



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

600 Independence Avenue, S.W. - Portals
Washington, D.C. 20202-6100

Telephone: 202-401-0113 - Fax: 202-205-0303

FAX TRANSMITTAL

Date: 4/11/96Number of Pages Including Cover Sheet: 2Telephone Number of Receiving Fax Machine: 401-4353

ADDRESSEE:

Bill Kincaid

Organization: _____

Telephone # : _____

FROM:

Catherine Jovicich

Organization: _____

Telephone # : 202-401-0039

MESSAGE:

Hope this helps!

GOALS 2000 - TITLE III
1994 and 1995 Allocations; 1996 Request

October 13, 1995

STATE	FY 1994 Revised Allocation (Without NH and VA)	FY 1995 Allocation (Post-Rescission)	FY 1995 President's Budget
TOTAL (52 STATES)	91,480,000	358,251,300	686,200,000
ALABAMA	1,601,966	\$5,941,766	\$11,572,558
ALASKA	459,903	1,547,345	3,130,816
ARIZONA	1,382,358	5,450,582	10,277,500
ARKANSAS	991,579	3,650,495	7,023,053
CALIFORNIA	10,524,929	42,111,705	80,142,675
COLORADO	1,085,028	4,288,514	7,991,435
CONNECTICUT	960,721	3,480,756	6,410,202
DELAWARE	405,701	1,291,544	2,508,180
FLORIDA	4,026,309	15,861,034	29,959,483
GEORGIA	2,360,625	8,959,402	17,343,379
HAWAII	417,148	1,381,641	2,683,114
IDAHO	457,585	1,568,397	3,010,795
ILLINOIS	4,142,656	15,992,571	30,427,858
INDIANA	1,734,498	6,557,145	12,806,626
IOWA	886,746	3,219,618	6,279,588
KANSAS	864,615	3,193,916	6,292,585
KENTUCKY	1,477,200	5,775,274	11,305,908
LOUISIANA	2,066,082	7,968,128	15,587,462
MAINE	505,886	1,647,540	3,135,968
MARYLAND	1,448,309	5,379,938	10,212,398
MASSACHUSETTS	1,881,814	6,990,859	12,799,068
MICHIGAN	3,626,515	14,371,488	27,809,890
MINNESOTA	1,387,624	6,377,078	10,357,667
MISSISSIPPI	1,359,616	5,094,972	9,949,682
MISSOURI	1,691,289	6,525,935	12,494,769
MONTANA	449,712	1,560,150	2,984,944
NEBRASKA	567,422	1,986,104	3,699,538
NEVADA	410,095	1,419,062	2,656,339
NEW HAMPSHIRE	0	1,290,294	2,512,007
NEW JERSEY	2,447,997	8,792,536	16,120,432
NEW MEXICO	741,603	2,762,261	5,334,775
NEW YORK	7,173,261	27,112,286	52,006,386
NORTH CAROLINA	2,062,239	7,745,087	14,818,939
NORTH DAKOTA	406,274	1,340,576	2,574,879
OHIO	3,715,308	14,833,684	29,085,459
OKLAHOMA	1,153,998	4,396,613	8,526,264
OREGON	1,046,640	4,012,392	7,750,101
PENNSYLVANIA	4,074,763	15,529,194	29,487,680
RHODE ISLAND	442,261	1,480,004	2,778,682
SOUTH CAROLINA	1,274,631	4,710,359	9,201,687
SOUTH DAKOTA	426,975	1,412,549	2,675,165
TENNESSEE	1,677,460	6,387,802	12,221,909
TEXAS	7,293,999	29,228,278	55,523,058
UTAH	709,092	2,587,039	4,993,422
VERMONT	406,722	1,272,847	2,505,857
VIRGINIA	0	6,658,924	12,609,058
WASHINGTON	1,581,128	6,328,974	12,386,966
WEST VIRGINIA	778,396	2,799,269	5,671,958
WISCONSIN	1,682,771	6,582,097	12,878,364
WYOMING	370,124	1,262,907	2,501,972
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	476,600	1,523,409	2,730,354
PUERTO RICO	2,383,988	9,608,968	18,491,188

Deepest Federal Cuts Since 1981 Proposed for Education

By WILLIAM CELIS 3d

In the deepest cuts proposed for education spending in more than a decade, the nation's public school students, particularly those in cities, would lose many popular remedial and supplemental educational programs unless they found the means to pay for them themselves.

Among the programs in danger of being cut along with \$1.4 billion in Federal aid to public education are supplemental lessons in math and science, bilingual programs and programs designed to eliminate violence and drugs in schools.

The programs were included among the \$17.3 billion in cuts in a measure approved on Thursday by the House and soon to be considered by the Senate. The cuts would affect 500,000 students, according to a survey by the Council of Great City Schools, a lobbying group representing the nation's 50 largest urban systems.

Another 451,183 students would lose free or reduced meals now paid for by the Agriculture Department and nearly 3,500 teachers, the survey projected, would lose their jobs unless those programs are paid for at the state or local level.

"These cuts don't make a whole lot of sense to me," said Michael D. Casserly, the executive director of the Council of Great City Schools. "We and a lot of other people are going to try to stop this."

Republicans face a tough challenge in getting their bill through the Senate, and even if they succeed,

President Clinton may veto the measure.

Although the proposed cuts represent just 10 percent of all Federal spending on education, many school officials said urban schools, which already educate the poorest and neediest of the country's students, will disproportionately bear the cuts at a time they can ill afford to do so.

Republicans acknowledged that the cuts would be painful but said that they were the reductions were necessary to trim Government spending and reduce the Federal debt, both of which were components of the Republicans' Contract With America.

Under the House measure, the single biggest Federal education program — the \$6.7 billion Title I, designed to help disadvantaged students reach grade level in reading and math — was cut by \$140.3 million. The program has come under mounting criticism in recent years as being ineffective.

Although Title I enjoyed success since its introduction in 1965, when it was known as Chapter 1, an independent group of educators established to study the program said in a 1992 report that it was now failing students and needed to be overhauled.

It is still too early to determine how a pared Title I program would unfold in public schools.

The Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, which is part of the Education Department, saw its \$245.2 million

budget reduced by \$38.5 million in the House measure. Bilingual education has come under intense opposition in recent years. As immigrant children have flooded American public schools, an English-only movement has flourished in opposition to such programs.

"Some of this is political," said Dr. Eugene Garcia, the director of the Office of Bilingual Education. "That's the reality."

Other education cuts approved by

*Schools will have
find the money to
pay for programs
they want to keep.*

the House included:

• \$472 million from the Safe Schools and Drug Free Act, which would leave only \$10 million for the widely popular program that sent money to states and schools to devise ways of controlling weapons and drugs among students.

• \$173.5 million from Goals 2000, the Clinton Administration's \$403.4 million education legislation designed to help states improve curriculums among things.

• \$100 million from the \$320.3 million Eisenhower professional development program, which trains

More...

DEEPEST CUTS, continued...

teachers in math and science.

\$78.4 million from the \$1.18 billion vocational education program.

\$12.5 million from the \$125 million school-to-work transition program.

Not since the Reagan Administration in 1981 proposed a 25 percent cut in government spending that was later reduced by Congress to about 12 percent have education programs been so deeply affected. Now, school officials say, the reductions threaten what little fiscal stability urban school districts have.

While Federal financing accounts for only 7 percent of a local district's total budget, on average, education analysts say the proposed cuts, combined with state and local budget problems ultimately will affect urban schools the most. For example, New York City, the nation's largest school system with 1.1 million students, faces more than \$600 million in budget cuts because of gaps in both city and state budgets.

In New York City, the mood in schools was one of uncertainty given that the Senate and the President have yet to act. But several teachers at Public School 2 in Manhattan's Chinatown said that in a neighborhood that theirs, students need the extra boost to help them make the transition from newly arrived immigrants to productive citizens.

"We need this money because the children keep coming," said Lai-Ying Lee, a bilingual education teacher for the second and third grades.

George Fleming, the director of government relations for the Seattle public schools, estimates that his district could lose \$2 million to \$3 million under the proposed cuts.

"It's not that we're against balanced budgets and efficiencies, but at the same time we don't want to disproportionately share the responsibility of balancing the budget," Mr. Fleming said.

INVESTING OR "DISINVESTING" IN EDUCATION?

BUDGET PROPOSALS IN CONGRESS FISCAL YEARS 1995 AND 1996

The following is a summary of very significant proposals working their way through Congress that will have profound effects on educational opportunity for America's students in the school years 1995 - 1996 (Fiscal Year 1995) and in 1996 - 1997 (Fiscal Year 1996) .

THE BASICS FOR BETTER EDUCATION FOR AMERICA'S STUDENTS	HOUSE COMMITTEE PROPOSAL TO <u>TAKE BACK</u> (RESCIND) EDUCATION FUNDING - FOR 199 5 - 1996	PRESIDENT'S BUDGET PROPOSAL TO <u>INVEST IN</u> QUALITY EDUCATION - FOR 199 6 ¹ - 1997
HELP MAKE SCHOOLS SAFER AND DRUG-FREE (Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act)	100% CUT (-\$482 million)	\$18 MILLION INCREASE
RAISE STANDARDS OF ACHIEVEMENT, DISCIPLINE, AND LEARNING SO THAT ALL CHILDREN WILL BE PREPARED FOR THE 21ST CENTURY (Goals 2000: Educate America Act)	40% CUT (-\$163 million)	\$347 MILLION INCREASE
PROMOTE PARENT INVOLVEMENT IN SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT (Parent Resource Centers)	100% CUT (-\$10 million)	PRESERVES FUNDING
PROVIDE ONGOING, CONTINUOUS TRAINING FOR TEACHERS (Eisenhower Professional Development Program)	19% CUT (-\$60 million)	\$415 MILLION INCREASE
HELP CHILDREN IN DISADVANTAGED SCHOOLS LEARN TO READ, WRITE AND DO MATH WELL (Improving America's Schools Act, Title I)	2% CUT (-\$105 million)	\$300 MILLION INCREASE
GIVE GREATER EMPHASIS TO WORK-STUDY AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION FOR HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS (Tech Prep)	100% CUT (-\$108 million)	EXPANDS PROGRAM THROUGH REORGANIZATION
PROVIDE STUDENTS ACCESS TO COMPUTERS AND TECHNOLOGY IN THE CLASSROOM (Technology Education Act)	75% CUT (-\$30 million)	\$43 MILLION INCREASE
EXPAND FINANCIAL AID FOR DESERVING COLLEGE STUDENTS (Student loans and grants)	ELIMINATES STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANTS (-\$63 million)	INCREASES MAXIMUM PELL GRANT FROM \$2,340 TO \$2,620 AND PROVIDES \$10,000 TAX DEDUCTION FOR COLLEGE

"Our students may be only 20% of the population, but they are 100% of our future."
(Richard Riley, U.S. Secretary of Education)

¹The President's proposal includes a modest overall increase of 3.8% for education and keeps the federal budget deficit in check. It also includes streamlining and consolidating programs to reduce costs to invest in high-priority reforms.

