sustainability. By providing sufficient funding for 10 pilots, our proposal addresses this concern.

Critics of performance pay also argue that teaching is a collegial profession and that efforts to reward individual performance detract from this atmosphere. There is little data upon which to judge this argument lending credence to the need to pilot such programs and evaluate them.

One area of agreement about pay for performance plans is that teachers should have a voice in the development of the performance indicators. The Denver plan includes this component. Teacher buy-in is essential for program success.

DPC proposal:

Our initiative is designed to support the commitment laid out in the Action Plan from the 1999 National Education Summit to pilot pay-for performance initiatives in 10 states or school districts and also to encourage districts to develop equitable and expeditious ways to evaluate teachers.

The initiative would support “Denver” style pay-for-performance initiatives in which all teachers receive an initial bonus for participating and additional rewards based on performance. As aforementioned, Denver set parameters for school participation; however, we recommend leaving details of this nature up to the local districts that participate but require at least the participation of 250 teachers and cap participation at

500 per site. While large school districts are the obvious targets for grants of this type, partnerships of smaller school districts that meet the threshold should also be eligible.

Although there will be pressure from constituency groups and within the Administration to explicitly define every aspect of the program for local school districts, it would be a mistake to do so. First, by specifically defining programs we would stifle innovation and limit the value of data from this pilot. For example, the 1999 National Education Summit pledge was deliberately vague as to whether pay for performance plans had to have an individual teacher component or could be school-site-based. Second, entangling the federal government too much in the area of teacher pay raises numerous political problems that can be avoided with a more flexible program design. The proper federal role in supporting this type of initiative is to provide leadership and resources, broad parameters for participation, and to measure, compare, and disseminate results. The ideal initiative would provide resources to 10 sites within a context of broad discretion as to program design. Ideally, both individual teacher bonuses and school-based bonuses will be piloted.

However, to ensure both sound policy and political viability, any program funded under this initiative should have the following characteristics:

- No teacher should receive less compensation as a result of participating in the program;
- Teachers should be involved in the development of performance indicators;
- Performance should be based on more than a single indicator;
- Student performance must be an indicator.

In order to help states and school districts develop more effective teacher evaluation systems a second set of grants would be given to school districts that agree to 5-year teacher contracts with peer evaluation every five years and an fast but fair way to dismiss teachers who fail this evaluation and do not subsequently improve.

This Spring, California passed a statewide peer review program that could result in dismissals for low-performing teachers. Boston, Cincinnati, Columbus, Minneapolis, Rochester, and Toledo also have peer review programs in place; however, often these programs focus on professional development rather than tenure issues. Cincinnati is a noteworthy exception and reviews teachers every 5 years and is probably the best example of a successful program.

As with pay for performance plans we should allow local grantees flexibility in developing their specific programs; however we should require teachers to be evaluated no more than every 5 years and require that a fair and fast system is in place for consistently low-performing teachers as well as a support system for new teachers and teachers in need of help.

Research indicates that one of the reasons that many teachers leave the profession during the first several years is that there is little to no support in place for them during this

critical time. In short, new teachers are often “thrown to the wolves” and because of seniority provisions in many collective bargaining agreements new teachers often end up with the most challenging students.

Requiring districts that participate to move to a 5-year renewable contract will be a big give for both teachers unions; however, by requiring districts that participate to provide support for both new teachers and teachers that are identified as struggling through this system we meet one of their largest member issues.

Cost:

Including a substantial evaluation component, 10 sites for pay for performance could be funded adequately for \$25 million annually including independent evaluation. With guaranteed bonuses of \$500 for participation and assuming that all 10 sites enroll the maximum of 500 teachers, the bonus component will cost \$2.5 million. For an additional \$12.5 million we can support pay incentives for performance of up to \$2500 per participation teachers for a total program cost of \$15 million for the actual bonus component. Each local site will need additional resources for development and implementation including legal and administrative expenses. At least an additional \$2 million should be included for national activities to attract potential grantees and to conduct rigorous evaluation of programs.

The peer review component will also cost approximately \$25 million. Most districts that have implemented a peer review system have taken experienced classroom teachers out of the classroom to help develop it. Therefore, funding for the participating sites must be sufficient to allow for this reallocation of staff (essentially hiring teachers in their place), design and implementation of the plan and ongoing efforts. The Cincinnati public schools spend approximately \$2.5 million annually on their model system and estimate that it took about \$2.5 million to develop it initially. With approximately 50,000 students Cincinnati is one of the nation's largest school districts. Smaller districts could develop proposals that are less costly and so \$25 million annually could adequately fund 10 sites and evaluation.

Fund for Future Schools

Background:

As the federal role in education evolves in conjunction with the emerging information-based economy, that role will increasingly become more strategic and less programmatic. For example, already the Title I program, the largest elementary and secondary program is moving toward becoming almost entirely flexible within the context of defined goals.

During our discussions with local school officials, a reoccurring theme was the inability to try innovative or new ideas because of a lack of funding. And, while there is certainly merit in ensuring that federal dollars fund proven and research based activities there is also merit in using federal resources to drive innovation in ways that might be impossible from a local fiscal or political standpoint.

Currently the federal government funds "innovative practices" from two main accounts in the Department of Education, the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE) and the Title VI account. FIE is largely consumed by legislative earmarks and pet programs of lawmakers and as a result drives little innovation in states and localities around the country. Title VI, while a very flexible block grant, is sent to states and localities through a formula that rarely provides sufficient revenue for large scale reform. In practice there is little evidence that Title VI money drives innovation and the Administration recommends zero-funding the program each year in its budget request. While Title VI funds fill gaps in local school district budgets and state departments of education enjoy the 15 percent set-aside in the program no one seriously argues that this money stimulates innovation.

The Obey-Porter Comprehensive School Reform program supports school-based reforms; however, there is no federal program targeted to statewide, district-wide, or multi-school initiatives or single school programs that fall outside the purview of Obey-Porter.

In England, a similar fund has been established to help disadvantaged schools try new strategies and cultivate bottom-up innovations. While their Education Action Zone fund got off to a slow start, British officials report that in its second year results are encouraging. Andrew Adonis, education advisor to Prime Minister Blair reports that the British found that without independence from established interests and a people committed to change at the helm, the effort will fall short and essentially fund the status quo. Hong Kong sponsors a similar effort to what we are proposing.

DPC Proposal:

Our proposal would establish an independent and bipartisan fund to support innovative regional, state, and local ideas that require upfront infusions of funding. As opposed to school-based only reforms these resources should support structural changes at the school district, state, and/or regional level. For example, a recent Education Commission of the States called for changes in school governance, especially in large school districts. The

report recommended that school districts either move toward complete site-based management or a portfolio approach where different schools are accountable to the school board for performance but operate independently essentially as charter schools. Hugh Price, President of the Urban League called for a similar change in an editorial in Education Week. Several school districts are moving in this direction. For example Seattle has implemented site-based management and Cincinnati is slowly moving toward the portfolio model. However, changes of this nature require both fiscal and political will. By providing funding we would help school districts that are struggling to maintain services with current funding adopt changes that would otherwise be out of their reach and also help generate political will by making funds available for changes of this nature.

Other ideas raised in our discussions included expanding the school day to 6 days or 5 ½ for at-risk students and year round schedules. Both of these ideas are frequently discussed but rarely implemented well. Another issue of discussion around the country right now is how to rework the senior year of high school. It is commonly agreed that better use could be made of this time and several participants in our discussions discussed service learning and other cooperative arrangements between schools, the private sector and community based organizations. Other ideas that are frequently discussed but not implemented are college preparatory academies for college bound students who are not academically ready for college level work. The prep schools that the service academies run are often cited as models for this approach. 32 states now have educational service agencies and these umbrella organizations are in an ideal position to undertake innovative activities if there is a source of funds for them.

Every activity ^{Supplied with} ~~Funded through~~ a grant from this fund will not lay the groundwork for a future federal program. However, by collecting and disseminating data on the various activities funded we can accomplish two things:

- Dissemination of information on successful and unsuccessful practices;
- The development of models which can be incorporated into federal policy.

Grants would be given out by an independent bipartisan board. The board would include representation from the Department of Education, the private sector, the foundation community, and the education community and be composed in such a way as to maintain a bipartisan division regardless of which party controls the White House threshold for grant approval would be structured to ensure that ideas are approved with bipartisan support from board members.

Grant size and longevity would be determined by the board within broad parameters (for example purposes already prohibited by federal law, vouchers and national testing would be disallowed). Grant renewals would entail a step-down process for funding that would gradually transfer the program to fully state and local funding. Programs that don't meet performance indicators would not receive "step-down" funding. Essentially, the federal government would capitalize promising initiatives, capture data on their effectiveness, and disseminate information. A local match of at least 20 percent should be required to ensure the investment of the state or school district in the undertaking.

No grant should:

- Be for more than 20 percent of the total appropriation for the fund (i.e. \$10 million);
- Be for a purpose explicitly prohibited by federal law (i.e. national testing, vouchers, etc.).

Cost:

\$50 million annually given out by competitive grant and less administrative and evaluation expenses of the board.

DRAFT MEMO ON EDUCATION INITIATIVES:

Elementary and Secondary Education

The ongoing reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act coupled with the need to provide increases to several elementary and secondary base programs has led us to develop initiatives that complement these efforts while supporting innovation, high standards, and efforts to fix failing schools.

Significant Existing Programs

Title I – We recommend increasing funding for the Title I accountability set-aside to \$250 million for FY01 and increasing the funding for the basic Title I grants by at least an equal amount.

After-School – We are analyzing options and developing a proposal that will make after-school programs universal for students in schools identified as failing under Title I. We also recommend allowing 30 percent of funds for after-school and other extended learning programs to be granted directly to non-profit community-based organizations (CBOs)—including faith-based organizations. These programs would be run in partnership with public schools at the school site. This change would allow local organizations that have proven track records in after-school and can offer innovative educational strategies and often better connections to parents and the broader community to get involved the program. At present, no funds can be granted to CBOs, although the ESEA reauthorization proposal would allow up to 10% of funds in a given year to be awarded to nonprofit CBOs.

Class Size – We recommend a significant increase to stay on track toward hiring 100,000 teachers. The program is now funded at \$1.3 billion and we recommend increasing funding to at least [Eric: check *with Bruce and get his latest thinking here, this has been a moving target*]

Charter Schools – With an increase of approximately \$120 million the charter schools program will support the President's goal of 3000 charter schools. We recommend funding the program at this level.

Elementary and Secondary Education Act Proposals

The President's ESEA reauthorization proposal contains items that we recommend including in the budget for FY01.

Teaching to High Standards: The President's ESEA reauthorization proposal would consolidate Goals 2000, the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, and Title VI into a standards-based-reform grant program. We recommend that the FY01 budget request reflect this proposal. At their FY00 enacted levels the Eisenhower program and Goals 2000 are a combined \$ 830 million. Although the Administration does not

recommend funding the Title VI program in its budget request, the Teaching to High Standards initiative should reflect an inclusion of current Title VI funding (\$380 million FY00) and be funded at a minimum of \$1.21 billion. In order to reach this level while funding our new initiatives, we recommend including five earmarks in the Teaching to High Standards funding: Teacher Academies (OMB proposal for \$100 million), Troops to Teachers – Transition to Teaching (\$50 million), Pay for Performance Demonstration Program (\$50 million), Dual Accredited Teachers (\$30 million), and School Leadership (\$40). *These earmarks are described in more detail in this memo.*

Public School Choice OPTIONS Proposal –The OPTIONS initiative would create a grant program that would fund the demonstration, development, implementation, evaluation and dissemination of information of innovative public school choice projects. Funded projects would focus on areas such as new choice options for students within districts, partnering choice schools with other schools to disseminate information and stimulate improvement, and overcome barriers to choice. The \$30 million request covers \$28 million for approximately 40 new grants \$1.3 million for evaluation, and \$200,000 for peer review.

Troops to Teachers – The Troops to Teachers program was created in 1994 to help improve public school education by injecting the talent, skills, and experience of military service members and other federal civilian personnel into high-poverty schools. Recent studies have found that a significant number of mid-career professionals who possess strong subject matter skills are interested in beginning a teaching career-this program taps this valuable resource. The new proposal will continue the recruiting, preparing and supporting retired military personnel as teachers in high-need subject areas and school districts. It will also support similar programs for other mid-career professionals by awarding grants to public agencies, institutions of higher education, and nonprofit organizations to recruit, prepare, and support career-changing professionals from diverse fields whose knowledge and experience could help them become successful teachers. \$50 million for FY01.

New Initiatives

Fund for Future Schools – During our discussions with educators and education leaders this fall, a common theme was the lack of funding available for large-scale innovation. Our proposal would establish an independent and bipartisan fund to support innovative regional, state, and local ideas that require up-front infusions of funding. As opposed to school-based only reforms these resources would support structural changes at the school district, state, and/or regional level. For example, a recent Education Commission of the States called for changes in school governance, especially in large school districts. The report recommended that school districts either move toward complete site-based management or a portfolio approach where different schools are accountable to the school board for performance but operate independently essentially as charter schools. Hugh Price, President of the Urban League recently called for a similar change in an editorial in Education Week and a few school districts are moving in this direction. For example Seattle has implemented site-based management and Cincinnati is slowly

moving toward the portfolio model. However, changes of this nature require both fiscal and political will. By providing funding we would help school districts that are struggling to maintain services with current funding adopt changes that would otherwise be out of their reach and also help generate political will by making funds available for changes of this nature. Of course, this funding could also support school based or other changes that the board deemed worthy of support. A local matching requirement would encourage local support and investment. Prime Minister Blair has started a similar fund in England and British officials report that in its second year their Education Action Zone initiative is showing positive results however they believe that the independence of the fund is a key characteristic. \$50 million would be distributed by competitive grants in the first year of this program.

Performance-Based Pay and Peer Review – As part of the 1999 National Education Summit in Palisades, New York, the governors and assembled business leaders pledged to sponsor “pay for performance” initiatives for teacher salary in 10 locations as a strategy to make teacher pay more competitive with other professions. Denver Colorado had adopted such a measure just prior to the summit. Despite considerable attention to the issue of teacher quality, teacher pay still remains far below other professions with the national average starting salary only approximately \$25,000, average teacher salary overall only approximately \$38,000, and the average maximum teacher salary in any state only about \$51,000. In addition, the Vice President and others have called for developing more equitable and expeditious ways to reward good teachers and get low-performing teachers out of the classroom. Specifically, in his May 16th speech at Graceland College, the Vice President called for teacher evaluations by experienced peers and administrators every 5 years to ensure, “faster but fair ways to identify, improve, and when necessary remove low performing teachers. California in addition to several large school districts have programs similar to what the Vice President proposed. Our proposal would fund 10 pilot pay for performance plans similar to what Denver has developed. While details would be left up to the local school districts and their teachers, the pilots could support performance awards that are either individual or school based. We would also provide grants for 10 pilots of “peer review” programs where teachers are evaluated by their peers every 5 years and low-performing teachers are given support to improve or ultimately removed from the system in a fair but fast manner. 10 pilots for each strategy could be funded for \$50 million in the first year.

Rewarding Leaders and High Performance –The federal government’s role in education has evolved to one that expects all students to achieve, holds schools accountable for performance, supports improvement, refuses to tolerate persistent failure, and rewards success. However, we have not yet put into place a viable rewards program. This proposal calls for a Rewards Fund for Leaders and High Performance that would award funding to states that met federal performance criteria and would support teacher performance pay demonstration projects (*described above*). From FY2001-2003, states would receive awards for developing accountability systems, including high school exit exams, meeting teacher quality requirements, and developing and disseminating report cards ahead of the timetable the President is calling for in his ESEA proposal. After

2003, the Reward Fund would move to a system based on actual student performance measures.

Initially, this fund would also provide seed money to states to help them develop school report cards including the guidelines that the President specified in his Education Accountability Act. This would help undermine Republican criticism of our ESEA requirements as unfunded mandates to the states. Beginning with \$125 million in FY01 and including our peer review and pay for performance proposals, we would be on a track to spend \$1 billion rewarding performance over five years.

Leadership for 21st Century Schools –Without quality school leaders, school reform is destined to fail. To address this, our initiative would fund independent School Leadership Centers. The Centers would focus on leadership development opportunities for existing schools leaders (principals, superintendents, etc) in areas such as effective management, school design, technology, and district governance. In addition, recruiting and training nontraditional candidates for school and district leadership would also be part of the Center's mission. Centers would be run by independent nonprofits or public-private partnerships on a state or regional basis and they would be required to partner with leadership from the public and private sector. Just as Presidential leadership has increased the national focus on improving teacher quality, federal leadership is needed to push states to make greater investments in developing quality school leaders prepared for accountability, the devolution of decision making, and the focus on school-based reform. At present, there is no federal program focused solely on school leadership and only a handful of programs allow funds to be used for it. There is broad political support for a focus on improving school leadership, as evidenced by the inclusion of a smaller provision in the House-passed ESEA bill. We recommend \$40 million in competitive grants to fund approximately 20 state-level or regional centers.

Schools without Walls: Ensuring Access through Distance Technology –This initiative aims to ensure challenging coursework for all students by providing access to high-quality on-line academic courses to students in under-served areas. While this Administration has shaped a federal education role that holds all students to high standards and expects they can achieve, the reality of school finance in America prevents all students from having access to challenging educational opportunities. Small and poor schools often lack the resources and teachers needed to offer challenging courses, including Advanced Placement courses at the high school level. Today, less than 60% of US high schools offer AP courses to their students. A lack of qualified teachers in these areas, also mean that students don't have access to challenging math and science courses or classes in English as Second Language.

This proposal complements existing federal efforts in technology to fund internet connections, equipment acquisition and teacher training, by funding a competitive grant program to districts that will allow schools to purchase on-line curriculum, train teachers to use on-line curriculum, or purchase course materials. Although many states are developing virtual school capacities to offer courses to students throughout their state, the quality of on-line courses has yet to match the capacity of technology. In order to ensure

high-quality content, the proposal also calls for a partnership with leading course software developers like APEX (run by Microsoft co-founder, Paul Allen), which would subsidize the cost of high quality Web-based course development in return for cut-rate prices for high poverty school districts. The proposal also calls for increases in the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, which allows computer equipment purchases, and the Technology Teacher Training Program, and continued commitment to E-Rate. The initiative should win broad support as Republicans and Democrats have supported AP fee assistance and Senate Democrats and Republicans have consistently supported Star Schools, a distance learning initiative. Total funding for the initiative would be \$225 million, including \$50 million for grants, \$25 million for course development, and \$125 million in increases in existing programs.

The Backyard Teacher Recruitment Initiative –The problems of teacher recruitment and out-of-field teaching are issues that loom large for public education. For schools and districts in rural areas and inner cities across the country they are especially difficult. Despite federal and state efforts, these areas continue to have great difficulty finding qualified candidates in areas such as math, science and special education. This proposal aims to help high-need poor school districts with large percentages of out-of-field teaching by paying for high-quality teachers in non-shortage field to be trained and certified in shortage areas. This program would focus on teachers who have already made the decision to teach in high-need areas. Recognizing that they already have teaching expertise, the program would provide bonuses and tuition assistance for content training in a high-need subject area for 10,000 teachers across the country. In return, they would commit to teach for at least three years in their district.

While this can certainly not be considered a fix for teacher recruitment, it can provide some immediate relief for districts with chronic teacher shortages in critical subject areas. And by focusing on a population already in schools, it adds a needed dimension to a federal recruitment effort that focuses largely on efforts to bring new people into the profession. Teacher recruitment is a key issue in states across the nation and could attract bipartisan support. The initiative would cost \$30 million.

Second-Chance Schools – This proposal would create new second-chance schools through an infusion of additional funds to the Department of Education's Charter Schools program earmarked for this purpose. The initiative would build on the existing charter schools program, maintaining priority for states with well-designed charter school laws that hold schools accountable for results. Second-chance schools would be intended to serve students who have been removed from their previous schools because of discipline problems. This funding would support schools that provide alternative settings for disruptive students while allowing them to continue academic work toward state academic standards. This initiative would cost \$50 million in the first year.

Small Schools – This proposal would build on an initiative in the FY00 appropriations bill supported by Congressman Obey to establish smaller learning communities in America's high schools. The program would offer competitive grants to school districts

that submit a plan to create smaller learning environments for students by opening smaller schools (including charter schools), or by breaking up larger schools using strategies such as creating schools-within-schools, establishing career academies, or restructuring the school day. Allowable uses of federal funds could include planning and implementation costs, professional development, team building, minor facility renovation, additional planning time, legal and accounting consulting, supplies and other relevant costs. These funds could also be used to seed small charter high schools in the district. The Obey initiative is funded at \$45 million in the FY 2000 appropriations bill and we recommend expanding funding to \$200 million for FY01.

SAT and ACT Test Preparation – Historically poor and minority students have not scored well on college entrance exams such as the SAT and ACT. At a time when these scores are a very influential factor in college admissions and when backlash against affirmative action is decreasing minority enrollment in some top institutions, it is appropriate and necessary to offer low income students the same college test prep courses that boost the scores of their more privileged classmates. This program would be modeled after California's College Preparation Partnership Program, which the NAACP has recently recommended replicating across the country. The program would support partnerships of high schools, proven providers of college test prep courses (such as Kaplan and Princeton Review), and community based organizations that would offer high-need students college test preparation and other services related to college admissions. Funding for these partnerships would be distributed by competitive grant. \$30 million would serve approximately 50,000 students.

Teacher Recruitment -- This program would provide competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to develop programs to "grow their own" teachers as a means of addressing their shortage of qualified teachers. Programs supported by this grant would begin to cultivate and recruit students as they move through high school. Upon high school graduation, participants would attend universities to gain expertise and teacher certification in a high-need field. After college, the students would return to high-poverty districts to guaranteed teaching positions. Throughout the program, students would receive exposure and training experiences at summer camps and as teaching assistants. "Home grown" teachers would also receive salaries for work during high school and college, scholarships for tuition, recruitment signing bonuses, and high quality professional development. This program could be started in 100 school districts with \$100 million in FY 2001.

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

From: Andrew Rotherham
Date: December 13, 1999
Subject: TITLE I SURPLUS PROPOSAL

This memo describes four options to substantially increase investment in Title I while increasing the focus on accountability and fixing failing schools within the program. In addition, these options would allow the President to make a challenge to the nation that by 2005 all failing schools would either be becoming high performance schools or being shut down.

Politically, a Presidential challenge of this nature would shift the emphasis from "Florida style" voucher plans and Governor George Bush's Title I proposal which focus on choice rather than improvement, to a Democratic agenda of fixing failing schools by investing more and demanding more. A focus on Title I and accountability would ensure that more schools get the help they need to turn around or are closed down—currently only 47 percent of schools identified for school improvement receive assistance. The most modest option of the four would result in an average of \$197,000 for each of the approximately 7,000 schools identified for school improvement and the most aggressive would result in an average of \$250,000 per school over the next five years.

Unfortunately, there is not data on the exact costs associated with turning around failing schools because it is a relatively new process. However, considering that schools receiving this funding would also already be receiving other Title I money it is reasonable to assume that investments of this magnitude would enable these schools to undertake more effective reform.

From a policy perspective, a focus on failing schools and accountability would allow us to give more structure to the accountability fund by highlighting activities in addition to technical assistance that school districts and states can undertake with the accountability funding. Mary Cassell at OMB has been developing a draft implementation plan for the Department of Education to help focus different resources there on the task of assisting failing schools. Ann O'Leary and I plan to work with Mary and Mike Cohen to broaden this implementation plan to ensure that the funding provided under the guise of "accountability" actually leverages effective practices at the school district level (for example curtailing the use of unqualified aides by promoting career ladders and high quality professional development). The plan we develop would serve as the policy supporting the President's goal and would link the different investments in the budget that are aimed at failing schools into a comprehensive strategy.

