


[home](#) [news now](#) [on the air](#) [inside npr](#) [your stations](#) [your turn](#) [search](#)

NPR Coverage:

Willingness to Pay
Morning Edition
September 7, 1999

*Purpose of
Education*
All Things
Considered
September 7, 1999

Don't Knows
All Things
Considered
September 7, 1999

*Different
Perceptions*
Morning Edition
September 8, 1999

Overview
Talk of the Nation
September 9, 1999

*Politics: Do People
Vote on Education?*

All Things
Considered
September 10, 1999

Race Differences
Weekend Edition
Saturday
September 11, 1999

Vouchers
Weekend All
Things Considered
September 11, 1999

*Financing II:
Equalization*
Weekend Edition
Sunday
September 12, 1999

Americans Willing to Pay for Improving Schools

**Public Approves of Higher Taxes for Schools, but Insists on
Fairness in How the Money Is Spent; Support Weak for
Vouchers, Unclear for Charter Schools**

Take or Read the Survey!

A new survey on education released today shows that Americans think education is so important they are willing to pay substantially higher taxes for specific improvements. Although parents generally are enthusiastic about their children's schools, they believe other schools in their community aren't as good and schools across the nation are even worse. There is strong support across the board for many improvements - from enforcing academic standards to paying teachers more and fixing up rundown schools. But a majority opposes one of the most controversial reform proposals, vouchers. However, the survey indicates vouchers are a volatile issue, with opinions subject to change, and on another controversial reform, charter schools, Americans are even less certain about their opinion. Reports based on the National Public Radio/ Kaiser Family Foundation/ Kennedy School of Government survey on education will be aired on NPR beginning Tuesday, September 7, 1999.

Key findings include:

Spending and Reform

The survey identified strong public support for educational reforms, even if it means paying higher taxes. Three out of four Americans say they would be willing to have their taxes raised by at least \$200 a year to pay for specific measures to improve community public schools; more than half (55%) say they would be willing to have their taxes raised by \$500. Only 16% say they would NOT pay even an additional \$100 for this purpose.

When asked whether states should spend the same amount of money on all students, more than four out of five Americans (83%) support equalizing school funding even if it means taking funding from wealthy school districts and giving it to poor districts. Furthermore, nearly 70% think wealthy districts' spending should be "capped so that poor districts are not left behind"; fewer than three in 10 (27%) think wealthy school districts should be able to spend as much as they want.

Americans are divided on school vouchers: 54% oppose vouchers and 42% favor them. However, about half change their position - in both directions - when confronted with arguments

against their initial position. This indicates that the debate over vouchers is still an open one. Moreover, 66% of parents of children in public schools say they would not take advantage of a voucher program, even if it paid all the tuition for them to send their child to a different school.

On public charter schools, another controversial reform, more Americans favor them than oppose them, but 63% say they haven't heard enough about charter schools to have an opinion about them.

The public is split over what the underlying purpose of schools should be, but teaching the basics seems to have an edge over other activities. In one question, about half (52%) think schools have gotten too far away from basics, although 41% say that schools need to teach students about a broader range of subjects than they used to because the world is more complex today. In another question, asking which is a more important role for schools, 52% choose giving students academic skills and other knowledge to prepare them for a job or college over developing students' character so they can make responsible decisions as adults (34%) - but 13% volunteer "both" as an answer to the question.

Education Seen As a Top National Issue

The public thinks education is one of the top problems facing the country today. While crime is cited as the No. 1 national problem, education and drugs round out the top three. Non-parents (14%) are just as likely as parents (13%) to cite education as their primary concern.

"My School Is OK, But Yours Isn't"

Parents give high marks to their children's schools (71% rate them A or B) but are less enthusiastic about schools in their community (60% rate them A or B) and think even less about the nation's schools overall (only 23% rate them A or B; 18% give them a D or F). This means that although parents may have underrated the nation's schools, they clearly tended to overrate their own children's schools and their community's schools as well; not everyone can be above average.

Parents think the nation's public schools have more serious problems than schools in their local community. The majority of parents named six concerns as major problems facing schools in the nation. But none of these was identified by a majority of parents as major problems in their own community's schools:

- Undisciplined and disruptive students (71% say it's major problem in schools nationwide; 40% say it's a major problem in their community's schools)
- Lack of parental involvement (68% nationwide; 43% community)
- Overcrowded classrooms (64% nationwide; 44% community)
- Violence and school safety (63% nationwide; 31% community)
- Students' use of alcohol and drugs (62% nationwide;

- 44% community)
- Inequality in funding among school districts (54% nationwide; 36% community)

Take or Read the Survey!

The NPR/Kaiser/Kennedy School Poll is an ongoing project of National Public Radio, the Henry J. Kaiser Family Foundation, and Harvard University's Kennedy School of Government. Representatives of the three sponsors worked together to develop the survey questionnaire and to analyze the results, with NPR maintaining sole editorial control over its broadcasts on the surveys.

The project team includes:
From NPR: Marcus D. Rosenbaum, Special Projects Editor.
From the Kaiser Family Foundation: Mollyann Brodie, Vice President, Director of Public Opinion and Media Research; and Ana Maria Arumi, Research Associate.
From the Kennedy School: Robert J. Blendon, a Harvard University Professor who holds joint appointments in the School of Public Health and the Kennedy School of Government; and John Benson, Deputy Director for Public Opinion and Health/Social Policy at the Harvard School of Public Health.

Methodology:
The results of this survey are based on nationwide telephone interviews administered by ICR/International Communications Research, between June 25 and July 19, 1999, with 1,422 adults, 18 years or older (570 were parents and 852 were non-parents). In this survey, parents are defined as adults who have children in grades K-12. Non-parents are defined as adults who either do not have children or whose children are not in grades K-12. The margin of sampling error is plus or minus 3 percentage points. For results based on subsets of respondents the margin of error is higher.

To order transcripts and tapes of this story and others, please call:
Toll-Free 1-877-NPR TEXT (1-877-677-8398)
International calls: (+801) 374-1022
Or write:
NPR
c/o Burrelle's Transcripts
P.O. Box 7
Livingston, New Jersey 07039-0007
Please include program name, date and subject.

This page and all contents are Copyright © 1999 by National Public Radio, Washington, D.C.



home news now on the air inside npr your stations your turn search

NPR/KAISER/KENNEDY SCHOOL EDUCATION SURVEY

This was a random telephone survey of 1,422 adults nationwide. Results are presented in percentages.

These are the answers to all the questions that were asked in the survey. Question numbers are not always in order because right before the survey was taken, some questions were added or deleted.

Skip to a section:

[A. Education as a Problem](#) | [B. Screen for Parents](#) | [C. Ratings of Schools](#) | [D. Participation](#) | [E. What is Wrong With Public Schools](#) | [F. What Needs to be Done to Improve Schools](#) | [G. School Funding](#) | [H. Testing Students and Teachers](#) | [I. Issues of Controversy](#)

A. EDUCATION AS A PROBLEM

1. What do you think are the two most important problems facing the country?

This was an open-ended question, with no suggested response.

	Total	Parents	Non-parents
Abortion	*	1	*
AIDS	1	1	1
Campaign finance	*	-	1
Clinton/sex scandal/Lewinsky affair/impeachment trial	4	3	5
Crime/violence	26	30	25
Defense	1	2	1
Domestic/social issues (non-specific)	2	2	3
Drugs	13	15	12
The economy (non-specific)	5	5	5
Education	14	13	14
Employment/jobs	5	6	4
Environment	3	2	3

Ethics in government	12	12	12
Family values (decline of)	11	13	10
Federal deficit/budget	3	3	4
Foreign policy (non-specific)	2	2	2
Gun control	6	7	6
Health care (not Medicare)	6	5	6
Homelessness	4	6	3
Human/civil/women's rights	1	1	1
Immigration	1	1	1
Issues involving children	4	4	4
Kosovo/Bosnia/ Serbia/Yugoslavia	2	1	2
Media	*	*	*
Medicare	3	1	3
Middle East/Iraq/Saddam Hussein	*	*	*
Morality/sex on TV	9	7	9
National Security	*		*
Overpopulation	*	*	*
Peace/world peace/nuclear arms	5	6	5
(Programs for) the poor/poverty	7	10	6
Programs for the elderly (not Social Security/Medicare)	1	*	1
Race relations	5	6	5
Religion (decline of)	5	5	5
Social Security	3	1	4
Taxes	4	3	4
Teen pregnancy/sex	1	1	1
Terrorism	*	*	*
Welfare	1	2	1
World hunger	2	4	1
Y2K	*	*	1
Other	2	1	3

Don't know	6	4	6
------------	---	---	---

Editor's note: Crime/violence was the most frequently cited problem among parents and non-parents alike. Five other items received substantial mention—roughly within the range of the margin of error. Here is an abbreviated chart containing that information.

Crime/Violence	26	30	25
Drugs	13	15	12
Education	14	13	14
Ethics in government	12	12	12
Family values (decline of)	11	13	10
Morality/sex on TV	9	7	9

B. SCREEN FOR PARENTS

3. During the past school year, that just ended, did you have any children in grades kindergarten through 12th grade?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Total	32	68	-
Parents	100	-	-
Non-parents	-	100	-

3A. (If yes to Question 3) During the school year that just ended, what grades were your children in?

	Total	Parents
Kindergarten-5 th grade	20	62
6 th – 8 th grade	12	38
9 th – 12 th grade	11	35
Don't know	*	*
No school-age children	68	NA

4A. (If yes to Question 3) During the school year that just ended, did you have any children in public school, or not?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	No school-age children
Total	27	5	-	68
Parents	84	16	-	NA

4B. (If yes to Question 3) How about a religious or parochial school?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	No school-age children
Total	4	28	-	68
Parents	13	87	-	NA

4C. (If yes to Question 3) How about a non-religious private school?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	No school-age children
Total	2	30	-	68
Parents	5	95	-	NA

4D. (If yes to Question 3) During the school year that just ended, did you have any children who were schooled at home rather than at a school?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	No school-age children
Total	1	31	-	68
Parents	4	96	-	NA

5. (Asked of those with school-age kids in different types of school) What kind of school does your oldest school-age child attend?

