

Education—Goodling

PHOTOCOPY
PRESERVATION



**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Nov. 17, 1999

**CONTACT: Becky Campoverde
or Dan Lara
(202) 225-4527**

CC Barbara
Brookrick
Andy
Eric
+ return

**Public School Choice Scheduled to Become Federal Law for
First Time through Education Spending Bill**

WASHINGTON – House Education and the Workforce Committee Chairman Bill Goodling (R-PA) announced today that the House, Senate and White House budget negotiators have agreed to accept a public school choice provision for Title I students trapped in failing schools. The provision is part of the Fiscal Year 2000 Labor-HHS-Education spending bill. An additional \$134 million has been added to the FY 2000 Education Department appropriations package to help local educational agencies (LEAs) meet the new parental choice option, as well as to improve low performing Title I schools.

Goodling pushed to have the public school choice provision added during last minute budget negotiations. A similar provision was included in the Student Results Act (H.R.2) that passed the House on October 21, 1999 and is pending in the Senate.

"Republicans in Congress have been looking forward to this day for years. School choice is finally poised to become a reality for thousands of students stuck in substandard learning environments. This is a significant step forward for Title I parents and their children," Goodling said. "For the first time, school districts must give parents the choice of taking their children out of schools that are identified as in 'school improvement' or in 'corrective action'. Parents will now be able to move their children to another public school or charter school that is not in school improvement or corrective action."

The federal Title I program provides over \$8 billion to help improve the performance of the most educationally disadvantaged students. A school is considered in school improvement if it fails to make adequate yearly progress under Title I guidelines over two consecutive years. Nationally, about 7,000 Title I schools are currently in school improvement.

Chairman Goodling thanked the President, House and Senate Labor, HHS and Education Appropriations Subcommittee chairmen Rep. John Porter (R-IL) and Sen. Arlen Specter (R-PA) for working with him on this agreement, as well as on the revisions to the President's class size reduction initiative that make the final package more acceptable. Once signed by President Clinton, the new school choice provision would take effect beginning in the 2000-2001 academic school year.

###

The school choice provision in the Labor/HHS/Education appropriations bill is attached.

**School Choice Provision
in the
FY 2000 Labor/HHS/Education Appropriations Bill**

"Provided further, That \$134,000,000 shall be allocated among the States in the same proportion as funds are allocated among the States under section 1122, to carry out section 1116 (c):
Provided further, That 100 percent of these funds shall be allocated to local educational agencies for the purposes of carrying out section 1116 (c) and that local educational agencies shall provide all students enrolled in a school identified under section 1116 (c) with the option to transfer to another public school within the local educational agency, including a public charter school, that has not been identified for school improvement under section 1116(c): Provided further, That if the local educational agency demonstrates to the satisfaction of the State educational agency that the local educational agency lacks the capacity to provide all students with the option to transfer to another public school, and after giving notice to the parents of children affected that it is not possible, consistent with state and local law, to accommodate the transfer request of every student, the local educational agency shall permit as many students as possible (who shall be selected by the local educational agency on an equitable basis) to transfer to a public school that has not been identified for school improvement under section 1116(c)."

THU 15:06 FAX

002

12410
L GOODLING
DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

CHAIRMAN:
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND
THE WORKFORCE

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

TOLL FREE DISTRICT NUMBER:
800-632-1811

<http://www.house.gov/goodling/>



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-3819

313941
ROOM 2107
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
TELEPHONE: (202) 225-5836

DISTRICT OFFICES:
FEDERAL BUILDING
200 SOUTH GEORGE STREET
YORK, PA 17405-9999

140 BALTIMORE STREET
ROOM 301
GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2311

2020 YALE AVENUE
CAMP HILL, PA 17011-5456

August 4, 1999

William J. Clinton
The President of the United States
The White House Office
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20500-0005

Dear Mr. President: *President*

(2) UC -
Goodling
Case
AUG 11 PM 6:31

This will be a lengthy letter. I hope you will have time to read it, and I hope you will have time to personally respond. I really don't want any response from the Department or from any of your advisors. If you don't have time to do it, please don't have anyone else respond.

I've worked hard to try to help you with your education legacy (just as I did with your predecessor), but I don't understand who the people are that advise the presidents, because in both cases I haven't been very successful. I know it isn't the Secretary, but I don't know who may get your ear on education matters. You constantly put the cart before the horse, and I've tried to get that message across.

When you came up with your testing idea, I tried to make it abundantly clear that you first have to help the 50 percent who have been told a thousand times, every time they have taken a standardized test, a state test, a local test, and a teacher's test, that they aren't doing very well. We didn't have to spend a hundred million dollars to tell that group one more time that they're not doing very well. If we had a hundred million dollars to spend, we had to find a way to help them to do better and then test them.