In addition, by substantially increasing the focus on failing schools and revenue targeted at that issue we would have more leverage to ensure that the dollars being provided for accountability are being used for effective strategies rather than simply reinforcing practices we know to be ineffective.

Senator Lieberman's ESEA bill sets the Title I authorization at \$12 billion. This is currently the high water mark for ESEA proposals. The four options below are differentiated by two key questions:

- How aggressively to increase investment in Title I during the next 5 years;
- How closely to track the proposed 2.5 – 3.5 percent growth curve for the accountability set-aside.

Option 1: Moving beyond the 2.5 percent set-aside:

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.64 Billion (+700)	\$250*
2002	\$9.34 Billion (+700)	\$300*
2003	\$10.04 Billion (+700)	\$350*
2004	\$10.74 Billion (+700)	\$400*
2005	\$12 Billion (+1.26)	\$500*

*Not on a percentage basis.

Under this model, Title I would be increased \$4.06 billion over 5 years and the set-aside for accountability would be increased from a current level of \$134 million to \$500 million over five years. Total investment in accountability from FY01-FY05 would be \$1.8 billion and in FY05 the set-aside would equal 4.1 percent of the total appropriation.

Option 2: Growing into the 2.5 – 3.5 percent set-aside:

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.64 Billion (+700)	\$250*
2002	\$9.34 Billion (+700)	\$292*
2003	\$10.04 Billion (+700)	\$334*
2004	\$10.74 Billion (+700)	\$376 (3.5 percent)
2005	\$12 Billion (+1.26)	\$420 (3.5 percent)

*Not on a percentage basis.

In the appropriations end game for FY00, the final deal included \$134 million for accountability. This funding was not based on any percentage of the underlying Title I appropriation. Under this model the set-aside would continue to be set on this basis until the Title I funding "grew into" the set-aside. Again, total investment in Title I would be \$4.06 billion but the set-aside would account for \$1.67 billion. In FY04 the set-aside of

\$376 million would be 3.5 percent of the total appropriation and would continue to grow on this basis.

Option 3: Stay the course on 2.5 – 3.5 percent with aggressive investment:

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.64 Billion (+700)	\$216 (2.5 percent)
2002	\$9.34 Billion (+700)	\$234 (2.5 percent)
2003	\$10.04 Billion (+700)	\$251 (2.5 percent)
2004	\$10.74 Billion (+700)	\$376 (3.5 percent)
2005	\$12 Billion (+1.26)	\$420 (3.5 percent)

*Not on a percentage basis.

Under this model, total Title I investment increases \$4.06 billion and accountability grows from \$216 million to \$420 million over 5 years. Total investment in accountability over the 5-year period would be \$1.5 billion.

Option 4: Stay the course on 2.5- 3.5 percent and more modest investment.

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.44 Billion (+500)	\$211 (2.5 percent)
2002	\$8.94 Billion (+500)	\$224 (2.5 percent)
2003	\$9.44 Billion (+500)	\$236 (2.5 percent)
2004	\$9.94 Billion (+500)	\$347 (3.5 percent)
2005	\$10.44 Billion (+500)	\$365 (3.5 percent)

*Not on a percentage basis

Under this model total investment in Title I would increase \$2.5 billion over the next five years with the set-aside growing from \$211 million to \$365 million. Total investment in accountability over 5 years would be \$1.38 billion.

MEMORANDUM FOR BRUCE REED

From: Andrew Rotherham

Date: December 13, 1999

Subject: TITLE I SURPLUS PROPOSAL

This memo describes four options to substantially increase investment in Title I while increasing the focus on accountability and fixing failing schools within the program. In addition, these options would allow the President to make a challenge to the nation that by 2005 all failing schools would either be becoming high performance schools or being shut down.

Politically, a Presidential challenge of this nature would shift the emphasis from "Florida style" voucher plans and Governor George Bush's Title I proposal which focus on choice rather than improvement, to a Democratic agenda of fixing failing schools by investing more and demanding more. A focus on Title I and accountability would ensure that more schools get the help they need to turn around or are closed down—currently only 47 percent of schools identified for school improvement receive assistance. The most modest option of the four would result in an average of \$197,000 for each of the approximately 7,000 schools identified for school improvement and the most aggressive would result in an average of \$250,000 per school over the next five years. Unfortunately, there is not data on the exact costs associated with turning around failing schools because it is a relatively new process. However, considering that schools receiving this funding would also already be receiving other Title I money it is reasonable to assume that investments of this magnitude would enable these schools to undertake more effective reform.

From a policy perspective, a focus on failing schools and accountability would allow us to give more structure to the accountability fund by highlighting activities in addition to technical assistance that school districts and states can undertake with the accountability funding. Mary Cassell at OMB has been developing a draft implementation plan for the Department of Education to help focus different resources there on the task of assisting failing schools. Ann O'Leary and I plan to work with Mary and Mike Cohen to broaden this implementation plan to ensure that the funding provided under the guise of "accountability" actually leverages effective practices at the school district level (for example curtailing the use of unqualified aides by promoting career ladders and high quality professional development). The plan we develop would serve as the policy supporting the President's goal and would link the different investments in the budget that are aimed at failing schools into a comprehensive strategy.

In addition, by substantially increasing the focus on failing schools and revenue targeted at that issue we would have more leverage to ensure that the dollars being provided for accountability are being used for effective strategies rather than simply reinforcing practices we know to be ineffective.

Senator Lieberman's ESEA bill sets the Title I authorization at \$12 billion. This is currently the high water mark for ESEA proposals. The four options below are differentiated by two key questions:

- How aggressively to increase investment in Title I during the next 5 years;
- How closely to track the proposed 2.5 – 3.5 percent growth curve for the accountability set-aside.

Option 1: Moving beyond the 2.5 percent set-aside:

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.64 Billion (+700)	\$250*
2002	\$9.34 Billion (+700)	\$300*
2003	\$10.04 Billion (+700)	\$350*
2004	\$10.74 Billion (+700)	\$400*
2005	\$12 Billion (+1.26)	\$500*

*Not on a percentage basis.

Under this model, Title I would be increased \$4.06 billion over 5 years and the set-aside for accountability would be increased from a current level of \$134 million to \$500 million over five years. Total investment in accountability from FY01-FY05 would be \$1.8 billion and in FY05 the set-aside would equal 4.1 percent of the total appropriation.

Option 2: Growing into the 2.5 – 3.5 percent set-aside:

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.64 Billion (+700)	\$250*
2002	\$9.34 Billion (+700)	\$292*
2003	\$10.04 Billion (+700)	\$334*
2004	\$10.74 Billion (+700)	\$376 (3.5 percent)
2005	\$12 Billion (+1.26)	\$420 (3.5 percent)

*Not on a percentage basis.

In the appropriations end game for FY00, the final deal included \$134 million for accountability. This funding was not based on any percentage of the underlying Title I appropriation. Under this model the set-aside would continue to be set on this basis until the Title I funding “grew into” the set-aside. Again, total investment in Title I would be \$4.06 billion but the set-aside would account for \$1.67 billion. In FY04 the set-aside of

\$376 million would be 3.5 percent of the total appropriation and would continue to grow on this basis.

Option 3: Stay the course on 2.5 – 3.5 percent with aggressive investment:

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.64 Billion (+700)	\$216 (2.5 percent)
2002	\$9.34 Billion (+700)	\$234 (2.5 percent)
2003	\$10.04 Billion (+700)	\$251 (2.5 percent)
2004	\$10.74 Billion (+700)	\$376 (3.5 percent)
2005	\$12 Billion (+1.26)	\$420 (3.5 percent)

*Not on a percentage basis.

Under this model, total Title I investment increases \$4.06 billion and accountability grows from \$216 million to \$420 million over 5 years. Total investment in accountability over the 5-year period would be \$1.5 billion.

Option 4: Stay the course on 2.5- 3.5 percent and more modest investment.

Fiscal Year	Total LEA Grants (Basic and Concentration)	Set-Aside
2000 Enacted	\$7.94 Billion	\$134 million*
2001	\$8.44 Billion (+500)	\$211 (2.5 percent)
2002	\$8.94 Billion (+500)	\$224 (2.5 percent)
2003	\$9.44 Billion (+500)	\$236 (2.5 percent)
2004	\$9.94 Billion (+500)	\$347 (3.5 percent)
2005	\$10.44 Billion (+500)	\$365 (3.5 percent)

*Not on a percentage basis

Under this model total investment in Title I would increase \$2.5 billion over the next five years with the set-aside growing from \$211 million to \$365 million. Total investment in accountability over 5 years would be \$1.38 billion.

4/3/29

S-RE

Varying
REPORT

NEW IDEAS:

- ① Director
- ① Reserve →
- ① Part of Reserve

-
- ① Administration GAP
 - ① Security CONTR

5/27

of IDS of the top
2000 companies are

History

IMPLEMENTATION
ISSUES →

Reforms →

BETTER
E.S.C.
LITERATURE

MEMORANDUM

December 10, 1999

To: OMB Staff

From: Senator Kennedy's Staff

Re: Funding Requests for President Clinton's FY 2001 Budget

Attached are brief descriptions of the priorities that Senator Kennedy recommends for the Administration's FY 2001 budget. These descriptions only focus on the areas of education, labor, poverty, disability, job training, and immigration. We greatly appreciate your consideration of these requests, and look forward to continuing to work with you throughout the budget process next year.

EDUCATION BUDGET PRIORITIES

GOAL: Increases in the education budget in FY2001 are essential to the success of ongoing standards-based reforms. A funding freeze not only will earn opposition from Democrats and the education community, but also will hand Republicans a political opportunity to "one-up" Democrats on education. An increase of \$5 billion is warranted.

BACKGROUND: Enrollments are rising, teachers are retiring, standards are higher, and children's needs are more diverse -- we need more resources to help communities meet those needs and help all children meet higher standards. We are reauthorizing ESEA this year. We should make clear early on that when we improve the law and increase accountability for results, we will also increase the resources to help schools accomplish the goals of the new law.

PROPOSAL: In addition to the signature Clinton programs, we need to support programs that are important to our core constituencies. The education community has been very supportive of the President's/Democrats' new programs such as after-school and class size, and will continue to be. But, the core programs that are critical to the groups' members such as Title I, Eisenhower, IDEA, bilingual education, and Technology are not getting the same support from the White House and Congress. For example, between FY98-FY2000, Title I received only an 8% increase, Eisenhower received 0% increase, Technology Literacy Challenge received a 0% increase. However, the new Class Size initiative received \$1.2 billion last year and \$1.3 billion this year (an 8% increase in Title I is only \$510 million), and after-school went from \$40 million to \$450 million. National, state, and local constituencies are blaming both Republicans and Democrats for this failure to increase key programs. Republicans have only fought for increases in Pell (+\$175 in the max. grant) and IDEA (\$700 million increase) this year. The education community believes that no one is fighting for real increases in core programs of ESEA. Even Bush is making Title I a signature issue.

POLITICS: Education polls high in every national poll. The education budget will be as much about message as it is about funding. As evidenced by the past year, Republicans are making headway on the education funding issue, and they will continue to try to do so this year. Even Bush is talking about more money for education and a strong federal role. The President's increase last year was modest (\$1.2 billion) and Republicans were able to make Democrats go on the defensive (they pushed for a \$3 billion increase). Republicans have also been able to make some headway on IDEA and Pell grants (core Democratic issues). We need to regain control over the education funding issue. We should not leave Gore and Congressional Dems susceptible to criticism on education funding -- especially in an election year.

COST: The education community is probably going to advocate for a \$5 billion increase (approximately 15%) in education funding. In a year when education is such a hot national, state, and local topic, and when even Republicans are arguing for increased funds, Democrats should come out strong for a substantial new investment in education.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

EARLY LEARNING INVESTMENTS

GOAL: Ensure that every child starts school ready to read, ready to learn, and ready to succeed by providing quality early educational services and development for children under the age of 6 by providing long-term investments necessary to create an early learning system that will sustain our nation's prosperity and ability to lead the world through the 21st century.

BACKGROUND: Medical research conducted this decade shows that adequate stimulation before age 5 (specifically ages 0-3) is necessary for children's brains to develop to their full potential. Proper stimulation consists of varied interactions and positive relationships with adults and other children, including music, exercise, reading, games, and other forms of creative expression. However, advances in scientific understanding are not reflected in our nation's practices. Unlike most European countries, America wholly lacks an early-learning infrastructure. Parenting support and early education programs are available in a few localities, but no coordination of programs or identification of best practices exists, and program quality varies widely.

Moreover, 60% of children under age 5 are cared for by someone other than a parent during the workday. No federal early learning standards exist, and state accreditation and regulation in this area is inconsistent, sparse, and largely limited to safety matters as oppose to education or development. Pay is barely above minimum wage for college-educated early learning instructors. The federal government runs a variety of programs for pre-school children but serve far less than those who are eligible. For example, some 40% of pre-school age children are served by Head Start, and less than 2% of eligible children are currently served by Early Head Start. Furthermore, federal support for early learning is scattered among Early Head Start, Head Start, the Child Care and Development Block Grant, and the Individuals with Disabilities Act. While these programs are effective, they are all severely underfunded, they are largely limited to low-income families, and no coordination exists among them. Many states have begun pre-kindergarten in recognition of the importance of early learning, but these reach no one below age four.

PROPOSAL: A major federal investment on the order of \$2 billion per year should be made to build our early learning infrastructure. This program should be administered by the Department of Health and Human Services. A mechanism akin to mandatory funding must be found to protect funding for effective programs that already exist while enabling providers to confidently engage in long-range planning. State matching funds should be required, and local and private cooperation encouraged. The object is to make early learning resources universally available to children before they enter kindergarten. Local organizations can best identify each community's most urgent needs, and they should be responsible for targeting resources. State and national initiatives can help monitor use of funds among localities, identify best practices and disseminate information, and make appropriate policy decisions. Virtually all of the new early learning resources should be used for seven specific early learning activities, as each locality deems most appropriate: (1) enhancing childhood literacy; (2) providing parenting education and support; (3) increasing access to Early Head Start and State pre-K programs; (4) increasing early learning access for young children with special needs; (5) expanding existing Head Start programs to full-day, full-year; (6) linking early learning programs with health services; and (7) improving quality of child care programs. In short,

1-11-88

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

the new federal support would be used to build and coordinate both existing programs and new ones as each locality believes will best promote early learning.

POLITICS: Republicans (Stevens, Jeffords, Voinovich, DeWine) have already joined Democrats' call for a new early learning initiative. Moderates like Snowe, Specter, and Collins should have cover to join a call for prompt passage of an initiative in the Senate. Education and health are consistently among the issues of highest concern to Americans today, and early learning can be cast as both an education and a health issue. Head Start, which should be preserved intact and helped by any new initiative, consistently enjoys broad public support.

COST: \$10 billion over 5 years of mandatory funding.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

PROTECTION FOR WORKING FAMILIES

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

GOAL: To ensure that the National Labor Relations Act is enforced properly to protect workers.

BACKGROUND: Until last year, the National Labor Relations Board rarely received the resources necessary to carry out its important mission. Past years' cuts have seriously eroded the NLRB's service to the public. Although the Board received a substantial increase for FY2000, a one-year boost alone will not enable it to sustain a full level of service. Funding must be maintained, with sufficient allowance for inflation, to permit full staffing through a multi-year hiring program, on-going training, and acquisition and maintenance of current technology, as well as travel to the sites of labor disputes and other necessary tools of investigative. The Administration insistence that the NLRB receive a significant \$205 million FY2000 budget was an important step in allowing this agency to turn the corner. A FY2001 budget of \$216 million would allow the agency to continue the progress that it has already made.

PROPOSAL AND COSTS: I urge your strong support for an additional increase in funding for the NLRB to \$216 million in FY2001 to enable it to fully carry out its mission of prompt, thorough investigation and resolution of workplace disputes.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION WAGE AND HOUR ADMINISTRATION

GOAL: To ensure that the laws protecting workers' safety and health and minimum wage, overtime pay, equal pay, prevailing wages, child labor, immigration are enforced.

BACKGROUND: While overall OSHA funding is important, a few programs deserve special attention for funding increases. In hearings in the HELP Committee this year, both the majority and minority agreed that whistleblowers are a crucial part of ensuring safe and healthy workplaces. OSHA should receive additional resources to fund 20 new positions focusing on assisting whistleblowers. OSHA also needs to devote additional resources to training its staff. The Susan Harwood Training Grant Program should be doubled to approximately \$14 million. This program provides grants to organizations around the country to offer training.

PROPOSAL AND COST: The Occupational Safety and Health Administration and the Wage and Hour Administration received significant increases in FY2000 and deserve a full 10% increase in FY2001.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

GRANTS FOR FAMILY LEAVE

GOAL: To establish demonstration projects to provide family income to respond to the needs of working families.

BACKGROUND: As you may know, Senators Dodd, Leahy, Murray, and I sponsored the Family Income to Respond to Significant Transitions Insurance Act, or FIRST bill, this past year. It would provide funds for states and to set up demonstration projects that offer wage replacement to workers taking family leave. The FIRST bill would build on President Clinton's initiative to allow the states to expand their unemployment insurance programs, so that new parents can take paid family leave to care for their children, and on the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993. As you know, workers covered by that law can take up to 12 weeks of unpaid leave a year to care for a newborn or adopted child, or a seriously ill family member, and know that their jobs will be there when they return. That Act was one of President Clinton's most important achievements, and it has given millions of workers the time they need to care for their families. But as recent studies have shown, the loss of a paycheck during unpaid leave prevents millions of other workers from taking leave when they need it. President Clinton's initiative and the FIRST bill are important steps towards solving that problem, and I urge funding of such a grant program.

PROPOSAL AND COSTS: I ask that you fund \$400 million in grants to allow states and localities to set up demonstration projects that offer wage replacement to workers taking family leave.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

HUNGER RELIEF

GOAL: Repair gaps in the Food Stamp Program, increasing Program costs by 2% to cure hunger in working families.

BACKGROUND: Recent studies consistently show that hunger remains a serious problem in America. Food pantries across the nation report 15-20% increases in requests for emergency assistance during 1998. USDA determined that 6.1 million adults and 3.3 million children lived in households that experienced hunger during 1998, comprising 3.5% of all U.S. households. A 1997 Urban Institute study of former welfare recipients concludes that 33% have to skip or cut meals due to lack of food. One of every five U.S. children is poor and lives in a family that receives food stamps. America's core defense against hunger is the Food Stamp Program. 90% of recipients have incomes below the poverty line. Despite essentially unchanged hunger rates, about eight million fewer people *who live in poverty* access food stamps today than did in 1995. A July 1999 GAO study concludes, "children's participation in the Food Stamp Program has dropped more sharply than the number of children living in poverty, indicating a growing gap between need and assistance." Much of the decline in food stamp participation is due to the 1996 welfare reform law, which restricted eligibility and made other changes designed to save \$22.5 billion over five years.

The cure for hunger is known, and under the Food Stamp Program it costs on average \$2.30 per person per day. With a cure so readily in sight, Hunger should not be tolerated even for a short time.

PROPOSAL: Approximately \$2.5 billion of the 1996 mandatory spending cuts should be restored as quickly as possible to meet the most urgent nutritional needs, which are concentrated in families of the working poor, including many legal immigrants. More should be done to eliminate hunger in America, especially among children. Specifically, the Hunger Relief Act: (1) restores food stamp eligibility to all legal immigrants ending the status-based limitations on eligibility imposed by the 1996 welfare reform law; (2) permits states to count the value of one vehicle for food stamp purposes the same way states do for TANF purposes, enabling more working families to have safe transportation for work and children while remaining eligible for food stamps; (3) raises the "shelter deduction cap" and then indexes it to inflation, which helps families who live in high-rent metropolitan areas qualify for more food stamps whenever they must spend more than half of their income on housing and energy costs; and (4) increases federal support for emergency food programs (commodity distributors, pantries, and soup kitchens) by 10%, or \$20 million per year. In short, this bill repeals about 10% of the food stamp cuts that were made in 1996 to address the most urgent nutritional needs of working families.

POLITICS: The bill is cosponsored by Senators Kennedy, Specter, Leahy, and Jeffords. Over 500 organizations, including some in every state and others of national renown, have signed a letter supporting the Hunger Relief Act. It appeals to religious, social services, educational, immigrant, poverty, homelessness, and nutrition groups. The Act's four components specifically attract support of immigrant advocates, rural populations that rely on vehicles to work, urban populations with high rents, and the families most urgently in need of emergency food. The

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

Administration hasn't completed a major anti-poverty initiative in over two years, and moderate Republicans in the House and Senate have already recognized the appeal of the Hunger Relief Act by cosponsoring it.

At a cost of \$2.30 per person per day, and especially in this time of prosperity, our nation can readily afford to restore \$2.5 of the \$22.5 billion (over 5 years) that was cut from the Food Stamp Program in 1996. This is true especially considering that adequate nutrition helps reduce health, education, and unemployment. Preventing hunger is the anti-poverty initiative likely to attract the most universal public support.

COST: \$2.5 billion over 5 years of mandatory funding.

TICKET TO WORK AND WORK INCENTIVES IMPROVEMENT ACT

GOAL: Ensure that adequate funding is made available for the remainder of this year , and in the 2001 budget for the work incentives planning, assistance and outreach provisions of the work incentives legislation.

BACKGROUND: With the passage of the Work Incentives Improvement Act, 2 million of the 9 million individuals with disabilities currently receiving health care and cash subsidies have the potential of becoming employed. If only 1% of the 9 million current beneficiaries are successfully employed, savings in cash assistance alone would total over \$3.5 billion over the work life of those individuals.

\$1.5 million in supplemental funds should be made available in FY2000 to set up the Work Incentive Planners and protection and advocacy infrastructure grants prior to the implementation of the health care and ticket to work provisions that become effective in FY2001. In FY2001, \$30 million is required to fund these same infrastructure grants which support consumer outreach and enrollment efforts.

PROPOSAL: Include in the 2001 budget the \$30 million (\$23 & \$7) that is needed to fund the Work Incentives Planning, Assistance and Outreach provisions of the Act, and to provide \$1.5 million in supplemental funding which is needed this year to begin implementation of the new infrastructure grant provisions.

COSTS: Supplemental Dollars -- FY2000 = \$1.5 million
FY2001 budget = \$30. million

HIGH TECH TRAINING INITIATIVE

GOAL: Now that our long-term effort to reform the employment training system has resulted in enactment of the Workforce Investment Act, the Administration should propose a major increase in the resources devoted to providing America's workers with the skills they will need to succeed in the 21st century workplace. It is one of the best investments we can make to keep the economic expansion going and to extend the current prosperity well into the next century. Across the nation from Massachusetts to Virginia to California, high tech companies are experiencing a serious shortage of employees possessing the necessary skills. Nationally, the number of unfilled high tech positions is believed to exceed 300,000. We need to provide additional resources through the workforce system to accelerate training in these specialized skills.

BACKGROUND: Enactment of the Workforce Investment Act in 1998 provides a modern and effective framework to reach those workers seeking to upgrade their skills. But, the financial resources to meet the challenge are not currently available. The only portion of the workforce system which has received a substantial increase in funding is the Dislocated Workers Program. The need for additional resources to retrain dislocated workers is very real and the Administration's on-going efforts to expand that program should continue. However, participation in the dislocated worker program is limited to workers who have been discharged by their former employer and are currently unemployed. That is a very narrow segment of the workforce. There has been no significant increase in funding for other portions of the overall workforce training system. We must also create training opportunities for those who currently hold relatively low paying jobs and wish to obtain new skills to enhance their employability and improve their futures. The demand for workers possessing high tech job skills is well documented. The federal government needs to bridge the high tech skill gap which today separates millions of workers from the 21st century jobs they desire.