HOUSE RESCISSIONS TO 1995 DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION BUDGET
(dollars in thousands)

	<u>1995 Approp.</u>	<u>House Subcommittee Rescission</u>	<u>Percent Change</u>
<u>Elementary and Secondary Programs</u>			
Goals 2000	\$403,400	\$173,530	-43%
School-to-Work Opportunities	125,000	12,500	-10%
Title I Grants to LEAs	6,698,356	105,000	-2%
Eisenhower Prof. Dev. State Grants	320,298	60,000	-19%
Safe and Drug-Free Schools	481,962	481,962	-100%
Inexpensive Book Distribution	10,300	5,300	-51%
Arts in Education	12,000	6,000	-50%
Education for Homeless Children & Youth	28,811	28,811	-100%
Education for Native Hawaiians	12,000	12,000	-100%
Training in Early Childhood Education	13,875	13,875	-100%
Family and Community Endeavor Schools	11,100	11,100	-100%
Special Programs for Indian Children	14,342	2,000	-14%
Bilingual Education Instructional Services	155,690	38,500	-25%
<u>Vocational and Adult Education</u>			
Tech-Prep Education	108,000	108,000	-100%
Vocational Education National Programs	34,535	34,535	-100%
Adult Education Literacy Programs	45,990	45,990	-100%
<u>Postsecondary Education</u>			
State Student Incentive Grants	63,375	63,375	-100%
State Postsecondary Review Program	20,000	20,000	-100%
Direct Loan Administration/FFEL Transition	345,000	47,000	-14%
Nat. Hawaiian/Alaska Native Culture and Arts	1,000	1,000	-100%
Urban Community Service	13,000	13,000	-100%
Student Financial Aid Database/Information Line	496	496	-100%
Federal TRIO Programs	463,000	11,200	-2%
Postsecondary Scholarships & Fellowships	112,030	54,522	-49%
Howard University	206,463	4,300	-2%
College Housing and Academic Facilities Loans	1,190	490	-41%
<u>Technology and Improvement</u>			
Educational Technology	40,000	30,000	-75%
Star Schools	30,000	30,000	-100%
Ready to Learn Television	7,000	2,700	-39%
Telecommunications Demonstration for Math.	2,250	2,250	-100%
Javits Gifted and Talented Education	9,521	4,600	-48%
National Diffusion Network	14,480	2,700	-19%
International Education Exchange	3,000	3,000	-100%
Public Library Construction	17,792	15,300	-86%
Library Research and Demonstrations	6,500	6,500	-100%
Other program rescissions		223,602	
Total Rescissions:		\$1,675,138	

REDUCTIONS IN MAJOR EDUCATION STATE GRANT PROGRAMS UNDER HOUSE-PROPOSED RESCISSION BILL

State	Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants	Goals 2000	Eisenhower Prof. Develop. State Grants	Title I	Education for Homeless Child. & Youth	Tech-Prep Education	State Student Incentive Grants	Total Reduction In State Aid	State
Alabama	\$7,506,839	\$2,366,125	\$1,001,811	\$1,962,344	\$525,737	2,155,167	\$942,619	\$16,480,842	Alabama
Alaska	2,229,544	608,601	297,000	231,538	100,000	223,491	100,632	\$3,788,806	Alaska
Arizona	6,487,092	2,076,599	855,000	1,537,483	410,990	1,784,340	1,068,117	\$14,219,821	Arizona
Arkansas	4,492,073	1,438,813	599,773	1,170,353	315,063	1,245,878	400,801	\$9,662,554	Arkansas
California	49,770,887	16,480,731	6,594,024	11,468,085	3,065,202	11,442,882	9,733,052	\$108,554,863	California
Colorado	5,182,413	1,638,285	692,662	1,023,919	274,508	1,395,210	865,042	\$11,072,039	Colorado
Connecticut	4,128,214	1,348,376	558,394	816,074	217,942	965,289	824,966	\$8,859,255	Connecticut
Delaware	2,229,544	508,285	297,000	239,300	100,000	261,555	169,008	\$3,802,692	Delaware
Florida	19,007,117	6,127,674	2,537,460	4,362,576	1,165,842	4,909,200	1,982,676	\$40,092,545	Florida
Georgia	11,106,766	3,469,757	1,483,224	2,582,297	700,842	3,187,484	1,100,104	\$23,630,474	Georgia
Hawaii	2,229,544	541,535	297,000	302,571	100,000	413,649	260,304	\$4,144,603	Hawaii
Idaho	2,229,544	614,534	297,000	342,955	100,000	592,338	212,142	\$4,388,513	Idaho
Illinois	19,856,819	6,316,855	2,624,862	4,952,695	1,323,895	4,348,819	3,423,963	\$42,647,908	Illinois
Indiana	8,156,638	2,606,324	1,091,478	1,696,799	455,286	2,664,228	1,266,888	\$17,937,641	Indiana
Iowa	4,067,495	1,287,658	548,882	788,496	213,157	1,290,492	681,081	\$8,877,261	Iowa
Kansas	3,811,881	1,253,970	514,709	811,761	218,855	1,083,923	701,971	\$8,398,870	Kansas
Kentucky	7,172,209	2,293,687	958,260	1,956,378	522,902	1,965,417	773,697	\$15,642,550	Kentucky
Louisiana	10,110,318	3,168,401	1,352,290	2,971,054	794,207	2,280,301	901,974	\$21,576,545	Louisiana
Maine	2,229,544	645,930	297,000	387,094	107,130	551,264	227,058	\$4,445,020	Maine
Maryland	6,638,325	2,093,125	886,820	1,325,220	358,712	1,581,800	1,155,421	\$14,039,423	Maryland
Massachusetts	8,240,235	2,714,818	1,106,775	1,814,715	504,735	1,867,655	2,036,889	\$18,285,822	Massachusetts
Michigan	17,680,559	5,663,816	2,359,036	4,745,395	1,268,026	4,034,454	2,618,534	\$38,369,820	Michigan
Minnesota	6,652,727	2,088,972	890,858	1,270,609	345,461	1,782,572	1,225,101	\$14,256,300	Minnesota
Mississippi	6,468,360	2,017,781	862,392	1,955,082	522,603	1,471,027	536,216	\$13,833,461	Mississippi
Missouri	8,166,309	2,562,053	1,086,868	1,791,663	479,610	2,241,209	1,251,956	\$17,579,668	Missouri
Montana	2,229,544	611,537	297,000	387,249	105,545	415,417	174,647	\$4,220,939	Montana
Nebraska	2,427,794	785,598	324,440	383,607	115,657	702,260	454,191	\$5,193,547	Nebraska
Nevada	2,229,544	543,102	297,000	287,467	100,000	465,839	172,785	\$4,095,737	Nevada
New Hampshire	2,229,544	505,898	297,000	243,584	100,000	402,671	220,829	\$3,999,526	New Hampshire
New Jersey	10,870,039	3,423,052	1,457,882	1,817,330	586,086	2,380,865	1,661,411	\$22,198,665	New Jersey
New Mexico	3,436,610	1,075,570	459,548	928,069	248,085	830,355	321,585	\$7,299,822	New Mexico
New York	33,823,401	10,673,761	4,512,771	9,216,055	2,577,033	5,730,930	5,354,743	\$71,888,694	New York
North Carolina	9,522,373	2,987,703	1,281,386	1,968,032	540,010	3,229,083	1,375,741	\$20,904,328	North Carolina
North Dakota	2,229,544	525,415	297,000	259,874	100,000	316,974	169,706	\$3,898,513	North Dakota
Ohio	18,676,767	5,852,194	2,483,241	4,717,752	1,260,747	4,825,508	2,511,570	\$40,327,779	Ohio
Oklahoma	5,526,746	1,729,445	733,951	1,311,882	351,075	1,622,260	853,060	\$12,128,419	Oklahoma
Oregon	4,588,094	1,574,049	614,107	1,035,442	276,792	1,295,572	813,719	\$10,197,775	Oregon
Pennsylvania	18,997,290	6,089,063	2,551,170	4,761,351	1,273,705	4,575,789	2,784,079	\$41,032,447	Pennsylvania
Rhode Island	2,229,544	580,323	327,910	283,018	100,000	381,683	338,844	\$4,241,322	Rhode Island
South Carolina	5,961,448	1,870,168	800,223	1,428,855	384,018	1,895,876	685,319	\$13,025,907	South Carolina
South Dakota	2,229,544	553,694	297,000	271,141	100,000	345,052	179,827	\$3,976,258	South Dakota
Tennessee	8,012,502	2,494,193	1,066,049	1,879,422	509,960	2,404,437	1,025,748	\$17,392,311	Tennessee
Texas	35,376,892	11,404,143	4,705,628	9,079,245	2,427,382	8,408,912	3,455,623	\$74,857,825	Texas
Utah	3,201,044	1,018,770	427,181	508,349	135,753	1,148,208	470,665	\$6,909,970	Utah
Vermont	2,229,544	498,961	297,000	227,767	100,000	254,111	159,104	\$3,766,487	Vermont
Virginia	8,335,477	2,606,724	1,113,482	1,362,201	415,494	2,537,886	1,349,210	\$17,720,474	Virginia
Washington	7,499,718	2,459,063	1,002,750	1,547,874	413,654	1,980,767	1,437,405	\$16,341,231	Washington
West Virginia	3,586,658	1,125,001	478,669	1,090,463	294,045	966,885	460,090	\$8,001,811	West Virginia
Wisconsin	8,240,236	2,588,548	1,110,305	1,921,825	514,498	2,179,902	1,321,143	\$17,877,457	Wisconsin
Wyoming	2,229,544	495,084	297,000	242,346	100,000	223,680	98,430	\$3,686,084	Wyoming
D.C.	2,229,544	597,665	297,000	310,700	100,000	168,844	461,427	\$4,165,180	D.C.
Puerto Rico	12,109,055	3,806,473	1,482,789	3,972,641	1,061,945	2,110,285	566,318	\$25,109,506	Puerto Rico

Impact of Education Rescissions on Selected Programs

House Appropriations Committee Proposal

Safe and Drug-Free Schools/FACES	1
Goals 2000	7
Title I State Grants/Evaluation	13
Education of Homeless Children and Adults	17
National Challenge Grants for Technology/Star Schools	23
Bilingual Education	28
Eisenhower Professional Development	31
Tech Prep/School to Work/Vocational and Adult Education	33
SSIG	44
TRIO	46

Source: Department of Education

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES

1995 Appropriation: \$482 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$482 million

Program Purpose

The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (SDFSCA) replaces the previously authorized Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (DFSCA). The Safe and Drug-Free Schools program is the Federal Government's primary vehicle for providing school-aged youth with a wide range of drug and alcohol prevention programming and violence prevention programming. It provides Governors, State educational agencies (SEAs), and local educational agencies (LEAs) considerable discretion in the types of programs and activities they can engage in. Program development is based upon their assessment of the problem and the resources available to address the problem.

The SDFSCA also authorizes National Programs, a broad discretionary authority that permits the Secretary to carry out, in accordance with his priorities, programs to prevent drug use and violence. Such programs may include training, demonstrations, direct services to schools districts with severe drug and violence problems, program evaluation, and information development and dissemination. The program also provides funds to institutions of higher education for drug and alcohol prevention and violence prevention programming.