	Public	Religious/parochial	Non-religious private	Home schooling	Did not name	No school-age children
Total	27	3	1	1	1	68
Parents	83	10	3	2	2	NA

C. RATINGS OF SCHOOLS

7. Students are often given the grades A, B, C, D, or FAIL to denote the quality of their work. Suppose the public schools themselves, in your community, were graded in the same way. What grade would you give your community's public schools —A, B, C, D, or FAIL?

	A	B	C	D	Fail	Don't Know
Total	12	40	28	8	5	6
Parents	17	43	27	7	4	2
Non-parents	10	39	29	9	5	8

8. How about the public schools in the nation as a whole? What grade would you give the public schools nationally—A, B, C, D, or FAIL?

	A	B	C	D	Fail	Don't Know
Total	2	21	51	14	4	8
Parents	3	21	51	13	5	8
Non-parents	2	21	50	15	4	7

9. Is the grade you give to the public schools in the nation as a whole based mainly on your own experience, on what you've learned from friends and family, or on what you've seen and heard on television or radio, in newspapers, or other things you have read?

	Own experience	Friends and family	Seen/heard in media	Don't Know
Total	26	13	53	7
Parents	31	12	51	6
Non-parents	24	14	54	8

10. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* Using the A, B, C, D, or FAIL scale again, what grade would you give the school your oldest child attends?

	A	B	C	D	Fail	Don't Know
Parents	29	42	22	3	3	1

12. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* What grade would you give your oldest child's teachers—A, B, C, D, or FAIL?

	A	B	C	D	Fail	Don't Know
Parents	37	39	17	4	2	1

13. Do you think most well-to-do people in your community send their children to public schools, or not?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Total	63	34	4
Parents	66	31	3
Non-parents	61	34	4

D. PARTICIPATION

14. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* How often do you help your children do homework assignments — nearly every day, once or twice a week, or less often than that?

	Nearly every day	Once/twice a week	Less often than that	Don't know
Parents	59	27	13	1

15. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* How often do you meet with your children's teachers — once a month, a few times a year, or only rarely?

	Once a month	A few times a year	Only rarely	Never (vol.)	Don't Know
Parents	35	50	12	1	1

16. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* Do you feel your oldest child's teachers have a good understanding of your child's academic abilities and weaknesses, or not?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Parents	83	16	1

17. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* How about your child's overall development and happiness? Do you feel your oldest child's teachers have a good understanding, or not?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Parents	78	20	1

18A. *(Asked of half sample of parents of school-age children)* How much influence do you think you have over your children's education – a great deal, quite a lot, some, or not much at all?

	Great deal	Quite a lot	Some	Not much	Don't know
Parents	54	24	15	6	-

18B. *(Asked of half sample of parents of school-age children)* When you participated in school events, did you feel teachers and school officials encouraged you to do so, or not?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Parents	82	18	1

E. WHAT IS WRONG WITH PUBLIC SCHOOLS

19A. *(Asked of half sample)* Here is a list of problems schools might face. For each one, please tell me how big a problem you think it is — a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the public schools in your community. How about... ?

TOTAL:

	Major	Minor	Not a problem	Don't know
a. Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	50	38	11	2
b. Lack of adequate academic standards	32	40	25	3
c. Overcrowded classrooms	47	31	19	2
d. Discrimination against children because of race or gender	18	43	35	3
e. Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	21	39	37	2
f. Lack of computers and technology	24	40	32	4
g. Violence and lack of school safety	35	43	21	1
h. Lack of parental involvement	55	27	16	2
i. Poor quality teachers	26	46	26	2
j. Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs	51	37	8	3
k. Poor school administration	27	44	25	4
l. Inequality in funding among school districts	34	37	23	7

PARENTS:

	Major	Minor	Not a problem	Don't know
a. Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	40	43	17	*
b. Lack of adequate academic standards	27	39	32	1
c. Overcrowded classrooms	44	32	24	1
d. Discrimination against children because of race or gender	18	40	40	3
e. Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	18	37	45	1
f. Lack of computers and technology	24	39	36	1
g. Violence and lack of school safety	31	39	30	*
h. Lack of parental involvement	43	31	23	2
i. Poor quality teachers	21	46	32	1
j. Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs	44	34	19	3
k. Poor school administration	23	42	33	2
l. Inequality in funding among school districts	36	37	22	5

NON-PARENTS:

	Major	Minor	Not a problem	Don't know
a. Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	54	36	8	3
b. Lack of adequate academic standards	33	41	23	4
c. Overcrowded classrooms	49	31	17	3
d. Discrimination against children because of race or gender	18	45	34	3
e. Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	23	39	35	3
f. Lack of computers and technology	24	39	32	5
g. Violence and lack of school safety	37	45	17	2
h. Lack of parental involvement	60	25	13	2
i. Poor quality teachers	29	46	23	3
j. Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs	54	39	3	3
k. Poor school administration	30	43	22	5
l. Inequality in funding among school districts	32	37	23	8

19A/ 20A. Of the problems you cited, which one is the BIGGEST problem facing schools in your community? SUMMARY:

	Total	Parents	Non-Parents
Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	11	8	13
Lack of adequate academic standards	3	3	3
Overcrowded classrooms	7	9	6
Discrimination against children because of race or gender	3	3	3
Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	*	1	*
Lack of computers and technology	2	2	2
Violence and lack of school safety	6	8	5
Lack of parental involvement	22	16	24
Poor quality teachers	4	4	3
Student use of alcohol and illegal drugs	15	12	16
Poor school administration	4	4	4
Inequality in funding among school districts	8	10	7
No major problems	13	18	10
Don't Know	2	1	2

19B. *(Asked of half sample)* Now I am going to read you a list of problems schools might face. For each one, please tell me how big a problem you think it is — a major problem, a minor problem, or not a problem for the public schools in the nation as a whole. How about... ?

TOTAL:

	Major	Minor	Not a problem	Don't know
a. Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	73	23	3	2
b. Lack of adequate academic standards	50	37	11	2
c. Overcrowded classrooms	61	29	8	2
d. Discrimination against children because of race or gender	33	45	20	2
e. Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	37	44	16	3
f. Lack of computers and technology	30	48	19	2
g. Violence and lack of school safety	64	29	6	1
h. Lack of parental involvement	78	16	5	1
i. Poor quality teachers	34	48	15	3
j. Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs	69	24	5	2
k. Poor school administration	42	42	13	4
l. Inequality in funding among school districts	51	33	10	6

PARENTS:

	Major	Minor	Not a problem	Don't know
a. Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	71	24	5	1
b. Lack of adequate academic standards	46	40	12	1
c. Overcrowded classrooms	64	28	7	1
d. Discrimination against children because of race or gender	33	44	22	2
e. Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	36	43	18	2
f. Lack of computers and technology	32	47	19	1
g. Violence and lack of school safety	63	26	10	1
h. Lack of parental involvement	68	23	7	2
i. Poor quality teachers	33	51	15	1
j. Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs	62	27	9	2
k. Poor school administration	41	43	14	3
l. Inequality in funding among school districts	54	30	12	4

NON- PARENTS:

	Major	Minor	Not a problem	Don't know
a. Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	74	23	2	2
b. Lack of adequate academic standards	53	35	10	3
c. Overcrowded classrooms	59	30	9	2
d. Discrimination against children because of race or gender	32	47	19	2
e. Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	37	44	15	4
f. Lack of computers and technology	29	49	20	2
g. Violence and lack of school safety	63	31	5	1
h. Lack of parental involvement	82	13	4	1
i. Poor quality teachers	35	47	14	4
j. Student use of alcohol or illegal drugs	73	22	3	2
k. Poor school administration	43	41	12	4
l. Inequality in funding among school districts	49	35	9	7

19B/20B. Of the problems you cited, which one is the **BIGGEST** problem facing schools in the nation as a whole? SUMMARY:

	Total	Parents	Non-Parents
Students who are undisciplined and disruptive	11	11	12
Lack of adequate academic standards	4	4	5
Overcrowded classrooms	6	6	6
Discrimination against children because of race or gender	3	2	3
Public school facilities that are unsafe or unhealthy	1	1	1
Lack of computers and technology	1	2	1
Violence and lack of school safety	12	16	10
Lack of parental involvement	24	20	26
Poor quality teachers	4	3	4
Student use of alcohol and illegal drugs	17	14	18
Poor school administration	5	7	5
Inequality in funding among school districts	6	7	6
No major problems	3	7	1
Don't Know	2	1	2

21A. Which is a more important role for schools — to give students academic skills and other knowledge to prepare them for a job, a career, or college OR to develop students' character so they can make responsible decisions as adults in society about such things as drugs, sex, family, and money?

	Academic skills and knowledge	Character development	Both(vol.)	Don't Know
Total	52	34	13	1
Parents	51	33	16	1
Non-parents	51	36	12	1

21B. Which of the following two statements comes closer to your view:
Schools need to return to their main function of giving knowledge to students, OR
schools need to focus on teaching children how to think critically rather than

worrying about how much detailed knowledge they have?

	Giving knowledge	Critical thinking	Both (vol.)	Neither (vol.)	Don't Know
7/19/99	56	35	7	1	1
Parents	58	35	6	*	2
Non-parents	55	36	8	1	1

21C. Which of the following two statements comes closer to your view:

Schools have gotten too far away from the basics, like reading, writing, and math,
OR schools need to teach about a broader range of subjects than they used to,
because the world is more complex today?

	Too far from basics	Teach broader range	Both (vol.)	Neither (vol.)	Don't Know
Total	52	41	5	1	1
Parents	49	44	5	1	1
Non-parents	53	40	5	1	1

21D. As you look back on your elementary and high school education, is it your impression that children today get a better or worse education than you did?

	Better	Worse	Same	Don't Know
Total	48	42	7	4
Parents	52	37	9	3
Non-parents	46	44	6	4

F. WHAT NEEDS TO BE DONE TO IMPROVE SCHOOLS

22A. *(Asked of half sample)* In your opinion, how much does the amount of money spent on a public school student's education affect the quality of his or her education—a great deal, quite a lot, not too much, or not at all?