PROPOSAL: The Administration should propose the creation of competitive grants to regional workforce boards in areas experiencing a substantial shortage of high tech workers to fill currently available positions. The grants would be in addition to those funds which the federal government currently provides for training, and would be awarded based on innovative high tech training proposals developed jointly by the board and area employers who are willing to commit to hiring a specific number of the graduating trainees. This will target the additional resources effectively to areas where the shortage of employees with high tech skills is greatest. I believe such a plan would receive broad-based support from the business community. It would respond directly to the concern of high tech employers over the inadequate number of skilled employees to meet their needs. It would greatly enhance the productivity of the workers trained. It would be a wise and prudent investment which would stimulate economic growth for years to come.

COST: The cost of training in the existing JTPA adult program averages \$2,500 per worker. It is likely that the cost of teaching the high tech proficiencies which these businesses now require will be somewhat higher -- \$3,000 to \$4,000 per employee. An investment of \$500 million

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

would enable us to upgrade the skills of approximately one hundred and fifty thousand workers. If we required the high tech employers who are benefitting to pay a portion of the training cost, we could reach even more workers. Spread over two or three fiscal years, a federal investment of this magnitude should be manageable.



Senator Edward M. Kennedy

immigrants. This is an important step in our struggle to eradicate hunger in our country.

PROPOSAL: Include in the budget funding to fully restore food stamps eligibility to all legal immigrants, regardless of their date of arrival.

COST: The estimated cost of restoring food stamps is \$630 million dollars over a five year period.

SUPPLEMENTAL SECURITY INCOME

GOAL: Restore SSI eligibility to all legal immigrants.

BACKGROUND: The Balanced Budget Act made significant steps in restoring SSI eligibility to legal immigrants. However, much more can be done. Most low-income, legal immigrants who entered the United States after August 22, 1996, are still barred from SSI, even if they experience an unforeseen accident or disabling illness. SSI should be extended to qualified immigrants who arrived after August 22, 1996, and later become disabled.

SSI coverage for elderly immigrants remains extremely restricted. Only elderly immigrants who were on the SSI rolls on August 22, 1996, may receive SSI benefits. Immigrants who were in the United States, but not receiving SSI should not become destitute when they grow old.

Immigrants who were living in the United States prior to August 22, 1996, should qualify for SSI as they reach age 65.

PROPOSAL: Include in the budget funding to extend of SSI to qualified immigrants who arrived after August 22, 1996, and later become disabled. Additionally, include in the budget funding to extend SSI to legal immigrants who were living in the United States prior to August 22, 1996 as they reach age 65.

COST: SSI coverage for legal immigrants who become disabled after arrival is estimated to cost \$1.5 billion over 5 years. The estimated cost of SSI coverage to legal immigrants who were living in the United States prior to August 22, 1996 as they reach age 65 is \$1.5 to 2 billion over a 5 year period.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

FUNDING FOR IMMIGRATION SERVICES

GOAL: Create an Immigration Services Capital Investment Fund.

BACKGROUND: The Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS) in all likelihood will undergo fundamental restructuring in the next few years, resulting in a separation of services from enforcement functions. While separating these two functions is an excellent idea, such a separation will exacerbate funding problems for services. Under existing law and practice, the service core functions of the INS -- the adjudication of applications for naturalization and residence -- are funded almost entirely through examination fees, a practice that has led to serious financial shortfalls and resulted in unacceptable delays and backlogs. Enforcement functions, on the other hand, are largely funded by directly appropriated funds.

Service funding shortfalls will only be resolved by appropriating adequate funding levels, to supplement examination fees. As such, an Immigration Services Capital Investment Fund should be enacted. Such a fund, appropriated to the Attorney General, would be used to fund service-related infrastructure improvements, major capital acquisitions, backlog reductions, and any other service-related expenses that the Attorney General determines are not adequately funded by examinations fees. We need only look at the recent successes in naturalization processing to see the results that adequate funding produces -- the completion of 1.2 million naturalization applications during FY 1999, a 105 percent increase over FY 1998. This result, however, was only possible by reprogramming funds and diverting resources from the adjudication of residence applications. The neglect of residence cases has now resulted in a backlog of over 900,000 cases. Appropriating funding for immigration services will enable the Attorney General to authorize needed funding and avoid future harmful trade offs.

PROPOSAL: Include in the budget funding to create an Immigration Services Capital Investment Fund to be used to fund service-related infrastructure improvements, major capital acquisitions, backlog reductions, and any other service-related expenses that the Attorney General determines are not adequately funded by examinations fees.

Senator Edward M. Kennedy

INCREASED REFUGEE ADMISSIONS

GOAL: Increase the refugee admissions ceiling to 100,000.

BACKGROUND: As a leader in refugee policy, America has a duty to maintain a strong refugee program. Such an obligation reaffirms our country's most cherished values and our long-standing humanitarian tradition to assist the persecuted and oppressed. By maintaining a vigorous refugee resettlement program, we also set an example that other nations will follow. As such, the Administration's refugee policy is important not only in terms of its immediate effect, but also in terms of its effect on other countries' decisions, where our leadership by example is essential. We saw this during the Kosovo crisis, where United States leadership was instrumental in establishing an international refugee protection response.

The Administration was commended for increasing the refugee admissions ceiling to 90,000 for fiscal year 2000. We must continue on this course in fiscal year 2001, and end the decline in refugee admission ceilings in recent years, falling more than 40 percent from 132,000 in 1993 to 78,000 in 1999. This decline occurred as the number of refugees fleeing global turmoil and civil strife steady increased. Today, there are an estimated 13 million refugees, the majority of whom are women and children.

The private refugee organizations make a compelling case for admission of at least 132,000 refugees in fiscal year 2001, the number admitted during the first year of Clinton's Administration. This figure is only a small fraction of the world's refugees. At a minimum, I urge you to increase refugee admissions to 100,000. Appropriating adequate funding to process these refugees in FY 2001 is critical. Congress appropriated only \$625 million in FY 1999 for the Migration and Refugee Assistance Account, \$25 million less than the Administration's request. Although the FY 2000 shortfall may be made up with remaining Kosovo emergency supplemental funding, this funding will not be available in FY 20001. Without adequate funding, the U.S. cannot maintain its commitment to refugees.

PROPOSAL: Include in the budget funding to allow the admission of 100,000 refugees.

COST: The estimated cost is over \$660 million for FY 2001.

21st Century Education Investment

Committee for Education Funding

President Clinton's FY2001 budget request should address the unfulfilled education needs of the nation's students and the challenges of the future at levels that reflect the urgent, overwhelming public concern for improving education. Given the robust economy and growing federal budget surpluses, the President's budget request should:

- **Begin reversing the decline in federal investment in education to keep pace with needs—the federal share of elementary and secondary education has declined from 11.9 percent to 7.6 percent between 1980 and 1998 and of higher education from 18 percent to 14.6 percent over the same period.**
- **Lead the way in achieving higher national standards for education by committing adequate resources for overcoming barriers to academic achievement and productive employment.**
- **Meet the challenges of rising enrollments at all levels, more students with special needs, increasing teacher shortages, unsafe and outdated school facilities, rapidly advancing technology, and increasing access to postsecondary education for low income families.**
 - **In constant dollars, federal on-budget funds for elementary and secondary education programs increased 15.5 percent while enrollment grew by 19.2 percent FY1980-1998. At the higher education level the disparity is much greater, as on-budget federal funds decreased by 27.7 percent while enrollments grew by 17.4 percent between 1982 and 1998.**
- **Make substantial increased investments in programs such as Title I, Pell grants, campus based student aid and support services, IDEA, vocational education, impact aid, bilingual and immigrant education, teacher quality, and technology assistance as well as programs for school improvement, research and development and many other vital Education Department programs that address these challenges.**
- **Education and Social Security: Investing in education is critical to the future solvency of Social Security. As the number of current workers per Social Security recipient continues to decline, it is vital that those workers be the best-trained, most well educated and productive work force possible.**
- **Offsets: Program savings, advance appropriations and other budget devices that affect education should result in equivalent increases in education funding rather than simply offsetting expenditures in other parts of the budget.**

December 6, 1999



Andrew Rotherham <arotherham@netzero.net>
12/05/99 03:06:29 PM

Record Type: Record

To: Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject:

Teacher Certification Changes Urged

WASHINGTON (AP) -- States need to loosen teacher certification rules to allow professionals from other fields into the classroom, an Ohio senator said Saturday in the weekly Republican radio address.

"We need alternative methods of teacher certification to enable qualified professionals to share their knowledge and experience with our children in the classroom," Sen. Mike DeWine said.

"We also need to start aggressively recruiting professionals from the military, industry and research institutions -- people with established careers and real-world job experience."

The first-term senator is sponsoring legislation that would offer states \$15 million to fund alternative teacher certification programs and a second bill that would set up a \$10 million grant program to encourage mentoring programs between veteran teachers and newcomers to the profession.

His radio speech did not expressly mention those bills.

"If former President Bush wanted to teach a high school government class, or if Bill Gates wanted to teach a high school computer science class, teacher certification requirements in some states would keep them from setting foot in a classroom, despite their obvious expertise," DeWine said.

AP-NY-12-04-99 1325EDT

Copyright © Associated Press. All rights reserved. This material may not be published, broadcast, rewritten, or redistributed.



- att1.htm

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996						Number of class- room teach- ers, fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9-12, 1995-96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995- 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority									Total	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12		
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Districts with more than 15,000 students	—	15,893,464	18,397,774	45.3	54.7	26.9	21.4	5.7	0.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	25,818
Baldwin County	AL	17,054	21,410	81.3	18.7	17.8	0.5	0.2	0.1	1,327	16.1	2,437	8.8	5.8	6.4	4.5	6.1	6.0	1,040	35
Birmingham City	AL	42,240	41,133	5.9	94.1	93.6	0.2	0.3	0.1	2,497	16.5	4,497	9.1	7.0	8.0	7.3	7.4	3.4	1,693	93
Huntsville City	AL	24,807	23,993	56.1	43.9	39.1	1.4	3.0	0.5	1,678	14.3	3,002	8.0	5.5	6.5	5.3	5.8	3.9	1,348	44
Jefferson County	AL	40,551	41,663	82.4	17.6	16.9	0.3	0.4	0.1	2,589	16.1	4,991	8.3	5.9	4.6	6.4	7.9	4.7	2,477	63
Madison County	AL	13,210	18,905	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,029	18.4	1,962	9.6	5.9	5.8	5.9	7.3	4.7	921	23
Mobile County	AL	67,553	64,833	48.7	51.3	49.2	0.3	1.4	0.4	3,632	17.9	7,000	9.3	6.5	8.7	6.4	5.3	3.5	3,172	88
Montgomery County	AL	35,984	34,746	29.9	70.1	68.3	0.7	1.0	0.1	2,119	16.4	3,892	8.9	5.1	2.1	6.8	7.0	4.9	1,484	56
Shelby County	AL	15,624	18,472	86.2	13.8	12.3	0.5	0.8	0.1	1,088	17.0	2,068	8.9	4.9	3.3	6.7	5.3	4.6	977	28
Tuscaloosa County	AL	14,090	15,372	77.4	22.6	22.0	0.3	0.3	0.1	943	16.3	1,746	8.8	5.4	5.3	5.7	5.8	4.5	869	27
Anchorage	AK	40,924	48,109	67.9	32.1	8.8	4.7	7.4	11.3	2,521	19.1	4,603	10.5	—	—	—	—	—	2,291	87
Fairbanks North Star Borough	AK	13,678	16,339	73.9	26.1	8.6	3.2	3.0	11.3	872	18.7	1,650	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	632	31
Amphitheater Unified	AZ	13,519	15,898	67.9	32.1	3.3	24.4	2.6	1.8	803	19.8	1,647	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	784	18
Cartwright Elementary	AZ	13,952	17,041	32.5	67.5	11.1	53.8	1.1	1.6	835	20.4	1,883	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	18
Chandler Unified	AZ	10,510	16,748	60.9	39.1	3.9	31.4	2.2	1.7	809	20.7	1,521	11.0	—	—	—	—	—	507	19
Deer Valley Unified	AZ	15,290	21,680	87.8	12.2	1.8	7.8	2.0	0.6	1,093	19.8	1,950	11.1	—	—	—	—	—	758	22
Gilbert Unified	AZ	9,451	19,877	85.3	14.7	1.9	10.3	2.1	0.5	1,044	19.0	1,897	10.5	—	—	—	—	—	942	21
Kyrene Elementary	AZ	9,281	18,578	80.3	19.7	3.9	9.8	4.9	1.1	969	19.2	1,688	11.0	—	—	—	—	—	—	23
Mesa Unified	AZ	61,324	70,181	74.9	25.1	3.0	17.1	1.8	3.2	3,432	20.4	6,620	10.6	—	—	—	—	—	2,228	76
Paradise Valley Unified	AZ	25,964	33,233	86.4	13.6	1.8	9.0	2.2	0.6	1,605	20.7	2,882	11.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,550	37
Peoria Unified	AZ	19,865	28,182	77.5	22.5	3.4	16.1	2.3	0.7	1,369	20.6	2,433	11.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,333	30
Phoenix Union High	AZ	18,006	21,307	25.3	74.7	12.0	57.2	2.1	3.4	1,110	19.2	2,215	9.6	—	—	—	—	—	2,275	12
Scottsdale Unified	AZ	19,273	25,103	87.4	12.6	1.4	7.8	2.4	0.9	1,318	19.0	2,303	10.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,246	28
Tucson Unified	AZ	55,737	62,867	45.6	54.4	6.4	42.0	2.3	3.7	3,374	18.6	6,779	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	2,594	113
Washington Elementary	AZ	21,875	25,268	73.4	26.6	4.1	18.1	2.3	2.1	1,415	17.9	2,429	10.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	33
Little Rock	AR	26,057	25,006	30.5	69.5	67.0	1.3	1.1	0.1	1,632	15.3	3,042	8.2	6.5	2.6	8.5	8.9	6.4	1,458	48
Pulaski County Special	AR	21,607	20,295	66.0	34.0	32.7	0.7	0.5	0.1	1,195	17.0	2,364	8.6	5.4	4.0	4.8	6.9	6.4	1,021	37
ABC Unified	CA	20,943	21,904	18.2	81.8	10.5	32.0	39.1	0.3	970	22.6	1,769	12.4	1.9	0.7	1.3	1.5	4.3	1,496	30
Alum Rock Union Elementary	CA	15,964	15,887	8.1	91.9	3.3	66.0	21.9	0.7	619	25.6	1,079	14.7	—	—	—	—	—	—	25
Alvord Unified	CA	13,973	16,746	40.5	59.5	7.0	45.7	6.5	0.3	665	25.2	1,112	15.1	2.8	2.8	2.7	2.7	3.1	672	17
Anaheim Elementary	CA	13,984	19,471	16.5	83.5	2.2	74.1	6.8	0.3	770	25.3	1,489	13.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	22
Anaheim Union High	CA	21,394	25,593	33.5	66.5	3.8	45.9	16.2	0.6	976	26.2	1,719	14.9	0.8	1.2	0.6	0.6	0.5	2,661	20
Antelope Valley Union High	CA	9,798	15,366	52.9	47.1	14.7	27.4	4.5	0.6	533	28.8	1,001	15.3	1.1	0.5	1.2	1.8	1.7	2,193	8
Antioch Unified	CA	12,608	16,622	62.2	37.8	8.8	19.7	7.9	1.3	696	23.9	1,172	14.2	0.5	0.1	1.0	0.5	0.4	742	17
Bakersfield City Elementary	CA	23,585	26,854	23.5	76.5	13.6	59.2	2.3	1.3	1,270	21.1	2,489	10.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	37
Baldwin Park Unified	CA	15,675	16,506	4.9	95.1	1.8	84.6	8.3	0.3	600	27.5	1,184	13.9	3.7	4.5	5.0	2.0	2.7	762	21
Cajon Valley Union Elementary	CA	16,443	19,145	68.5	31.5	5.8	21.1	3.3	1.3	880	21.8	1,449	13.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	26
Capistrano Unified	CA	24,846	37,539	75.6	24.4	1.6	16.6	6.0	0.3	1,632	23.0	2,776	13.5	1.5	0.9	1.0	1.7	2.7	1,720	36
Chaffey Union High	CA	12,855	17,296	38.3	61.7	9.8	44.4	6.8	0.7	654	26.4	1,158	14.9	5.0	2.5	3.3	5.8	9.6	2,848	7
Chino Unified	CA	22,127	29,342	48.8	51.2	5.1	37.0	8.9	0.1	1,214	24.2	2,064	14.2	0.5	0.1	0.1	0.0	2.2	1,351	30
Chula Vista Elementary	CA	16,952	19,899	25.4	74.6	5.8	56.7	11.3	0.8	844	23.6	1,508	13.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	33
Clovis Unified	CA	21,299	30,627	64.0	36.0	3.0	18.8	12.8	1.4	1,349	22.7	2,493	12.3	3.3	3.0	3.1	4.0	3.2	1,580	32
Colton Joint Unified	CA	15,342	19,712	24.8	75.2	8.4	62.3	3.9	0.5	820	24.0	1,498	13.2	1.7	1.8	0.7	1.1	3.4	749	25
Compton Unified	CA	26,889	28,839	0.2	99.8	36.4	62.2	1.1	0.1	1,026	28.1	2,322	12.4	8.6	4.0	10.0	10.6	13.9	749	35
Conejo Valley Unified	CA	17,092	18,553	77.1	22.9	1.5	14.1	6.7	0.7	779	23.8	1,337	13.9	1.4	1.0	1.7	1.2	1.8	1,166	27
Corona-Norco Unified	CA	21,660	29,528	48.8	51.2	4.1	41.0	5.5	0.5	1,170	25.2	2,091	14.1	2.8	1.2	1.4	3.5	5.8	1,406	34
Desert Sands Unified	CA	15,241	20,461	36.2	63.8	2.4	59.2	1.8	0.5	811	25.2	1,571	13.0	4.3	2.8	7.5	3.1	3.2	908	23
Downey Unified	CA	14,731	19,100	25.6	74.4	5.0	60.4	8.2	0.8	760	25.1	1,354	14.1	1.3	2.2	1.4	0.8	0.4	1,010	21
East Side Union High	CA	21,566	23,037	18.8	81.2	6.1	39.0	35.2	0.9	1,015	22.7	1,697	13.6	7.9	8.7	6.0	7.8	9.2	4,167	15
Elk Grove Unified	CA	24,390	37,787	42.2	57.8	19.1	15.7	21.6	1.3	1,635	23.1	2,930	12.9	4.0	3.8	3.0	3.3	6.3	1,572	40
Escondido Union Elementary	CA	13,868	17,583	46.7	53.3	2.7	45.9	4.2	0.5	773	22.8	1,346	13.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	19
Fairfield-Suisun Unified	CA	18,892	21,202	46.4	53.6	20.5	17.1	15.2	0.8	926	22.9	1,460	14.5	1.5	0.6	1.7	1.9	1.8	896	26
Fontana Unified	CA	24,521	32,175	21.8	78.2	12.4	62.9	2.5	0.5	1,320	24.4	2,254	14.3	2.3	2.3	2.9	2.4	1.6	1,397	31
Fremont Unified	CA	26,913	30,237	49.6	50.4	5.0	13.6	31.2	0.5	1,233	24.5	1,979	15.3	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.7	1,603	41