Improvements made through authorization:

The SDFSCA was authorized by the Improving America Schools Act, and contains the following improvements over the former DFSCA:

- Adds violence prevention as a key element of the programs. LEAs will have the flexibility to design their own violence prevention programs, which could include comprehensive school safety strategies, coordination with community agencies, implementation of violence prevention activities such as conflict resolution and peer mediation, and (subject to a 20 percent cap) the installation of metal detectors and hiring of security guards.
- Targets resources to where they are most needed. States will determine criteria for selecting high-need LEAs and target 30 percent of their LEA funding funds to those districts.

- Increases accountability. States and LEAs will be required to assess needs and measure program outcomes and to use this information to formulate policies and program initiatives.
- Broadens the range of authorized prevention activities. LEAs will be authorized to implement a broader range of prevention activities, including mentoring, community service and service learning projects, conflict resolution, peer mediation, character education, acquisition of metal detectors, and hiring of security personnel.

Performance measures and evaluation findings:

A study, examining changes in the field of drug prevention following implementation of the first 2 years of the DFSCA, found that States reported the following positive changes:

- increases in the number of school districts with formal prevention programs (52 States/territories)
- increases in school-community collaboration on drug prevention issues (50 States/territories)
- increases in parent involvement in drug education efforts (49 States/territories)
- increases in the degree of community involvement in prevention programs for youth (46 States/territories)
- increases in the number of high-risk youth served in drug education programs (38 States/territories).

Overall Impact

The rescission, if implemented, will have the following effect:

- the reduction or elimination of violence prevention and drug prevention programs serving approximately 39,000,000 students in 94 percent of local educational agencies around the Nation.
- the reduction or elimination of drug and violence prevention programming on dozens of college campuses.
- the elimination, in every State, of Governor's drug and violence prevention programs for youth not served by local educational agencies or for children and youth who need special services or additional resources.

- the elimination of training and technical assistance to schools in the area of violence prevention and drug and alcohol prevention. Currently, only a handful of States provide such training and technical assistance.
- elimination of the development and distribution of publications on school violence and drug/alcohol prevention, which have been the cornerstone of the Department's effort to provide schools with information on models and effective practices. The Parent's Guide on Drug Prevention has been requested by over 30 million persons. A Guide to the Selection of Conflict Resolution Curricula, which is currently being developed, would be curtailed -- as would other publications on early childhood development and alcohol use among teenagers and a series of information packets on violence prevention.
- elimination of assistance and model development in area of alternatives to expulsion. With expulsion rates increasing dramatically in some communities, it is essential that we provide leadership and direction in this area, or we will find that many kids will go from the schoolhouse to the courthouse.

Specific Examples

The following are some examples of the impact on local school districts:

VIRGINIA

- In Fairfax County (VA) Public Schools, almost all violence and drug-prevention programming would be eliminated. Three staff positions would be lost. (This loss comes on the heels of the elimination of 7 prevention specialists in 1994 because of cuts in the DFS Program); parent training, professional development for staff and a drug-free rally involving 9,000 youth would be eliminated; all-day inservice training on violence prevention for middle school counselors would be canceled; intervention seminars on alcohol and drugs involving students and parents would be eliminated; and the district would not be able to afford coordinators for its school/community partnerships program.

At the building level, the following programs would be eliminated: peer mediation at Rocky Run Middle School; a self-esteem program at Riverside Elementary School; planning for Robinson Secondary School's Teen Center; home visits at apartment complexes by counselors who work with students; and the violence prevention programs for students at risk of being expelled in Glasgow Middle School.

IOWA

- The Council Bluffs (IA) School District currently receives approximately \$56,000 in DFSCA funds. These funds are used for: purchase of classroom drug prevention material; teacher and staff training; partial salaries for police officers in four schools; peer mediation and conflict resolution training; elementary school counselors; and an alternative school for 14 high- risk students who would otherwise be expelled.

At the building level, Thomas Jefferson High School would be forced to eliminate or severely curtail the following programs/activities: drug and violence prevention classes; school security officer; program that sends high school students to elementary schools to make prevention presentations and serve as role models; and other activities such as teacher training.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY ENDEAVOR SCHOOLS PROGRAM

1995 Appropriation: \$11 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$11 million

Program Purpose

The Family and Community Endeavor Schools Act (FACES), part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994, authorizes grants to improve the overall academic and social development of at-risk children in communities that are experiencing significant poverty and violent crime.

Grants will be awarded on a competitive basis to local educational agencies or community-based organizations to develop or expand a variety of programs serving the comprehensive needs of students, including:

- homework assistance and after-school programs, including educational, social, and athletic activities;
- nutrition services;
- mentoring programs;
- family counseling; and
- parental training programs.

The FACES program was announced in the Federal Register along with the Community Schools Program (HHS), on March 6, 1995. ED and HHS have been working closely together on implementing the two programs. Since the two programs are similar, and in order to concentrate resources on communities with the greatest need and reduce burden on applicants, the two programs will: use the same selection criteria and application form; allow applicants to apply separately for either program or jointly for both programs using a single application; and employ a uniform evaluation.

Performance measures and evaluation findings:

As this is the first year of operation for this program, there are no evaluation findings. However, research findings support the concept of the FACES and Community Schools Programs. Two community school programs that have demonstrated success are:

CALIFORNIA

- California Healthy Start. This program, which began in 1991, funds 40 local collaborative agencies to implement comprehensive, integrated, school-linked

services. Each site has tailored its project to its needs. The program has had some impressive results. In projects that have an employment-related goal, there was a 14 percent decrease in the number of individuals who were not employed, and student grades increased. Students in grades K-12 with the lowest GPAs had the largest increase, from 1.26 to 1.47.

NEW YORK

- The Children's Aid Society's Community Schools Program is part of New York City's Beacon School Program. In this program, 37 schools have been turned into community schools. The schools are open both before and after the traditional 9 to 3 school day. A wide range of services are offered to youth and their families at the community schools. The program has resulted in improved attitudes regarding property (graffiti and destruction of property are almost non-existent); and attendance rates and test scores are higher at the community school than at a demographically similar school.

Overall Impact

While no projects have yet been funded under the Family and Community Endeavor Schools Act, the prospect of Federal support for this type of program has generated a significant amount of interest. To date, ED and HHS have received either calls for applications or letters of intent to apply for funding from more than 5,000 groups and organizations. The combined FACES and Community Schools Program could turn out to be the most popular competition run by HHS or ED. Loss of the program would not only mean the loss of the opportunity to fund approximately 40 FACES programs but also the opportunity to get local schools and private non-profit organizations to begin to collaborate, work closely together, and share resources, all in the name of providing support to children and youth.

GOALS 2000 -- TITLE III STATE FORMULA GRANTS

1995 Appropriation: \$371,870,000

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$142,000,000

Program Purpose

Goals 2000 formula grants to States support the development and implementation of comprehensive plans to improve schools. Funding supports bottom-up reform featuring high standards for all students and broad participation in education reform. Goals 2000 is designed to facilitate a State's own individualized school improvement activities, capitalizing on existing reforms, and furthering local district and school level efforts. Support is provided for the development and implementation of plans that address standards, assessment, curriculum, professional development, governance, and parental involvement among other aspects of education reform that are identified by States and localities.

Goals 2000 funding is directed through States; the bulk of the funds, however, flow through to the local districts and to schools. Ninety percent of the 1995 funds proposed for rescission would flow directly to local districts and schools for teacher professional development and retraining and local school reform planning. At least 50 percent of the funds provided by districts to individual schools must be made available to schools with special need for assistance as indicated by a high number or percentage of students from low-income families.

Overall Impact

States and school districts have already begun planning for the use of the 1995 funds. An estimated 4,000 fewer schools (out of a total of 16,000 originally projected) would receive the seed money they need to implement reforms based on challenging academic standards. Absent the funding, much needed improvements in professional development, curriculum, parent involvement, and various other aspects of school improvement will not be available.

Specific examples of States' Use of FY 1994 Goals 2000 Funds

KANSAS

- The Lawrence School District is using Goals funds to develop a variety of assessment tools to help its schools more accurately describe student performance in relation to its high academic standards.

MICHIGAN

- Michigan's school reform legislation requires that school districts adopt a challenging core curriculum that outlines what students should learn in math, science, history, geography, economics, and American Government. To advance local efforts to meet this requirement, Michigan is using some of its Goals 2000 subgrants to support curriculum and standards development in a process that more actively involves parents, the business community, institutions of higher education, and other concerned citizens.

PENNSYLVANIA

- Pennsylvania has awarded \$250,000 of its Goals 2000 funding to the Philadelphia School District to develop "community school clusters" within Philadelphia to provide the schools and their supporting communities with more freedom from local rules in designing their teaching and learning curriculum in return for more responsibility for improved student achievement in the schools. Among the innovations being considered are: a longer school day and extended times for school services to adults as well as children from the local community.

FLORIDA

- St. Lucie County Goals 2000 funds will support creation of innovative schools in high-poverty areas to serve as "break-the-mold" models for the district.

DELAWARE

- Training will help school leadership teams in Seaford learn how to revise and align their curricula with the State's new standards, how to make "participatory management" work, and how to involve parents in school decisions.

MASSACHUSETTS

- Massachusetts is using Goals 2000 funds to support the start-up costs of 15 charter schools.

GOAL 2000 - TITLE IV PARENTAL ASSISTANCE

1995 Appropriation: \$10,000,000

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$10,000,000

Program Purpose

Title IV authorizes the establishment and funding of resource centers to provide training, information, and support to parents of children aged birth through the age at which they complete secondary school. The centers are expected to increase parents' knowledge and confidence in child-rearing and help parents enhance their children's development. The centers also can provide activities for individuals who work with parents, to strengthen partnerships between parents and professionals in meeting the educational needs of children and improving the relationship between home and school. Grants can be made to non-profit organizations and consortia comprised of non-profit organizations and local educational agencies through a competitive process.

Funding will be provided to urban and rural areas as well as areas with high concentrations of low-income families. Grantees will address the needs of parents of preschool children by funding a project component based on the Parents as Teachers program or Home Instruction for Preschool Youngsters program. Parents of minority and limited-English proficient children will be a particular focus of center activities.

Overall Impact

Connecting families and schools is an integral part of the Goals 2000 education reform strategy to help all children achieve to higher standards. The Parent Resource Centers would provide information, training, and support to improve the connection between parents and schools in at least 44 communities throughout the country. Hundreds of schools and thousands of parents in those communities that would otherwise be able to access more information about ways in which they could support their children's learning will not be served. The lack of resources that would be provided by Parent Centers will diminish the results that could be obtained.

Specific Examples

More than 250 organizations, schools, and individuals have requested that they be put on a mailing list to receive information and an application to apply for Parent Center grants.