	A Great deal	Quite a lot	Not too much	Not at all	Don't know
Total	37	28	25	6	4
Parents	45	27	21	5	2
Non-parents	33	28	28	7	4

22B. *(Asked of half sample)* How do you feel about the placement of students with learning problems in the local public schools? In your opinion, should students with learning problems be placed in the same classes as other students, or should they be placed in separate classes?

	Same classes	Separate classes	Don't know
Total	35	57	8
Parents	39	54	7
Non-parents	33	59	8

23. Here is a short list of changes some people have suggested might improve the public schools. Please tell me whether you favor or oppose making each of the following changes in your community to improve your public schools.

TOTAL:

	Favor			Oppose			Don't know
	NET	Strongly	Not strongly	NET	Not strongly	Strongly	
a. Requiring schools to teach values/morality	73	55	18	26	13	13	2
b. Making students meet adequate academic standards to be promoted/graduate	94	85	8	6	2	4	1
c. Holding parents accountable when their children are disruptive	79	67	12	20	9	11	2
d. Requiring teachers to pass standardized competency test	89	77	12	10	5	5	1

PARENTS:

	Favor			Oppose			Don't know
	NET	Strongly	Not strongly	NET	Not strongly	Strongly	
a. Requiring schools to teach values/morality	76	59	17	24	12	12	1
b. Making students meet adequate academic standards to be promoted / graduate	96	87	8	4	2	2	1
c. Holding parents accountable when their children are disruptive	79	67	12	20	9	11	1
d. Requiring teachers to pass standardized competency test	94	82	12	6	3	3	-

NON-PARENTS:

	Favor			Oppose			Don't know
	NET	Strongly	Not strongly	NET	Not strongly	Strongly	
a. Requiring schools to teach values / morality	72	54	18	26	13	13	2
b. Making students meet adequate academic standards to be promoted / graduate	93	84	9	6	2	4	1
c. Holding parents accountable when their children are disruptive	79	67	12	19	9	10	2
d. Requiring teachers to pass standardized competency test	87	75	12	11	6	6	1

24. Here is a short list of possible changes that could cost more money and require additional tax dollars. Please tell me if you would favor or oppose making each of the following changes in your community to improve your public schools. Do you (favor/oppose) strongly or not strongly?

TOTAL:

	Favor			Oppose			Don't know
	NET	Strongly	Not strongly	NET	Not strongly	Strongly	
a. Paying teachers more	77	60	17	20	9	11	3
b. Placing more computers in classroom	81	61	20	16	8	8	2
c. Reducing class sizes	86	69	16	13	7	6	1
d. Fixing run-down schools	92	80	12	7	3	4	1
e. Adding more security at schools	76	53	23	22	13	9	2

PARENTS:

	Favor			Oppose			Don't know
	NET	Strongly	Not strongly	NET	Not strongly	Strongly	
a. Paying teachers more	80	63	16	18	8	10	2
b. Placing more computers in classroom	86	71	15	12	7	6	1
c. Reducing class sizes	90	75	15	10	5	5	*
d. Fixing run-down schools	94	84	10	6	2	3	1
e. Adding more security at schools	81	58	23	18	11	8	1

NON-PARENTS:

	Favor			Oppose			Don't know
	NET	Strongly	Not strongly	NET	Not strongly	Strongly	
a. Paying teachers more	75	58	17	21	10	11	4
b. Placing more computers in classroom	78	56	23	19	9	9	3
c. Reducing class sizes	84	66	17	15	7	7	1
d. Fixing run-down schools	91	78	13	8	3	5	1
e. Adding more security at schools	74	51	24	24	13	10	2

25. To pay for this/these change(s), would you be willing to raise your taxes by... \$100?... \$200... \$500 per year?

	Total	Parents	Non-parents
Willing to raise taxes by \$500	55	59	53
Willing to raise taxes by \$200 but not \$500	20	20	20
Willing to raise taxes by \$100 but not \$200	9	8	10
Not willing to raise taxes by \$100 or oppose all changes	16	12	17

G. SCHOOL FUNDING

27A. (Asked of half sample) Do you think elementary school students of

different ability levels should be grouped together in the same classes, or separated into different classes based on their ability?

	Grouped together	Separated	Don't know
Total	43	53	4
Parents	41	55	4
Non-parents	43	53	4

27B. *(Asked of half sample)* Do you think high school students of different ability levels should be grouped together in the same classes, or separated into different classes based on their ability?

	Grouped together	Separated	Don't know
Total	45	51	4
Parents	43	54	3
Non-parents	46	50	4

28A. *(Asked of half sample)* Do you think that the amount of money that goes to education in your state should or should not be the same for all students, even if it means taking funding from some wealthy school districts and giving it to poor districts?

	Should	Should not	Don't Know
Total	83	14	3
Parents	84	15	2
Non-parents	83	14	3

28B. *(Asked of half sample)* Should wealthy school districts be allowed to spend as much as they want on their schools, or should their spending be capped so that poor districts are not left behind?

	Spend as much as they want	Not spend as much as they want	Don't Know
Total	27	69	5
Parents	25	71	4
Non-parents	28	67	5

H. TESTING STUDENTS AND TEACHERS

29. All schools give their students standardized tests from time to time. Do you think standardized tests should or should not be used for the following purposes?

TOTAL

	Should	Should not	Don't know
a. To determine level of funding each local school receives	39	57	4
b. To identify areas in which teachers need improvement	89	9	2
c. To identify areas where students need help	95	4	1
d. To determine whether students are promoted/graduate	69	30	1
e. To rate/ rank schools	58	39	2
f. Used by employers when student graduates/applies for a job	38	59	3
g. To ensure students meet adequate natl. academic standards	87	12	1

PARENTS

	Should be used	Should not be used	Don't know
a. To determine level of funding each local school receives	38	59	3
b. To identify areas in which teachers need improvement	89	10	1
c. To identify areas where students need help	95	4	*
d. To determine whether students are promoted/graduate	67	32	1
e. To rate/ rank schools	57	42	1
f. Used by employers when student graduates/applies for a job	38	59	3
g. To ensure students meet adequate national academic standards	86	14	1

NON-PARENTS

	Should be used	Should not be used	Don't know
a. To determine level of funding each local school receives	39	56	5
b. To identify areas in which teachers need improvement	89	8	2
c. To identify areas where students need help	95	4	1
d. To determine whether students are promoted/graduate	70	28	2
e. To rate/ rank schools	59	38	3
f. Used by employers when student graduates/applies for a job	39	58	3
g. To ensure students meet adequate national academic standards	87	11	2

30. Who do you think should be primarily responsible for developing these standardized tests?

	School district	State govt.	Fed. govt.	Private org.	Don't know
Total	37	18	16	25	4
Parents	42	18	15	22	4
Non-parents	35	18	16	26	4

31. How confident are you that the test scores on standardized tests are an accurate indicator of a student's progress and abilities?

	Very confident	Somewhat confident	Not too confident	Not confident at all	Don't know
Total	12	56	21	10	1
Parents	13	57	20	10	*
Non-parents	11	55	22	10	2

32. In general, do you think standardized tests are biased against minority students, or not?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Total	28	65	8
Parents	29	64	8
Non-parents	27	66	8

I. ISSUES OF CONTROVERSY

33A. *(Asked of half sample)* What effect do you think class size has on students' achievement? For elementary school students, do you think small classes make a great deal of difference, little difference, or no difference at all?

	Great deal	Little difference	No difference	Don't know
Total	73	21	5	1
Parents	79	18	3	*
Non-parents	70	23	6	1

33B. *(Asked of half sample)* What effect do you think class size has on students' achievement? For high school students, do you think small classes make a great deal of difference, little difference, or no difference at all?

	Great deal	Little difference	No difference	Don't know
Total	62	28	9	1
Parents	67	24	8	*
Non-parents	59	30	10	1

34A. *(Asked of half sample)* Do you favor or oppose the government offering parents money or "vouchers" to send their children to private or religious schools, or public schools outside their district?

	Favor	Oppose	Don't Know
Total	42	54	4
Parents	46	51	3
Non-parents	39	56	5

34B. *(Asked of half sample)* Do you favor or oppose the government offering parents money or "vouchers" to send their children to private or religious schools, or public schools outside their district, or haven't you heard enough about that to have an opinion?

	Favor	Oppose	Don't Know
Total	31	36	33
Parents	36	29	35
Non-parents	28	39	32

35. *(If favor vouchers)* Would you still favor this if it meant there would be less money for public schools in your area?

	Yes, still favor	No, would oppose	Don't Know
Total	52	44	5
Parents	51	46	3
Non-parents	52	42	6

34/35 Summary table: *(Note: Lines 2 & 3 add up to Line 4)*

	Total	Parents	Non-Parents
1. Initially favored and still favor, even if less money for public schools	19	21	18
2. Initially favored, but oppose if less money for public schools	16	19	14
3. Initially opposed (therefor not asked this follow-up question)	45	40	47
4. Total opposed after follow-up question	61	59	61
5. Don't Know	20	20	21

36. *(If oppose vouchers)* Would you still oppose this if it meant that children from less well-off families might not be able to attend better schools?

	Yes, still oppose	No, would favor	Don't Know
Total	52	43	5
Parents	50	44	6
Non-parents	53	42	4

34/36 Summary table: *(Note: Lines 2 & 3 add up to Line 4)*

	Total	Parents	Non-Parents
1. Initially opposed and still oppose even if children from less well off families cannot attend better schools	23	20	25
2. Initially opposed, but favor if children from less well off families cannot attend better schools	19	17	20
3. Initially in favor (therefor not asked this follow-up question)	36	41	34
4. Total in favor after follow up question	55	59	54
5. Don't know	21	22	21

37. *(Asked of parents of public-school children)* Suppose the government would pay all of the tuition for you to send your oldest child to a public school in another district, a religious or parochial school, or a private school. Would you send your oldest child to the school he or she now attends or to a different school?

	Same school	Different school	Don't Know
Parents	66	29	5

38. *(Of parents of public-school children)* Which kind of school — a public school in another district, a religious or parochial school, or a non-religious private school?