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996—Continued

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996						Number of class- room teach- ers, ¹ fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9–12, 1995–96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995– 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority									Total	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12		
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Fresno Unified	CA	67,492	78,470	22.8	77.2	11.1	43.6	21.7	0.8	3,525	22.3	6,639	11.8	7.1	6.7	7.6	7.5	6.3	2,868	90
Garden Grove Unified	CA	36,725	44,661	24.4	75.6	1.3	42.8	31.0	0.3	1,810	24.7	3,514	12.7	1.6	1.5	1.7	1.3	2.0	2,203	63
Glendale Unified	CA	24,280	30,164	58.8	41.2	1.1	23.6	16.3	0.2	1,131	26.7	2,336	12.9	0.4	0.0	0.2	0.6	0.9	1,785	29
Grossmont Union High	CA	18,626	22,202	69.9	30.1	5.9	17.3	5.4	1.4	885	25.1	1,736	12.8	4.0	4.4	4.3	4.2	2.7	3,663	13
Hacienda La Puente Unified	CA	22,779	22,345	10.9	89.1	2.6	66.9	19.2	0.4	892	25.1	1,744	12.8	2.9	2.6	2.2	2.8	4.2	1,241	35
Hayward Unified	CA	18,608	21,693	24.5	75.5	19.7	36.2	18.8	0.7	977	22.2	1,619	13.4	6.5	7.4	6.7	6.5	4.5	830	33
Hemet Unified	CA	11,976	15,500	66.1	33.9	2.6	28.6	2.0	0.8	632	24.5	1,111	13.9	1.9	1.4	2.9	1.4	1.8	700	18
Hesperia Unified	CA	11,814	15,327	61.4	38.6	5.2	31.2	1.5	0.6	618	24.8	1,186	12.9	6.5	5.5	5.7	8.2	8.2	622	16
Inglewood Unified	CA	15,863	16,765	0.6	99.4	43.3	55.2	0.9	0.1	612	27.4	1,086	15.4	4.7	4.9	4.3	4.0	5.8	522	18
Irvine Unified	CA	20,303	22,563	63.3	36.7	3.2	7.3	25.8	0.4	996	22.7	1,735	13.0	0.5	0.8	0.3	0.1	0.8	1,530	31
Jurupa Unified	CA	14,571	17,686	41.2	58.8	5.2	51.4	2.1	0.2	717	24.7	1,285	13.8	3.0	3.9	2.4	2.7	2.8	777	23
Kern Union High	CA	19,391	25,919	48.7	51.3	7.3	40.1	3.0	0.9	962	26.9	1,969	13.2	4.2	1.7	2.4	4.0	12.2	4,514	23
Lodi Unified	CA	23,230	25,662	46.5	53.5	5.8	23.3	23.7	0.8	1,166	22.0	2,172	11.8	4.8	3.4	5.3	5.5	5.4	1,246	35
Long Beach Unified	CA	68,292	83,038	19.9	80.1	20.7	39.0	20.0	0.4	3,613	23.0	7,322	11.3	10.2	6.2	7.5	11.7	17.1	3,178	84
Los Angeles Unified	CA	609,746	667,305	11.0	89.0	14.0	68.0	6.7	0.3	28,492	23.4	53,221	12.5	8.9	8.5	10.2	9.4	6.6	24,646	642
Lynwood Unified	CA	14,612	16,206	0.4	99.6	13.0	85.8	0.8	0.1	599	27.1	1,069	15.2	4.5	4.3	6.4	4.8	1.8	590	12
Madera Unified	CA	13,046	16,015	28.7	71.3	3.7	66.0	1.3	0.2	683	23.5	1,314	12.2	4.9	1.4	3.7	3.7	12.5	672	20
Manteca Unified	CA	13,177	15,841	59.3	40.7	4.4	28.1	6.8	1.4	650	24.4	1,138	13.9	1.6	2.0	2.0	1.1	0.8	676	19
Modesto City Elementary	CA	16,609	18,157	40.7	59.3	4.6	41.5	12.4	0.8	750	24.2	1,337	13.6	—	—	—	—	—	—	27
Montebello Unified	CA	32,362	33,147	3.8	96.2	0.5	90.1	5.5	0.1	1,184	28.0	2,323	14.3	3.4	4.0	3.3	2.0	3.9	1,440	28
Moreno Valley Unified	CA	26,630	31,303	36.9	63.1	22.7	33.6	6.5	0.3	1,299	24.1	2,488	12.6	2.3	2.0	2.4	2.5	2.5	1,477	34
Mt. Diablo Unified	CA	32,534	35,834	67.8	32.2	4.7	15.6	11.4	0.4	1,618	22.1	2,702	13.3	2.7	2.7	1.7	3.3	3.2	1,897	54
Napa Valley Unified	CA	12,978	15,704	68.7	31.3	1.7	25.0	3.5	1.1	719	21.8	1,250	12.6	0.7	0.5	0.5	0.6	1.6	776	30
Newport-Mesa Unified	CA	16,085	19,560	58.8	41.2	1.1	33.4	6.5	0.1	870	22.5	1,554	12.6	1.6	2.0	1.9	1.4	1.1	996	27
Norwalk-La Mirada Unified	CA	18,557	21,600	24.5	75.5	5.0	62.1	8.2	0.3	843	25.6	1,929	11.2	3.7	1.4	1.2	6.0	7.7	981	26
Oakland Unified	CA	50,741	53,462	6.2	93.8	51.7	21.7	19.9	0.5	2,508	21.3	4,618	11.6	9.1	8.9	10.4	8.9	7.1	1,710	93
Oceanside City Unified	CA	16,309	20,247	34.3	65.7	15.1	40.8	8.9	0.8	867	23.3	1,556	13.0	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.7	2.0	691	22
Ontario-Montclair Elementary	CA	20,356	24,196	17.2	82.8	7.9	70.2	4.1	0.5	1,068	22.7	1,930	12.5	—	—	—	—	—	—	31
Orange Unified	CA	24,618	28,294	48.8	51.2	2.1	36.0	12.7	0.3	1,112	25.4	2,108	13.4	2.7	3.6	2.8	2.5	1.8	1,517	37
Pajaro Valley Joint Unified	CA	16,147	18,355	25.1	74.9	0.6	71.4	2.8	0.2	815	22.5	1,622	11.3	3.3	5.4	3.0	2.0	1.0	698	24
Palm Springs Unified	CA	13,302	18,129	37.2	62.8	5.9	52.2	3.6	1.1	749	24.2	1,442	12.6	2.6	3.1	1.9	1.8	3.7	618	21
Palmdale Elementary	CA	11,548	18,631	40.9	59.1	15.4	38.4	4.2	1.0	659	28.3	1,106	16.8	—	—	—	—	—	—	18
Paramount Unified	CA	12,738	15,843	5.5	94.5	15.3	74.8	4.0	0.4	647	24.5	1,236	12.8	7.8	9.6	8.6	6.4	5.2	534	15
Pasadena Unified	CA	21,674	22,490	17.2	82.8	32.9	46.0	3.7	0.1	942	23.9	1,966	11.4	4.6	4.4	5.8	4.3	3.7	986	30
Placentia-Yorba Linda Unified	CA	21,216	24,381	63.5	36.5	2.1	25.1	9.1	0.2	986	24.7	1,689	14.4	1.0	0.6	1.4	1.0	1.0	1,239	29
Pomona Unified	CA	25,990	31,214	9.8	90.2	11.5	70.7	7.9	0.1	1,199	26.0	2,237	14.0	5.0	4.9	5.5	4.6	4.8	1,039	37
Poway Unified	CA	23,402	30,626	72.6	27.4	2.8	7.5	16.6	0.5	1,339	22.9	2,436	12.6	1.0	0.6	0.5	0.8	2.3	1,812	28
Redlands Unified	CA	15,247	17,950	50.7	49.3	7.8	30.3	10.3	0.9	726	24.7	1,226	14.6	2.0	0.4	0.2	1.8	6.2	997	17
Rialto Unified	CA	18,487	24,757	18.1	81.9	27.9	49.8	4.0	0.2	984	25.2	1,881	13.2	3.4	3.8	3.5	3.5	2.3	1,065	24
Riverside Unified	CA	30,258	35,407	45.1	54.9	10.1	39.4	4.8	0.6	1,502	23.6	2,830	12.5	2.6	3.4	2.8	2.1	1.6	1,670	42
Rowland Unified	CA	18,881	18,833	12.2	87.8	6.6	54.5	26.5	0.2	770	24.4	1,450	13.0	2.9	4.6	3.1	2.0	1.0	1,031	22
Sacramento City Unified	CA	48,061	51,240	27.2	72.8	21.8	22.8	26.7	1.5	2,064	24.8	4,279	12.0	6.3	6.1	6.5	6.4	6.2	1,861	76
Saddleback Valley Unified	CA	24,156	31,833	72.7	27.3	2.1	14.6	10.3	0.3	1,435	22.2	2,197	14.5	1.9	0.3	1.2	2.4	4.3	1,701	35
San Bernardino City Unified	CA	39,033	46,309	24.8	75.2	19.1	50.0	4.7	1.4	1,931	24.0	3,699	12.5	8.1	9.3	7.8	7.6	5.6	1,670	58
San Diego City Unified	CA	119,314	133,687	29.3	70.7	16.9	34.4	18.7	0.7	6,024	22.2	11,805	11.3	3.1	2.7	2.7	2.8	4.5	5,813	163
San Francisco Unified	CA	61,935	61,174	12.7	87.3	16.8	20.9	48.9	0.7	3,412	17.9	5,567	11.0	2.1	2.8	2.2	1.8	1.2	3,549	112
San Jose Unified	CA	29,005	32,592	31.3	68.7	3.4	48.8	14.6	1.9	1,155	28.2	2,619	12.4	1.7	1.1	2.6	1.5	1.6	1,543	49
San Juan Unified	CA	46,640	47,819	77.4	22.6	5.9	8.6	6.0	2.0	2,199	21.8	4,186	11.4	4.4	1.8	2.8	5.1	8.3	2,767	87
San Ramon Valley Unified	CA	15,851	18,967	81.7	18.3	1.7	4.3	11.7	0.6	813	23.3	1,387	13.7	1.2	0.2	0.3	0.9	3.5	1,208	25
Santa Ana Unified	CA	42,785	52,107	3.6	96.4	1.2	89.9	5.3	0.0	2,082	25.0	4,147	12.6	7.6	8.1	8.5	7.0	5.8	1,781	45
Simi Valley Unified	CA	18,279	18,923	72.9	27.1	1.7	17.4	7.0	1.0	815	23.2	1,461	13.0	2.1	0.0	0.8	4.0	3.4	1,202	27
Stockton City Unified	CA	31,849	35,154	16.6	83.4	13.0	41.3	27.4	1.6	1,532	22.9	3,132	11.2	2.4	1.7	1.5	2.9	4.5	994	41
Sweetwater Union High	CA	27,265	30,772	18.2	81.8	4.9	63.4	12.9	0.6	1,303	23.6	2,376	12.9	4.4	5.1	4.2	3.6	4.7	3,341	19
Torrance Unified	CA	19,125	23,260	49.3	50.7	4.2	15.0	30.9	0.6	978	23.8	1,713	13.6	0.4	0.2	0.7	0.4	0.5	1,521	30
Vallejo City Unified	CA	18,496	19,479	22.6	77.4	34.3	15.1	27.5	0.6	759	25.7	1,437	13.6	3.6	0.5	7.5	3.7	2.6	879	25
Ventura Unified	CA	15,308	16,859	61.2	38.8	2.3	32.3	3.3	1.0	679	24.8	1,293	13.0	4.7	3.7	3.1	4.4	8.9	809	27
Visalia Unified	CA	19,913	24,515	46.8																

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996—Continued

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996						Number of class- room teach- ers, fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9–12, 1995–96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995– 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority									Total	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12		
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
West Contra Costa Unified	CA	31,102	32,284	22.5	77.5	35.0	23.7	18.5	0.3	1,412	22.9	2,596	12.4	2.9	3.0	2.9	3.2	2.1	1,600	57
Adams-Arapahoe	CO	25,345	28,492	54.1	45.9	24.1	15.7	5.1	1.0	1,502	19.0	2,920	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,177	44
Boulder Valley	CO	21,013	25,648	82.9	17.1	1.7	10.0	4.5	0.9	1,373	18.7	2,603	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,361	52
Cherry Creek	CO	28,027	37,128	82.6	17.4	7.0	5.1	4.9	0.4	2,018	18.4	4,001	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	2,101	45
Colorado Springs	CO	29,931	33,175	73.3	26.7	9.5	13.9	2.3	1.1	1,696	19.6	3,162	10.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,648	61
Denver County	CO	58,299	66,331	26.1	73.9	21.3	47.5	3.7	1.4	3,198	20.7	7,117	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	2,363	118
Douglas County	CO	12,001	24,495	92.9	7.1	0.9	3.5	2.2	0.5	1,330	18.4	2,491	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,055	39
Jefferson County	CO	75,164	86,670	86.0	14.0	1.1	9.3	2.8	0.7	4,134	21.0	9,201	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	4,443	151
Littleton	CO	15,356	16,044	90.7	9.3	1.3	4.9	2.7	0.4	856	18.8	1,615	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	960	25
Mesa County Valley	CO	16,286	19,049	85.9	14.1	0.7	11.7	0.9	0.8	1,039	18.3	1,880	10.1	—	—	—	—	—	1,140	37
Northglenn-Thornton	CO	20,692	25,604	75.2	24.8	1.9	18.4	3.3	1.2	1,291	19.8	2,414	10.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,237	40
Poudre	CO	17,965	21,922	84.8	15.2	1.2	10.4	2.6	1.0	1,101	19.9	2,080	10.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,139	44
Pueblo City	CO	18,403	18,100	44.6	55.4	2.2	50.9	0.7	1.6	931	19.4	1,719	10.5	—	—	—	—	—	994	38
St. Vrain Valley	CO	14,929	17,459	79.3	20.7	0.4	17.5	1.8	1.0	885	19.7	1,673	10.4	—	—	—	—	—	879	33
Bridgeport	CT	19,332	21,884	11.3	88.7	42.1	42.9	3.6	0.1	1,391	15.7	2,533	8.6	7.0	8.3	5.6	6.7	7.0	600	36
Hartford	CT	24,682	23,429	4.6	95.4	42.1	50.7	2.6	0.1	1,712	13.7	2,911	8.0	23.8	33.8	18.0	16.6	15.6	787	36
New Haven	CT	17,689	18,951	12.5	87.5	58.7	26.8	2.0	0.0	1,234	15.4	2,473	7.7	14.9	15.6	18.3	13.2	11.1	643	45
Christina	DE	16,784	20,182	60.7	39.3	32.8	3.8	2.6	0.1	1,171	17.2	2,233	9.0	6.1	6.5	7.0	5.4	4.6	876	30
Red Clay Consolidated	DE	14,372	15,517	54.8	45.2	30.6	11.8	2.7	0.1	884	17.6	1,598	9.7	6.0	5.1	7.8	6.7	4.0	631	26
District of Columbia	DC	81,301	78,648	3.9	96.1	87.3	7.2	1.4	0.1	5,288	14.9	9,318	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	2,696	184
Alachua County	FL	25,495	29,648	57.1	42.9	37.2	3.3	2.2	0.2	1,630	18.2	3,885	7.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,250	44
Bay County	FL	21,002	25,665	81.0	19.0	15.2	1.4	2.1	0.3	1,447	17.7	3,012	8.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,085	34
Brevard County	FL	53,619	66,663	79.8	20.2	14.6	3.7	1.8	0.2	3,711	18.0	7,062	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	2,957	85
Broward County	FL	148,739	218,608	47.4	52.6	35.3	14.4	2.6	0.3	10,341	21.1	20,338	10.7	—	—	—	—	—	8,623	193
Charlotte County	FL	11,831	16,088	87.0	13.0	8.5	3.1	1.2	0.2	826	19.5	1,868	8.6	—	—	—	—	—	810	24
Clay County	FL	20,847	25,940	86.2	13.8	9.0	2.6	2.0	0.2	1,360	19.1	2,588	10.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,183	29
Collier County	FL	19,576	28,177	62.7	37.3	11.2	25.1	0.5	0.5	1,569	18.0	3,416	8.2	—	—	—	—	—	965	41
Dade County	FL	279,420	341,117	13.5	86.5	33.6	51.5	1.3	0.1	17,241	19.8	33,013	10.3	—	—	—	—	—	14,290	322
Duval County	FL	106,961	126,118	53.7	46.3	40.7	2.8	2.6	0.1	6,276	20.1	11,576	10.9	—	—	—	—	—	4,436	155
Escambia County	FL	41,967	45,744	60.4	39.6	35.1	1.2	2.7	0.6	2,470	18.5	5,147	8.9	—	—	—	—	—	2,127	81
Hernando County	FL	11,978	15,859	86.5	13.5	7.7	4.9	0.8	0.1	816	19.4	1,946	8.1	—	—	—	—	—	734	19
Hillsborough County	FL	119,810	147,826	56.0	44.0	24.1	17.6	2.0	0.3	8,735	16.9	17,652	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	5,874	164
Lake County	FL	20,095	26,131	75.3	24.7	17.8	5.8	0.8	0.2	1,366	19.1	2,914	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,078	42
Lee County	FL	40,569	52,317	71.1	28.9	15.9	11.7	1.1	0.2	2,883	18.1	5,760	9.1	—	—	—	—	—	2,316	72
Leon County	FL	26,211	31,560	58.2	41.8	38.6	1.6	1.5	0.1	1,810	17.4	4,219	7.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,370	47
Manatee County	FL	25,384	32,794	69.6	30.4	18.1	11.4	0.8	0.1	1,783	18.4	3,957	8.3	—	—	—	—	—	1,098	61
Marion County	FL	27,702	36,242	71.5	28.5	22.1	5.5	0.7	0.2	2,052	17.7	4,456	8.1	—	—	—	—	—	1,493	49
Okaloosa County	FL	25,524	30,067	80.6	19.4	12.8	3.0	3.2	0.4	1,602	18.8	3,306	9.1	—	—	—	—	—	1,576	37
Orange County	FL	96,244	129,143	50.7	49.3	28.5	17.2	3.4	0.3	7,053	18.3	15,397	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	6,067	160
Osceola County	FL	17,769	27,376	58.9	41.1	9.5	28.6	2.8	0.2	1,334	20.5	3,083	8.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,175	32
Palm Beach County	FL	98,705	137,585	53.8	46.2	29.6	14.3	2.0	0.4	7,258	19.0	14,873	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	5,703	135
Pasco County	FL	32,164	43,461	88.9	11.1	4.0	5.8	1.1	0.2	2,447	17.8	5,506	7.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,709	47
Pinellas County	FL	90,133	107,060	75.1	24.9	19.0	3.1	2.7	0.2	6,183	17.3	12,910	8.3	—	—	—	—	—	4,471	146
Polk County	FL	63,503	74,808	67.1	32.9	23.4	8.4	0.9	0.2	4,186	17.9	8,883	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	2,840	124
Santa Rosa County	FL	15,181	20,668	91.4	8.6	5.4	1.2	1.5	0.5	1,123	18.4	2,090	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	888	30
Sarasota County	FL	27,541	31,950	83.3	16.7	10.8	4.5	1.2	0.1	1,825	17.5	4,008	8.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,397	39
Seminole County	FL	46,505	55,972	71.8	28.2	14.6	10.6	2.8	0.2	2,829	19.8	5,381	10.4	—	—	—	—	—	2,585	58
Saint Johns County	FL	11,473	16,374	85.6	14.4	11.7	1.8	0.8	0.2	1,012	16.2	1,942	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	662	26
Saint Lucie County	FL	20,653	27,672	60.0	40.0	31.0	7.8	1.0	0.2	1,858	14.9	4,021	6.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,026	35
Volusia County	FL	45,697	58,004	75.6	24.4	16.3	6.9	1.0	0.2	3,370	17.2	7,295	8.0	—	—	—	—	—	2,577	79
Atlanta City	GA	61,364	60,064	6.6	93.4	90.1	1.9	1.3	0.0	3,605	16.7	4,187	14.3	10.1	13.8	8.9	7.6	6.0	2,054	99
Bibb County	GA	24,033	24,840	31.7	68.3	67.1	0.5	0.4	0.2	1,469	16.9	1,712	14.5	12.6	4.8	25.9	11.7	12.9	912	41
Chatham County	GA	33,399	36,382	34.7	65.3	62.4	1.2	1.5	0.2	2,224	16.4	2,450	14.9	8.2	10.1	7.9	7.0	5.2	1,511	43
Cherokee County	GA	15,354	22,189	94.9	5.1	2.3	2.0	0.6	0.1	1,287	17.2	1,463	15.2	6.3	0.9	2.6	6.1	20.0	939	30

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996—Continued

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996						Number of class- room teach- ers, ¹ fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9–12, 1995–96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995– 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority									Total	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12		
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Clayton County	GA	33,670	41,658	41.8	58.2	50.3	3.2	4.5	0.1	2,378	17.5	2,710	15.4	11.1	11.5	11.3	11.0	9.7	1,665	44
Cobb County	GA	66,971	85,765	75.7	24.3	18.1	3.2	2.9	0.2	4,775	18.0	5,765	14.9	4.1	2.9	5.5	5.8	1.9	4,455	89
Columbia County	GA	13,328	17,923	82.4	17.6	12.4	1.6	3.5	0.1	981	18.3	1,100	16.3	2.7	3.2	2.4	2.2	2.7	924	23
De Kalb County	GA	72,824	90,311	17.2	82.8	74.5	4.1	4.0	0.1	5,390	16.8	6,242	14.5	8.7	9.4	7.9	9.0	8.2	4,057	112
Dougherty	GA	18,882	17,802	22.6	77.4	76.7	0.4	0.3	0.1	1,025	17.4	1,163	15.3	15.8	18.4	15.9	11.3	14.8	834	25
Douglas County	GA	13,679	16,012	82.0	18.0	16.0	1.0	0.6	0.5	968	16.5	1,109	14.4	3.2	2.7	4.2	3.7	2.3	874	21
Fayette County	GA	12,390	17,502	85.8	14.2	10.5	1.3	2.2	0.1	1,045	16.7	1,280	13.7	4.7	4.7	5.0	4.7	4.2	1,027	21
Fulton County	GA	40,325	59,953	51.2	48.8	41.6	3.6	3.6	0.1	2,689	22.3	4,107	14.6	5.0	1.2	2.8	5.4	11.5	2,410	60
Gwinnett County	GA	62,241	88,855	78.2	21.8	10.3	4.7	6.7	0.1	5,140	17.3	5,727	15.5	5.2	5.2	5.7	5.1	4.4	4,042	74
Hall County	GA	13,350	17,571	82.3	17.7	5.7	10.9	0.9	0.2	1,032	17.0	1,204	14.6	11.6	3.4	18.0	12.2	19.1	714	25
Henry County	GA	10,345	17,227	84.2	15.8	13.4	1.3	1.0	0.0	886	19.4	1,097	15.7	8.9	2.7	9.6	11.0	17.0	643	23
Houston County	GA	15,574	19,956	66.1	33.9	31.3	1.1	1.4	0.2	1,162	17.2	1,461	13.7	7.7	10.1	8.0	7.0	3.8	1,057	29
Muscogee County	GA	29,541	33,606	38.1	61.9	57.6	3.0	1.1	0.2	1,946	17.3	2,210	15.2	8.6	8.8	8.8	8.8	7.8	1,548	50
Richmond County	GA	32,386	36,826	32.2	67.8	64.9	1.9	1.0	0.1	2,111	17.4	2,330	15.8	10.1	11.9	8.9	9.3	9.2	1,597	57
Hawaii Department of Education	HI	169,507	187,653	24.0	76.0	2.9	8.8	63.9	0.4	10,576	17.7	16,867	11.1	4.7	3.9	4.4	5.3	5.6	9,992	249
Boise City Independent	ID	22,634	26,898	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,444	18.6	2,471	10.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,556	46
Meridian Junction	ID	14,228	19,624	—	—	—	—	—	—	968	20.3	1,676	11.7	—	—	—	—	—	994	25
City of Chicago	IL	408,201	469,098	10.5	89.5	54.1	32.1	3.2	0.2	23,433	20.0	27,827	16.9	—	—	—	—	—	14,889	567
Community Unit 300	IL	10,818	16,505	79.6	20.4	3.7	15.0	1.2	0.4	787	21.0	913	18.1	—	—	—	—	—	702	20
Indian Prairie 20	IL	6,875	17,091	84.1	15.9	6.1	3.0	5.7	1.0	840	20.3	976	17.5	—	—	—	—	—	537	20
Naperville Community Unit District 203	IL	15,720	19,844	86.7	13.3	2.6	1.4	9.1	0.2	950	20.9	1,134	17.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,176	21
Peoria	IL	17,095	19,684	44.8	55.2	51.5	2.0	1.7	0.1	990	19.9	1,138	17.3	—	—	—	—	—	869	45
Rockford	IL	26,757	31,995	60.5	39.5	27.1	9.2	3.0	0.2	1,662	19.3	2,029	15.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,179	51
Schaumburg	IL	15,460	17,954	74.4	25.6	6.5	6.4	12.5	0.1	940	19.1	1,102	16.3	—	—	—	—	—	—	28
School District 46	IL	26,767	35,501	60.5	39.5	8.2	25.1	6.1	0.1	1,659	21.4	1,932	18.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,428	51
Springfield	IL	15,567	18,898	66.8	33.2	30.5	0.8	1.5	0.2	954	19.8	1,148	16.5	—	—	—	—	—	811	35
Waukegan	IL	11,528	15,275	19.6	80.4	27.8	49.7	2.8	0.1	725	21.1	857	17.8	—	—	—	—	—	463	23
Evansville-Vanderburgh School Corporation	IN	22,832	23,763	84.3	15.7	14.4	0.5	0.6	0.2	1,438	16.5	2,858	8.3	4.1	1.3	4.2	6.5	4.6	1,352	40
Fort Wayne Community	IN	31,843	31,727	69.2	30.8	24.8	3.9	1.7	0.3	1,749	18.1	3,490	9.1	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.0	3.9	1,668	53
Gary Community School Corporation	IN	26,506	21,679	1.0	99.0	96.6	2.3	0.1	0.1	1,160	18.7	2,740	7.9	4.3	4.6	4.0	4.2	4.3	1,150	39
Indianapolis	IN	48,805	44,434	39.4	60.6	58.0	1.8	0.6	0.2	2,831	15.7	5,588	8.0	7.4	8.5	7.4	7.7	3.5	1,257	96
South Bend Community School Corporation	IN	21,539	20,966	57.7	42.3	33.2	7.1	1.5	0.5	1,245	16.8	2,812	7.5	4.5	2.1	4.2	8.1	3.8	1,119	36
Vigo County School Corporation	IN	16,983	16,913	91.0	9.0	6.9	0.7	1.4	0.1	982	17.2	2,032	8.3	4.9	3.0	5.9	5.9	5.1	1,045	30
Cedar Rapids	IA	17,014	17,949	88.4	11.6	7.4	1.6	2.2	0.4	1,013	17.7	1,982	9.1	2.6	0.9	2.0	4.2	3.6	880	33
Davenport	IA	17,693	17,627	73.9	26.1	16.6	5.7	2.5	1.3	1,157	15.2	2,002	8.8	4.9	2.1	4.5	7.4	6.0	926	36
Des Moines Independent	IA	29,760	31,484	74.4	25.6	14.5	5.2	5.2	0.7	2,015	15.6	3,842	8.2	3.8	4.1	3.8	4.0	3.2	1,623	65
Kansas City	KS	22,374	21,456	30.7	69.3	54.0	12.2	2.9	0.3	1,417	15.1	2,876	7.5	10.2	14.6	9.7	7.7	5.7	992	47
Olathe	KS	13,971	18,385	90.2	9.8	4.5	2.3	2.5	0.5	1,270	14.5	2,222	8.3	2.7	0.1	2.8	3.9	4.6	965	34
Shawnee Mission	KS	29,845	31,633	90.5	9.5	3.5	3.1	2.5	0.3	1,959	16.1	3,541	8.9	3.4	1.5	4.0	3.9	4.5	1,945	57
Wichita	KS	45,835	46,391	58.9	41.1	22.7	11.3	5.0	2.0	2,684	17.3	5,103	9.1	9.5	7.7	9.8	9.4	11.8	2,012	96
Fayette County	KY	31,191	32,830	73.3	26.7	23.4	1.0	2.2	0.1	2,124	15.5	2,337	14.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,545	63
Jefferson County	KY	91,353	91,878	66.3	33.7	31.7	0.6	1.1	0.2	5,469	16.8	6,060	15.2	—	—	—	—	—	5,017	153
Bossier Parish School Board	LA	17,814	19,063	67.5	32.5	29.1	1.8	1.3	0.3	1,047	18.2	2,066	9.2	6.6	7.4	6.7	6.7	5.1	825	30
Caddo Parish School Board	LA	52,309	49,577	38.0	62.0	60.9	0.5	0.5	0.1	2,922	17.0	6,248	7.9	10.2	12.4	8.8	9.7	7.9	2,275	74
Calcasieu Parish School Board ..	LA	32,726	35,782	67.7	32.3	31.2	0.4	0.5	0.1	2,144	16.7	4,362	8.2	6.9	7.0	8.0	5.9	6.3	1,741	60
East Baton Rouge Parish School Board	LA	60,279	61,499	34.7	65.3	62.7	0.5	2.2	0.0	3,622	17.0	6,894	8.9	14.0	15.6	13.9	11.3	14.3	2,800	102
Iberia Parish School Board	LA	15,279	16,340	56.4	43.6	39.8	0.5	3.2	0.1	982	16.6	1,914	8.5	11.1	10.3	11.0	8.0	16.9	601	33
Jefferson Parish School Board ..	LA	57,663	55,876	46.0	54.0	42.9	6.5	4.1	0.5	3,438	16.3	7,060	7.9	18.9	21.4	18.1	16.6	18.6	2,393	83