**GOALS 2000 - TITLE III
NATIONAL LEADERSHIP**

1995 Appropriation: \$21,530,000

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$21,530,000

Program Purpose

National leadership funding will be used to:

- 1) provide school improvement grants to urban and rural districts;
- 2) provide technical assistance to States, local districts developing or implementing school improvement plans;
- 3) support a peer review process to assist States and advise the Secretary on State reform plans, as required by law;
- 4) gather data, conduct research and evaluate education improvement efforts and how such improvements affect student learning;
- 5) disseminate research findings and other information on outstanding examples of education improvement efforts in States and local communities through dissemination systems;
- 6) provide grants to State education agencies and local districts to develop and field test assessments that can judge student progress toward reaching State and local academic standards;
- 7) support national demonstration and model projects that unite local and State education agencies, institutions of higher education, government, business, and labor, in collaborative arrangements to make educational improvements system-wide; and
- 8) provide technical assistance through organizations with nationwide networks that help parents and others work with schools on behalf of their children.

Overall Impact

Successful State and local education reform efforts have proven just how difficult it is to reform schools to significantly improve student achievement. The National Leadership funds in Goals 2000 are the primary source of funds to provide technical support to help States, districts and schools successfully implement reforms to help all children reach challenging academic standards. In the absence of these funds, there will be little direct Federal support for these efforts and poor districts, often the districts that most need assistance with reform, will be left on their own to try to overhaul their schools.

Overall Impact on Urban and Rural Program

We anticipate that approximately 100 urban and rural education agencies will apply for funding under this program; the Department anticipates awarding grants to approximately 40 districts. Funding will be made available through grants and contracts to States, non-profit organizations, and to districts. Funding will be available to all school districts whether or not the State has received Goals 2000 funding and will provide an opportunity for the local school districts to develop and implement local reform plans.

The Secretary recognizes that LEAs with high concentrations of economically disadvantaged or limited-English proficient students share similar problems. In order to maximize the impact of these resources, this program is designed to document the key activities associated with the development and implementation of local reform plans that the funded urban and rural districts participated in so that similar districts may replicate not only consensus building processes but state-of-the-art programs.

Specific Examples

Technical assistance and peer review: These funds would support activities such as regional and national conferences where States and school districts would have the opportunity to meet with colleagues from other parts of the country to discuss model programs and approaches to improving student achievement. The peer review panels, made up of business people, teachers, State education experts and others, are required by law to review State plans and advise the Secretary on the quality of the plans. National leadership specifically provides funds for this required review of State plans. Plans must be approved for States to receive additional funds under Goals 2000, to receive waivers from specific statutory and regulatory requirements, and to participate in the Ed Flex Demonstration Program, through which the Secretary delegates waiver authority to the States.

Assistance to economically disadvantaged school districts: This is a new program. Based upon experience with other programs, we know that districts with high concentrations or large numbers of economically disadvantaged or limited-English proficient students are least likely to receive a grant through the State subgrant process. It is also likely that the specific needs of the high poverty districts will not be addressed by many States since these problems do not reflect the needs of the State as a whole.

Assessment Grants: The Department anticipates awarding 16 grants to consortia of States and local education agencies to speed up the development of new assessments. Without these new assessments, States will have difficulty in adequately judging student progress.

TITLE I GRANTS TO LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES

1995 Appropriation: \$6.698 billion

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$105 million

Program Purpose

Title I Grants to LEAs provides supplemental financial assistance to almost all school districts in the country, and to about 50,000 schools, especially in high-poverty areas. Funds help improve the teaching and learning of at-risk children to enable them to master challenging curriculum and learn to high academic standards expected of all children. Federal formula funds are allocated to States, who suballocate funds to school districts. Within districts, funds go to schools with the highest proportions of children from low-income families.

Evaluation Findings

- Title I has improved basic reading and mathematics skills of the lowest-achieving school-children in the Nation, and has helped close the learning gap between those children and their peers. With the help of Title I, for example, the achievement gap between black and white 9-year olds' narrowed over the past two decades by 18 percent in math and 25 percent in reading. Even so, prior to reauthorization, the program was not structured to help disadvantaged children make the kind of progress necessary to meet internationally competitive standards.
- The educational needs of disadvantaged children, especially in high-poverty schools, are growing. Evaluations show that children in high-poverty schools are held to lower expectations than children in other schools, and they are more likely to fall behind in the early school grades and never catch up. For example: first graders in poor schools start school scoring 27 and 32 percentile points lower in reading and math, respectively, than other school-children, and the initial gap widens in both grades 4 and 8. In addition, eighth-graders in poor schools are 57 percent more likely to leave school by grade 10 than are students in other schools.
- Administrative costs for Title I are comparatively modest: States retain not more than 1 percent of the funding for State administration; school districts use only 4-10 percent of local Title I funds for district administration. According to a recent GAO study, districts devote a greater percentage of Title I funds to classroom instruction (73 percent) than they do with other district funds (62 percent).

Improvements Resulting from the Reauthorization

- Shifts the program from providing remedial instruction to bring low-achieving students up to minimal levels of competency to a new focus on helping Title I children achieve to the same challenging academic standards that other children are expected to meet.
- Integrates Title I with wider State and local education reforms that stress challenging curriculum and instruction linked to high standards, and eliminates unnecessary testing of Title I children by requiring that States use their own assessment systems instead of a separate Title I assessment system.
- Gives teachers, principals, and parents more control over decisions about how program resources are used, so that each school's program operates in a way that reflects local needs and conditions and will most help its children make the most progress.
- Promotes "schoolwide programs" that allow schools to combine Title I funds with other Federal, State, and local programs to provide more comprehensive approaches to meeting the needs of at-risk children.

Impact of the Rescission

- Decreases LEA allocations on average by about 1.6 percent, which would deprive approximately 100,000 at-risk children of special services designed to help them to achieve to challenging academic standards.
- Dilutes momentum for implementing reforms in the reauthorized program that:

MASSACHUSETTS

Enrich and accelerate learning opportunities for disadvantaged children so that they are able to meet internationally competitive standards. **Example:** All students in grades 6-8 at the Accelerated Learning Laboratory (ALL) School, in a high-poverty area of Worcester, Massachusetts, attend five-week intensive seminars and laboratories that find creative ways of teaching complex skills in math, social sciences, and other curriculum areas. Title I funds support a Higher Order Thinking Skills (HOTS) laboratory, and the school's reform agenda calls for a technology magnet school, multi-grade "clusters," and an alternative grading system that evaluates student portfolios and awards certificates to students for mastering standards that are described by leading professional organizations and the State.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Narrow the gap between the lowest-achieving children and other children, and between high- and low-poverty schools. **Example:** After its first year as a Title I schoolwide project, the test scores of fourth and fifth graders at Ronald E. McNair Elementary School, in a poor, crime-ridden urban area of North Charleston, South Carolina, rose from the 1st percentile to the 25th percentile. Since then, the school's ranking has moved from the lowest of the middle range of comparable schools in the district. Title I funds also support summer programs to give extra help to students who score poorly on district tests.

CALIFORNIA

Involve parents more centrally in the education of their children. **Example:** In Fresno, California, the district built Balderas Year-Round Elementary School to serve a new and growing transient, multicultural student population, most of whom are limited English proficient. The school's Title I schoolwide program provided impetus for the school to reach out to parents who are predominantly Asian, Hispanic, and African American. Approximately 80 percent of the parents attend two English classes offered at the school and monthly parent workshops; school-to-home communications are routinely translated into five languages. The effort helped the school reduce its transiency rate by one quarter from its first to second year; in 1993, it had the best student attendance rate in the district, and garnered recognition in Redbook magazine as one of the 177 best schools in the country.

ARIZONA

Focus on early intervention strategies that may help prevent school failure. **Example:** Ganado Primary School in Arizona enrolls approximately 450 children in grades K-2, almost all of whom are from poor Navajo families. About 58 percent of students entering school for the first time have limited English proficiency; and 23 percent speak neither English nor Navajo fluently. Ganado's literacy intervention program targets the lowest 20 percent of first-grade readers. After one year in the program, most students advanced to the level of top-achieving readers. Ganado also uses Title I funds to provide counseling programs for students and families that address topics such as drug prevention, addiction, co-dependency, parenting, marriage, and other family issues.

TITLE I EVALUATION

1995 Appropriation: \$8 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$8 million

Program Purpose

Title I is a \$7 billion program aimed at helping at-risk children -- the largest Federal program in elementary and secondary education. Evaluations provide the independent information that members of Congress, Department officials, and taxpayers need to know about the educational impacts and improvements resulting from this important program. The previous national assessment of this program identified major program weaknesses and resulted in substantial congressional changes and set the stage for significant improvements in schools' and students' performance.

The evaluation request is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Title 1 budget -- a reasonable amount for tracking progress and identifying problems.

Overall Impact

Eliminating funding for Title I evaluation would mean:

- **No independent, objective evaluation of Title I.** The rescission would eliminate funding for evaluations of Title I's impact on the academic success of six million disadvantaged students served.
- **Congressional Title 1 evaluation mandates not met.** The Secretary is required to evaluate the impact of changes in Title I, as required by section 1501, Part E, Title I and section 14701, Part G, Title XIV. The first mandated report to Congress is due January 1, 1996.
- **GPRA requirements not met.** The Department could not meet performance measurement requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) for its largest elementary and secondary program.

EDUCATION FOR HOMELESS CHILDREN AND YOUTH

1995 Appropriation: \$28.8 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$28.8 million

Program Purpose

The purpose of this program is to provide formula grants to the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico and reserve funds for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Outlying Areas, to enable them to provide all homeless children and youth equal access to the same free, appropriate public education, including preschool education, as provided to other children and youth. SEAs and LEAs receiving subgrants are required to review and revise any policies that may act as barriers to the enrollment, attendance, and success in school of homeless children and youth. SEAs must establish or designate an Office of Coordinator of Education of Homeless Children and Youth and develop and implement a State plan to carry out the purposes of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act.

Evaluation Findings and Performance Measures

- According to Congresswoman Louise Slaughter, a leading advocate in Congress for the homeless, since the implementation of the McKinney Act, attendance rates for homeless children and youth in school have jumped from over 50 percent to over 80 percent.
- Since the implementation of this program, 27 States have undertaken legislative reform to eliminate State residency laws or regulations that act as barriers to the enrollment of homeless children and youth in school.

Improvements Made Through Reauthorization

- **Focus on comprehensive, high-quality services for homeless children and youth.** Refocuses program on enabling all homeless children to achieve to the same high standards expected of all children by: making those who need it eligible for Title I services; eliminating current law's focus on remedial education; and allowing funds to be used for tutoring, supplemental instruction, and enriched educational services.
- **Elimination of distinction between "primary" and "related" activities.** Thirty-eight States report that the high cost of transporting homeless children and youth to and from school is among the top three barriers to their enrollment in school. With the elimination of the distinction between "primary"

and "related" activities during the 1994 reauthorization, local agencies can choose to target more funds on transportation services, reducing a major obstacle to the enrollment and success in school of homeless children and youth.