Different School				
Same school	Public school/other district	Religious/parochial school	Non-religious private school	Don't know
66	6	13	9	6

39A. *(Asked of half sample)* The charter school program exempts some public schools from certain state regulations and permits them to function independently from the local school district as long as they meet state standards for student achievement. Do you favor or oppose such a program?

	Favor	Oppose	Don't know
Total	62	29	9
Parents	65	28	7
Non-parents	60	30	10

39B. *(Asked of half sample)* The charter school program exempts some public schools from certain state regulations and permits them to function independently from the local school district as long as they meet state standards for student achievement. Do you favor or oppose such a program, or haven't you heard enough about that to have an opinion?

	Favor	Oppose	Don't know
Total	25	12	63
Parents	26	9	65
Non-parents	24	14	62

40A. *(Asked of half sample)* Do you think children who are schooled at home rather than at a school get a better, worse, or about the same quality of education as other children?

	Better	Worse	About the same	Don't know
Total	26	31	33	11
Parents	29	28	37	7
Non-parents	24	33	30	12

40B. *(Asked of half sample)* Do you think children who are schooled at home rather than at a school develop as well as other children, or not as well?

	As well	Not as well	Don't know
Total	38	53	9
Parents	45	48	6
Non-parents	34	55	11

41. In general, do you think African-American, Latino, and other minority children get as good an education as white children in your community, or not?

	Yes	No	There are no minorities (vol.)	Don't know
Total	72	23	2	3
Parents	73	22	2	3
Non-parents	72	23	2	3

42. Do you think African-American, Latino, and other minority children get a better education in a racially integrated school, is it worse, or does it make little difference?

	Better	Worse	Little difference	Don't know
Total	25	7	60	8
Parents	21	8	63	9
Non-parents	27	7	58	8

43. As you may know, the government requires schools to spend extra money to educate children with physical and learning disabilities. Who do you think should be primarily responsible for paying the additional costs for these children with disabilities?

	Parents of the disabled	Local public schools	State gov't	Federal gov't	Don't know
Total	6	8	33	49	4
Parents	6	7	30	53	4
Non-parents	7	8	35	46	4

43A. Do you favor or oppose cutting programs for children with physical and learning disabilities so more money could be spent on the majority of students without special needs?

	Favor	Oppose	Don't know
Total	13	85	2
Parents	11	88	1
Non-parents	14	83	2

44A. *(Asked of half sample)* Which of the following two statements comes closer to your own view: Whether or not young people are sexually active, schools should give them information about birth control and safer sex, *OR* schools should not give young people information about birth control and safer sex?

	Total	Parents	Non-Parents
Whether or not students sexually active, schools should give birth control/ safe sex info.	79	80	77
Schools should not give young people info. About birth control/ safe sex	20	19	21
Don't Know	2	1	2

44B. *(Asked of half sample)* Do you think high school nurses or health clinics should provide young people with condoms and other forms of birth control if students ask for them, or not?

	Provide condoms	Do not provide condoms	Neither	Don't know
Total	50	46	1	3
Parents	54	43	1	1
Non-parents	48	48	1	3

45A. *(Asked of half sample)* Which student is more likely to succeed — the student from a stable and supportive family who goes to a poor school, *OR* the student from a troubled family who goes to a good school?

	Total	Parents	Non-Parents
Student from a stable/ supportive family/ goes to poor school	71	76	69
Student from troubled family/ goes to a good school	20	18	20
Don't know	9	6	10

45B. *(Asked of half sample)* Which student is more likely to succeed — the student from a family where people read a lot but who goes to a poor school, *OR* the student from a family where people are not reading so much but who goes to a good school?

	Total	Parents	Non-Parents
Student whose family reads a lot/ goes to a poor school	72	69	74
Student whose family does not read much/ goes to a good school	17	21	15
Don't know	11	10	12

46. Regardless of how you usually vote, which party do you think is doing a better job improving public schools — the Democratic Party, the Republican Party, both about the same, or neither?

	Democratic	Republican	Both the same	Neither	Don't Know
Total	22	11	32	30	6
Parents	19	10	30	34	6
Non-parents	23	11	33	27	6

47A. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* Do you have any children with a physical or learning disability diagnosed by a doctor or other professional?

	Yes	No	Don't Know	No school-age children
Total	7	25	*	68
Parents	20	79	*	NA

47B. *(Asked of parents of school-age children)* Have you ever moved your child from a school you found unsatisfactory to another school?

	Yes	No	Don't Know
Parents	23	77	*

This page and all contents are Copyright © 1999 by National Public Radio, Washington, D.C.

Amend section 4116(b)(4)(D) to read as follows:

(D) the development and implementation of character education and training programs that reflect the values of parents, teachers, and local communities, and incorporate elements of good character, including honesty, citizenship, courage, justice, respect, personal responsibility, and trustworthiness;

character education

10/05/00 13:35 FAX 202 226 1010

CMTE ON ED & WORKFORCE

Q 012

F:\SAC\106HEA\H4504AMD.008

U.L.C.

AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4504

OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

1 SEC. 8. ADDITIONAL AMENDMENT.

2 Section 117(i) of the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and

3 Technical Education Act of 1998 (20 U.S.C. 2327(i)) is

4 amended by inserting "such sums as may be necessary" *for*

5 before "each of the 4 succeeding fiscal years."

May 24, 2000 (8:43 PM)

Side-by-Side Analysis of and Rep. Goodling's School Construction Proposal for Charter Schools

	Goodling Proposal
Funds	\$100,000,000 authorized for FY 2001.
Mechanism	Not less than 3 grants to the following: (1) a public entity, (2) a private nonprofit entity, (3) a consortium of both.
Priorities	At least one grant to each of the three different eligible entities.
Authorized activities	Broader authority that allows grantees to demonstrate innovative methods of assisting charter schools to address the costs of acquiring, constructing, and renovating facilities by enhancing the availability of loans or bond financing. Activities include: • Acquisition of interests in improved or unimproved real property (including by purchase, lease, or donation, and interests held by a third party for the benefit of a charter school). • Construction of new facilities or the renovation, repair, or alteration of existing facilities. These activities will be financed by the establishment of a reserve account set aside for the following purposes: • Guaranteeing, insuring, and reinsuring bonds, notes, evidences of debt, loans, and interests therein • Guaranteeing and insuring leases of personal and real property • Identifying potential lending sources, encouraging private lending, and other similar activities that directly promote lending to or for the benefit of charter schools • Facilitating the issuance of bonds by charter schools or by other public entities for the benefit of charter schools, by providing technical, administrative, and other appropriate assistance (including the recruitment of bond counsel, underwriters, and potential investors and the consolidation of multiple charter school projects within a single bond issue). Any earnings on funds must be deposited in the reserve fund and used for the same purposes.
Limitations	No more than 0.25 percent of the funds received by a grantee may be used for administrative purposes.
Application	Application must include: • Description of activities proposed to be undertaken • Explanation of the potential for the proposed activities to be broadly expanded or replicated and disseminated • Assurances of the involvement of charter schools in the applications development and the design of the proposed

Side-by-Side Analysis of and Rep. Goodling's School Construction Proposal for Charter Schools

	Goodling Proposal
	activities • Assurances that the applicant possesses expertise in capital market financing • Assurances that the proposed activities will leverage the maximum amount of private sector financing capital relative to the amount of government funding used and otherwise enhance credit available to charter schools • Assurances that the applicant possesses sufficient expertise in education in order to evaluate the likelihood of success of a charter school program for which facilities financing is sought
Audits	The financial records of each grantee shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and shall be subject to an annual audit by an independent public accountant.
Reports/Evaluation	Each grantee shall submit an annual report that includes: • A copy of the most recent financial statements, and any accompanying opinion on such statements by the independent auditor • A copy of any report made in relation to the annual audit • An evaluation by the grantee of the effectiveness of these Federal funds in leveraging private funds • A description of the number of charter schools served during the reporting period • A description of the characteristics of lenders and other financial institutions participating in the activities undertaken by the grantee during the reporting period Secretary shall review the reports and provide a report to Congress a comprehensive annual report on the activities conducted under this program.
Full Faith and Credit	The full faith and credit of the U.S. is not pledged to the payment of funds.
Recovery of funds	In accordance with chapter 37 of title 31, U.S.C., the Secretary shall collect: • All of the funds in a reserve account if the Secretary determines that, no earlier than 2 years after the grant was made, the entity has failed to achieve at least one of the purposes of the program • All or a portion of the funds in a reserve account if the Secretary determines that the grantee has ceased to use all or a portion of the funds to accomplish any purpose of the program

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Goodling Proposal
Funds	No amount given, but a set-aside of funds from the top of the appropriation.	\$100,000,000 authorized for FY 2001.
Mechanism	Competitive grant to State entities and private, nonprofit organizations to support innovative approaches to meeting the facilities acquisition or renovation needs of eligible charter schools.	Not less than 3 grants to the following: (1) a public entity, (2) a private nonprofit entity, (3) a consortium of both.
Priorities	No similar provision	At least one grant to each of the three different eligible entities.
Authorized activities	Carry out credit enhancement activities designed to assist charter schools in acquiring or renovating school facilities, including: • guaranteeing, insuring, or otherwise subsidizing facilities loans made to charter schools. • facilitating the development of secondary markets for charter school facilities loans • facilitating the issuance of charter school facilities bonds, such as by assisting in the underwriting of such bonds • subsidizing charter school facilities bonds, or other activities designed to enhance their commercial feasibility, such as providing bond insurance or taking other actions to reduce the risk of default on such bonds • directly issuing bonds or other debt instruments for the benefit of charter schools • assisting charter schools' efforts to borrow funds from the private sector for facilities acquisition or renovation; or • such other activities as the Secretary may determine are appropriate	Broader authority that allows grantees to demonstrate innovative methods of assisting charter schools to address the costs of acquiring, constructing, and renovating facilities by enhancing the availability of loans or bond financing. Activities include: • Acquisition of interests in improved or unimproved real property (including by purchase, lease, or donation, and interests held by a third party for the benefit of a charter school). • Construction of new facilities or the renovation, repair, or alteration of existing facilities. These activities will be financed by the establishment of a reserve account set aside for the following purposes: • Guaranteeing, insuring, and reinsuring bonds, notes, evidences of debt, loans, and interests therein • Guaranteeing and insuring leases of personal and real property • Identifying potential lending sources, encouraging private lending, and other similar activities that directly promote lending to or for the benefit of