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996—Continued

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996							Number of class- room teach- ers, fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9-12, 1995-96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995- 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority					Total					Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12			
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native												
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	
Lafayette Parish School Board ...	LA	28,392	31,287	63.8	36.2	34.2	0.7	1.1	0.1	1,855	16.9	3,401	9.2	8.7	12.2	8.1	7.5	5.0	1,407	41	
Lafourche Parish School Board ...	LA	16,494	17,100	73.5	26.5	21.2	0.6	1.2	3.4	1,148	14.9	2,043	8.4	6.9	6.4	8.0	6.4	6.7	802	28	
Livingston Parish School Board ...	LA	16,359	18,496	93.2	6.8	6.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	1,031	17.9	1,900	9.7	11.9	14.1	10.9	12.4	8.8	842	34	
Orleans Parish School Board ...	LA	84,428	85,064	5.5	94.5	90.7	1.3	2.5	0.0	4,579	18.6	8,602	9.9	14.4	15.3	13.9	12.4	16.2	3,340	122	
Ouachita Parish School Board ...	LA	17,523	18,289	75.2	24.8	23.8	0.4	0.6	0.0	1,104	16.6	2,148	8.5	18.4	11.7	20.7	20.6	24.7	1,641	31	
Rapides Parish School Board ...	LA	24,404	25,404	56.3	43.7	41.0	0.4	1.0	1.3	1,609	15.8	3,169	8.0	9.1	9.3	10.9	9.3	6.7	1,400	55	
Saint Landry Parish School Board ...	LA	17,379	18,552	45.0	55.0	54.5	0.2	0.1	0.1	1,086	17.1	2,219	8.4	6.7	9.3	7.5	5.3	3.3	787	37	
Saint Tammany Parish School Board ...	LA	28,055	33,100	83.7	16.3	14.7	0.8	0.7	0.1	2,102	15.7	4,075	8.1	9.4	11.1	8.8	8.4	8.7	1,642	49	
Tangipahoa Parish School Board	LA	17,266	19,431	54.4	45.6	44.4	0.6	0.4	0.0	1,020	19.1	2,077	9.4	21.6	17.9	26.3	21.0	23.0	863	37	
Terrebonne Parish School Board	LA	21,331	22,179	64.2	35.8	26.2	0.6	1.1	7.9	1,233	18.0	2,282	9.7	11.7	13.4	12.4	11.2	8.3	911	43	
Anne Arundel County Public Schools ...	MD	64,104	72,322	77.9	22.1	18.1	1.6	2.2	0.2	4,064	17.8	7,094	10.2	—	—	—	—	—	3,569	111	
Baltimore City Public School System ...	MD	107,782	108,759	13.4	86.6	85.1	0.4	0.6	0.5	6,259	17.4	10,020	10.9	—	—	—	—	—	3,827	179	
Baltimore County ...	MD	84,133	104,073	68.7	31.3	26.5	1.2	3.4	0.2	6,442	16.2	11,531	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	5,510	160	
Carroll County ...	MD	21,244	26,231	96.0	4.0	2.3	0.7	0.9	0.2	1,408	18.6	2,428	10.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,421	33	
Board of Education, Charles County ...	MD	18,299	21,159	68.8	31.2	26.9	1.3	1.9	1.1	1,161	18.2	1,939	10.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,235	32	
Frederick County Board of Education ...	MD	26,173	33,749	88.7	11.3	7.9	1.7	1.6	0.2	2,008	16.8	3,472	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,968	50	
Harford County ...	MD	30,217	37,709	83.3	16.7	12.7	1.7	1.8	0.5	2,244	16.8	3,896	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,813	52	
Howard County Public Schools System ...	MD	28,874	38,857	73.9	26.1	16.3	1.8	7.9	0.1	2,457	15.8	4,352	8.9	—	—	—	—	—	2,304	59	
Montgomery County ...	MD	100,261	122,505	54.7	45.3	19.8	12.5	12.6	0.4	7,208	17.0	13,765	8.9	—	—	—	—	—	6,765	182	
Prince George's County Public Schools ...	MD	106,974	125,198	16.7	83.3	73.4	5.7	3.8	0.4	6,996	17.9	13,472	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	6,751	179	
Board of Education, Washington County ...	MD	17,424	19,896	91.9	8.1	5.9	1.1	1.1	0.1	1,219	16.3	2,034	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,128	44	
Boston ...	MA	59,597	63,239	16.9	83.1	48.4	25.2	9.2	0.4	4,076	15.5	8,444	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.6	8.1	5.7	3,001	124	
Brockton ...	MA	14,738	15,461	48.6	51.4	35.3	12.4	3.3	0.5	961	16.1	1,800	8.6	7.3	5.2	11.5	7.2	3.3	549	24	
Lowell ...	MA	13,414	15,759	45.2	54.8	3.4	21.8	29.5	0.1	1,087	14.5	1,788	8.8	2.6	1.9	4.2	1.8	1.7	454	29	
Springfield ...	MA	23,614	24,422	28.1	71.9	30.3	39.5	2.0	0.1	2,038	12.0	3,786	6.5	2.9	3.4	3.4	2.1	1.6	805	46	
Worcester ...	MA	21,081	23,728	57.1	42.9	9.4	26.0	6.9	0.6	1,891	12.5	3,308	7.2	7.4	5.2	8.3	8.6	7.8	808	49	
Ann Arbor ...	MI	13,640	15,587	70.9	29.1	17.6	2.2	8.9	0.4	809	19.3	1,740	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	832	32	
Dearborn City ...	MI	12,950	15,593	95.5	4.5	1.3	2.1	0.9	0.3	918	17.0	1,726	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	832	29	
Detroit City ...	MI	175,329	182,316	5.2	94.8	90.7	2.8	1.0	0.2	8,808	20.7	22,077	8.3	—	—	—	—	—	6,056	279	
Flint City ...	MI	28,701	26,335	25.0	75.0	69.9	2.3	0.3	2.6	1,404	18.8	2,967	8.9	—	—	—	—	—	914	48	
Grand Rapids City ...	MI	26,063	28,282	40.8	59.2	41.7	14.2	2.0	1.3	1,392	20.3	3,267	8.7	—	—	—	—	—	781	100	
Lansing Public ...	MI	21,407	19,413	47.0	53.0	34.0	12.6	5.2	1.2	1,066	18.2	2,440	8.0	—	—	—	—	—	691	45	
Livonia ...	MI	16,115	18,100	95.7	4.3	1.6	0.8	1.5	0.3	906	20.0	1,935	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,171	36	
Plymouth-Canton Community Schools ...	MI	14,934	15,800	91.2	8.8	2.6	1.0	4.7	0.5	739	21.4	1,606	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	935	22	
Utica Community ...	MI	24,486	25,635	96.2	3.8	1.0	0.5	2.2	0.2	1,182	21.7	2,416	10.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,599	41	
Wayne-Westland Community ...	MI	16,600	15,151	84.7	15.3	11.9	1.5	0.9	1.0	693	21.9	1,394	10.9	—	—	—	—	—	674	26	
Anoka-Hennepin ...	MN	33,562	39,874	93.4	6.6	2.0	1.1	2.4	1.2	2,201	18.1	3,833	10.4	5.4	1.1	4.8	8.0	8.3	2,075	50	
Minneapolis ...	MN	36,385	47,978	35.0	65.0	41.2	5.0	12.6	6.3	3,080	15.6	5,515	8.7	18.2	18.0	17.1	18.1	19.9	1,617	144	
Osseo ...	MN	18,966	21,664	82.2	17.8	10.1	1.4	5.6	0.6	1,197	18.1	2,009	10.8	5.9	0.6	5.6	8.8	9.4	1,213	31	
Rochester ...	MN	13,258	15,544	85.2	14.8	4.3	2.2	8.2	0.3	848	18.3	1,547	10.0	4.6	1.6	5.3	7.1	4.3	898	29	
Rosemount-Apple Valley-Eagan St. Paul ...	MN	17,185	26,566	90.4	9.6	3.3	1.3	4.5	0.5	1,559	17.0	3,102	8.6	3.0	0.6	2.5	3.9	5.7	1,334	36	
St. Paul ...	MN	31,852	43,766	42.9	57.1	21.5	7.2	26.7	1.7	2,203	19.9	3,471	12.6	12.5	5.2	11.5	16.2	18.6	1,596	139	
Desoto County ...	MS	13,099	16,625	81.3	18.7	16.5	1.4	0.3	0.3	853	19.5	1,699	9.8	4.3	4.7	4.1	3.0	5.0	686	21	
Jackson Public ...	MS	33,330	32,636	11.1	88.9	88.3	0.2	0.4	0.1	1,808	18.0	4,215	7.7	8.6	11.2	8.1	7.2	5.1	1,330	58	
Columbia ...	MO	12,539	15,605	77.9	22.1	16.6	1.2	3.9	0.4	1,052	14.8	1,356	11.5	9.2	2.1	15.1	9.6	8.6	771	30	

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996—Continued

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996						Number of class- room teach- ers, ¹ fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9–12, 1995–96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995– 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority									Total	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12		
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Francis Howell	MO	12,836	18,106	93.8	6.2	5.0	0.4	0.6	0.2	1,097	16.5	1,390	13.0	6.0	5.8	7.1	6.4	4.4	965	15
Hazelwood	MO	17,175	18,511	60.7	39.3	37.4	0.7	1.1	0.1	1,034	17.9	1,281	14.5	4.3	3.4	5.0	4.6	4.1	1,122	25
Kansas City	MO	34,640	38,521	20.1	79.9	71.5	6.0	2.0	0.3	2,645	14.6	3,488	11.0	11.2	12.3	12.7	11.0	6.6	1,132	83
North Kansas City	MO	15,617	16,941	92.1	7.9	3.5	2.5	1.6	0.4	1,072	15.8	1,305	13.0	7.5	5.5	5.2	9.8	10.0	920	29
Parkway	MO	22,379	21,483	74.7	25.3	18.1	0.9	6.1	0.1	1,248	17.2	1,592	13.5	2.1	1.7	2.4	2.7	1.5	1,530	28
Rockwood	MO	14,657	19,871	83.3	16.7	14.3	0.5	1.8	0.1	1,109	17.9	1,403	14.2	3.7	2.9	4.0	4.7	3.6	1,131	26
Springfield	MO	23,248	25,207	92.0	8.0	4.1	1.6	1.7	0.6	1,483	17.0	2,057	12.3	8.1	5.1	8.4	10.3	9.1	1,434	57
St. Louis City	MO	44,056	44,620	18.0	82.0	79.7	0.7	1.6	0.1	3,205	13.9	4,471	10.0	22.4	27.0	24.1	17.5	11.5	1,084	111
Lincoln	NE	27,356	30,691	87.7	12.3	5.2	2.6	3.3	1.2	2,124	14.5	4,223	7.3	7.0	1.2	4.6	10.1	13.1	1,699	53
Millard	NE	16,244	18,647	95.7	4.3	1.1	1.3	1.7	0.3	1,090	17.1	1,962	9.5	2.1	0.4	1.1	2.3	4.9	1,114	29
Omaha	NE	41,251	44,761	59.6	40.4	29.8	7.7	1.3	1.5	2,853	15.7	5,512	8.1	10.9	8.8	15.4	11.1	6.5	2,131	82
Clark County	NV	111,460	179,106	58.4	41.6	13.8	21.4	5.5	0.9	8,875	20.2	14,752	12.1	11.1	4.2	6.8	12.7	24.6	7,063	211
Washoe County	NV	36,662	49,671	72.7	27.3	3.5	16.4	4.8	2.6	2,842	17.5	4,962	10.0	8.2	2.4	5.2	10.6	17.8	2,032	83
Manchester	NH	13,912	16,265	91.1	8.9	2.4	4.0	1.9	0.5	851	19.1	1,367	11.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,304	23
Camden City	NJ	18,999	19,841	3.1	96.9	57.8	36.7	2.3	0.1	1,512	13.1	3,584	5.5	—	—	—	—	—	688	33
Elizabeth City	NJ	14,955	17,056	16.6	83.4	28.7	51.9	2.7	0.1	1,247	13.7	2,472	6.9	—	—	—	—	—	725	25
Jersey City	NJ	27,788	31,666	9.2	90.8	42.3	37.3	10.5	0.6	2,133	14.8	4,169	7.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,047	37
Newark City	NJ	48,573	45,805	8.6	91.4	63.4	27.2	0.8	0.0	3,538	12.9	7,689	6.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,413	80
Paterson City	NJ	21,671	23,408	6.6	93.4	41.3	50.1	2.0	0.0	1,666	14.1	3,239	7.2	—	—	—	—	—	632	35
Toms River Regional	NJ	16,055	16,854	94.1	5.9	2.1	2.2	1.5	0.1	1,058	15.9	2,007	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,069	16
Albuquerque	NM	86,370	89,092	44.2	55.8	3.6	46.2	1.8	4.1	5,631	15.8	10,545	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	4,358	124
Las Cruces	NM	18,688	22,523	34.3	65.7	2.3	60.6	1.1	1.7	1,396	16.1	2,675	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,049	34
Buffalo City	NY	46,689	47,845	33.1	66.9	54.0	10.4	1.3	1.2	3,200	14.9	5,831	8.2	6.4	4.6	7.5	8.0	6.0	1,905	73
New York City	NY	930,440	1,063,561	16.1	83.9	36.1	37.3	10.0	0.5	57,338	18.5	110,709	9.6	5.7	2.9	6.2	11.1	2.5	38,075	1,120
Rochester City	NY	31,930	37,912	19.6	80.4	60.2	17.7	2.2	0.3	2,584	14.7	4,337	8.7	7.1	5.5	8.7	10.3	4.2	935	58
Syracuse City	NY	21,811	23,760	49.6	50.4	42.7	4.9	1.7	1.2	1,682	14.1	3,917	6.1	5.4	4.1	7.1	7.3	3.4	806	36
Yonkers City	NY	17,992	23,655	24.2	75.8	30.1	41.2	4.5	0.1	1,471	16.1	2,823	8.4	3.7	3.3	3.4	5.2	3.5	811	36
Alamance-Burlington	NC	10,330	18,943	68.4	31.6	26.7	3.7	1.0	0.2	1,135	16.7	2,157	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	895	31
Buncombe County	NC	21,821	24,547	91.7	8.3	5.8	1.2	0.8	0.5	1,429	17.2	2,801	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,232	36
Cabarrus County	NC	12,463	16,497	83.5	16.5	13.5	2.2	0.6	0.3	1,005	16.4	1,811	9.1	—	—	—	—	—	777	20
Charlotte-Mecklenburg	NC	75,903	93,533	52.2	47.8	41.2	2.4	3.7	0.5	5,523	16.9	10,602	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	4,156	130
Cumberland County	NC	44,327	51,035	46.1	53.9	45.8	4.8	1.6	1.6	2,918	17.5	5,578	9.1	—	—	—	—	—	2,481	72
Davidson County	NC	16,155	18,099	96.6	3.4	2.2	0.4	0.5	0.3	1,025	17.7	1,927	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	925	26
Durham	NC	18,046	29,050	37.9	62.1	57.4	2.4	2.0	0.3	1,972	14.7	4,056	7.2	—	—	—	—	—	1,334	44
Forsyth County	NC	37,842	41,851	57.7	42.3	38.0	3.0	1.0	0.2	2,674	15.7	4,545	9.2	—	—	—	—	—	2,058	58
Gaston County	NC	30,064	29,708	78.2	21.8	19.6	0.7	1.4	0.2	1,823	16.3	3,157	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,394	53
Guilford County	NC	23,981	58,736	55.8	44.2	39.0	1.5	3.0	0.7	3,656	16.1	7,025	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	2,887	95
Johnston County	NC	14,547	17,504	72.1	27.9	22.5	4.8	0.3	0.3	1,139	15.4	2,144	8.2	—	—	—	—	—	828	27
Nash-Rocky Mount	NC	11,680	17,932	41.8	58.2	54.5	2.6	0.9	0.3	1,113	16.1	2,171	8.3	—	—	—	—	—	863	27
New Hanover County	NC	18,919	21,603	68.2	31.8	29.7	0.8	0.9	0.4	1,295	16.7	2,681	8.1	—	—	—	—	—	1,144	30
Onslow County	NC	17,996	20,880	67.6	32.4	25.9	3.7	2.1	0.8	1,176	17.8	2,260	9.2	—	—	—	—	—	935	29
Pitt County	NC	17,303	19,613	47.7	52.3	50.0	1.3	0.9	0.1	1,238	15.8	2,274	8.6	—	—	—	—	—	927	30
Randolph County	NC	13,546	15,751	91.7	8.3	5.1	2.4	0.4	0.4	917	17.2	1,913	8.2	—	—	—	—	—	704	23
Robeson County	NC	23,658	23,762	23.3	76.7	30.9	1.2	0.3	44.4	1,503	15.8	2,936	8.1	—	—	—	—	—	1,068	41
Rowan-Salisbury	NC	16,313	19,349	74.2	25.8	22.7	1.8	1.1	0.3	1,211	16.0	2,306	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	939	28
Union County	NC	12,623	19,177	76.7	23.3	20.3	2.1	0.5	0.3	1,143	16.8	2,177	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	838	30
Wake County	NC	62,474	85,735	67.9	32.1	26.6	2.2	3.1	0.2	5,166	16.6	9,326	9.2	—	—	—	—	—	3,870	102
Wayne County	NC	13,407	19,279	52.0	48.0	44.1	2.9	0.9	0.1	1,124	17.2	2,239	8.6	—	—	—	—	—	971	27
Akron City	OH	33,230	31,992	51.5	48.5	45.9	0.5	2.0	0.1	2,308	13.9	5,023	6.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,466	62
Cincinnati City	OH	50,842	50,396	30.1	69.9	68.6	0.3	0.8	0.1	2,878	17.5	4,948	10.2	—	—	—	—	—	1,246	82
Cleveland City	OH	69,799	74,026	20.6	79.4	70.4	7.7	1.0	0.3	4,196	17.6	7,634	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,665	122
Columbus City	OH	63,749	63,894	42.1	57.9	54.4	0.9	2.4	0.2	3,830	16.7	7,286	8.8	6.6	4.8	6.1	6.0	11.6	2,444	146
Dayton City	OH	27,662	26,762	31.1	68.9	67.8	0.5	0.5	0.1	1,699	15.8	3,154	8.5	—	—	—	—	—	795	50