- **Greater role for parents.** To the extent feasible, LEAs are required to comply with a parent or guardian's request to enroll a homeless child in a particular school.
- **Encouragement for provision of preschool services.** The reauthorized program encourages services to preschool children by authorizing the use of funds for early childhood programs and by requiring States to ensure that homeless children have equal access to public preschool programs.
- **Increased minimum funding amount.** The minimum grant award to States was increased from \$50,000 to \$100,000.

Overall Impact

- Although homeless children and youth's enrollment in school has improved significantly since the implementation of the McKinney Act, 23 percent of identified homeless children and youth are still not enrolled in school. Gains in attendance rates can be expected to drop with a rescission as States and localities will lack the essential Federal resources to ensure that all homeless children and youth enroll in and succeed in school.
- With a rescission, States will lose funding for the Office of the Coordinator of Education of Homeless Children and Youth. The Coordinator is often the leading advocate for homeless children and youth in the State and the primary source of information and authority on issues related to homelessness. Coordinators have worked successfully to reduce the more egregious barriers to enrollment posed by State policies on residency, school records, immunizations, and guardianship.
- Services, such as before- and after-school tutoring and transportation, that help minimize disruptions in homeless children and youth's education would end if funding for this program is terminated.

Specific Examples

WASHINGTON, DC

- The District of Columbia Coordinator maintains a student data base of homeless children and youth in the school system to identify homeless children and monitor their progress in school. The Coordinator works with the Department of Human Services to obtain shelter rosters to locate homeless children and visits shelters on a weekly basis to identify such children and youth. During fiscal year 1994, D.C. disseminated back-to-school packets to homeless students and implemented a bus token program to assist in paying transportation costs. D.C. also provided resources to parents, including a handbook listing service providers and educational resources for homeless families, and information regarding the necessary documentation and immunizations required to register their children in school.

MASSACHUSETTS

- In Massachusetts, the State Coordinator worked with public and private agencies in the Boston area to establish a child care center for homeless children. The Center serves 40 families in Boston's poorest neighborhoods. The Coordinator also worked with the Massachusetts Coalition for the Homeless to publish and distribute a statewide directory of homeless services, which also includes detailed descriptions of the educational and legal rights of homeless children and youth.

LITERACY TRAINING FOR HOMELESS ADULTS

1995 Appropriation: \$9,498,000

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: - \$9,498,000

Program Purpose

This discretionary program, authorized by the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act, provides assistance to State educational agencies to plan and implement, either directly or through contracts or subgrants with a variety of providers such as local educational agencies, homeless shelters and/or, community-based organizations, a program of literacy training and basic skills for adult homeless individuals.

Programs must meet the literacy and life skills needs of the specific homeless target groups to be served. Programs must be accessible and encourage provision of instructional services at a shelter or transitional housing site.

Homeless adults receiving services are making progress, but still function at a relatively low level. As a result of this program, as of 1992:

- 4 in 5 participants accomplished one or more personal goals.
- 3 in 5 advanced from Level I competency (applied basic skills) to Level II (Secondary Education).
- 2 in 5 obtained or improved their employment.
- About 1 in 10 got off welfare, registered to vote for the first time, and/or obtained a driver's license.

Overall Impact

- This program currently funds 28 States' efforts to provide education services to homeless adults and families. The program serves over 50,000 homeless adults each year.
- The proposed rescission would eliminate direct educational services to these 50,000 homeless adults and, in turn, would severely limit the opportunities that they have to improve their life circumstances through improved educational skill development.

- The Administration has proposed consolidating the adult homeless program into a flexible State grant program. Eliminating this program before the consolidation occurs would mean that most if not all of the current homeless programs will not be there for States to continue to build on in fiscal year 1996.

Program Descriptions:

The following are examples of programs that would not be funded if the rescission were implemented:

- **KANSAS** -- This grant, funding eight local programs through 25 shelter sites and a mobile learning unit, serves more than 1,000 homeless families with children, including pregnant women. All sites have collaborated with family support programs (including Even Start, Head Start, Kansas Parents as Teachers, and Chapter I preschool programs) in order to provide more comprehensive services to homeless children as well as adult homeless clients.

Project objectives include the delivery of basic skills instruction, coordination of services, data collection, and program-related improvement. In addition to one-on-one individualized learning sessions and group sessions, this project includes an experiential learning approach. Learners visit local businesses and learn vocabulary, interpersonal skills, community information, business operations, employment practices, and consumer skills in the context of their use.

The project is managed through a team approach. An Instructional Team addresses approach, methodology, staff development, and curriculum. Additional teams, including six Interagency Teams and a Statewide Evaluation Team, ensure extensive outreach, maximization of local resources, and evaluation for program improvement.

- **FLORIDA** -- This project provides instructional services to an estimated 3,000 homeless adults and social services, through referral, to an estimated 5,000 homeless adults. In addition to basic skills, life skills, and pre-vocational preparation, self-esteem and social skills are addressed through a program of individualized instruction.

All funded projects incorporate cooperative relationships for comprehensive support to the homeless. For example, Emergency Housing has provided immediate allowances for families whose members are full-time students and shelters have agreed to let homeless individuals stay for free for as long as six months if they are enrolled in classes. Public utilities have granted

waivers and reduction of deposits for student families moving into apartments. Public health care facilities, hospitals, and mental health programs have given preference to homeless students. Unions are accepting homeless learners into apprenticeship programs.

NATIONAL CHALLENGE GRANTS FOR TECHNOLOGY IN EDUCATION

1995 Appropriation: \$27 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$27 million

Program Purpose

Challenge grants will enable communities accross the country to transform their schools into information age learning centers. They will use the information superhighway and powerful new technologies to improve student achievement in core academic subjects; they will enhance the professional development of teachers; they will support greater parent and community involvement in education; and they will smooth the school to work transition by developing the skills needed to compete in an information age economy. But as we move into the information age, we must guard against a future in which low income neighborhoods and other areas with the greatest need for technology are left behind in the acquisition of knowledge and skills needed for productive citizenship. A failure to include these communities will put their future, the future of the country, at risk. Challenge grants will provide the seed money to support alliances of educators, industry partners, and community leaders who are developing creative responses to the information age learning requirements of all children, including those from low income communities and other areas with the greatest need for access to new technologies.

Research and evaluation studies support Challenge grant objectives: Students increase their academic performance, students increase their mastery of vocational and workforce skills, classroom behavior improves, and students work more effectively in collaborative groups, when new technologies are integrated into the curriculum;

- Research also demonstrates that teachers are able to deliver more individualized instruction, they are able to revise their curriculum to bring rich sources of new information and experience into the classroom, they have more opportunities to collaborate with their colleagues on instructional improvements, and they gain new tools to manage information about student performance.
- Studies show that parents will use new forms of telecommunication to communicate more effectively with teachers in support of their child's studies, and that they are eager to use these new technologies to bring high quality learning activities into the home.

- A recent survey finds that only three percent of our classrooms are linked to the Internet. Without these Challenge grants, the abundant learning resources available on the information superhighway will remain out of reach for most of our students, teachers, and parents.

Overall Impact of Rescission

Approximately 20 grants will be made in this first year of the Challenge grant competition. The typical grant would be \$1 million a year, with three or four grants ranging between \$2 and \$3 million a year. The total value of matching commitments by consortium members is expected to significantly exceed the amount of the grant, so that the combination of the grant and matching commitments will make it possible for low income communities to leverage significant resources for their schools. It is estimated that, at a minimum, 20 school districts and 50,000 children in low income neighborhoods and high need communities would benefit from Challenge grants during the next school year.

U. S. Secretary of Education Richard W. Riley has said that if these Challenge grants are cut, it will be a clear message to low income children --- "you can't get on the Information Superhighway."...."It will be absolutely impossible to educate the coming generation of young people to high standards of excellence without their access and use of the National Information Infrastructure. "The Speaker of the House has billed himself as a man of the future, someone who understands and values technology and its important role in education. He has said that 'We must bring technology into the classroom and radically rethink our education system.' Well, words are one thing and actions are another. Eliminating our technology budget is not what I call planning for the future or developing a way to 'bring technology into the classroom'."

Specific Examples

NEW JERSEY

- At Union City, New Jersey, at the Christopher Columbus Middle School in a poor, urban, Latino community, technology has been used to turn the school into a success story, with a challenging curriculum, improved test scores, and increased attendance.

PENNSYLVANIA

- In Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, high school students are using the Internet to learn science, mathematics, and foreign languages, and across the State, the Reading School District is developing plans to bring new technologies into the classroom.

IOWA

- North High School in Des Moines, Iowa, with support from Drake University, is using the Internet to access some of the best libraries in the world for student research.

WISCONSIN

- In Wisconsin, the School District of Mauston has plans to link local schools with colleges and universities to give K-12 students access to rich new learning resources.

ALBUQUERQUE

- In Albuquerque, New Mexico, at the Eugene Field School, parents can use the computer center in the evening and on weekends to work with their children on school projects.

If the Challenge grant competition is cut, tens of thousands of children will not have the chance to learn with these new technologies in their communities, and we will lose the opportunity to use these powerful new resources to improve their education.

STAR SCHOOLS

1995 Appropriation: \$30 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$30 million

Program Purpose

The Star Schools Program provides quality instruction to public and private school children through distance education technologies. Since the program began in 1988, Star Schools projects have served more than 10,000 schools in 48 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. More than 200,000 students and 30,000 teachers have participated in instructional programming and staff development activities.

To deliver services, projects use many distance education technologies--satellite delivery systems, open broadcasts, cable fiber optics, microcomputers, digital compression, interactive videodiscs, and the Internet communication system. Projects offer instructional modules that can be integrated into classroom curricula, video field trips, and enrichment activities, as well as semester-long and year-long courses.

Through Star Schools, students in a rural school can study calculus or a small group of city students can take an advanced placement physics class even when a local teacher is not available.

Overall Impact

- At a time when Congress is emphasizing the necessity for students and other citizens to understand and use technology, and Vice President Gore is encouraging participation in the Information Superhighway, rescission of funds would end a program that has a strong track record since 1988 of providing access to quality instruction through technology to over 200,000 students--many of them minority, low-income, limited English-proficient, and disabled.
- Instructional programming in such courses as hands-on science and mathematics, algebra, calculus, physics, advanced placement courses, several foreign languages, and adult literacy would not continue.
- Consortia throughout the country would not be able to continue to build on investments of training and equipment that have already been made.

Specific Examples

- A 17,000 square-mile "electronic campus" to enhance educational opportunities for 3,900 rural and Native American students in the Southwest would end.
- In the Pacific Northwest, courses delivered to such diverse areas as Alaska, Hawaii, and the Pacific territories would be reduced by 75 percent, affecting 12,000 students.
- A project serving predominantly urban areas in 21 States and the District of Columbia that provides ongoing staff development in math, science, social science, and English/language arts will not be able to continue its second year of service.

BILINGUAL EDUCATION

1995 Appropriation: Total \$245.2 million (\$156 million for Subpart 1)

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: Rescind \$38.5 million, 25 percent of the Subpart 1 appropriation. Committee report language directs the Department to eliminate all continuation grants for Math/Science projects, Developmental Bilingual projects, Family English literacy projects, and Special Populations projects. In order to meet the \$38.5 million total, \$2 million in additional (new or continuation) projects would have to be cancelled as well.