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Goodling Proposal
		charter schools Facilitating the issuance of bonds by charter schools or by other public entities for the benefit of charter schools, by providing technical, administrative, and other appropriate assistance (including the recruitment of bond counsel, underwriters, and potential investors and the consolidation of multiple charter school projects within a single bond issue). Any earnings on funds must be deposited in the reserve fund and used for the same purposes.
Prohibited Activities	A State entity or private nonprofit organization shall not use funds to provide direct grants or loans to charter schools. A charter school may not use these funds to pay for a new facility or to pay for normal operating expenses of the school.	No similar provision
Limitations	No similar provision	No more than 0.25 percent of the funds received by a grantee may be used for administrative purposes.
Application	Application shall include: - describe how the State entity or private nonprofit organization will assist charter schools in acquiring or renovating school facilities using funds under this subsection - describe the methods that the State entity or private nonprofit organization will use in determining which charter schools will receive assistance, and how much and what types of assistance they will receive - in the case of a State entity, describe actions that the State entity has taken, or will take, to ensure that	Application must include: - Description of activities proposed to be undertaken - Explanation of the potential for the proposed activities to be broadly expanded or replicated and disseminated - Assurances of the involvement of charter schools in the applications development and the design of the proposed activities - Assurances that the applicant possesses expertise in capital market financing - Assurances that the proposed activities will

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Goodling Proposal
	charter schools within the State receive the funding they need to provide adequate public school facilities, including, if applicable-- • how the State entity will use funding under this subsection to help meet that objective; and • changes in State policy that will enable charter schools in the State to have access to adequate facilities; or • in the case of a private nonprofit organization-- • identify the State or States in which the organization will provide assistance to charter schools using funds under this subsection; and • describe the previous activities of the organization (such as experience in capital market financing to support improvements in public infrastructure or in helping charter schools with financing) that demonstrate that the organization has the experience to administer a grant under this subsection successfully; • include an assurance that the State entity or private nonprofit organization will provide funds or other assistance to a charter school under this subsection only if the State or organization finds that the projects assisted will be carried out in an economical manner; • describe how the State entity or private nonprofit organization will ensure that it, and the charter schools that it will assist under this subsection, will use the funds received under this subsection, and any funds used to match those funds, only to supplement the amount of funds that they would have used for school renovation in the absence of such funds; • describe how the State entity or private nonprofit	leverage the maximum amount of private sector financing capital relative to the amount of government funding used and otherwise enhance credit available to charter schools • Assurances that the applicant possesses sufficient expertise in education in order to evaluate the likelihood of success of a charter school program for which facilities financing is sought

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Goodling Proposal
	organization will ensure that, if it uses funds under this subsection to assist a charter school in renovating leased property, and the charter school later goes out of existence or vacates the property, other charter schools in the area, or the local educational agency, will have the opportunity to continue the lease and make use of the renovated facilities for school-related activities; and • such other information and assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require.	
Minimum Grant	No similar provision	No similar provision.
Audits	No similar provision.	The financial records of each grantee shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and shall be subject to an annual audit by an independent public accountant.
Reports/Evaluation	State progress report to the Secretary that: • Describes the implementation of this program, and how the State has met the requirements. • Identifies the specific school facilities renovated using these funds, and type of assistance provided to finance those renovations.	Each grantee shall submit an annual report that includes: • A copy of the most recent financial statements, and any accompanying opinion on such statements by the independent auditor • A copy of any report made in relation to the annual audit • An evaluation by the grantee of the effectiveness of these Federal funds in leveraging private funds • A description of the number of charter schools served during the reporting period • A description of the characteristics of lenders and other financial institutions participating in the activities undertaken by the grantee during the reporting period Secretary shall review the reports and provide a report to Congress a comprehensive annual report on the activities

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Goodling Proposal
		conducted under this program.
Full Faith and Credit	The full faith and credit of the U.S. is not pledged to the payment of funds.	Same.
Recovery of funds	No similar provision.	In accordance with chapter 37 of title 31, U.S.C., the Secretary shall collect: • All of the funds in a reserve account if the Secretary determines that, no earlier than 2 years after the grant was made, the entity has failed to achieve at least one of the purposes of the program • All or a portion of the funds in a reserve account if the Secretary determines that the grantee has ceased to use all or a portion of the funds to accomplish any purpose of the program
Clarifications		

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
Funds	No amount given, but a set-aside of funds from the top of the appropriation.	Greater of \$150,000,000 or 10% of appropriation for school construction.	\$100,000,000 authorized for FY 2001.
Mechanism	Competitive grant to State entities and private, nonprofit organizations to support innovative approaches to meeting the facilities acquisition or renovation needs of eligible charter schools.	Competitive grant to private, not-for-profit corporations, including non-profits in collaboration with State and local governmental entities.	Not less than 3 grants to the following: (1) a public entity, (2) a private nonprofit entity, (3) a consortium of both.
Priorities	No similar provision	Competitive preference given to: • Entities with mission of providing facilities and other financial support to public charter schools. • Entities with previous government support to design and implement credit enhancement programs. • Entities with expertise in capital marketing financing in non-profit sectors on behalf of multi-state programs benefiting education. • Entities with demonstrated ability to leverage maximum private sector support. • Entities that are involved with existing and developing charter schools in the State(s) to be served. • Entities with methods of involving governmental entities and other non-profits to help charter schools address facilities financing. • Entities that have the capacity to	At least one grant to each of the three different eligible entities.

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
		operate a large, broad-based, multi-state program.	
Authorized activities	Carry out credit enhancement activities designed to assist charter schools in acquiring or renovating school facilities, including: • guaranteeing, insuring, or otherwise subsidizing facilities loans made to charter schools. • facilitating the development of secondary markets for charter school facilities loans • facilitating the issuance of charter school facilities bonds, such as by assisting in the underwriting of such bonds • subsidizing charter school facilities bonds, or other activities designed to enhance their commercial feasibility, such as providing bond insurance or taking other actions to reduce the risk of default on such bonds • directly issuing bonds or other debt instruments for the benefit of charter schools • assisting charter schools' efforts to borrow funds from the private sector for facilities acquisition or renovation; or • such other activities as the Secretary may determine are	Broader authority that allows States to leverage Federal funds to obtain and renovate facilities. Activities include: • Acquisition of interests in improved or unimproved real property (including by purchase, lease, or donation, and interests held by a third party for the benefit of a charter school). • Construction of new improvements or the renovation, repair, or alteration of existing improvements. • Planning, development, and other incidental costs. • Credit enhancement activities (consistent with State and local laws): • Activities intended to enhance the availability and affordability of loans (incl. mortgage loans and refinancing loans) to or for the benefit of charter schools by: • Guaranteeing all or a portion of loans. • Insuring such loans. • Providing security for such	Broader authority that allows grantees to demonstrate innovative methods of assisting charter schools to address the costs of acquiring, constructing, and renovating facilities by enhancing the availability of loans or bond financing. Activities include: • Acquisition of interests in improved or unimproved real property (including by purchase, lease, or donation, and interests held by a third party for the benefit of a charter school). • Construction of new facilities or the renovation, repair, or alteration of existing facilities. These activities will be financed by the establishment of a reserve account set aside for the following purposes: • Guaranteeing, insuring, and reinsuring bonds, notes, evidences of debt, loans, and interests therein • Guaranteeing and insuring leases of personal and real property

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
	appropriate	loans (e.g., pledging collateral, taking title to real property). - Facilitating a secondary market for such loans. - Providing all or a portion of a downpayment, subsidizing interest payments, or directly facilitating loans. - Identifying lending sources, encouraging private lending, and other similar activities. - Activities to enhance the availability and affordability of bond financing, including: - Facilitating the issuance of bonds by charter schools or other public entities for charter schools by providing: (1) technical assistance, including recruitment of bond counsel, underwriters and investors, and helping to consolidate multiple charter school projects within a single bond issue, and (2) providing financial or other assistance to improve the rating of the	- Identifying potential lending sources, encouraging private lending, and other similar activities that directly promote lending to or for the benefit of charter schools - Facilitating the issuance of bonds by charter schools or by other public entities for the benefit of charter schools, by providing technical, administrative, and other appropriate assistance (including the recruitment of bond counsel, underwriters, and potential investors and the consolidation of multiple charter school projects within a single bond issue). Any earnings on funds must be deposited in the reserve fund and used for the same purposes.