Then you decided, for some unknown reason, 18 in a classroom is a magic number. Again, you put the cart before the horse. Unless you have quality teachers to go into center city and rural America to fill the teaching jobs created by smaller classes, you've really done nothing to improve the academic standing of the needy children. The most recent grants that you've sent out to foster this notion have no accountability attached to them at all. They didn't have to show you how this class size reduction improved the academic standing of all children. In fact, there wasn't anything to cause them to have teachers in the classroom that can read and write. As you know, Governor Wilson got on this kick before you did (he spent \$2 billion), and the result is that there are now more than 30 percent totally unqualified teachers in center city Los Angeles.

INCOMING LETTER
THAT CORRESPONDS W/
ANDY ROTHERHAM'S DRAFT
RESPONSE

Again, if you look at our Teacher Empowerment Act that we passed in the House, you will see that we are trying to help you, because we give them the opportunity at the local level to help those who have the potential to become good teachers to do just that. We have high accountability standards so that the district (if they are to get a 5 year contract) has to show how every child has improved academically.

I'm not sure where the number 18 came from in the first place. Most of the research that I've seen said that if you can't get down to 13-14 students in a classroom, you probably aren't going to make much of a difference. However, more importantly, if you can't put a quality teacher in that classroom you have accomplished nothing, except to have spent a lot of money foolishly. You're very well aware of the past history of the sisters in parochial schools who had 30-45 students in their classrooms. Those sisters were the best-educated and the most dedicated that one could find, and they were completely in charge of the classroom.

You sent a Reading Excellence Bill (I think you called it "America Reads," but we changed it to Reading Excellence), and it contained nothing that would help you to reach your goal. I asked you if 40 percent of the fourth grade students can't read at the fourth grade level, wouldn't the first thing you would look at be teacher preparation to teach reading? We added that. I then said that the literacy of the parents has a lot to do with the child's ability to learn, and we added a preschool family literacy program so that the parent could be the child's first and most important teacher. Fortunately, rather than veto it, you took credit for it, which was fine with me.

I hope you will look very carefully at our Teacher Bill now, before someone tells you to veto it, and find a way to take credit for it so that we can help those children most in need to succeed in life.

Sincerely,



BILL GOODLING
Member of Congress

Goodling Response Draft

The Honorable Bill Goodling

This is in response to your letter of August 4th regarding teacher quality, class size, and voluntary national testing. I was disappointed to receive your letter and could only conclude that you fail to see the linkage between the investments that my administration has made in research-based practices and efforts to increase accountability in our public school system. Since 1992 we have put forward complementary proposals to raise standards for students and teachers, invest in what works, and ensure that all children are learning the skills they will need in the New Economy. Every education investment I have proposed has been linked to the crucial issue of raising student achievement. Unfortunately, rather than work with us on this effort, it appears that many continue to support proposals that would undermine national on this important issue.

As you know, my administration is committed to improving teacher quality and reducing class-size. I believe that pitting these issues against each other creates a false choice. We can improve teacher quality while reducing class-size. My proposal for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act consolidates several existing programs into the Teaching to High Standards initiative. This initiative will support state and local efforts to align curricula and assessments with challenging standards, provide sustained and high-quality professional development for teachers in the core academic content areas, and provide support for new teachers in the crucial first 3 years in the classroom.

Moreover, this past July, the Department of Education provided \$43 million in grants to raise teacher quality and address teacher shortages in high-need areas. Twenty-four states received grants to support stronger teacher certification and licensing standards, alternative certification, and accountability measures for institutions that train teachers. Twenty-eight grants were also given to support partnerships between universities and school districts to attract qualified new students into teaching and reduce shortages and turnover in high need areas.

To complement these efforts, my ESEA proposal also calls for sustaining our commitment to reducing class size in the early grades. As you are aware, substantial research indicates that smaller class sizes are one of the most direct and effective ways to improve academic achievement. Last year, acting on both research and common sense, Congress came together and passed a bipartisan initiative to help reduce class-size in the early grades. . In addition, so that the program is responsive to the varying needs of states and localities, the Department of Education has granted waivers to jurisdictions desiring additional flexibility with this funding. Despite this, I am disappointed to see that rather than building on this historic commitment, less than a year later some on Capitol Hill are trying to undermine this program.

Investments to raise teacher quality and lower class size will help improve academic achievement; however, I don't believe that investments alone are the answer. That is why I have repeatedly worked to introduce more accountability into our education system. All of the

investments I have called for are designed to help give students the tools they need to reach high academic standards. These standards however are meaningless if success against them is not measured. This is why I proposed voluntary national testing in 4th-grade reading and 8th-grade math. Parents intuitively know that in our New Economy their children will need a higher level of skills to be successful and they want to know whether public schools are teaching their children these skills. I don't agree with your assertion that there is nothing to be learned from an assessment of this nature. To the contrary, for the first time it would allow parents to accurately compare the achievement of their children with children in other schools, communities, and states. A voluntary national test of this nature would be a valuable diagnostic, curricular, and accountability tool.