Program Purpose

The purpose of the Bilingual Education program is to educate limited English proficient (LEP) children and youth to meet the same rigorous standards for academic performance expected of all children and youth. Discretionary grants are provided to local educational agencies (LEAs), State educational agencies (SEAs), community-based organizations (CBOs), and institutions of higher education (IHEs) to implement and improve instructional programs and professional development appropriately designed to help LEP children become proficient in English and master challenging content curriculum to high standards.

Evaluation Findings

- Over 20 years of research and practice have found that bilingual education, when appropriately implemented, is a successful vehicle to help linguistically diverse children learn English and to master challenging content in all areas of the curriculum:
- The National Center for Research on Cultural Diversity and Second Language Learning indicates that instructional practices that build upon the strengths of linguistically diverse students make significant progress in helping the student become proficient in English and master the academic curriculum. Most of the learning that takes place in the native language transfers readily to English.
- The Family English Literacy (FEL) Title VII-funded program, which would be eliminated by the rescission, provides English literacy instruction and training for parents and family members to help them become full partners in the education of their children. A study of this program (1985-89) conducted by the Department of Education found that it increased parent participation in the education of LEP students and improved student academic achievement. The FEL program was found to be effective in helping reduce the adult

illiteracy rate and the dropout rate of students, as well as helping the schools improve their services for LEP students.

Improvements Made through Reauthorization

Under the Improving America's School Act (IASA), the Bilingual Education program is strengthened and reconfigured to provide LEAs, SEAs, CBOs, and IHEs greater flexibility in designing programs to help improve educational services for LEP students. Along with flexibility, the new Title VII is strengthened by new accountability provisions that will hold funded programs accountable for the demonstrated progress of enrolled students towards meeting the high standards expected of all children.

Overall Impact

- The Nation's public schools today enroll 2.5 million LEP students who speak over 180 different languages. At the FY 1995 appropriation level, these programs would serve an estimated 639,000 students, about 25 percent, of the total LEP student enrollment.
- The rescission would eliminate Title VII services to some 100,000 to 160,000 LEP students.

Specific Examples

PORTLAND, MAINE

- Some 40 pre-school children would stop receiving educational services.
Languages spoken at home: Russian, Polish, Chinese, Farsi, and Sudanese.

SAN YSIDRO, CALIFORNIA

- Over 300 Hispanic pre-school children would no longer be in public school.
Language spoken at home: Spanish.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

- More than 100 limited English proficient pre-school students would stop receiving educational services in preparation for kindergarten and first grade.
Languages spoken at home: Hmong, Laotian, Vietnamese, and Cambodian.
- The only preschool program offered to the Southeast Asian families in the school district would be lost.

**AROMAS-SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT, SAN JUAN BAUTISTA,
CALIFORNIA**

- Some 50 Hispanic pre-school children would no longer receive educational services to prepare them for the first grade.

Statement by the Coordinator: "The Aromas/San Juan School District's bilingual preschool program offers the only opportunity in our rural community for 50 at-risk children to enter school ready to learn. The elimination of Title VII funding will mean that these children from low-income families, whose parents are limited English speakers with little formal education, will remain at a severe disadvantage. Now is our best chance to give these children the foundation for the skills they need to succeed in school, before their self-esteem and enthusiasm for learning are hampered by the experience of failure."

EISENHOWER PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

1995 Appropriation: \$320.298 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$60 million

Program Purpose

The Eisenhower Professional Development Program (EPDP) provides financial assistance to State and local educational agencies and to institutions of higher education to support sustained and intensive high-quality professional development, to ensure that all teachers are able to provide challenging learning experiences for their students in elementary and secondary schools.

- The new program has been expanded to include all the core academic subjects of the curriculum, not exclusively mathematics and science.
- The program corrects the shortcomings of its predecessor program, which a 1991 evaluation found did not provide professional development opportunities of sufficient depth and duration.
- The program provides for sustained and high-quality professional development that is aligned to challenging State content standards and State student performance standards in the core academic subjects.
- The program focuses on improving teaching and learning, making the important link between professional development and student learning.

Overall Impact

- Because the Eisenhower statute includes a \$250 million minimum funding level for professional development in math and science, the proposed rescission would greatly impair the program's impact on teachers outside of the mathematics and science disciplines. It would leave only \$10.3 million to be spread across the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia, for other core academic subjects such as English and history.
- Since over 90 percent of LEAs receive Eisenhower funds, the decrease amount will not only jeopardize the professional development plans of LEAs, but also will prevent the implementation of sustained and intensive activities.

Specific Examples

The new Eisenhower Professional Development program is not yet operational. The following are examples of activities carried out under the antecedent Eisenhower Mathematics and Science Education program. These are the types of activities that (in other subject areas) would be eliminated or scaled back if the rescission passes.

NORTH CAROLINA

- The North Carolina Central University offers a three-week intensive institute for mathematics teachers of grades 9-12 to: 1) strengthen participants' mathematical background in probability, statistics, and data analysis, 2) increase participants' understanding of and skills in teaching mathematics through modern technology, and 3) give teachers strategies for improving mathematics studies for minorities and females.

DELAWARE

- In Delaware, several school districts have adopted a program entitled Mathematics Their Way for K-2 teachers. The workshop and follow-up help teachers implement a more interactive and creative approach to introducing mathematics to their students.

TEXAS

- The Minority Mathematics and Science Education Cooperative Statewide Coordination Project (MMSEC) at the University of Texas at San Antonio works in 16 predominantly minority and disadvantaged elementary schools from 11 school districts to foster rigorous teacher instruction in science and mathematics content and teaching methods.

TECH-PREP EDUCATION

1995 Appropriation: \$108 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$108 million

Program Purpose

Tech-Prep Education is a key vocational education reform strategy and a cornerstone of School-to-Work systems. The purpose of tech-prep is to provide an education-career path to prepare students for high-skilled technical careers. Tech-prep is built on two important education reform innovations--the integration of academic and vocational curricula and instruction and the comprehensive linkage of secondary and postsecondary institutions in their career preparation programs. Tech-prep provides a seamless, planned sequence of study for a technical field beginning no later than the eleventh grade in high school. The sequence extends through at least 2 years of postsecondary occupational education, usually at a community college, or an apprenticeship program and culminates in either a certificate or an associate degree.

All States receive funding for tech-prep education. States then distribute those funds, usually on a competitive basis, to local consortia comprised of high schools and two-year postsecondary institutions. All secondary students are eligible to participate--those preparing for college, those who have elected vocational-technical training, and those in the so-called general track.

- Students are enthusiastic about tech-prep education. Student enrollment has increased from 172,000 students in 1993 to 430,000 students in 1994.
- Many secondary and two-year postsecondary institutions are involved. As of 1994, over 5,000 school district were tech-prep consortium members, and 65 percent (975) of public community and technical colleges were involved in the program.
- Tech-prep programs are developing all over the country. In 1993, 250 tech-prep consortia were operating; by 1994 there were 456 nationwide.

Overall Impact

- Most adversely affected would be the tech-prep student. Tech-prep students would be unable to complete the first 4-year program cycle, leaving the 430,000 currently enrolled in tech-prep without promised program completion. Tech-prep is now in its third year of program implementation.

- States will suffer severely, being left with inadequate time or resources to incorporate tech-prep fully into their secondary and postsecondary systems. For example, in Illinois, at least 323 participating school districts will be adversely affected through a loss of \$4.2 million to the State; in New Jersey, 162 school districts and a loss of \$2.3 million; in Texas, 692 school districts and a loss of \$8.1 million. Southern States, with 46 percent of the tech-prep consortia, will be particularly hard hit.
- The School-to-Work systems-building effort will be seriously affected. Tech-prep is a major building block in States' efforts to develop school-to-work systems. South Carolina, for example, is using tech-prep as the basis for developing its school-to-work system.

Specific Examples

SOUTH CAROLINA - Tri-County Technical College Consortium (PACE)

- The PACE Consortium consists of representatives from Tri-County Technical College, 16 high schools, four career centers, Clemson University National Drop-out Prevention Center, and the Anderson County Business and Education Partnership. This Consortium eliminated traditional high school general education courses and incorporated an embedded applied academics and vocational curriculum. Without Federal funding these activities would be greatly restricted.

PENNSYLVANIA

- The 18 regional tech-prep consortia in Pennsylvania would be critically affected with the rescission. The newly developed business and education partnerships would be sacrificed.

FLORIDA

- Florida flows almost all of its tech-prep funding to consortia. The impact of the rescission would be the inability to maintain the current system of tech-prep, which involves all school districts and community colleges.

ARKANSAS - Springdale Tech-Prep Consortium

- Springdale High School and Northwest Arkansas Community College focus on eliminating the general track in secondary education and creating workplace experiences for all students. This program would not continue without Federal funding.

CALIFORNIA - State Center Tech Prep Consortium

- This tech-prep consortium in Fresno provides career training for high-skill jobs and serves 1,725 secondary students in 29 high schools. The program emphasizes the integration of academic and occupational education and grants students college credit while in high school. While this consortia receives two other grants in addition to the Federal tech-prep funds, the program would have to be significantly scaled down if Federal funds are rescinded.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK OPPORTUNITY SYSTEMS

1995 Appropriation:

State and Local Grants	\$115.6 million
National Programs	\$9.4 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal:

State and Local Grants	-\$3.1 million
National Programs	-\$9.4 million

Program Purpose

The School-to-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 is a performance partnership with States and local communities that provides venture capital for the development of high quality school-to-work transition systems. The Act builds upon promising State and local strategies such as tech-prep, youth apprenticeship, career academies, and cooperative education, to promote better preparation for the workplace and/or higher education. The Act emphasizes State and local flexibility and limits the Federal role to an initial investment of start-up grants lasting no longer than 5 years.

Titles II and III of the Act support grants to States and local partnerships. Title IV supports several Federal activities -- a congressionally-mandated evaluation, performance measurement and accountability, technical assistance to States and communities, and research and demonstration.

Overall Impact

Support for National Activities would be eliminated -- including evaluation, performance measurement, technical assistance, and R&D. The number of grants to States and local communities would also be reduced. Specifically,

- **No evaluation of School-to-Work.** Congress has mandated an evaluation to determine whether there has been progress in achieving program objectives.
- **No performance measurement.** The Act calls for a system of performance measures designed in collaboration with the states that would enable states to measure progress and identify problem areas that need to be addressed.
- **No technical assistance.** The rescission would eliminate ED funding for all activities designed to help states and communities share information and build upon research-validated "best practices."
- **Fewer State and local partnership grants.** The proposed rescission will reduce grant awards by approximately 3 percent.

WORKPLACE LITERACY PARTNERSHIPS

1995 Appropriation: \$18.7 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$18.7 million

Program Purpose

The National Workplace Literacy program provides assistance for demonstration projects that teach literacy skills needed in the workplace through exemplary education partnerships between (1) business, industry, or labor organizations and (2) educational organizations. Projects are designed to a) improve the productivity of the workforce, b) prevent possible worker displacement by upgrading the basic literacy skills of the workforce, c) demonstrate to businesses the value of investing in upgrading the basic skills of their workers, and d) identify the most efficient and effective approaches to teaching basic skills in the workplace.