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
		bond issue, induce participation of underwriters, or enhance the commercial feasibility of a proposed transaction. • Directly issuing bonds, notes, or pooled financing for the benefit of charter schools.	
Prohibited Activities	A State entity or private nonprofit organization shall not use funds to provide direct grants or loans to charter schools. A charter school may not use these funds to pay for a new facility or to pay for normal operating expenses of the school.	Grantees may not provide direct loans or grants to charter schools or provide funds for the ordinary operating expenses or acquisition of school materials.	No similar provision
Limitations	No similar provision	No similar provision	No more than 0.25 percent of the funds received by a grantee may be used for administrative purposes.
Application	Application shall include: • describe how the State entity or private nonprofit organization will assist charter schools in acquiring or renovating school facilities using funds under this subsection • describe the methods that the State entity or private nonprofit organization will use in determining which charter schools will receive assistance, and how	Not-for-profit applicant must include in application: • a statement identifying the proposed activities, • description of how those activities will leverage private capital and enhance credit available to charter schools, and • explanation of the potential for the activities to be replicated,	Application must include: • Description of activities proposed to be undertaken • Explanation of the potential for the proposed activities to be broadly expanded or replicated and disseminated • Assurances of the involvement of charter schools in the applications development and the design of the proposed

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
	much and what types of assistance they will receive - in the case of a State entity, describe actions that the State entity has taken, or will take, to ensure that charter schools within the State receive the funding they need to provide adequate public school facilities, including, if applicable-- - how the State entity will use funding under this subsection to help meet that objective; and - changes in State policy that will enable charter schools in the State to have access to adequate facilities; or - in the case of a private nonprofit organization-- - identify the State or States in which the organization will provide assistance to charter schools using funds under this subsection; and - describe the previous activities of the organization (such as experience in capital market financing to support improvements in public infrastructure or in helping charter schools with financing) that demonstrate that the	expanded, and disseminated, Such other information as the Secretary may require. Deadline for submission of applications is 3/31/01. Department shall make awards by 5/15/01.	activities - Assurances that the applicant possesses expertise in capital market financing - Assurances that the proposed activities will leverage the maximum amount of private sector financing capital relative to the amount of government funding used and otherwise enhance credit available to charter schools - Assurances that the applicant possesses sufficient expertise in education in order to evaluate the likelihood of success of a charter school program for which facilities financing is sought

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
	organization has the experience to administer a grant under this subsection successfully; • include an assurance that the State entity or private nonprofit organization will provide funds or other assistance to a charter school under this subsection only if the State or organization finds that the projects assisted will be carried out in an economical manner; • describe how the State entity or private nonprofit organization will ensure that it, and the charter schools that it will assist under this subsection, will use the funds received under this subsection, and any funds used to match those funds, only to supplement the amount of funds that they would have used for school renovation in the absence of such funds; • describe how the State entity or private nonprofit organization will ensure that, if it uses funds under this subsection to assist a charter school in renovating leased property, and the charter school later goes out of existence or vacates the property, other charter schools in the area, or the local educational agency, will have the		

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
	opportunity to continue the lease and make use of the renovated facilities for school-related activities; and • such other information and assurances as the Secretary may reasonably require.		
Minimum Grant	No similar provision	\$30,000,000	No similar provision.
Audits	No similar provision.	No similar provision.	The financial records of each grantee shall be maintained in accordance with generally accepted accounting principles and shall be subject to an annual audit by an independent public accountant.
Reports/Evaluation	State progress report to the Secretary that: • Describes the implementation of this program, and how the State has met the requirements. • Identifies the specific school facilities renovated using these funds, and type of assistance provided to finance those renovations.	Grantees must submit a report on their activities and providing for an evaluation of the effectiveness of their efforts within two years; annual reports thereafter. Secretary shall review the reports and provide a report to Congress identifying broader policy initiatives to address charter school facilities financing needs in a comprehensive manner.	Each grantee shall submit an annual report that includes: • A copy of the most recent financial statements, and any accompanying opinion on such statements by the independent auditor • A copy of any report made in relation to the annual audit • An evaluation by the grantee of the effectiveness of these Federal funds in leveraging private funds • A description of the number of charter schools served during the reporting period • A description of the characteristics of lenders and

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
			other financial institutions participating in the activities undertaken by the grantee during the reporting period Secretary shall review the reports and provide a report to Congress a comprehensive annual report on the activities conducted under this program.
Full Faith and Credit	The full faith and credit of the U.S. is not pledged to the payment of funds.	Same.	Same.
Recovery of funds	No similar provision.	No similar provision.	In accordance with chapter 37 of title 31, U.S.C., the Secretary shall collect: • All of the funds in a reserve account if the Secretary determines that, no earlier than 2 years after the grant was made, the entity has failed to achieve at least one of the purposes of the program • All or a portion of the funds in a reserve account if the Secretary determines that the grantee has ceased to use all or a portion of the funds to accomplish any purpose of the program
Clarifications		Grantee activities remain subject to State and local laws. Grantees do not obtain any powers of	

Side-by-Side Analysis of Department, Roemer, and Goodling School Construction Proposals for Charter Schools

	Department proposal	Roemer Proposal	Goodling Proposal
		the Federal Government (e.g., tort immunity). Grantees may acquire interests in real property.	

Proposed Changes to Rep. Goodling's Charter School – School Construction Proposal

Goodling Proposal – Section 10322 requires the Secretary “to award not less than 3 grants to eligible entities...”

Proposed Change – Delete the phrase “not less than 3”

Explanation – Having a minimum number of grantees is too rigid and may not provide the Secretary with necessary flexibility to make awards to the highest-quality applicants.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10322(b) requires the Secretary make awards to at least one of each type of eligible entity, provided that each application is of sufficient quality.

Proposed Change – Delete the requirement.

Explanation – This provision is too rigid, and may not provide the Secretary with necessary flexibility to make awards to the highest quality applicants, regardless of what type of entity they are.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10323(a) describes the application process for applicants.

Proposed Change – Delete the phrases “for a fiscal year” and “for such year”

Explanation – The program is only authorized for one fiscal year.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10323(b)(1) requires the applicant to include a statement identifying the activities proposed to be undertaken under the program.

Proposed Change – Add, at the end of the sentence, the following: “, including how the applicant will determine which charter schools will receive assistance, and how much and what types of assistance they will receive”

Explanation – This requirement would enable the Department to judge applications on the basis of the quality of their plans for selecting and providing assistance to charter schools.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10323(b)(2) requires the applicant to explain the potential for its activities to be broadly expanded or replicated or disseminated.

Proposed Change – Delete the requirement.

Explanation – There is no authorization for grantees to disseminate or replicate their activities and this is an unnecessary component of the application.

Goodling Proposal – Sections 10323(b)(3) and (4) and (5) and (6) requires the application include assurances on proposed activities and expertise.

Proposed Change – Change “assurances” to “descriptions”

Explanation – Assurances are not sufficient to ensure that the application is of high-quality or the proposed activities or expertise are sufficient to merit Federal funds. A description of the proposed activities and expertise would allow for a better determination of the quality of the application.

Goodling Proposal – Sections 10323(b) describes the required elements of the application.

Proposed Change – Add the following three required elements of the application:

“In the case of a State entity, a description of the actions that the entity has taken, or will take, to ensure that charter schools within the State receive the funding they need to provide adequate public school facilities, including, if applicable-

- how the State entity will use funding under this subsection to help meet that objective; and
- changes in State policy that will enable charter schools in the State to have access to adequate facilities.

Explanation – This requires States to develop a long-range strategy for dealing with the facilities needs of charter schools, which, over the long term, should be a State responsibility.

“A description of how the applicant will ensure that, if it uses funds under this subpart to assist a charter school in renovating leased property, and the charter school later goes out of existence or vacates the property, other charter schools in the area, or the local educational agency, will have the opportunity to continue the lease and make use of the renovated facilities for school-related activities.”

Explanation – Part of the charter school experiment is the ability of charter schools to be closed if they fail to meet the terms of their charter. If a charter school is closed, or expands in size and moves to a larger facility, other charter schools, or secondarily other public schools, should have access to the facilities improved with Federal funds. Otherwise the benefits of the facilities program would flow entirely (or almost entirely) to private landlords.

“Such other information as the Secretary may reasonably require.”

Explanation – As the Department implements a new program like this, other necessary elements may arise that should be included in the application.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10324(2) states that funds can be used for “the construction of new facilities, or the renovation, repair, or alteration of existing facilities...”

Proposed Change – Delete the phrase “the construction of new facilities, or”

Explanation – The broader School Renovation program will not pay for new construction, neither should the charter school program pay for it.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10327(b)(2) describes the required elements of reports from grantees.

Proposed Change – Add the following required element: “a description of the activities carried out by the entity to assist charter schools in meeting the objectives set forth in section 10324.”

Explanation – This would ensure that the reports submitted by grantees would include sufficient information to understand their activities and would result in a better accounting of how Federal funds are being used.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10327(8) requires the Secretary to report annually on the activities of the grantees.

Proposed Change – Change this to a periodic report.

Explanation – An annual report would be too often and too difficult to complete with any meaningful information. The Secretary should have the flexibility to determine when a sufficient amount of new information is available to make a new report advisable.

Goodling Proposal – Section 10329 allows the Secretary to collect funds from the reserve account if the grantee fails to “achieve at least one of the purposes described in section 10325(a)”

Proposed Change – Change “achieves at least one of” to “carry out ”

Explanation – This would raise the threshold, which the original proposal would set too low, and provide the Secretary with flexibility to determine if the grantee is adequately addressing the activities in 10325(a).

Technical edits:

Page 2, Line 17: “means of **enhancing credit for the** financing **of** charter...”

Page 5, Lines 10-11: “...promote lending to, or for the benefit of, charter schools.”

Page 5, Lines 13-14: “...schools, or by other public entities for the benefit of charter schools, by providing...”

Page 7, Line 2: “the effectiveness of **its use of** the Federal funds...”

Page 7, Line 4: “a **listing and** description of the ~~number of~~ charter”

Page 9, Line 8: “a public entity, **such as a State entity**”

School Modernization

The following bill language would appropriate \$1.3 billion to states under the allocation formula for title VI to fund school repair and renovation projects. Major features of the language include:

- ◆ \$50 million would be available for the Secretary to make awards to LEAs with 50% or more of Indian school children.
- ◆ The remaining \$1.25 billion would be allocated to state educational agencies (SEA). Each SEA would design a grant competition for its share of the funds considering factors such as the number of low income children and the LEA's need for repairs.
- ◆ Federal funds should provide no more than 50% of the projects costs.
- ◆ If applications in sufficient number and quality are not received by the SEA, any remaining funds would be suballocated to LEAs for any authorized activity under title VI.

INSERT: Provided further, That of such \$2,700,000,000 amount, \$1,300,000,000 shall be available, notwithstanding any other provision of law, for school renovation grants in accordance with section 307 of this Act;

Sec. 307. (a) From the amount made available for school renovation grants under the heading "School Improvement Programs" in accordance with this section, the Secretary of Education shall provide-

"(1) \$50,000,000 for school renovation and construction grants to local educational agencies (as defined in section 8013(9) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act) in which the number of children determined under section 8003(a)(1)(C) of such Act constituted at least 50 percent of the number of children who were in average daily attendance in the schools of those local educational agencies during the preceding school year, and

"(2) the remainder of such amount to State educational agencies, on the basis of the allotment formula described in section 6101(b) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, for awarding grants in accordance with subsection (b) to local educational agencies to enable them to make urgent repairs and renovations to public school facilities.