Over the past 34 years the Elementary and Secondary Education Act has been a vehicle for national leadership to improve education for disadvantaged students, raise standards, and help states and local school districts meet the myriad challenges that they face. I am proud of what my administration has accomplished and our continuing to improve and modernize ESEA. This is why attempts to undercut national leadership on important issues such as standards-based reform, raising teacher quality, and reducing class size are so troubling. I hope that as we reauthorize ESEA we can work together to strengthen research-based national efforts to improve schools rather than waste valuable time on unproven schemes. Our nation's school children deserve no less.

99 AUG 17 PM 4:58

THE WHITE HOUSE
WASHINGTON

August 23, 1999

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JANET MURGUIA *jm*
SUBJECT: CONGRESSIONAL CORRESPONDENCE

Eric -
Can you send
Karen T. a draft
of the note you
proposed? Thanks BR

Attached for your review is a letter from Rep. William F. Goodling (R-PA) concerning education reform and the Teacher Empowerment Act.

*Brud
feed
How should
he reply?
Tom*

BILL GOODLING
19TH DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

CHAIRMAN:
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND
THE WORKFORCE

COMMITTEE ON
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

TOLL FREE DISTRICT NUMBER:
800-632-1811
<http://www.house.gov/goodling/>



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-3819

313941
ROOM 2107
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
TELEPHONE: (202) 225-5836

DISTRICT OFFICES:
FEDERAL BUILDING
200 SOUTH GEORGE STREET
YORK, PA 17405-9999

140 BALTIMORE STREET
ROOM 301
GETTYSBURG, PA 17325-2311

2020 YALE AVENUE
CAMP HILL, PA 17011-5456

August 4, 1999

William J. Clinton
The President of the United States
The White House Office
1600 Pennsylvania Avenue NW
Washington, D.C. 20500-0005

Dear Mr. President:

This will be a lengthy letter. I hope you will have time to read it, and I hope you will have time to personally respond. I really don't want any response from the Department or from any of your advisors. If you don't have time to do it, please don't have anyone else respond.

I've worked hard to try to help you with your education legacy (just as I did with your predecessor), but I don't understand who the people are that advise the presidents, because in both cases I haven't been very successful. I know it isn't the Secretary, but I don't know who may get your ear on education matters. You constantly put the cart before the horse, and I've tried to get that message across.

When you came up with your testing idea, I tried to make it abundantly clear that you first have to help the 50 percent who have been told a thousand times, every time they have taken a standardized test, a state test, a local test, and a teacher's test, that they aren't doing very well. We didn't have to spend a hundred million dollars to tell that group one more time that they're not doing very well. If we had a hundred million dollars to spend, we had to find a way to help them to do better and then test them.

Then you decided, for some unknown reason, 18 in a classroom is a magic number. Again, you put the cart before the horse. Unless you have quality teachers to go into center city and rural America to fill the teaching jobs created by smaller classes, you've really done nothing to improve the academic standing of the needy children. The most recent grants that you've sent out to foster this notion have no accountability attached to them at all. They didn't have to show you how this class size reduction improved the academic standing of all children. In fact, there wasn't anything to cause them to have teachers in the classroom that can read and write. As you know, Governor Wilson got on this kick before you did (he spent \$2 billion), and the result is that there are now more than 30 percent totally unqualified teachers in center city Los Angeles.

Again, if you look at our Teacher Empowerment Act that we passed in the House, you will see that we are trying to help you, because we give them the opportunity at the local level to help those who have the potential to become good teachers to do just that. We have high accountability standards so that the district (if they are to get a 5 year contract) has to show how every child has improved academically.

I'm not sure where the number 18 came from in the first place. Most of the research that I've seen said that if you can't get down to 13-14 students in a classroom, you probably aren't going to make much of a difference. However, more importantly, if you can't put a quality teacher in that classroom you have accomplished nothing, except to have spent a lot of money foolishly. You're very well aware of the past history of the sisters in parochial schools who had 30-45 students in their classrooms. Those sisters were the best-educated and the most dedicated that one could find, and they were completely in charge of the classroom.

You sent a Reading Excellence Bill (I think you called it "America Reads," but we changed it to Reading Excellence), and it contained nothing that would help you to reach your goal. I asked you if 40 percent of the fourth grade students can't read at the fourth grade level, wouldn't the first thing you would look at be teacher preparation to teach reading? We added that. I then said that the literacy of the parents has a lot to do with the child's ability to learn, and we added a preschool family literacy program so that the parent could be the child's first and most important teacher. Fortunately, rather than veto it, you took credit for it, which was fine with me.

I hope you will look very carefully at our Teacher Bill now, before someone tells you to veto it, and find a way to take credit for it so that we can help those children most in need to succeed in life.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Bill", with a stylized flourish at the end.

BILL GOODLING
Member of Congress