The program is targeted to adults with inadequate literacy skills, including those with limited English proficiency, for whom training would mean new employment, continued employment, career advancement, or increased productivity.

As required by law, the Department has undertaken an evaluation of workplace literacy projects. The evaluation will document the effects of participation in workplace literacy programs and determine which program practices are most effective in improving employees' functioning and enhancing workplace productivity.

Fiscal year 1995 funds would support the fourth year of the 5-year evaluation.

Overall Impact

- The proposed rescission would almost certainly result in the termination of the 46 projects serving close to 36,000 workers who need to improve their skills to be productive in their jobs. Federal dollars represent about 70 percent of the funds in these projects. The projects exist because of the Federal demonstration grants and the matching funds secured specifically to meet grant requirements.
- These are three-year projects for which 1995 would be the third and final year of funding. If they were terminated after the second year, the evaluation could not be finished, and we would lose potentially valuable information on what makes workplace literacy programs successful.

- The rescission will also eliminate the final planning period during which businesses would conclude plans to institutionalize the program after the third year.
- The Administration has proposed consolidating Workplace Literacy Partnerships and other nationally competitive grant programs into a flexible State grant program. Workplace Literacy programs are examples of the kind of services the Department hopes States will support with the consolidated Adult Education and Family Literacy program funds. If projects are terminated prematurely, they will not be around for States to continue to build on in fiscal year 1996.

Project Descriptions:

- Chicago's largest employer, First Chicago Corporation, is using \$211,895 for employee training in support of major technological and organizational changes in cash management, administrative functions, and bank card processes that require employees to work in teams and handle more responsibility. Some of the 4,000 employees benefiting from this training include clerks in remittance, payroll, research and adjustment, accounts payable and mail distribution jobs. Grant funds are also used to instruct tellers and customer personnel in the basic reading and math skills needed to handle increasingly complex financial services.
- The Massachusetts Workplace Literacy Consortium's grant funds provide almost 10,000 hours of work-related basic skills training to 1,200 workers each year during the three-year project. A consortium, led by the Massachusetts Department of Education, encompasses 9 local partnerships composed of 42 partners across the State. These partners include 27 large and small businesses in the fields of: manufacturing, health, and education, and four labor organizations. The grantee provides basic skills training to assembly and production line workers, hospital and nursing aides, housekeepers, dietary workers, and university maintenance and food service personnel.
- The Alabama Partnership for Training provides basic literacy, adult secondary education, and literacy for limited English proficient adults. Partners include the Alabama State Department of Education, Michelin Tire Corporation, UAW-Chrysler, O'Neal Steel, and Victorian Classics. The project serves an estimated 2,300 adults.

- The Washington State Board for Technical and Community Colleges is using \$215,112 to assist 575 employees to acquire skills in reading comprehension, math, problem solving, critical thinking, and English as a Second Language. Partners include Accra-Fab, Eaton Corp., I-Tron, Korry Electronic, Marriott Hotel, Metropolitan Mortgage, Provident Hospital, Community Colleges of Spokane, Edmonds Community College, Seattle Central Community College, South Seattle Community Colleges, and Tacoma Community House.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION NATIONAL PROGRAMS

1995 Appropriation: \$34,535,000

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$34,535,000

Program Purpose

This authority supports national research, development and demonstration programs in vocational-technical education, and the National Center for Research in Vocational Education. It also supports the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee and the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committees and Data Systems. Recipients include institutions of higher education, area vocational education schools, State boards of vocational education, public or private nonprofit organizations, local educational agencies, and consortia composed of these entities.

Overall Impact

The proposed rescission would eliminate the following National Program efforts:

- **The National Center for Research in Vocational Education**

The last two years of funding would be eliminated, affecting six Research and Development areas and 16 national research studies covering changing skill demands, new curricular models, methods for serving special populations of students, staff development, institutional collaboration, and performance measures and standards. Also terminated would be the Urban Schools Network, a network of 30 teams of teachers, administrators, researchers, and State and local officials, representing 26 cities, that promotes the creation of high-quality, career-related courses of study in urban high schools and colleges. Rescission would force the closing of the National Center located at the University of California at Berkeley and six sites: RAND - Santa Monica, CA; the University of Illinois Champaign/Urbana; the University of Minnesota; Teachers College, Columbia University; Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University; and the University of Wisconsin-Madison.

- **National Network for Curriculum Coordination in Vocational and Technical Education**

The rescission would eliminate this free curriculum dissemination network, closing six regional Curriculum Coordination Centers located in Honolulu, HI; Springfield, IL; Mississippi State, MS; Aberdeen, NJ; Stillwater, OK; and

Tacoma, WA. This network avoids unwarranted duplication of effort, identifies relevant materials, and achieves maximum benefit of limited vocational education dollars for elementary, secondary, postsecondary, and adult education systems, JTPA and CBO trainers, and school administrators. During 1993 and 1994, over 1,500 CCC-identified curriculum products were adopted or adapted by the States, over 21,000 curriculum searches were conducted, and over 1,000 inservice and technical assistance workshops serving over 100,000 participants were provided.

- **CEECs - Community Education Employment Centers**

Five centers, located in Covington, GA; Dix Hills, NY; New York, NY; Poplar, MT; and Cheney, WA, would not receive their third, and final year of funding. The centers provide comprehensive vocational-technical education, employer-labor-community partnerships, career planning, employment counseling, staff training, parental involvement, and school-to-work transition services. Rescission would leave these communities and students without critical career education services, and would leave five potential national models as incomplete and uncompleted programs.

- **Career Academies**

The Career Academy Program's last two years of funding would be eliminated. The academies, which operate based on a five-year agreement between the Departments of Education and Defense, provide leadership training and vocational and academic learning to approximately 4,000 students at eight Academies located in Los Angeles, CA; Washington, DC; Indianapolis, IN; Louisville, KY; Buffalo, NY; Charlotte, NC; Dayton, OH; and Philadelphia, PA.

- **The Integration of Vocational and Academic Learning Program**

These comprehensive projects, begun using FY 1993 and FY 1994 funding, are designed to operate for 4 years. Elimination of funding will halt these programs after their initial year, or second year, of operation. This program supports the design of curriculum and courses that integrate vocational and academic learning; the provision of inservice training for teachers and administrators of vocational education programs; and the dissemination of information and materials on effective practices to national audiences. Projects include training over 6,000 teachers, school board members, school superintendents and counselors; providing certified job skills for careers in agriculture and natural resources for Navajo youth; and demonstrating how an urban comprehensive high school can remove barriers between vocational

and academic departments to achieve fully integrated instruction. Specific examples are:

- A Transportation Career Academies Program in partnership with the Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority, serving secondary and postsecondary students in a 4-year sequence of courses leading to technical degrees in transportation-related fields and/or advanced study in engineering, architecture or urban planning.
 - An Integrated Vocational and Academic Learning Through Tech-Prep model, in partnership with Valencia Community College, Orlando, FL, and the Orange County Public Schools, serving secondary and postsecondary students through teacher professional development, curriculum design, private-sector partnerships, and apprenticeships in the fields of science, mathematics and communications.
 - The development of integrated courses, instructional materials, team-teaching, and essential skills required for employment to support postsecondary vocational education students at the El Paso Community College, El Paso, TX.
 - An Integrated Curriculum Development, Teacher Preparation, Professional Development Program, and Alternative Education Laboratory Setting sponsored by the University of Southern Colorado, Pueblo School District, Pueblo Community College, private businesses, and community leaders.
 - The creation of advanced models of integrated academic and vocational curricula in 18 high schools which link into a learning network with other schools and with national experts, sponsored by the Southern Regional Education Board, and having one school site per State in Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia and West Virginia.
- **Data Systems**

The proposed rescission would eliminate all support for the National and State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee (NOICC/SOICC) network through which workforce preparation and labor market issues can be addressed and acted upon in an integrated, coordinated manner. Career Information Delivery Systems located in over 19,000 sites nationwide and serving over 7 million people each year would be eliminated. Programs in

over 40 States that focus on the improvement of career guidance and counseling would be terminated; and the State training inventory, which provides a data base of over 200,000 available education and training programs, would be eliminated.

STATE STUDENT INCENTIVE GRANTS

1995 Appropriation: \$64 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$64 million

Program Purpose

The State Student Incentive Grant (SSIG) program provides grants to States to assist them in providing need-based grant and work-study assistance to eligible postsecondary students. Federally supported grants and job earnings are limited to \$5,000 per academic year for full-time students.

States must, at a minimum, match Federal SSIG funds dollar-for-dollar with State funds provided through State appropriations for this purpose. They must administer the program under a single State agency agreement and meet maintenance-of-effort criteria. States may use up to 20 percent of their SSIG allotment in support of campus-based work-learning jobs that provide community services.

Students must demonstrate financial need under a need analysis system established by the State and approved by the Secretary in order to qualify for an SSIG grant or work-learning job. States have broad discretion in establishing other student eligibility requirements.

Overall Impact

The Department has proposed a two-year phase-out of the program beginning in 1996 to give States lead time to plan for elimination of this funding. Some States, for example, use multi-year budgeting for their State grant programs, while others have legislative calendars that would not allow adequate time after the completion of the Federal appropriations process for States to consider funding alternatives. The Department proposes to phase-out the SSIG program by funding at half of the 1995 levels in 1996, and completely eliminating funding for the program in 1997.

To the extent that States do not increase their own funding to make up for the elimination of Federal funds, up to \$127 million in grant aid to 211,250 students could be lost under the proposed rescission.

Specific Examples

In some States -- such as Virginia, Wyoming, and Utah--the legislature has already adjourned for the year, and thus will not be able to respond to the elimination of Federal SSIG funds until next year. As a result, 1995-96 awards to students in those states would either be reduced or eliminated. Virginia students could lose up to \$2.7 million; Wyoming students could lose \$2 million; and Utah students could lose \$941 thousand.

Two States -- Louisiana and North Carolina -- have laws that terminate the State program immediately if no Federal SSIG funds are allocated to the State. Delaying termination of the program, as proposed by the Administration, would allow these States to consider repealing such laws. Under the proposed rescission, Louisiana students would lose over \$1.8 million in aid; North Carolina students would lose over \$2.7 million.

In addition, many postsecondary institutions have already begun to package student aid and have sent award letters to students for 1995-96 based on information from States that included their anticipated SSIG allotments. Institutions would have to reassess the financial need of students and send amended award letters to students once final action is completed on the rescission bill, potentially disrupting the enrolment plans of needy students.

FEDERAL TRIO PROGRAMS

1995 Appropriation: \$463 million

1995 House Committee Rescission Proposal: -\$11 million

Program Purpose

The Federal TRIO programs fund postsecondary education outreach and support services designed to encourage qualified individuals from disadvantaged backgrounds to enter and complete college, to motivate and prepare these students for doctoral studies, and to train individuals serving or preparing for service in Federal TRIO programs. Eligible participants in Federal TRIO programs must be low-income and first-generation college students. Upward Bound is the only program that would be affected by the rescission:

- Upward Bound, provides intensive academic instruction to high school students and veterans to generate the skills and motivation needed to pursue and complete a program of education beyond high school. Services may include Saturday classes, tutorial and counseling sessions, cultural enrichment activities, and a 6-week summer component.