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996—Continued

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996						Number of class- room teach- ers, fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9-12, 1995-96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995- 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority									Total	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12		
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
South-Western City	OH	16,441	19,000	90.9	9.1	7.0	0.7	1.3	0.1	1,072	17.7	1,891	10.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,005	29
Toledo City	OH	40,617	39,712	49.3	50.7	43.7	6.2	0.8	0.1	2,534	15.7	4,613	8.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,735	66
Edmond	OK	12,519	16,182	87.4	12.6	5.2	1.9	2.2	3.3	917	17.7	1,628	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	824	21
Lawton	OK	17,898	18,501	54.2	45.8	29.9	8.0	2.6	5.3	1,046	17.7	2,389	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	954	42
Midwest/Del City	OK	15,744	15,675	67.0	33.0	22.0	2.9	2.2	5.8	882	17.8	1,652	9.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,005	26
Moore	OK	16,320	18,243	77.2	22.8	3.9	3.8	3.4	11.7	1,114	16.4	2,073	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,131	27
Oklahoma City	OK	38,092	39,827	36.3	63.7	39.7	16.0	2.8	5.3	2,238	17.8	5,149	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,128	86
Putnam City	OK	17,716	19,079	76.4	23.6	12.4	4.3	3.6	3.3	1,097	17.4	1,791	10.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,016	27
Tulsa	OK	40,919	41,644	51.2	48.8	34.3	5.1	1.3	8.2	2,461	16.9	5,400	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,702	80
Beaverton	OR	23,443	30,027	80.4	19.6	2.1	6.5	10.2	0.8	1,370	21.9	2,520	11.9	8.0	2.4	5.8	10.1	14.8	1,557	42
Eugene	OR	17,368	18,717	88.2	11.8	2.1	3.7	3.9	2.0	829	22.6	1,677	11.2	7.3	5.1	7.6	8.1	8.8	1,139	46
Hillsboro	OR	—	15,963	78.7	21.3	1.1	15.2	4.4	0.5	756	21.1	1,762	9.1	—	—	—	—	—	777	27
Portland	OR	51,825	56,856	68.6	31.4	15.2	5.5	8.4	2.3	2,910	19.5	5,429	10.5	10.3	8.2	8.4	10.3	15.5	2,795	101
Salem/Keizer	OR	26,930	32,491	82.7	17.3	1.3	12.0	2.6	1.4	1,430	22.7	2,854	11.4	9.0	4.9	7.3	8.4	16.7	1,635	53
Allentown City	PA	13,396	15,491	47.3	52.7	12.6	37.6	2.4	0.1	753	20.6	1,466	10.6	7.4	3.1	7.3	9.4	11.4	708	23
Philadelphia City	PA	189,451	212,150	19.8	80.2	63.8	11.6	4.7	0.2	11,144	19.0	23,216	9.1	11.7	10.7	12.7	12.9	11.2	9,009	259
Pittsburgh	PA	39,559	39,955	42.6	57.4	55.6	0.4	1.4	0.1	2,687	14.9	5,441	7.3	6.7	5.2	7.8	7.2	7.3	2,140	89
Providence	RI	20,429	24,535	24.1	75.9	23.1	41.2	11.0	0.6	1,482	16.6	2,340	10.5	6.7	6.7	8.6	5.3	5.1	829	45
Aiken County	SC	23,300	24,588	64.5	35.5	33.9	0.9	0.5	0.1	1,320	18.6	1,516	16.2	4.4	6.0	4.3	4.2	2.1	1,242	37
Berkeley County	SC	27,080	26,106	63.4	36.6	33.1	1.3	1.8	0.4	1,465	17.8	1,674	15.6	2.3	2.0	2.7	2.4	2.4	1,238	35
Charleston County	SC	42,893	43,457	39.2	60.8	58.6	1.0	1.0	0.1	2,798	15.5	3,139	13.8	1.9	1.6	2.9	1.5	1.3	1,692	72
Dorchester	SC	13,267	15,367	73.0	27.0	24.9	0.8	1.0	0.4	878	17.5	972	15.8	2.3	2.1	2.1	2.5	2.7	825	15
Greenville County	SC	50,876	55,893	71.1	28.9	26.5	1.2	1.1	0.1	3,456	16.2	3,902	14.3	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.6	0.8	2,860	92
Horry County	SC	23,713	26,114	69.8	30.2	28.5	0.7	0.8	0.3	1,729	15.1	1,950	13.4	2.7	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.1	1,281	38
Pickens County	SC	14,449	15,417	89.7	10.3	8.9	0.5	0.8	0.1	923	16.7	1,048	14.7	3.7	3.4	3.5	5.6	2.1	735	25
Richland #2	SC	12,362	15,313	21.5	78.5	76.8	1.0	0.7	0.1	987	15.5	1,096	14.0	2.1	1.7	2.1	1.9	2.8	867	17
Richland #1	SC	26,966	27,102	49.6	50.4	45.1	2.7	2.4	0.2	2,022	13.4	2,287	11.9	2.6	3.2	2.5	2.4	1.9	1,296	51
Sioux Falls	SD	15,455	18,175	90.6	9.4	3.2	1.2	2.0	3.0	1,089	16.7	1,954	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	922	37
Chattanooga City	TN	21,385	19,938	34.5	65.5	63.2	0.5	1.7	0.0	1,257	15.9	2,432	8.2	—	—	—	—	—	922	37
Hamilton County	TN	22,654	23,589	93.9	6.1	4.2	0.7	1.1	0.1	1,413	16.7	2,230	10.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,289	43
Knox County	TN	50,087	51,224	84.5	15.5	13.3	0.7	1.4	0.1	3,404	15.0	6,204	8.3	—	—	—	—	—	2,816	84
Memphis City	TN	105,604	111,156	14.4	85.6	82.5	0.6	1.3	1.2	6,351	17.5	11,367	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	4,598	164
Montgomery County	TN	16,066	22,280	69.0	31.0	25.1	3.6	2.0	0.3	1,283	17.4	2,343	9.5	—	—	—	—	—	990	26
Nashville-Davidson	TN	67,352	69,888	51.1	48.9	42.4	1.8	3.9	0.8	4,504	15.5	7,985	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	2,832	124
Rutherford County	TN	17,518	22,680	88.1	11.9	8.7	1.1	1.9	0.2	1,262	18.0	2,064	11.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,335	27
Shelby County	TN	36,180	46,454	76.0	24.0	20.6	1.2	1.9	0.3	2,490	18.7	4,493	10.3	—	—	—	—	—	2,450	44
Sumner County	TN	19,605	21,864	92.1	7.9	6.5	0.7	0.5	0.2	1,337	16.4	2,485	8.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,372	34
Williamson County	TN	11,144	16,471	93.3	6.7	4.4	0.9	1.3	0.1	947	17.4	1,674	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,039	25
Abilene ISD	TX	18,690	19,562	60.6	39.4	11.0	26.6	1.5	0.3	1,464	13.4	2,518	7.8	—	—	—	—	—	812	42
Aldine ISD	TX	39,133	47,242	17.5	82.5	36.0	42.7	3.7	0.1	3,048	15.5	5,741	8.2	—	—	—	—	—	1,627	49
Alief ISD	TX	28,408	38,383	17.9	82.1	34.2	29.1	18.8	0.1	2,344	16.4	4,148	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	1,251	34
Amarillo ISD	TX	26,983	29,566	58.4	41.6	9.9	28.5	2.9	0.3	1,865	15.9	3,216	9.2	—	—	—	—	—	1,350	50
Arlington ISD	TX	42,352	53,343	58.9	41.1	16.9	17.1	6.5	0.7	3,225	16.5	5,270	10.1	—	—	—	—	—	2,334	63
Austin ISD	TX	63,886	76,054	37.7	62.3	18.0	41.7	2.2	0.3	4,645	16.4	7,880	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	2,865	100
Beaumont ISD	TX	20,675	19,999	25.6	74.4	65.3	6.5	2.4	0.1	1,351	14.8	2,363	8.5	—	—	—	—	—	777	33
Birdville ISD	TX	18,019	20,398	80.6	19.4	2.9	11.4	4.9	0.2	1,245	16.4	2,113	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	944	34
Brownsville ISD	TX	36,538	40,494	3.1	96.9	0.1	96.6	0.2	0.0	2,687	15.1	5,439	7.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,674	41
Carrollton-Farmers Branch ISD ..	TX	15,833	21,283	53.9	46.1	8.5	25.2	11.9	0.5	1,350	15.8	2,156	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	943	33
Clear Creek ISD	TX	21,334	27,552	74.0	26.0	6.6	10.8	8.3	0.3	1,579	17.5	2,626	10.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,354	29
Conroe ISD	TX	22,234	29,599	78.7	21.3	5.7	13.9	1.5	0.2	2,003	14.8	3,600	8.2	—	—	—	—	—	1,576	39
Corpus Christi ISD	TX	41,277	41,606	25.1	74.9	6.0	67.7	0.9	0.4	2,465	16.9	4,471	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	1,814	63
Cypress-Fairbanks ISD	TX	38,920	52,930	65.8	34.2	8.9	17.8	7.3	0.2	3,185	16.6	5,613	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	2,426	49
Dallas ISD	TX	132,256	154,847	11.0	89.0	41.5	45.5	1.7	0.4	9,202	16.8	15,717	9.9	—	—	—	—	—	4,910	211

Table 93.—Selected statistics on enrollment, teachers, graduates, and dropouts in public school districts enrolling more than 15,000 pupils, by state: 1989 and 1996—Continued

Name of district, by state	State	Enrollment, fall 1989	Enrollment, fall 1996	Percentage distribution of enrollment, by race, fall 1996						Number of class- room teach- ers, 1 fall 1996	Pupil/ teacher ratio, fall 1996	Total number of staff, fall 1996	Student/ staff ratio, fall 1996	Percent dropouts from grades 9-12, 1995-96					Number of high school grad- uates, 1995- 96 ²	Number of schools, fall 1996
				White	Minority									Total	Grade 9	Grade 10	Grade 11	Grade 12		
					Total	Black	His- panic	Asian/Pacific Islander	American Indian/Alas- kan Native											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
Ector County ISD	TX	26,366	28,709	43.7	56.3	4.9	50.4	0.7	0.4	1,724	16.7	3,080	9.3	—	—	—	—	—	1,158	44
Edinburg ISD	TX	15,089	19,153	4.1	95.9	0.1	95.5	0.2	0.1	1,203	15.9	2,477	7.7	—	—	—	—	—	807	27
El Paso ISD	TX	64,047	64,444	18.0	82.0	4.5	76.2	1.1	0.1	4,044	15.9	7,378	8.7	—	—	—	—	—	2,811	81
Fort Bend ISD	TX	33,647	46,881	43.2	56.8	27.5	15.8	13.3	0.1	2,573	18.2	4,629	10.1	—	—	—	—	—	2,300	45
Fort Worth ISD	TX	69,396	75,813	25.9	74.1	33.2	38.4	2.3	0.2	4,277	17.7	7,769	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	2,262	130
Galena Park ISD	TX	15,278	17,610	25.0	75.0	20.5	52.1	2.3	0.1	1,017	17.3	1,718	10.2	—	—	—	—	—	820	20
Garland ISD	TX	36,158	44,869	58.0	42.0	14.5	21.4	5.4	0.6	2,628	17.1	4,469	10.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,904	62
Goose Creek ISD	TX	17,150	17,921	46.2	53.8	17.2	35.6	0.8	0.1	1,098	16.3	1,956	9.2	—	—	—	—	—	789	25
Grand Prairie ISD	TX	16,464	18,383	42.5	57.5	12.7	40.2	3.8	0.8	1,116	16.5	1,807	10.2	—	—	—	—	—	750	28
Harlandale ISD	TX	15,039	15,148	6.8	93.2	0.5	92.4	0.2	0.1	963	15.7	1,862	8.1	—	—	—	—	—	561	25
Harlingen Cons ISD	TX	14,498	16,156	14.1	85.9	0.8	84.4	0.6	0.0	977	16.5	1,916	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	697	22
Houston ISD	TX	191,282	209,375	11.1	88.9	34.3	51.8	2.8	0.1	11,853	17.7	20,741	10.1	—	—	—	—	—	6,311	286
Humble ISD	TX	18,835	22,650	79.2	20.8	8.3	9.8	2.6	0.1	1,503	15.1	2,703	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,309	30
Hurst-Euless-Bedford ISD	TX	17,542	19,204	76.7	23.3	6.2	9.8	6.5	0.8	1,196	16.1	2,046	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,052	28
Irving ISD	TX	22,639	26,714	43.4	56.6	13.9	36.0	6.0	0.7	1,673	16.0	2,751	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,052	33
Judson ISD	TX	12,883	15,460	44.1	55.9	22.4	30.3	2.9	0.2	1,021	15.1	1,856	8.3	—	—	—	—	—	740	20
Katy ISD	TX	18,385	26,597	78.7	21.3	4.7	12.4	4.1	0.1	1,579	16.8	2,768	9.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,231	26
Killeen ISD	TX	22,854	28,414	41.1	58.9	37.8	16.1	4.4	0.5	1,856	15.3	3,543	8.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,064	39
Klein ISD	TX	25,088	29,892	67.6	32.4	11.7	13.6	6.8	0.3	1,841	16.2	3,465	8.6	—	—	—	—	—	1,619	27
Laredo ISD	TX	23,161	22,987	1.6	98.4	0.1	98.2	0.1	0.0	1,403	16.4	3,197	7.2	—	—	—	—	—	1,237	29
Lewisville ISD	TX	19,554	30,243	82.4	17.6	5.4	9.2	2.5	0.4	2,019	15.0	2,969	10.2	—	—	—	—	—	1,419	39
Lubbock ISD	TX	30,908	30,081	44.4	55.6	14.1	40.2	1.1	0.2	2,066	14.6	3,328	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,672	59
McAllen ISD	TX	21,169	21,704	11.4	88.6	0.3	86.7	1.5	0.1	1,427	15.2	2,747	7.9	—	—	—	—	—	1,233	31
Mesquite ISD	TX	24,649	29,971	70.6	29.4	11.8	13.5	3.7	0.4	1,674	17.9	2,884	10.4	—	—	—	—	—	1,394	38
Midland ISD	TX	20,276	23,284	51.9	48.1	10.2	36.6	0.9	0.3	1,378	16.9	2,471	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	992	35
North East ISD	TX	39,622	45,184	54.2	45.8	8.9	34.4	2.4	0.1	2,949	15.3	5,435	8.3	—	—	—	—	—	2,502	55
Northside ISD	TX	49,447	59,284	40.6	59.4	6.8	50.3	2.1	0.2	3,789	15.6	6,814	8.7	—	—	—	—	—	3,142	77
Pasadena ISD	TX	36,637	40,512	36.7	63.3	5.3	54.1	3.6	0.3	2,342	17.3	4,137	9.8	—	—	—	—	—	1,680	52
Pharr-San Juan-Alamo ISD	TX	18,062	20,362	1.7	98.3	0.1	98.1	0.1	0.0	1,274	16.0	2,778	7.3	—	—	—	—	—	935	29
Plano ISD	TX	29,554	40,864	77.2	22.8	5.7	7.3	9.6	0.2	2,611	15.7	4,056	10.1	—	—	—	—	—	2,085	49
Richardson ISD	TX	32,229	34,141	57.0	43.0	19.7	14.2	8.8	0.3	2,187	15.6	3,531	9.7	—	—	—	—	—	1,842	52
Round Rock ISD	TX	18,735	26,371	73.3	26.7	6.3	15.2	4.9	0.3	1,752	15.0	2,887	9.1	—	—	—	—	—	1,358	33
San Angelo ISD	TX	16,346	17,354	50.2	49.8	6.0	42.7	1.0	0.2	1,098	15.8	1,847	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	806	29
San Antonio ISD	TX	61,156	61,361	5.2	94.8	10.8	83.7	0.2	0.1	3,692	16.6	6,854	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	1,669	109
Socorro ISD	TX	12,998	21,098	9.3	90.7	1.2	89.0	0.4	0.1	1,302	16.2	2,352	9.0	—	—	—	—	—	854	21
Spring Branch ISD	TX	26,044	29,881	40.8	59.2	6.5	44.6	7.9	0.1	1,900	15.7	3,513	8.5	—	—	—	—	—	1,269	37
Spring ISD	TX	17,917	21,044	53.2	46.8	21.2	19.4	5.8	0.3	1,337	15.7	2,415	8.7	—	—	—	—	—	894	23
Tyler ISD	TX	16,069	16,511	42.6	57.4	36.2	20.2	0.9	0.1	1,081	15.3	1,965	8.4	—	—	—	—	—	769	29
United ISD	TX	11,478	21,387	4.4	95.6	0.1	94.8	0.6	0.1	1,289	16.6	2,529	8.5	—	—	—	—	—	853	31
Waco ISD	TX	14,325	16,170	23.7	76.3	40.2	35.6	0.5	0.1	1,062	15.2	1,713	9.4	—	—	—	—	—	—	30
Wichita Falls ISD	TX	14,889	15,594	63.9	36.1	16.1	17.0	2.5	0.5	1,121	13.9	1,757	8.9	—	—	—	—	—	779	30
Ysleta ISD	TX	50,009	47,366	11.1	88.9	2.6	85.4	0.5	0.4	2,991	15.8	5,172	9.2	—	—	—	—	—	2,620	66
Alpine	UT	38,246	43,719	94.3	5.7	0.3	3.1	1.5	0.6	1,712	25.5	2,574	17.0	2.4	0.5	1.6	3.6	4.1	2,672	51
Davis	UT	53,411	59,220	94.0	6.0	1.0	3.0	1.6	0.4	2,324	25.5	4,519	13.1	1.5	1.0	1.7	1.9	1.2	3,746	78
Granite	UT	77,515	76,456	84.8	15.2	1.0	8.0	5.1	1.0	3,090	24.7	6,541	11.7	9.3	8.4	10.2	11.0	7.4	4,499	96
Jordan	UT	63,605	72,748	93.8	6.2	0.3	3.7	1.7	0.4	2,851	25.5	5,035	14.4	3.0	0.0	2.4	4.5	5.6	4,082	72
Nebo	UT	16,154	19,256	95.9	4.1	0.1	3.0	0.7	0.3	732	26.3	1,294	14.9	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.1	0.6	1,191	27
Salt Lake City	UT	24,569	25,881	65.1	34.9	2.9	20.8	8.6	2.6	1,155	22.4	2,412	10.7	13.6	8.4	11.6	15.5	20.6	1,140	40
Washington	UT	12,647	18,078	93.9	6.1	0.3	3.0	1.0	1.8	689	26.3	1,218	14.8	2.2	0.1	1.7	2.4	5.4	1,003	27
Weber	UT	25,275	28,139	93.2	6.8	1.0	4.0	1.4	0.5	1,080	26.1	1,891	14.9	3.3	0.1	3.0	4.0	7.0	1,761	39
Arlington County	VA	14,290	17,546	42.1	57.9	17.1	30.7	9.9	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	788	30
Chesapeake City	VA	28,324	35,593	63.5	36.5	33.7	1.0	1.6	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,936	42
Chesterfield County	VA	42,864	49,781	76.3	23.7	19.5	1.4	2.7	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	2,816	56
Fairfax County	VA	126,713	143,266	64.5	35.5	11.4	9.8	14.0	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	8,789	212
Hampton City	VA	20,788	23,980	41.8	58.2	54.4	1.7	1.8	0.2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,214	34
Henrico County	VA	31,963	38,102	63.7	36.3	31.7	1.2	3.3	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,940	58
Loudoun County	VA	14,174	21,574	82.8	17.2	8.5	4.3	4.2	0.1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1,009	36



Andrew Adonis <AAdonis@no10.gsi.net>

12/07/99 05:12:01 AM

Record Type: Record

To: Andy Rotherham/OPD/EOP

cc:

Subject: RE: innovative ideas

Andy:

This sounds very interesting - we also have a fund 'seeding' partnership projects between the public and private school sectors, as well as Education Action Zones, which are intended to promote local innovation (this one is largely state money, but some private sponsorship is a condition).

My thoughts are:

1. You need a very clear remit. From what you say, it isn't clear what areas you wish the collaboration to cover - is this about the provision of new schools, the curriculum, new teaching employment practices, or everything going?
2. The problem (in my experience) from simply saying that you want 'collaboration' and 'innovation' without defining the precise areas you wish to see it cover is that the money ends up going on 'more of the same' and lowest common denominator projects (once the teacher unions, school boards, etc. have finished with the plans). This has been a particular problem with our Education Action Zones, where the lack of a clear prospectus for the kind of innovation we want has led to mixed results at best. We are now trying to be far more prescriptive (eg. stipulating a list of areas in which we wish to see innovation - modern language and instrumental music tuition in the last years of primary school; numeracy and literacy work in the first years of secondary, etc.)
3. The board needs to be chaired by a strong champion of change, for the same reason.

But as I say, I may be completely off-beam for not having understood what you have in mind. Very happy to talk on the phone if that would be of use.

Regards,

Andrew

-----Original Message-----

From: Andy_Rotherham@opd.eop.gov [SMTP:Andy_Rotherham@opd.eop.gov]

Sent: Monday, December 06, 1999 5:05 PM

To: Andrew Adonis

Subject: innovative ideas

Andrew:

I'm looking at a proposal here that is similar to something you all have done. Michael Barber and I have discussed it but I wanted your input as well.

I want to establish an independent fund, seeded with government money, to sponsor innovative projects around the country particularly in the area of school governance and collaborative projects between schools and between schools and the private sector. I envision a bipartisan board that gives out large sums of money to promising practices so that we can support innovation that might not otherwise take place and capture data on the effectiveness of various ideas.

Because it is something that doesn't give the government explicit control and could lead to some reforms that our left doesn't like I'm getting some flack and need to beef up my justifications for it.

Any ideas?

Hope you're well.

Andy

CPRE *FINANCE BRIEFS*

Reporting on issues and research in education finance

Reinventing Teacher Compensation Systems

by Carolyn Kelley and Allan Odden

Over the years, state and local policymakers made several well-publicized efforts to reform teacher pay. Reformers tried to use salary structures to encourage and reward good teaching. Unfortunately, these efforts largely were ineffective. As a result, teacher compensation structures today look pretty much as they did decades ago. Most districts pay teachers according to a single-salary schedule that provides salary increases for differences among teachers in education units, university degrees and years of teaching experience.

In the 1980s, two main efforts were made to modify the single-salary schedule. Merit pay, designed to recognize and reward the best teachers, was tried in a few states and districts. And career ladder programs tried to alter the flat career structure of teaching. These efforts failed for generally the same reasons earlier efforts fizzled—they were not linked to the organizational needs and working processes of effective schools and thus were poorly designed.

For example, merit pay plans usually require individual teachers to compete against each other for a limited pool of funds. Such competition among teachers works against the collaborative culture found in most highly effective schools and thus is at odds with strategies to improve school performance.

Career ladder programs provide non-teaching jobs for a fixed number of excellent teachers, thus offering a way out of the classroom for the best professionals in schools, just the opposite of how a high-performance school should deploy its best workers. Further,

teachers often were not integral partners in the design process, and too often funding was eliminated after the first years of implementation.

But other organizations in the country have been successful in implementing new compensation structures. Moreover, these new plans have been associated with wide worker acceptance, better employee morale, improved organizational performance, and higher individual salaries.

In this issue of *CPRE Finance Briefs*, the authors argue that it is now time for education to join these successful efforts and revise teacher pay systems. The brief provides a short history of changes in teacher compensation over the last century and a discussion of key organizational and educational changes today that could be reinforced by a new teacher compensation structure. It also suggests some new teacher pay elements and a set of principles states and districts could follow if they embark on the journey to redesign how teachers are paid.¹ Examples of leading-edge compensation programs are included in sidebars on pages 2-5.

Carolyn Kelley is an assistant professor at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where she directs CPRE's Teacher Compensation Project. She also has conducted research on school-linked services and the utility of private sector approaches to public school problems. **Allan Odden** is professor of education administration at the University of Wisconsin-Madison where he also serves as co-director of the Finance Center of CPRE. An expert on school finance and education policy, Dr. Odden is a prolific author.

The views expressed here are those of the authors and are not necessarily shared by CPRE or its funding agencies.

History of Teacher Pay Changes

The history of teacher compensation provides a rich source of information on how change can “stick” when it is aligned with the strategic needs of schools and existing organizational forms (Protsik 1995). For example, in the latter half of the 1800s, local communities designed schools to provide basic academic skills and moral education for children. Teacher compensation consisted primarily of room and board provided by the local community. The “Boarding Round” pay system was a strong incentive for teachers to maintain positive relations with community members and to maintain a high moral character. It also reflected the barter economy of the time.

In the early 1900s, teacher preparation became more uniform, requiring higher levels of education, and schools began to reflect the bureaucratic organizational structures of the developing

industrial cash economy. The Boarding Round system was replaced by a position-based salary system that reflected the new form of teacher work, the cash basis of the economy, and increased pre-service education requirements. This system also paid elementary teachers less than secondary teachers (which in part reflected differences in education required for these positions), and unfortunately, paid women and minority teachers less than non-minority males, reflecting societal biases of the time. Nevertheless, the position-based salary schedule was a salary system aligned with the strategic aspects of the economy and school systems.

The single-salary schedule emerged early in the 20th century in response to further changes in the social and educational context. Opposition to overt discrimination and demand for greater teacher skills led to the system which paid the same salary to teachers with the same qualifications regardless of grade level taught, gender or race.

The single-salary schedule did not, however, pay every teacher the same amount. Differentials were provided based on the objective measures of years of experience, educational units, and educational degrees. It paid teachers salary supplements for coaching sports, advising clubs, and coordinating activities. The bases for paying differential salary amounts were objective, measurable and not subject to administrative whim.

The single-salary schedule was appropriate for the bureaucratic, hierarchically organized school of the first half of this century. Administrators were responsible for goals, objectives and school success, and teachers were responsible mainly for delivering a basic skills-focused, standardized curriculum. Teachers needed a beginning set of skills which were assessed in the process of licensure. Once in the system, they were paid more for each year of experience, a practice typical of bureaucracies and the way most workers were paid in the broader economy (Kelley 1995; Odden 1995).

Performance Awards in Kentucky

Adopted in 1990, the Kentucky Instructional Results Information System (KIRIS) rewards schools that show improvements toward performance standards over time. Every two years, schools that exceed their improvement goals receive funds which teachers, school counselors, and the principal may distribute as they see fit. Funds may be used as salary bonuses, for professional development, or as school improvement funds. In 1994-95, the awards were about \$2,000 per teacher in eligible schools, or a total appropriation of \$26 million.

A six-part accountability index is used to measure improvements in school performance. Five parts are based on the results of reading, math, social studies, science, and writing scores on open-ended tests; a problem-solving activity; and student portfolios. The sixth component is a non-cognitive composite score based on factors such as attendance and graduation rates.

In the first year (1994-95), 38 percent of the schools received bonus awards. It is still too early to tell the long-term impact of the program, including the type of behavior it incites within each school.

But as the next section shows, this salary structure is not adequate for schools of today. Current reforms are requiring teachers to continuously expand their professional instructional skills, take on management and leadership roles within schools, and focus on results produced as much as services provided. A revised teacher compensation structure could help to address these new and more complex system needs.

Linking Compensation to Organizational Needs

The history of successful change in teacher compensation can serve as a guide for thinking through

teacher compensation change today. If pay practices that endure are those that are well-aligned with broader changes in the economic and social climate, as well as the strategic needs of the school system, the obvious first step in designing a new teacher compensation structure is to identify the broader changes in the society, and parallel changes in the education system (Kelley 1995).