"(b)(1) A State educational agency shall award school renovation grants to local educational agencies under this section on a competitive basis that includes consideration of each local educational agency applicant's-

"(A) relative percentage of children from low-income families;

"(B) need for school repairs and renovations;

"(C) fiscal capacity; and

"(D) plans to maintain the facilities repaired or renovated under the grant.

"(2) The Federal share of any project funded under this subsection shall not exceed 50 percent.

"(3) If a State educational agency does not receive applications from local educational agencies that are of a sufficient number and quality to award all of that State educational agency's share of the amount allocated under subsection (a)(2), the State educational agency shall award the remainder of its share of those funds in accordance with title VI of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to local educational agencies for activities under such title to be determined by each such local educational agency as part of a local strategy for improving academic achievement.

0...5 R...

Trends in Schools Identified as in Need of Improvement Under Title I

- In 1996-97, state education agencies reported that they identified more than 7000 schools (16% of Title I schools) as in need of improvement under Title I. In 1997-98, that number rose to more than 9000 schools (20 percent of Title I schools). Preliminary figures for the 1998-99 school year indicates that the numbers of schools identified as in need of improvement continues to rise -- to more than 11,000 or 23 percent of all Title I schools.
- The increases in schools identified for improvement, however, are fueled by major increases in identification in a few states. For example, in 1996-97 California identified 8 percent of its schools (or 330 schools) as in need of improvement under Title I. In 1997-98 California identified 34 percent (more than 1300 schools) and in 1998-99, California identified 42 percent (more than 1600 schools) as in need of improvement. Iowa identified 4 percent of schools in 1996-97 and 46 percent in 1997-98. States such as Arizona, Georgia, Kentucky, and Maine significantly increased the numbers of schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I between 1996-97 and 1997-98. These increases may exist for a number of reasons. Some states have only recently instituted new, more rigorous assessment systems, which usually result in an initial increase in the number of schools identified as low-performing.
- Some states appear to identify a very small number and proportion of their schools for improvement under Title I. Texas, for example, with more than 4000 Title I schools in the states, identified 58 schools (1 percent) for improvement in 1998-99. In the same year, Alabama, Alaska, Colorado, Idaho, New Hampshire, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Oregon and South Dakota identified less than 5 percent of their Title I schools as in need of improvement.

Preliminary Findings from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools on Schools in Need of Improvement (1998-99)

- Schools identified as in need of improvement serve disproportionately poor and minority students. Almost half of Title I schools in need of improvement (compared to only 20 percent of all Title I schools) are schools where 75 percent or more students are minority and eligible for free and reduced price lunch.
- According to the survey, 31 percent of Title I schools identified as in need of improvement did not know what their districts considered adequate or substantial yearly progress. Urban and elementary Title I schools were much more likely than rural Title I schools or high schools in need of improvement to know what their districts considered adequate progress.
- Of those school principals that are familiar with how school performance is judged, more than a third overall, and a majority of urban principals, feel that the measures of adequate yearly progress are inadequate for judging their schools.

- Similar to findings reported in the National Assessment of Title I for the 1997-98 school year, data from the National Longitudinal Survey of Schools for the 1998-99 school year show that less than half (47 percent) of principals of schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I report that they receive additional technical assistance or professional development as a result. In general, the longer schools are identified as in need of improvement, they more likely they are to report receiving additional assistance. Sixty-two percent of principals in schools identified for more than three years reported extra assistance. However, only 30 percent of principals of schools identified for three years reported extra assistance.
- Almost a quarter of principals in schools identified as in need of improvement under Title I report that they have not implemented any additional strategies to address the issue.
- For the schools that reported receiving additional assistance as a result of identification for improvement, the majority report receiving that assistance from their school district (84 percent), the state department of education (65 percent), or school support teams (77 percent). Eighteen percent reported assistance from the U.S. Department of Education comprehensive assistance centers and 14 percent reported assistance from the Department's Regional Educational Laboratories.

school days or school years to increase learning time. Others provide learning opportunities before and after school or on the weekends. Instruction time can also be increased through greater efficiency in the use of time during the regular school day. Block scheduling, small class size, and the use of tutors and mentors are all techniques that successful schools have used to increase the efficient use of school time. Schools can also work to reduce or eliminate distractions that disrupt the school day and detract from time spent on task.

5. High-performing schools have teachers and administrators who are committed to the philosophy and mission of their schools and who have access to quality professional development that helps them achieve that mission.

In order for schools to succeed in achieving high standards, teachers need to work together as a team to fulfill the school's goals. Hiring staff who are a good match with the school's mission and philosophy is crucial. Teachers who insist on working in isolation from other teachers and from administrators will probably not be effective. In order for the whole school to reach its goals, there must be open and effective communication between teachers and administrators, as well as among teachers.

Teachers' skills are also important. If teachers lack the knowledge or experience to effectively carry out the school's mission and meet its educational philosophy, they must have access to adequate professional development to alleviate deficiencies. Schools need to create professional development programs that are aligned with the content of the curriculum, consistent with school standards, and focused on improving instruction. Ideally, professional development activities should be sustained, with follow up and monitoring to assure that teachers are putting new knowledge into practice. Teachers should also be encouraged to share what they learn from professional development activities with other teachers on their campuses.

Professional development should not be limited to teachers. School principals and administrators should also have access to professional development that will allow them to enhance their roles as instructional leaders. Of particular importance is training in how to use data to improve instruction.

6. High-performing schools have high levels of parent and community involvement.

Schools cannot do their jobs alone. Low-performing schools, in particular, need the help of parents and the community to improve student performance. Effective schools find ways to communicate regularly with parents and to involve them in their children's education. Parental involvement, however, needs to extend beyond traditional fund-raising activities and limited volunteering. Communication with parents is vital; parents need to know about and understand the school's curriculum, standards, and goals so that they can better help students prepare to do well. Successful schools encourage parents to read to and with their children, to check their homework, and to ask about their assignments. Teachers also need training in how best to work with parents to maximize instructional benefits for students.

Successful schools also form ties with the larger community. Many successful schools have formed fruitful partnerships with local businesses, colleges and universities, and cultural organizations that help students learn more and help teachers teach more effectively.

7. High-performing schools have the freedom of flexibility in curriculum design, as well as in personnel and finance.

School leaders need to have sufficient flexibility to use resources in ways that best meet the needs of their schools. Principals need reasonable freedom to hire teachers who are willing and able to adapt to the needs of the school as well as to the school's guiding philosophy. In the same way, principals should be able to reassign or fire teachers who cannot or will not adapt to meet the school's mission. School administrators who have some leeway in how they spend available funds and some flexibility in terms what gets taught and how it is taught are more likely to be able to make decisions that will enhance the performance of their schools.

SUMMARY OF SCHOOL MODERNIZATION PROPOSALS

Three critical pieces of federal legislation address public school modernization needs. In the House, Representative Rangel (D-NY) has introduced the Public School Modernization Act (H.R. 1660) and Representative Johnson (R-CT) has introduced the America's Better Classrooms Act (H.R. 1760). In the Senate, Senator Robb (D-VA) has introduced the Public School Modernization and Overcrowding Relief (MORE) Act of 1999 (S. 1454).

Each of these bills would subsidize some \$25 billion in **zero-interest school modernization bonds**. Essentially, the federal government would provide tax credits for the interest normally paid on a bond. Funds that would have gone to pay bond interest would be freed for other community needs.

- **PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION ACT (H.R. 1660)**

Sponsor: Representative Rangel (D-NY) and 172 cosponsors.

Funding: H.R. 1660 would provide \$22 billion over two years for zero-interest school modernization bonds (\$11 billion in both 2000 and 2001). This bill would also include \$400 million in school modernization bonds for Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and \$2.4 billion for expansion of the existing Qualified Zone Academy Bond program (QZAB). The QZAB program provides school modernization bonds to school districts in Empowerment Zones or in areas where at least 35 percent of the students are eligible for free or reduced price school lunch.

Allocation of Zero-Interest Bonds: The bill would give 50 percent of the bonds to the 100 school districts with the largest number of low-income students and would give the remaining 50 percent directly to states. The Secretary of Education could allocate bonds to an additional 25 school districts. All the allocations would be based on Title I funding (a poverty-based distribution).

Federal Role: States and eligible school districts would complete a comprehensive review of construction and renovation needs. State plans would include processes for allocating funds to areas with the greatest needs, including rural and high-growth areas. The federal government would simply provide a tax credit equal to the interest that would otherwise be paid on a school construction bond.

Cost to Federal Government: The five-year cost of the tax credits would be \$3.1 billion.

Davis-Bacon Requirements: H.R. 1660 would extend Davis-Bacon provisions -- which require payment of prevailing wage rates on all federal construction projects -- to projects funded through school modernization bond tax credits.

- **AMERICA'S BETTER CLASSROOMS ACT (H.R. 1760)**

Sponsor: Representative Johnson (R-CT) and 33 cosponsors.

Funding: H.R. 1760 would provide \$25 billion over two years for zero interest school modernization bonds (\$12.5 billion in both 2000 and 2001).

Allocation of Zero-Interest Bonds: H.R. 1760 would give 100 percent of the bonds to states for distribution to school districts. Half of the bonds would be distributed to states based on Title I state allocations; the remaining half would be allocated based on the number of school-age children.

Federal Role: Identical to H.R. 1660

Cost to Federal Government: Identical to H.R. 1660

Davis-Bacon Requirements: Identical to H.R. 1660

- **PUBLIC SCHOOL MODERNIZATION AND OVERCROWDING RELIEF ACT**

Sponsor: Senator Robb (D-VA), plus 18 cosponsors.

Funding: S. 1454 would provide \$23.6 billion over two years for zero-interest school modernization bonds (\$11.8 billion in both 2001 and 2005). The bill would also include \$400 million in school modernization bonds for Bureau of Indian Affairs schools and \$800 million for expansion of the QZAB program. In addition, S. 1454 would allow private for-profit corporations to issue private activity bonds for public school construction, relax arbitrage rebate rules for schools in small communities, and allow school districts to refinance construction bonds to take advantage of lower interest rates.