Overall Impact

The proposed rescission would result in approximately 40 fewer Upward Bound projects being supported, and as many as 3,000 low-income, first-generation college students being denied services when compared to the fiscal year 1995 level. The Administration strongly opposes rescission of \$11.2 million in 1995 funding for this program.

Specific Examples

Examples of the actual projects that would be affected by the proposed rescission are not available at this time because applications for the Upward Bound program are now under review.

The projects outlined below -- which were funded in prior years -- are provided to illustrate the types of activities and services that would not be funded if the proposed rescission is adopted:

- The Upward Bound project at ROGERS STATE COLLEGE in Claremore, Oklahoma serves both an extremely rural and urban school environment. One urban school is classified as "at risk" by the State Legislature. The

program provides extensive support to students during the academic year through regular tutoring services at the target schools, guidance and counseling programs, study skills instruction, and career development activities. Saturday meetings are held on the college campus for intensive guidance and counseling, instruction, career development and tutoring. The summer residential program provides instruction in reading, mathematics, language arts, and science skills. Some elective course topics are offered. Participants receive a stipend for participation in the project. Cultural and social activities are provided year long as well as visits to other programs of postsecondary education.

- THE WICHITA STATE UNIVERSITY in Kansas operates an Upward Bound Math/Science Regional Center Known as the "Galaxy Experience", which is a six-week summer residential experience with a space science theme serving 50 students annually. This project serves a Midwestern target area that includes Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska, and Iowa. Students are recruited from these states to participate in the program during the summer. The Center uses an integrated curriculum package in providing comprehensive math-science instruction utilizing an interactive collaborative learning model which helps students move from passive learning to more active learning. The curriculum is an interdisciplinary, interactive program which integrates subject matter in the sciences with tools of mathematics, writing and computer technology. An integral part of this project is the mentoring component. Other components of the project include counseling, tutoring, cultural enrichment activities, and participant follow-up. Workshops, seminars and hands-on laboratory experiences are provided to participants. The participants are paid a small stipend for participation in the project. A small number of students are selected each year to participate in a week-long Future Astronaut Training Program.

MAJOR CHANGES IN DEPARTMENT'S 1996 BUDGET

DISCRETIONARY INCREASES totalling \$1.7 billion include:

Elementary and Secondary Education

- Goals 2000, +\$347 million or 86 percent to support States and communities as they begin to implement their comprehensive education reform plans.
- Title I, +\$302 million or 4.5 percent for programs serving disadvantaged children, with targeting a larger share of Title I resources on communities and schools with the highest concentrations of children from low-income families.
- Eisenhower Professional Development State Grants, +\$415 million or 130 percent for intensive professional development for educators in the core academic areas.
- Safe and Drug-Free Schools, +\$18 million to help States and school districts address the increasing problems of student drug and alcohol use and school violence.
- Special Education State Grant Programs, +\$89 million or 3 percent for serving over 5 million children with disabilities.
- Educational Technology, +\$43 million or 108 percent to expand learning opportunities and help create technology-rich, high performance learning environments for adults and children through a collaboration of education and industry.
- Research, Statistics, and Assessment, +\$25.5 million or 15.2 percent to expand research on improving teaching and learning, to improve student assessment and data collection, and to provide information to support education reform.

Preparing Students for Work and Further Education

- School-to-Work Opportunities, +\$75 million or 60 percent to help States develop systems to prepare high school youth for challenging jobs and future education.
- Vocational Education Restructuring, level funding to consolidate 12 programs into 2, a State Grants program and a National Programs authority; and Adult Education Restructuring, +\$104.1 million or 7 percent to consolidate all adult education and literacy programs into a single grant to States.

Postsecondary Education

- Pell Grants, increases of nearly \$700 million in aid available and in the maximum award from \$2,340 to \$2,620 for degree students for over 2.8 million students. Under the GI Bill for America's Workers, students enrolled in non-degree programs who now are eligible for Pell Grants would receive Department of Labor Skill Grants with the same maximum award. *1.6 B to*
- State Postsecondary Review, +\$5 million or 25 percent to expand State oversight of institutions using Federal student aid.

DECREASES totalling \$0.8 billion include:

- Elimination of 21 programs in 1996, including Innovative Education Program Strategies State Grants (preciously Chapter 2), -\$347 million; Interlibrary Cooperation, -\$24 million; Harris Fellowships, -\$20 million, Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property, \$16 million; and 17 other programs.
- ✓*

SUMMARY of PROGRAM TERMINATIONS and CONSOLIDATIONS
in ED'S 1996 BUDGET

	Number of Programs	(\$ in 000's) Change from 1995 Enacted
Program Terminations by 1995 Rescissions	16	-\$222,735
Program Terminations in 1996	21	-504,102
Program Phase-outs beginning in 1996	4	-76,275
Subtotal	41	-803,112
Program Consolidations into Broader, More Flexible Programs, Net	27	+46,337
TOTAL PROGRAM TERMINATIONS, PHASE-OUTS, AND CONSOLIDATIONS	68	-756,775

February 6, 1995

Program Terminations and Consolidations in ED's 1996 Budget

	(\$ in 000's)
Program Terminations by 1995 Rescission	FY 1995 Appro.
Education Infrastructure	\$100,000
Instruction in Civics, Government, and the Law	5,899
Dropout Prevention Demonstrations	28,000
Ellender Fellowships	4,185
Vocational Education Community-Based Organizations	9,479 /1
Vocational Education Consumer and Homemaking Education	34,409 /1
Eisenhower Leadership Program	4,000
Law School Clinical Experience	14,920
National Early Intervention Scholarships and Partnerships	3,108
National Academy of Science, Space, and Technology	2,000
Olympic Scholarships	1,000
Teacher Corps	1,875
College Housing and Academic Facilities Loan Subsidies (\$10 M in new loans)	168
21st Century Community Learning Centers	750
Library Literacy Programs	8,026 /2
Library Education and Training	4,916
Subtotal	222,735

Program Terminations in 1996

Migrant High School Equivalency Program	\$8,088
College Assistance Migrant Program	2,204
Impact Aid Payments for Federal Property	16,293
Innovative Education Program Strategies State Grants (prev. Chapter 2)	347,250
Christa McAuliffe Fellowships	1,946
Education for Native Hawaiians	12,000
HEA III Endowment Challenge Grants (excludes HBCU set-aside)	6,045
Native Hawaiian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development	1,000
Innovative Projects for Community Service	1,423
Cooperative Education	6,927
Urban Community Service	13,000
Student Financial Aid Database and Information Line	496
Mary C. McLeod Bethune Memorial Fine Arts Center	4,000
National Science Scholars	4,424
Douglas Teacher Scholarships	14,599
Javits Fellowships	7,787
Harris Fellowships	20,244
Legal Training for the Disadvantaged	2,964
National Writing Project	3,212
Interlibrary Cooperation	23,700
Library Research and Demonstrations	6,500
Subtotal	504,102

/1 Proposed for consolidation under the Vocational Education Program. (Note: Programs included on OMB's list of consolidations rather than terminations.)

/2 Proposed for consolidation under the Adult Education and Family Literacy Program. (Note: Program included on OMB's list of consolidations rather than terminations.)

**Program Terminations and Consolidations
in ED's 1996 Budget**

Program Phase-outs beginning in 1996	(\$ in 000's)	
	FY 1995 Appro.	FY 1996 Estimate
Impact Aid Payments for Children with Disabilities	\$40,000	\$40,000
Training in Early Childhood Education and Violence Counseling	13,875	9,600
HEA Strengthening Institutions-excludes HBCU's and Hispanic-serving institutions	80,000	40,000
State Student Incentive Grants	63,375	31,375
TOTAL	197,250	120,975

TOTAL AMOUNT OF PROGRAM TERMINATIONS \$924,087

Number of Program Terminations by 1995 Rescission	-16
Number of Program Terminations in 1996	-21
Number of Program Phase-outs	-4
Total Number of Program Terminations	-41

Program Consolidations	(\$ in 000's)	
	FY 1995 Appro.	FY 1996 Estimate
Special Education:		
Research and Demonstrations	---	\$63,000
Technical Assistance and Systems Change	---	50,000
Professional Development	---	97,000
Parent Training	---	14,534
Technology Development and Support	---	29,500
Deaf-blindness	\$12,832	---
Serious Emotional Disturbance	4,147	---
Severe Disabilities	10,030	---
Early Childhood Education	25,167	---
Secondary and Transitional Services	23,966	---
Postsecondary Education	8,839	---
Innovation and Development	20,635	---
Media and Captioning Services	19,142	---
Technology Applications	10,862	---
Special Studies	4,160	---
Personnel Development	91,339	---
Parent Training	13,535	---
Clearinghouses	2,162	---
Regional Resource Centers	7,218	---
Rehabilitation Services Special Demonstration Programs:	---	23,942
Special Demonstration Programs	19,942	---
Supported Employment Projects	10,616	---
National Technical Institute for the Deaf:	---	43,041
Operations	42,705	---
Endowment Grant	336	---
Construction	150	---
Gallaudet University:	---	80,030
University Programs	54,244	---
Elementary and Secondary Education Programs	24,786	---
Endowment Grant	1,000	---

Program Terminations and Consolidations in ED's 1996 Budget

		(\$ in 000's)	
Program Consolidations (Continued)		FY 1995 Appro.	FY 1996 Estimate
Vocational Education Consolidation:			
State Grants		---	\$1,141,088
National Programs		---	37,000
Basic State Grants		\$955,626	---
Basic Grants Territorial Set-aside		2,015	---
Basic Grants Indians and Hawaiian Natives Set-aside		15,109	---
Tech-Prep Education		108,000	---
Tribally-Controlled Postsecondary Vocational Institutions		2,919	---
State Councils		8,848	---
Vocational Education Research		7,851	---
Vocational Education Demonstrations		20,684	---
NOICC		6,000	---
Adult Education and Family Literacy Consolidation:			
State Grants		---	479,487
National Programs		---	11,000
Even Start		102,024	---
Adult Education State Programs		336,506 /3	---
Adult Education Evaluation and Technical Assistance		3,900	---
National Institute for Literacy		4,869	---
State Literacy Resource Centers		7,787	---
Workplace Literacy Partnerships		18,736	---
Literacy Training for Homeless Adults		9,498	---
Literacy Programs for Prisoners		5,100	---
TOTAL		2,023,285	2,069,622

Total Number of Programs Consolidated	-39
Total Number of Broader, More Flexible Programs	12
Net Change	-27

/3 Adjusted for comparability. Includes \$84,161 thousand for literacy training carried out prior to 1996 under the Job Training Partnership Act in the Department of Labor; such activities will be incorporated into the Adult Education and Family Literacy consolidation and carried out by the Department of Education as part of the GI Bill for America's Workers.

February 6, 1995