Economic Context

Today the broader economy is undergoing a dramatic change in the organization of the workplace and the manner in which employees are paid. The globalization of the economy is pressuring companies to drastically improve product and service quality, in a short time frame and often with limited resources. These same pressures are pressing upon governments and public agencies, including schools.

To produce these large-scale improvements, many companies are restructuring, often decentralizing their management systems and flattening their organizational structures. They are creating multi-functional work teams, giving them power and authority to accomplish organizational and team goals, while holding the teams accountable for results.

This new strategy for organizing work requires considerable ongoing investment in training. Team members are trained in technical areas, in new functional areas for which teams are responsible, and in the business skills needed to engage in self-management. Galbraith, Lawler and colleagues (1993) have termed these changes the "new logic" of organization.

Many companies following this new logic also have designed new forms of employee compensation

South Carolina's Performance Pay Plan

Established in 1984, The South Carolina School Incentive Reward Program (SIRP) is the longest running state-sponsored, group-based performance plan in the nation.

It gives performance bonuses to approximately 25 percent of schools. Schools must meet student achievement criteria to receive 80 percent of the full award for that year; an additional 10 percent is awarded to each winning school that maintains teacher and student attendance at or above 96 percent (Richards and Sheu 1992).

Schools are placed in one of five comparison bands based on percentage of students receiving free lunches; percentage receiving reduced-priced lunches; average teachers' years of education beyond the bachelor's degree; and percentage of students meeting or exceeding the readiness standard on a cognitive skills test given in all elementary schools.

INDIAN

Schools compete with other schools in the same band for awards, and the SIRP rewards improvement in student test scores. Awards of about \$25-\$40 per pupil have been distributed annually to winning schools, with the typical school receiving \$15,000-\$20,000. Award monies are used for instructional purposes by the winning schools.

South Carolina's banding system has been found to more equitably distribute funds across schools with different student SES levels. However, the banding system is also vulnerable to challenges of possible racial bias, since it sets lower expectations for schools serving lower SES students.

to encourage and reward the skills needed in their new organizations—team-based leadership and management skills, technical and analytical skills to support continuous improvement, and skills needed to work across traditional functional lines.

As a result, concepts such as skills-based pay, competency-based pay, pay for knowledge, pay for professional expertise, collective rewards for adding value to performance, and gainsharing characterize new compensation strategies that have been developed and used successfully in private sector organizations (Firestone 1994; Odden and Conley 1992).

Under these strategies, individuals are not paid on the basis of seniority or for doing a particular

job. They are paid based on the skills and competencies they develop to do the many job tasks they perform as work-team members. Further, a portion of each team member's pay can depend on the results of the team's effort. In short, compensation has been changed to align organizational incentives and rewards with the strategic needs of the workplace.

Education Changes

Current education reform trends reflect changes in the organization of work described above, thus suggesting a need to realign teacher compensation to these new ways of organizing schools.

Starting with the Effective Schools movement of the 1970s, recent reforms began requiring teachers

Douglas County, Colorado's New Pay Plan

In 1993-94, Douglas County teachers, administrators, and community members developed a new pay plan. Implemented in 1994-95, the plan retains base pay and pay for additional coursework from the single-salary schedule. But it revises the years of experience component to provide annual increments only for years in which teachers' performance is judged "proficient" on established criteria as judged by their principals. In addition, the new plan adds four bonuses:

1. *A \$1000 bonus for outstanding teachers* selected by principals who evaluate teaching practice portfolios based on specific written criteria. The number of bonuses that may be awarded in any one year, and the number of awards any one teacher may receive over time is unlimited.

2. *A \$250-500 bonus for learning one or more specific skill blocks* which the district identifies and provides training for. Over a three-year period, teachers may participate voluntarily. After the three years, the skill blocks will be incorporated into the annual evaluation as skills required for all "proficient" teachers. In the first year, the district offered training for only one skill block, computer skills. The number of blocks is expected to increase over time to about seven, with the next one focused on student assessment.

3. *A bonus for responsibility pay*, which for most teachers is nominal (\$35-\$200 per year). Each school receives \$4.50 per student for responsibility pay. A teacher committee is established at the school site to determine how the money will be distributed. In the first year, it compensated teachers for school committee leadership, coaching, curriculum development, and for advising student activities.

4. *A school-performance award bonus*. Each school can voluntarily propose a school-wide project for improving student performance. Submitted at the beginning of the year to a committee of teachers and administrators, the proposal must identify planned activities and evaluation mechanisms. Bonuses are awarded to schools that successfully complete the activities, whether or not student achievement improved. This stipulation is intended to award creativity, innovation, and risk-taking. In the first year, every school participated (although a few individual teachers within the schools did not). The award per teacher depends on the number of schools and teachers that successfully complete the process.

to develop new skills and competencies and take on new roles. The Effective Schools movement required teachers to develop a set of "effective teaching" practices and to become involved with the principal in school improvement efforts. Today's education reforms expect teachers to acquire the professional expertise sufficient to teach a "world-class" curriculum well to the diverse students in schools. Today's

teachers also are being asked to take broader leadership roles in school management, organization and instruction. And in the past few years, teachers also have been asked to focus on results—student achievement—rather than just education processes.

In other words, major changes in the organizational needs of schools, generally similar to those in non-school contexts, have emerged

over the past 30 years (Kelley 1995). Just as in other organizations, these changes have produced significant gaps between the needs of schools as organizations and the current teacher salary structure.

Shifting pay increments from years of experience and loosely related education units to more direct measures of professional skills and competencies, adding a mechanism that encourages ongoing training and assessment of instructional strategies, and perhaps adding group-based performance bonuses, are compensation changes that could link how teachers are paid with the evolving strategic needs of new school organizations (Conley and Odden 1995; Darling-Hammond 1996; Odden and Odden 1995; Odden 1996; Mohrman, Mohrman and Odden 1995).

Elements of New Compensation Systems

Three major elements should be considered in redesigning teacher compensation: skills- or competency-based pay, pay-at-risk, and group-based performance awards.

Skills- or Competency-based Pay

The single-salary schedule currently provides pay increases for years of experience, education units and university degrees. These variables are indirect indicators of knowledge and skills; under this system, a teacher with more education units and more experience in the classroom is assumed to have developed a greater professional expertise. Furthermore, many of the credits used as bases for salary increases

are only loosely—if at all—connected to teaching responsibilities or to emerging notions of challenging subject-matter instruction.

A skills- or competency-based pay system would more directly measure teacher knowledge and skills. Such a system could reward the development of three types of knowledge and skills. The first, and most critical, would be depth in the areas of content, curriculum and instructional expertise. A second set of skills would be “breadth” skills—those vital to important non-teaching functions such as curriculum development, professional development, guidance counseling, and parent outreach. A third set would be “management” skills, particularly for schools engaged in site-based management.

A skills/competency-based pay salary component could be added to the current salary schedule, replace either the education or experience component of the current salary schedule, or replace both components (see Models 1-4 on pages 6, 7, 8, and 9 for examples of salary schedules incorporating elements of skills-based pay).

For example, salary increases could be tied to professional licensure and certification such as that being developed by the Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium (see INTASC, 1995), the Educational Testing Service’s PRAXIS, and the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. Teachers could start their teaching career with a provisional license (a temporary teaching permit) at a beginning salary level, and earn significant bumps in pay when they receive a professional teaching license, and if they become certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

School-Based Rewards in Dallas, Texas

The Dallas school-based performance award is part of the district’s accountability system, created by a 1990 Commission with substantial business community involvement. The performance measure is primarily based on the results of the Texas Assessment of Academic Skills, and the Iowa Test of Basic Skills, with weights for each that vary annually.

The award is based on gain scores, aggregated to the school level from individual student data. Through complex two-stage regression analysis, the predicted score is purged of the influence of socio-economic variables including race, ethnicity, English proficiency, school mobility, poverty status, and school overcrowding. These achievement gains are supplemented by school-wide measures of student attendance, grade-to-grade promotion, drop-out rates, enrollments in accelerated courses, and SAT and PSAT scores.

Schools’ final performance gain scores are then ranked from highest to lowest. Each winning school receives \$2,000, its principal and teachers receive a bonus of \$1,000, and the nonprofessional staff receive \$500 each from a fixed pot of money. Awards are provided to staffs and schools by rank order, until the budgeted amount is expended. In 1994-95, Dallas created a second tier of winners, with bonuses of \$450 for the professionals and \$225 for the non-professional staff, to provide incentives to the lower ranked but still improving schools.

A local or national skills-assessment system driven by the teaching profession could identify and assess additional milestones between professional licensure and Board certification. Locally determined salary increases could be linked to these accomplishments.

Skills-based pay should be clearly distinguished from individual performance-based pay systems which traditionally have evaluated teachers against one another for a fixed pool of funds. Individual performance systems usually aim to identify and reward the “best” teachers with additional pay. In contrast, skills-based pay rewards teachers for attaining and being able to use knowledge and competencies valued by the school—such as the ability to teach all students the mathematics promoted by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Skill

attainment is judged against a predetermined, clear-cut standard. It does not create competition among teachers, but signals the type of skills the school wants its faculty to acquire. Skills-based pay systems, thus, focus individual skill development on the knowledge and skills necessary for the organization to accomplish its goals.

Pay-At-Risk

Some organizations require employees to put a portion of base pay “at-risk” until key sales or financial targets are met. This notion of pay-at-risk does not fit education. But at General Motors’ new Saturn plant in Tennessee, employees have 10 percent of their base pay at-risk in ways that may apply to education. Five percent of pay is contingent upon all workers spending at least 5 percent of the work year (92 hours)

in ongoing training that is provided by the plant. Another 5 percent is contingent on the plant meeting certain quality and production targets for its cars.

The idea of committing teachers, schools and school systems to an ongoing training process as well as to meeting high quality standards could have appeal in education. Thus, a percentage of teachers' base pay could be contingent upon each teacher engaging in a specified amount of professional development each year, such as 100 hours. The district or school would have to provide professional development opportunities and the teacher would have a strong incentive to participate. Such training could focus primarily on development of the

various competencies in a skills-based pay structure. Careful thought would need to go into the design and implementation of the professional development activities to be sure they are effective and support the student learning goals of the school and district.

The quality concept could be transferred in many ways to education. One way would be to require the faculty to work together to produce a performance report, such as the School Quality Review in New York State. The report would provide a vehicle for faculty to develop reflective practice, and for them to take part in an ongoing process of improving both teaching skills and the educational program.

In short, states or districts could put a portion of teacher pay at-risk, with some percentage contingent upon engaging in ongoing professional development and the remainder contingent on producing a focused, useful, quality performance report which assesses the educational strategies of the school in light of student achievement targets.

Group-based Performance Awards

Group-based performance awards, or collective incentive-pay plans, recognize that student outcomes are the joint product of many teachers working together in a school. They explicitly encourage school staff to work together toward common goals—such as

MODEL 1
Current Step and Column Salary Schedule with
Skills-Based Pay Additions (professionally and locally assessed)

Experience	Column 1 BA	Column 2 BA +	Column 3 MA	Column 4 MA +	Skills-Based Pay Increments (professionally assessed)	Skills-Based Pay Increments (examples) (locally assessed)
Step 1					Passing a Content Test in Area of License	Non-graded Primary School
Step 2					Licensure in a Second Area	Cooperative Learning
Step 3					Licensure in a Shortage Area	Reading Recovery
Step 4					Certification from National Board for Professional Teaching Standards	Computer Skills
Step 5						
Step 6						
Step 7						
Step 8						
Step n						

Model 1 maintains the current single-salary schedule structure, with annual increments for years of experience (steps) and additional educational units (columns). It adds to this structure salary increments for skills demonstrated through professional assessment procedures, and for skills identified and assessed locally by the school or district. Local districts could determine the degree to which educational units (columns) would need to be related to areas of licensure and local educational needs. Currently, some locals and states make these requirements; others do not. Specific dollar amounts would be identified for each cell in this model.

improving student performance. Collective incentives provide an important symbolic focus on outcomes while avoiding the divisive aspects of *individual* performance incentives.

Individual merit pay, the most commonly applied outcome-oriented incentive system in education, creates competitive rather than collegial work environments. In addition, the underlying assumption of individual merit pay is that the *individual* teacher has control over the achievement of school goals. By contrast, collective incentives, such as group-based performance awards, assume the entire faculty and students must work together to produce student performance and, thus, provide to everyone in a school a

salary bonus for achieving collective goals.

Group-based performance incentives could provide bonuses to all school employees or to teams of teachers, and additional funds for the school when, for example, student achievement in core content areas exceeded some predetermined criterion for improvement.

Gainsharing is another type of group-based performance incentive. Gainsharing programs provide incentives for employees to find more efficient means of achieving organizational goals. For example, school faculties that found lower-cost means of providing the same quality services could receive a portion of the

cost-savings, with the rest of the funds going toward instructional materials.

Group-based performance awards would need to be carefully designed. They would need to be based on improvements in performance. They also would need to be adjusted for student mobility, be explicit about the achievement targets for students in special education programs, capture student performance across the full range in order not to ignore the bottom half, and include appropriate modifications for socio-economic background, to insure a level playing field for participation in the award.

MODEL 2 Performance Reviews for Annual Increments Combined with Skills-based Pay Elements

Annual Performance Reviews	Additional Local Skills/Competencies	
Performance Review 1	Skill Area A	
Performance Review 2	Skill Area B	Certification from National Board for Professional Teaching Standards: 5-10 percent salary addition over base salary from both Columns 1 and 2 but only after Performance Review at some step, e.g., Step 4.
Performance Review 3	Skill Area C	
Performance Review 4	Skill Area D	
Performance Review 5	Skill Area E	
Performance Review 6	Skill Area F	
Performance Review 7		
Performance Review 8		
Performance Review 9		
Performance Review 10		

Model 2 modifies the current single-salary schedule by providing annual salary increments (steps) only for those teachers who have successfully passed a performance review, ideally, conducted through a professional, peer-review process. Teachers would also receive pay increments for demonstrating skills and competencies identified by the local school or district as those needed to achieve student achievement goals. The specified skills could be learned in a variety of ways (such as through coursework, staff development, individual research, or professional networking opportunities), and would replace the educational units in the traditional single-salary schedule. In addition, teachers who achieved certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards would receive a 5-10 percent pay increase. Specific dollar amounts would need to be identified for each cell in this model.

MODEL 3 A Skills-based Teacher Compensation Schedule for Board Certification and Retention		
Primary Content Specialty		Second Content Specialty
Entry Level with full Teacher License		Extra amount for a full Second License
Advanced 1		Advanced 1
Advanced 2 (Tenured)		Advanced 2
Advanced 3	Model 3 completely replaces the current single-salary schedule with a skills-based compensation schedule. Under this plan, teachers would receive pay increments for demonstrating skills and competencies identified by the teaching profession as reflective of what excellent teachers should know and be able to do at various stages in their careers.	
Advanced 4		
Advanced 5		
National Board Certification		
Years of Experience after Board Certification		
Step 1	Only after being certified by the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards would teachers begin to receive annual increments for years of experience beyond Board Certification. This would provide an incentive for outstanding teachers to remain in the teaching profession. Teachers could also receive additional pay for demonstrating skills in a second content area. Specific dollar amounts would need to be identified for each cell in this model.	
Step 2		
Step 3		
Step 4		
Step 5		
Step n=???		

Design and Development

Generally, notions of skills- or competency-based pay, pay-at-risk, and group-based performance awards are new to schools and education systems. However, several states and districts are attempting to better align their compensation systems with current educational goals and the organization of schools.

Kentucky, South Carolina, and Texas have developed school-based performance awards for improvements in student performance over time. Douglas County, Colorado; Rochester, New York; Boston, Massachusetts; and Dallas, Texas are districts that have developed alternative com-

penetration systems, incorporating principles of skills-based pay, individual-, group-, and school-based performance awards, and job-based pay. Further, a growing number of districts have agreed to reward teachers for participating in or successfully completing the National Board certification process. Early results suggest that these efforts have the potential to support teacher professional development and encourage teachers to focus on improving student achievement. (Programs in Kentucky, South Carolina, Douglas County, and Dallas are described briefly in the sidebars on pages 2, 3, 4, and 5.)

In contrast to education, other enterprises have been using these forms of pay for several years and

their early experiences provide some lessons that may be applicable to education. Interestingly, studies show that the process issues are even more crucial than the technical issues (Jenkins, et al. 1992).

Process Principles

Ten key process principles are important to the successful development, design, and implementation of a new compensation system that incorporates any or all of the elements of skills-based pay, pay-at-risk, or group-based performance rewards.

1. Involvement of all key parties, and especially those whose compensation is being affected, is the preeminent principle for successfully changing compensation policies. Teacher unions, administrators, school boards and the public all should be centrally involved in the process of development, design and implementation.

2. Broad agreement on the most valued educational results is also crucial. All parties—teachers, administrators, board members, parents and the public—need to agree on the results that are most valued.

3. Sound, comprehensive evaluation systems need to be in place to assess teacher knowledge and skill development in a skills-based pay system, and to evaluate organizational products and processes to be rewarded through group-based performance awards. Assessment mechanisms might include measures of student achievement, parent satisfaction, and teacher and administrator skills, knowledge, and performance.

4. Adequate funding which is integrated within the school finance structure is less likely to be vulnerable to cuts than a

separate funding pool. Lack of funding and a lack of a long-term funding commitment have been key aspects of the downfall of many efforts to reform compensation in education. Transition funds often are needed to move from the old to the new structure, and performance bonuses need a stable funding pool.

5. Investments in ongoing professional development are key to skills- and competency-based pay structures. Such investments should be in the range of 2-3 percent of the operating budget.

6. Quotas should be avoided. All schools meeting performance-improvement targets should be rewarded, not just a fixed percent-

age of schools. Organizational excellence is dependent on consistent rewards for improvements in performance.

7. General conditions of work must be addressed. The better the conditions of work in a school (teacher involvement in decision-making, sound facilities, availability of materials, safety, etc.), the more likely a new form of compensation can be implemented successfully. A corollary to this principle is that the compensation system should be designed with the general conditions of work in mind. For example, skills assessment in a high-involvement school should incorporate teachers fully in the assessment process.

8. Management maturity is also important. Administrators and the school board should have good working relations, and the administration should develop a history of working cooperatively with teachers and their unions to further system goals and objectives. Restructuring the salary schedule should occur in an environment characterized by interest-based bargaining, in which each party recognizes the interests and concerns of the other parties.

9. Labor maturity goes hand-in-hand with the behavior of the administration. Teacher associations, and their members, need to have positive commitment to the academic goals of the school, good working relations among

MODEL 4
A Comprehensive Skills-Based Teacher Compensation Schedule
High School Version

First Content Specialty	Second Content Specialty	School-Site Expertise (examples)	Breadth Skills	Management Skills
Entry		Spanish Fluency	Counseling	Decision-Making Team Leader
Provisional License	Provisional License	Hmong Fluency	Professional Development	School Operations
Professional License	Professional License			
Advanced 1	Advanced 1	Korean Fluency	Curriculum Development	Budgeting
Advanced 2 (Tenure?)	Advanced 2 (Tenure?)	Reading Recovery	School to Work Transition	Accounting and Financial Mgt
Advanced 3 (Recertification?)			Computers and Technology	Marketing
Advanced 4			Community Outreach	Program Evaluation
Advanced 5			Family Liaison	
National Board Certification				

Model 4 builds on Model 3, but adds opportunities for teachers to receive pay increments for demonstrating skills and competencies identified by the school or district as important for achieving local educational goals. This model provides for tailoring of teacher skill development to needs of the local school context, including specific depth and breadth skills geared to the local student population, and management skills which may be required for local school operations. Specific dollar amounts would need to be identified for each cell in this model.

themselves, and a tradition of working with management toward education system key goals.

10. Persistence until the plan is “perfected” is the key to long-term success. Most plans have initial “bugs” and are viewed with skepticism by some employees. Thus, persistence is needed to continue implementation, to revise the plan when problems are identified, and to encourage full participation to see how the plan works when fully implemented.

Technical Principles

Although there are numerous technical design issues, any new compensation system must first be perceived as fair by everyone involved. The system must also be communicated in a way that can be clearly understood by all those affected. And the new system must provide incentives that will lead to the desired teacher behaviors such as working collegially in schools, actively learning new skills and competencies, and seeking to improve learning among all students. In addition, there are specific design issues associated with each type of compensation.

Skills- and competency-based plans should include:

- *clear, specific and measurable skill blocks.* Skill blocks should be directly related to the needs of a particular school or district and provided in written form with clear standards. They could be designed locally or could be based on national standards developed by subject-matter associations.
- *an objective, sound, and credible assessment system* that involves teachers and administrators. In the long term, core curriculum and instruction skill blocks should probably be

assessed by a state or national teaching standards board, as is done in many other professions (Kelley and Taylor 1995).

Pay-at-risk plans should include:

- *identification of tasks critical to a district's top education goals;* and
- *selection of one to two tasks that both teachers and the district can readily implement,* such as ongoing training and an ongoing quality review.

Performance awards plans should:

- *be given on a group basis,* not based on individual performance. Usually this means everyone in a school—professional and classified staff—would be eligible.
- *clearly state what performance is most valued*—such as student achievement, student/teacher attendance, and parent satisfaction. The system will get more of what is in the performance measure and less of other system results. Thus, if the system focuses on achievement, it should incorporate a full range of achievement measures, over a range of subject areas.
- *be given based on improvements* over some historic base, should reflect local context, and should set timetables for reaching goals. The performance assessment should also recognize changes in the student population, such as student mobility, which may impede accurate measures of progress.
- *be funded at levels that reward all schools meeting performance targets.* Stability in performance award funding is essential for the awards to serve as an incentive for future performance improvements.

- *provide rewards that are valued by teachers.* Such awards could be salary bonuses, or dollars for school improvement activities or professional development.

Performance-based plans should also give teachers professional control over the work environment. If teachers are to be held responsible for student results, they need to have the capacity to improve organizational effectiveness. Knowledge, power, and information should be devolved to teachers to give them the capacity to make the changes needed to create performance improvements (Wohlstetter and Mohrman 1994).

New Structures and Approaches to Compensation

No one compensation plan should be viewed as an ideal, or universally applicable model. And teacher compensation systems alone are not the solution to vague and often conflicting educational goals, and low levels of student achievement. However, compensation is a potentially powerful tool that could be used to support education reform efforts, reward excellence, and undergird a climate of educational excellence. The compensation reforms in Kentucky, South Carolina, Dallas, and Douglas County, as well as research evidence from the private sector provide some early lessons, about new approaches to teacher compensation.

State and local policymakers may want to consider launching efforts to transform compensation by adding elements of skills- or competency-based pay. This would send a signal to teachers and the education system that new skills are needed and valued, and that a key to accomplishing the educa-

tion goal of teaching students to world-class achievement levels is to enhance the professional knowledge and skills of teachers. Pay-at-risk and performance bonuses should also be considered, but probably as smaller elements of new compensation programs.