Allocation of Zero-Interest Bonds: S. 1454 would give 65 percent of the bonds to states based on their Title I allocation (a poverty-based distribution). States would have maximum flexibility to distribute bonds to school districts within the state. S. 1454 would give the remaining 35 percent directly to the 100 school districts with the largest number of low-income students. S. 1454 would grant the Secretary of Education authority to directly allocate bonds to 25 additional school districts.

Federal Role: Identical to H.R. 1660

Cost to Federal Government: The five-year cost of the tax credits would be \$1.3 billion. Private activity bonds would cost \$181 million over five years, arbitrage relief would cost \$25 million over five-years, and advance refunding would cost \$1.5 billion over five years.

Davis-Bacon Requirements: S. 1454 would extend Davis-Bacon protections to all projects funded under provisions of the bill.

**ESTIMATED STATE ALLOCATIONS UNDER RANGEL, JOHNSON,
AND ROBB SCHOOL MODERNIZATION PROPOSALS**

(ALL NUMBERS IN THOUSANDS OF DOLLARS)

	RANGEL (50 % for states)	JOHNSON (100 % to states)	ROBB (65 % for states)
ALABAMA	373,179	404,167	391,664
ALASKA	45,552	65,032	57,177
ARIZONA	321,189	411,796	363,217
ARKANSAS	191,361	247,618	240,892
CALIFORNIA	3,029,203	2,927,044	2,903,783
COLORADO	203,299	302,629	220,910
CONNECTICUT	195,615	256,933	212,693
DELAWARE	46,746	62,420	58,842
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	113,625	54,388	82,009
FLORIDA	1,337,671	1,176,935	1,112,815
GEORGIA	606,081	679,333	642,501
HAWAII	49,685	86,904	62,545
IDAHO	55,825	101,692	70,274
ILLINOIS	1,125,357	1,113,380	1,025,362
INDIANA	326,773	467,242	372,880
IOWA	135,205	226,474	170,200
KANSAS	154,208	220,277	174,330
KENTUCKY	344,582	388,562	392,352
LOUISIANA	596,956	538,762	592,068
MAINE	76,808	106,285	96,688
MARYLAND	351,517	395,586	319,687
MASSACHUSETTS	402,027	501,362	452,035
MICHIGAN	1,001,250	1,007,172	1,011,645
MINNESOTA	266,123	382,103	280,206
MISSISSIPPI	327,445	347,589	396,604
MISSOURI	386,832	469,682	410,518
MONTANA	62,924	86,322	79,212
NEBRASKA	82,857	138,451	104,303
NEVADA	90,274	115,143	74,837
NEW HAMPSHIRE	44,910	85,362	56,281
NEW JERSEY	526,789	623,119	533,970
NEW MEXICO	185,062	194,854	200,220
NEW YORK	2,750,541	1,934,134	2,268,847
NORTH CAROLINA	390,043	571,070	451,416
NORTH DAKOTA	46,746	61,519	58,842
OHIO	949,239	1,026,840	942,827
OKLAHOMA	270,233	307,267	292,688
OREGON	191,113	265,199	216,213
PENNSYLVANIA	1,007,919	1,082,114	1,026,208
PUERTO RICO	636,673	647,080	801,465
RHODE ISLAND	81,320	84,150	77,378
SOUTH CAROLINA	261,777	331,551	308,353
SOUTH DAKOTA	47,922	69,538	60,326

	RANGEL (50 % for states)	JOHNSON (100 % to states)	ROBB (65 % for states)
TENNESSEE	396,843	453,517	409,301
TEXAS	2,149,680	2,037,230	2,159,100
UTAH	84,796	179,227	106,743
VERMONT	43,847	57,405	54,800
VIRGINIA	317,458	482,229	362,017
WASHINGTON	285,098	447,535	337,982
WEST VIRGINIA	177,753	199,382	223,761
WISCONSIN	418,781	475,091	416,592
WYOMING	43,236	53,296	53,947
OUTLYING AREAS	42,054	50,000	50,653
BIA SCHOOLS	400,000	0	400,000
POTENTIAL RESERVE FOR ADDITIONAL DIRECT ALLOCATION TO LEAs	750,000	0	557,818
TOTAL	24,800,000	25,000,000	24,800,000

NOTE: Numbers may not add due to rounding. Distributions for Robb and Rangel prepared by U.S. Department of Education. State totals for Robb and Rangel include combined allocations to SEA, large LEAs, and QZABs. Distributions for Johnson prepared by Congressional Research Service.

School Renovation Talking Points

October 11, 2000

Based on our conversations with Chairman Specter two weeks ago, the Administration was optimistic that we could reach an acceptable compromise on school renovation. The Administration was willing to accept a State-administered program design, so long as it included strong targeting and sufficiently large grants to districts to address real renovation and repair needs. Unfortunately, the new Specter-Goodling proposal has moved in the opposite direction.

- **Funds Too Diffuse** Under the Specter-Goodling proposal, funds would be distributed to all school districts through a formula based largely on student population (Title VI). While this would ensure that all school districts received funds, the average school district would receive less than \$85,000..
- **No Targeting** Under the Specter-Goodling proposal, funds are not targeted based on need for renovation, poverty, or fiscal capacity of the school district.
- **Narrow Set of Allowable Activities** Under the Specter-Goodling proposal, renovation funds could be used for repairs to ensure the health and safety of students, to make buildings handicapped accessible, to remove asbestos, or to acquire assistive technology. This proposal does not appear to address other important needs such as repairs to roofs, electrical wiring, heating, ventilation, air conditioning, and plumbing.
- **Districts Can Opt Out** Under the Specter-Goodling proposal, school districts can elect to use their funds for any activity allowable under Title VI or IDEA instead of dedicating funds to school renovation. Because the average district will get less funding than is needed for a repair project, it is likely that many districts will be forced to abandon renovation projects in favor of providing small increments to the activities they carry out under Title VI or paying for a portion of the cost of IDEA services.
- **Private School Involvement** The Specter-Goodling proposal would allow private schools to use funds to make repairs including making buildings handicapped accessible, removing asbestos, and purchasing assistive technology.

An acceptable bill must address these key principles:

- **Distribution of funds to States should be based on poverty and distribution to districts should be based on competition.** The bill should distribute funds to States based on child poverty, the share of Title I funding States get, or some combination of these two factors. States should then hold a competition to determine which school districts will get awards. This will ensure that the neediest schools receive funds and that school districts receive enough funding to complete needed repair projects.
- **Funds should be targeted to poorest LEAs.** In the aggregate, school districts with 30% or greater poverty rates or with at least 10,000 poor children should receive, through the competition, at least an amount proportional to the amount these school districts would receive under Title I.

Administration School Renovation Proposal

- **Program should provide \$1.3 billion in federal funds for urgently needed school repairs.** Renovations to be funded through this program include repairs to roofs; heating, air conditioning, or ventilation systems; and electrical wiring.
- **A key program goal should be leveraging new money for renovation and repairs.** The Federal Government should not take on primary responsibility for financing local renovation projects. It can be most effective in helping to reduce the backlog of repair needs by providing strong financial incentives for States and localities to increase their investment in repair and renovation activity.
- **Within the \$1.3 billion program, \$50 million will be provided to LEAs with large Native American populations.** Funds should be distributed by formula to LEAs with half or more of students living on tribal lands. These funds can be used for construction as well as repairs.
- **The Administration proposed \$1.25 billion to be distributed through competitive grants and loans.** This would ensure that funds went to the neediest districts and would leverage new renovation activity. In addition, this design would allow the Federal Government to fund only the highest quality applications to address the critical need for school repair. If, the \$1.25 billion is distributed to States by formula, the program's design still must meet leveraging objectives and ensure that a significant portion of funds reach the neediest districts.
- **If the program is administered by States:**
 - **Distribution of funds to States should be based on poverty.** The bill should distribute funds to States based on poverty, the amount of Title I funding States get, or some combination of these two factors. States will then hold a competition to determine which LEAs will get awards.
 - **States that don't apply for funds will have their allocations redistributed.** The Bill should require that States that don't apply for funds for school renovation should return their funds to the Department of Education to redistribute to other States.
 - **Funds should be targeted to poorest LEAs.** In the aggregate, LEAs with 30% or greater poverty rates or with at least 10,000 poor children should receive an amount proportional to the amount these LEAs would receive under Title I.
 - **States and localities should demonstrate that funds will supplement not supplant State and local school renovation efforts.** The bill should include a supplement not supplant provision.
 - **Matching requirement for new State and local funds should be determined on a sliding scale.** If States require a uniform match from every district, the poorest districts may not participate. The matching requirement should be set such that the poorest districts provide little or no match while the wealthiest districts are required to provide a larger match. To meet the program goal of stimulating new investment, matches must be made with new money. That is, a State or district should spend more on school repair than they had in past years.
 - **Funds should go to State entity that is responsible for financing education facilities.** Our experience with QZABs strongly suggests that not all SEAs are qualified to operate this program effectively. Funds should be allocated to the State agency that has responsibility for school repair and modernization.

- **Program should provide funds for urgently needed school repairs.** This program should include repairs needed to improve the ability of students to learn in their school environment, including repairs to roofs; heating, air conditioning, or ventilation systems; and electrical wiring.
- **States that don't apply for funds will have their allocations redistributed.** The bill should require that States that don't apply for funds for school renovation return their funds to the Department of Education to redistribute to other States. States and districts should not be able to opt out of addressing needed school repairs.
- **Federal contribution should be used to leverage State and local funds for school renovation.** This should include both a strong supplement not supplant provision and a matching requirement.
- **Private school eligibility raises serious issues.** There are significant constitutional questions surrounding aid to private schools. In addition, funding for private school infrastructure (as compared with improving services to private school students) sets a problematic precedent.
- **Other Issues**
 - School renovation funds should go to the State entity that is responsible for financing education facilities.
 - Bill should not mandate funding of every charter school that is an LEA. Instead, it could require States to address charter school renovation need as part of their State plan.