References

- Conley, S., and Odden, A. R. (1995). "Linking teacher compensation to teacher career development: A strategic examination." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 17(2), 219-238.
- Darling-Hammond, L. (1996, forthcoming). "Beyond bureaucracy: creating incentives for 'high performance' schools." In S. Fuhrman and J. O'Day, Eds. *Incentives and Systemic Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Firestone, W. A. (1994). "Re-designing teacher salary systems for education reform." *American Educational Research Journal*, 31(3), pp. 549-574.
- Galbraith, J. R., Lawler, E. E., and Associates. (1993). *Organizing for the Future: The New Logic for Managing Complexity*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Interstate New Teacher Assessment and Support Consortium. (1995). *The INTASC Performance Assessment Development Project*, Draft. Washington, DC.: Council of Chief State School Officers.
- Jenkins, G. D., Ledford, G. E., Jr., Gupta, N., and Doty, D. H. (1992). *Skill-based Pay: Practices, Payoffs, Pitfalls, and Prescriptions*. Scottsdale, AZ: American Compensation Assn.
- Kelley, C. (1995). "Teacher compensation and organization." Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Kelley, C., and Taylor, C. (1995). "Compensation and skill development in four professions and implications for the teaching profession." Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Lawler, E. E., III (1990). *Strategic Pay*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Mohrman, A. M., Jr., Mohrman, S. A., and Odden, A. R. (1995, forthcoming). "Aligning teacher compensation with systemic school reform: Skill-based pay and group-based performance pay." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*.
- National Board for Professional Teaching Standards. (1994). *What Teachers Should Know and Be Able to Do*. Detroit, MI: Author.
- Odden, A. R. (1996, forthcoming). "Incentives, school organization and teacher compensation." In S. Fuhrman, and J. O'Day (Eds.), *Incentives and Systemic Reform*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Odden, A. R., and Conley, S. (1992). "Restructuring teacher compensation systems." In A. Odden (Ed.), *Rethinking School Finance: An Agenda for the 1990's* (pp. 41-96). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Odden, A. R., and Odden, E. R. (1995). *Educational Leadership for America's Schools*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Protsik, J. (1995). "History of teacher pay and incentive reforms." Consortium for Policy Research in Education, University of Wisconsin-Madison.
- Richards, C. E., and Sheu, T. M. (1992). "The South Carolina school incentive reward program: A policy analysis." *Economics of Education Review*, 11:71-86.
- Wohlstetter, P., and S. A. Mohrman. (1994). "School-based management: Promise and process." *CPRE Finance Briefs*. New Brunswick, NJ: Eagleton Institute of Politics, Consortium for Policy Research in Education.

Endnote

1. The CPRE Finance Center's research on teacher compensation has been informed by a series of meetings held with leaders from several key education organizations, supported in part by the Pew Charitable Trusts. We would like to thank the Teacher Compensation Working Group for their insightful comments. The opinions expressed in this paper are those of the authors, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the members of the Teacher Compensation Working Group, CPRE, or the Pew Charitable Trusts. ■

New CPRE-Sponsored Book Available Soon

Incentives in Systemic Reform

edited by Susan H. Fuhrman and Jennifer O'Day

Available Spring 1996 from Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, CA
(415) 433-1740

Some of today's top policy analysts discuss issues such as teacher incentives and student performance, student incentives, standards and instructional reform, and going to scale with education reforms.

URL: <http://www.prospect.org/archives/V11-2/rothstein.html>

Copyright © 1999 by *The American Prospect, Inc.* Preferred Citation: Richard Rothstein, "Blaming Teachers," *The American Prospect* vol. 11 no. 2, December 6, 1999. This article may not be resold, reprinted, or redistributed for compensation of any kind without prior written permission from the author. Direct questions about permissions to permissions@prospect.org.

Blaming Teachers

Richard Rothstein

Are inadequate teachers causing schools to underperform? A 1998 Harris poll finds that, by a ratio of over six to one, the public thinks improving teacher quality, not instituting vouchers or charter schools, is the key to school reform, more important than standardized testing, better curricula, or smaller classes. President Clinton complains that there ought to be a "process for removing teachers who aren't competent" and proposes denying federal funds to schools that hire unqualified teachers. We "can no longer fiddle around the edges of how we recruit, prepare, retain and reward America's teachers," says Education Secretary Richard W. Riley. "A growing number of school districts are throwing a warm body into a classroom, closing the door, and hoping for the best."

We have bemoaned teacher quality at least since "A Nation at Risk," the 1983 report of the Reagan administration's Department of Education, concluded that America was economically uncompetitive with Europe and Japan because of inferior schools. That charge soon proved ridiculous. And the report's claim that "teachers are being drawn from the bottom quarter of graduating high school" students was always nonsense; virtually no youngsters from the bottom quarter of high school seniors go to college, much less become teachers. Yet the prescriptions of "A Nation at Risk" have, if anything, gained in influence since the report was published—particularly the insistence that our poorly trained teacher force desperately needs upgrading.

Today a widely accepted syllogism goes something like this:

Student performance is unsatisfactory because most teachers are themselves pretty dumb. (If they're not the least talented high school grads, then they must be the least able college students.)

Traditional certification encourages hiring academically inferior teachers because it requires courses in pedagogy, not academic content.

Once inferior teachers are hired, tenure and unions make getting rid of them impossible.

Thus, to improve student outcomes, districts need to break the lock of both education schools and unions, by recruiting bright college grads uncorrupted by "methods" courses and by allowing principals to fire teachers who can't raise student test scores.

Versions of this story are now being advanced by both the New Democrats' Progressive Policy Institute (PPI) and the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation, a conservative group led by former Reagan education official Chester Finn. Their get-different-teachers approach to education reform seems to have enormous appeal, perhaps because most parents remember at least one horrible teacher who may have had no business in the profession. But we don't really know if children typically must endure one bad teacher—or, say, five—out of the 15 or more they usually have before high school. If it's only one, quality control in education would seem to be on a par with well-run institutions in other fields. In this case, what's needed is not a whole new teaching corps but ongoing efforts to improve overall instructional quality and to weed out the few teachers who don't belong. If, on the other hand, children typically have more than an occasional bad teacher, gross dissatisfaction with public schools may be justified. This is precisely what the critics assume, but there is no basis for their assumption. Anecdotal and polling evidence actually suggest the opposite: In the Harris poll, most Americans (69 percent) considered their communities' teachers to be well or even highly qualified. In the absence of data, it is

quite premature to suppose that the problem of teacher quality is as dire as the critics say—or as simple to solve.

In fact, nobody has figured out how to disentangle the effects of teachers on school achievement from the effects of families, economic circumstances, or school culture. [See Richard Rothstein, "Charter Conundrum," TAP, July-August 1998.] Even if we could isolate an individual teacher's responsibility for student performance, we couldn't quantify precisely what good teachers do to generate achievement and thus couldn't easily test anyone for it. Elevating overall teacher effectiveness and removing poor teachers from the profession require one-on-one evaluations of teachers and teacher candidates by qualified professionals. This kind of nuanced supervision is a far more expensive approach than reformers like Fordham and PPI are prepared to contemplate.

A pernicious mix of myth and reality underlies the campaign against teacher inadequacy. It needs to be examined.

Bottom of Their Class

Consider the now-conventional assertion that, as PPI puts it, "students who enroll in teacher education programs in U.S. colleges tend to have lower scores on SAT and ACT exams than those in virtually all other programs of study." This claim usually originates with analyses of voluntary questionnaires distributed by the Educational Testing Service (ETS) with SATs, showing that high school juniors and seniors who plan to major in education have lower average scores than classmates who plan arts and sciences majors. Yet high schoolers announcing intended majors may eventually major in other fields; majors in education may not attempt to become teachers or may fail qualification tests if they do try to teach; and arts and sciences majors may teach after taking courses in pedagogy or (increasingly) after earning a master's degree in education. High schoolers' SAT questionnaires provide no useful information about the abilities of actual teachers. Another common analysis—of the SAT scores of entering freshmen at colleges that graduate teachers—isn't much help either.

ETS studies of actual teachers in fact show their academic abilities comparing favorably with those of other professionals. Analyzing the 1992 National Adult Literacy Survey, ETS found that the verbal scores of teachers are higher than those of managers but similar to those of lawyers, engineers, accountants, and social workers. In quantitative skills, teachers are on a par with most other managers and professionals. ETS also looked at the high school SAT scores of those who later passed Praxis tests, used by many states for licensing teachers. High school teachers who passed Praxis tests in math, social studies, foreign languages, science, and English had higher SAT scores than college graduates generally. Teachers who passed Praxis tests in physical education, special education, elementary education, and art and music had lower SAT scores.

Though claims of low teacher ability are unfounded, bright teachers with higher than average scores do generate higher student achievement. We know, for instance, that students with high math and reading scores are likely to have had teachers who themselves had high scores. James Coleman's 1966 analysis "Equality of Educational Opportunity" made this argument. It was reinforced in a widely circulated study of Texas student achievement, published by Kennedy School scholar Ronald Ferguson in 1991. Reports by Dominic Brewer of the RAND Corporation and his colleagues confirm that teachers with high test scores probably improve their students' scores.

But it doesn't follow that good teachers succeed because they have a deeper understanding of the subject matter or that they can succeed without the pedagogical skills that teacher-training institutions should impart. There's a plausibility to the notion that you can't teach what you don't know, but most teachers cover material far less advanced than that distinguishing high from low SAT scorers. It's just as plausible that brighter teachers succeed not only because they have superior content knowledge but also because they can better diagnose learning difficulties; are more flexible in adapting to students' varied learning styles; make more balanced decisions about when to work with students individually, in groups, or in whole classes; and can judge when it makes sense to wait patiently for a child's answer and when to move on. College grads with high SAT scores but no training in pedagogy are unlikely to have these skills.

Bypassing the Ed Schools

There may nonetheless be merit in bypassing traditional undergraduate education schools. In 1986 the Carnegie Corporation's Task Force on Teaching as a Profession recommended that all teachers major in academic subjects as undergraduates, not in education, and then obtain a master's degree in pedagogy before being licensed to teach. A consortium of university education deans (the Holmes Group) advanced a similar proposal, that instructors with a bachelor's degree work only under the direct supervision of professional teachers who have postgraduate pedagogical training. In 1996 a National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, organized by Linda Darling-Hammond, revived and promoted these recommendations. They still make sense.

Recruiting people who didn't originally train to be teachers also makes sense, where programs include serious pre-employment pedagogical training and intense supervision of initial teaching. However, many alternative-certification programs offer neither. Best known is Teach for America (TFA), founded by Princeton graduate Wendy Kopp, who took pride in her lack of professional training and teaching experience, arguing that states should "abolish licensure laws altogether." TFA assumes that enthusiastic college graduates can be effective after attendance at its summer workshop, mostly designed and led by other recent recruits. Indeed, some TFA teachers have been successful, but others have not. Faced with the realities of classroom life, TFA recruits bail out more rapidly than typical beginning teachers. Many TFAers graduate from elite universities prior to being assigned to inner-city schools. As Linda Darling-Hammond observes, "Never having had difficulty learning themselves, they cannot figure out . . . what to do when a lesson does not succeed." TFA's defenders argue that, given the shortage of inner-city teachers, the alternative to a TFAer is not a properly trained teacher, but a substitute with no training at all, and that some TFA recruits remain in the profession, continue to acquire training, and become unusually creative teachers. But despite these successes, long-term teaching stints have not been the program's primary goal. Instead, TFA has promised idealistic college grads meaningful teaching experiences for a couple of years before they embark upon "real" careers. While senior teachers are not always better than junior ones, and teachers do not gain effectiveness in direct proportion to experience, skill does tend to grow during a teacher's first 7 to 10 years. If teachers generally don't hit their strides for nearly a decade, then TFA is not the best model.

Alternative certification for older career-changers also should require rigorous professional training. Experience as an accountant or business manager can't substitute for knowledge of child psychology, pedagogical theory, and classroom management tools. One promising approach was the federal Troops to Teachers program implemented in 1994. Troops to Teachers provided \$5,000 stipends to military personnel with a bachelor's degree to enroll in teacher-training programs, and then it subsidized districts to hire those who gained certification. While program quality varied with the rigor of state certification programs, there was less attrition among the 3,000 Troops to Teachers than among TFA recruits. The ex-military personnel were also more likely than existing teachers to have hard-to-staff specialties like math, science, and special education; to be members of minority groups in which teacher shortages are especially acute; and to be willing to teach in inner cities or rural communities. The Clinton administration has proposed expanding this program, but its future in Congress is uncertain.

Mentoring on the Cheap

Even with pedagogical training, talented recruits flounder without support. Critics and policy makers alike agree on the need for a more highly paid corps of "mentor teachers" to develop young teachers' competency, evaluate more senior teachers, partner with less experienced teachers to remedy deficiencies, and recommend additional training or, in extreme cases, removal from the profession. What is not widely acknowledged is that this reform would create a new and expensive school supervisory structure. Because mentors cannot observe, diagnose, and collaborate with junior teachers while instructing their own students, the costs of mentoring include not only bonuses paid to mentors, but also salaries for replacements in their classrooms.

Curiously, many mentoring advocates also denounce what they regard as schools' excessive administrative spending. Yet schoolteachers are the most undersupervised professionals in the nation. A

recent law school graduate, hired as an "associate," typically works for seven years preparing briefs, meeting with clients, even trying cases under the tutelage of senior partners. Partners rarely (except in some New York megafirms) oversee more than one associate at a time, and they may spend 25 percent of their time on this mentoring. Similar relationships characterize accounting, architecture, and medicine. Few corporate managers have more than four or five "direct reports" (the junior executives under their supervision). At The American Prospect, five senior editors devote much of their time to mentoring four writing fellows plus other junior editorial employees—about a 1:3 ratio.

But public school supervisory ratios are typically closer to 1:20. A principal may supervise 20 teachers or more, evaluating each by making a few brief classroom visits. In larger, better funded schools, assistant principals may help, but the ratios remain much the same. Training and evaluation compete for administrators' time with disciplinary crises, parent meetings, and administrative tasks. Teachers who claim they're not "treated like professionals" are right. No junior lawyer would ever handle 25 important client cases behind closed doors, with only twice-yearly peeks by supervising attorneys.

Yet imagine a system in which skilled teachers are mentors to junior colleagues. Imagine that each mentor could, if functioning full time in this role, simultaneously supervise five junior teachers by demonstrating model lessons, observing junior teachers at work, jointly diagnosing student needs, recommending and discussing professional literature. Imagine that, when removal of junior teachers is the only reasonable option, mentors are given time to document deficiencies, prepare necessary paperwork for due-process hearings, and either counsel junior teachers to resign or testify regarding their unsuitability. Imagine that half the regular teachers in a school are sufficiently senior and talented not to require such supervision and that mentoring roles continue to be shared with principals and assistant principals. Still, this model could require the number of school professionals to grow by 10 percent. At current salaries—accounting neither for the next decade's anticipated enrollment growth nor for efforts to reduce class size—the annual cost of replacing mentors in their classrooms could be more than \$13 billion.

Mentoring is the one reform likely both to improve average teacher quality and to remove the worst cases of malpractice. But nowhere in America have enough mentors been relieved of teaching responsibilities so they may do either job effectively.

Immovable Incompetents

To be sure, incompetent teachers are hard to remove [see Kate Cambor, "Bad Apples," TAP, September-October 1999], and it's not just union protections and public employee codes that are to blame. In a recent study of inner-city Catholic schools, Martin Carnoy, Louis Benvenista, and I were surprised to discover that, even here, underperforming teachers were rarely dismissed because archdiocesan legal departments, fearing lawsuits, imposed due-process protections nearly as extensive as in the public sector.

Horror stories abound of districts spending small fortunes on hearings to dismiss incompetent teachers. But districts' hesitancy to fire incompetent teachers, when counseling fails, has little to do with the costs of arbitration. In fact, if school districts effect one involuntary termination per thousand teachers per year, and if formal procedures cost \$100,000 in legal fees (far less is typical), this cost is only \$100 per teacher per year—worth every cent if it gives greater credibility to more routine mentoring procedures.

No, it's the costs of effective supervision that frustrate good personnel management. Most discharge-for-incompetence cases fail because districts are forced to defend inconsistent practice. Typically, a new tough principal takes action against a teacher whose incompetence was tolerated for years. Or a principal attempts to remove a teacher whose incompetence is no greater than that of others in the district. Winning arbitrations requires demonstration of consistent practice, which is impossible unless every teacher is supervised and is given opportunities to improve—or progressive warnings about failure to do so. None of this can happen with current school supervisory ratios.

Some districts (Rochester, Toledo, and Columbus are best known) have implemented peer-review programs to enhance supervision, but under most state bargaining laws, peer-review mentors cannot

recommend discharge of incompetent teachers without themselves becoming supervisors, legally ineligible for union membership. Consequently, mentors have not been given this essential power, and peer-review districts have had little success in removing incompetent teachers. The lack of results threatens to discredit the whole idea of mentoring.

Overwhelmingly, however, it is the looming shortage of teachers that defeats virtually every reform idea for improvement of teacher quality. In the next decade, the baby boom "echo" will add 1.5 million schoolchildren to the nation's classrooms. At the same time, many existing teachers will be retiring—one-fourth of today's teachers are over age 50, two-thirds are over 40. These trends alone require hiring 200,000 new teachers annually over the next 10 years—five times the recent rate.

Moves to reduce class size will further exacerbate this shortage. Based on limited but probably valid research showing that students benefit from small classes in primary grades, the states and the Clinton administration are rushing to fund this reform. In the context of the current shortage, this could be disastrous, as California recently demonstrated.

In 1996—after years of stagnant school spending, with classes among the largest in the nation—California suddenly appropriated \$1.5 billion to reduce class sizes to 20 in grades K-3, with additional appropriations in subsequent years. But when classes were suddenly reduced from 30 to 20, demand for primary grade teachers instantly jumped by 33 percent. With rapidly rising enrollments and too few qualified teachers, the new policy caused a calamitous churning and redistribution of teachers.

Vacancies appeared everywhere. The best and most qualified teachers could choose districts in which to work, and they took newly created positions where conditions were considered more favorable—fewer children "at risk" of failure, more coming to school ready to learn, fewer discipline problems—or in districts closer to their suburban homes. As the best teachers abandoned inner-city assignments, urban schools had to hire teachers without credentials or training. Statewide, one-fourth—and in Los Angeles, two-thirds—of new teachers hired to reduce class sizes lacked credentials. The most disadvantaged children traded large classes with more skilled teachers for small classes with those less skilled.

Wishful Thinking about Salaries

Today's reformers are much taken with economists Dale Ballou and Michael Podgursky, who argued in a 1997 report that widespread teacher inadequacy can't be remedied with raised salaries. Union-inspired salary schedules, they said, will prevent schools from focusing new funds to attract more effective teachers. Rather, districts will distribute raises among all teachers on the schedule, wasting money on low-ability teachers already employed. Ballou and Podgursky claim that raising salaries could even result in lowering teachers' average effectiveness because higher pay would dissuade existing teachers from quitting; seeing fewer vacancies, more talented college students would decide against pursuing teacher training.

The warning about too few vacancies to attract high-ability candidates is curious, given the gargantuan teacher shortage we are facing. In such a market, teacher salaries cannot help but be a crucial factor in recruitment. Because professions are not fully comparable, we can't estimate precisely how much teacher pay must increase to influence both career changes and the initial decisions of bright students contemplating alternative careers. But managers and administrators, for example, whose average literacy level is below that of teachers, currently earn, on average, about \$30,000 more per year.

It will also take substantially higher salaries to address the qualifications gap between suburban and inner-city teachers, accelerated by union contract provisions that give teachers a seniority right to fill vacancies in more "desirable" schools. Thus, within metropolitan districts, experienced teachers flock from inner-city, poor, and minority schools to predominantly suburban, middle-class, and white schools. Making matters worse, cascading seniority moves—each opening a vacancy for another teacher to occupy—may not conclude until the beginning of the academic year, leaving districts to fill last-minute vacancies with uncredentialed applicants in locations where teaching skill is most critical.

It is no use to demand, however, as many critics do, that unions abandon these procedures. Teachers who

have accumulated experience should have opportunities, if they wish, to teach where discipline is easier, children come to school more ready to learn, and schools (and teachers) get public credit for students' easier-to-achieve successes. Not all experienced teachers want this, but those who do will only seek openings elsewhere if they are prevented from exercising seniority rights to choose assignments within their districts, or they will abandon the profession altogether.

The alternative is pay differentials for hard-to-staff schools. Some local unions have agreed to these, although amounts have usually been token, insufficient to equalize teacher experience between schools attended by poor and middle-class children. New York City, however, has recently offered 15-percent bonuses to teachers who volunteer for its 40 lowest-scoring schools. For experienced teachers, this could amount to \$7,500 a year. If substantial numbers of teachers accept the offer, and if it is extended to all inner-city schools now staffed by inexperienced teachers, massive new funds will be required.

In fields with the most serious teacher shortages—math, science, bilingual studies, and special education—the solution is the same. There is even stronger sentiment in public education against these kinds of pay differentials. Unions earlier fought to establish single-salary schedules to replace the separate scales for better-paid (mostly male) high school teachers, and lower-paid (mostly female) elementary teachers. But today, paying high school physics teachers more than fourth-grade classroom teachers does not imply that high school physics is more important than fourth-grade reading. Rather, it signals a market imbalance requiring a market response. If college students and other professionals respond to higher pay by flocking to hard-to-staff schools and fields, differentials can always be reduced.

Accountability

PPI and Fordham believe that teacher quality can be ensured only if principals and teachers are held accountable for student performance—rewarded for high achievement and replaced when performance is inadequate. They are right. But how to measure performance? The most popular methods—standardized reading and math tests—are dangerously flawed. Because we want a variety of outcomes from schools (good citizenship, ethical behavior, creativity, health, physical fitness, teamwork, and personal responsibility as well as literacy and numeracy), holding principals and their teachers accountable only for math and reading skills, which are the easiest skills to measure, creates perverse incentives to ignore the rest.

Even if we look only at basic skills, it's nearly impossible to judge a school staff's effectiveness by test scores. Most score variation results from family influences, not school effects. A principal and teachers in a middle-class community with high test scores may be less effective than a principal and teachers in a disadvantaged community with low scores. In poor communities where students move frequently, it's hard to know which school is responsible for which students' outcomes. Scores in any year are the cumulative product not only of that year's teachers but also of those in each prior grade.

For 75 years, state legislatures have made sporadic attempts to implement performance bonus plans for high-performing schools and merit pay plans for superior teachers. Most have been abandoned after short trials, defeated by controversy over whether award criteria were really within schools' or teachers' control. The conservative Fordham Foundation along with the Education Trust, a liberal advocacy group for poor and minority children, now argues that districts can overcome these problems by utilizing statistical methods developed by Professor William Sanders of the University of Tennessee. Sanders compares teacher (and school) effectiveness by measuring the "value added" by each teacher each year, the gain between last year's and this year's scores. Yet "high value-added" Tennessee schools seem more often to have high proportions of middle-income students. Perhaps Sanders is onto something, but the possibility remains that his method measures student social class as much as teacher or school effectiveness.

We have little choice, therefore, but to rely on supervisory judgments regarding which teachers are effective and which should be removed, and on superintendents' judgments regarding which principals are suited to make such decisions. Many superintendents have little understanding about how to select and evaluate good principals, arguably their most important task. This problem must be solved before teacher quality can be addressed successfully.

Holding schools accountable for results requires more than frequent testing. It requires adequate supervision, consistent leadership, and well- designed incentives. It requires schools organized around a nuanced conception of high achievement, with principals and mentor teachers chosen because of their ability to establish a school culture that responds to rewards for high achievement, unquantifiable though it may be.

For this model, we've got to fund salary increases to attract college students to teaching, though some of this new money will unavoidably "leak" to teachers already employed. Money is needed for higher salaries in hard-to-staff fields and locations, recruitment of even more teachers to replace mentors who move out of full-time classroom roles and into supervisory ones, class-size reduction for the most disadvantaged children, and expansion of public schooling to preschool years, especially for at-risk youth. Even if average teacher salaries increased by only \$10,000 annually to compete with other professions, the bill for these reforms could easily total \$50 billion a year, politically a nearly inconceivable increase of almost 20 percent in what schools presently spend. Attacks on teacher ability are cheap; providing the teachers our schools need will not be.

Click here for information on the author
[Richard Rothstein](#)

Copyright © 1999 by *The American Prospect, Inc.* Preferred Citation: Richard Rothstein, "Blaming Teachers," *The American Prospect* vol. 11 no. 2, December 6, 1999. This article may not be resold, reprinted, or redistributed for compensation of any kind without prior written permission from the author. Direct questions about permissions to permissions@prospect.org.