

Whole school reform

House 98

- Edo for Dead CP 138 F
- CERI (p 175)
- Addtl views (p 275 f4)

Union Calendar No.

105TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
105-205

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1998

JULY 25, 1997.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. PORTER, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2264]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services (except the Food and Drug Administration, Indian Health Service, and the Office of Consumer Affairs), and Education, Armed Forces Retirement Home, Corporation for National and Community Service, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, National Council on Disability, National Education Goals Panel, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, Physician Payment Review Commission, Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, Railroad Retirement Board, the Social Security Administration, and the United States Institute of Peace for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

Obey
begin
p. 139
176, 178,
275
162(?)
Savte

Voluntary Natural
T-17
p. 178

HSD, p. 180
21st C. Long
Union
p. 180

account includes compensatory education programs authorized under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Grants to local educational agencies

Of the amounts provided for Title I programs, \$6,191,350,000 is available for basic grants to local education agencies and state administration. This is \$81,862,000 below the amount for the 1997-98 school year and the same as the request. Funding for concentration grants, which targets funds to Local Education Agencies in counties with high levels of disadvantaged children, is \$949,249,000, \$72,771,000 below last year and \$50,000,000 below the request level. The Committee provided \$400,000,000 under Targeted Grants which focuses even more funding on the most disadvantaged local educational agencies. This level is \$50,000,000 above the request level and \$400,000,000 above last year.

Financial assistance flows to school districts by formula, based in part on the number of school-aged children from low-income families. Within districts, local school officials target funds on school attendance areas with the greatest number or percentage of children from poor families. Local school districts develop and implement their own programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged students. About 14,000 local school districts participate in the program, which served an estimated 6.2 to 6.5 million pupils in 1995.

Funds under this account will also be used to pay the Federal share of state administrative costs for title I programs. The maximum state administration grant is equal to 1 percent of title I local educational agency plus state agency grants to the state, or \$400,000, whichever is greater. These funds are included in the grants to local educational agencies account, rather than being a separate line item.

Demonstrations of innovative practices

The bill includes \$150,000,000 for demonstrations of innovative practices; this is \$150,000,000 more than provided in 1997 and in the budget request. The Committee provides these funds to accelerate the wide-scale application of effective approaches to whole school reform in Title I schools. With \$50,000,000 provided under the fund for the improvement of education for similar demonstrations at non-Title I schools, the bill provides a total of \$200,000,000 for whole school reform initiatives.

The Committee has become aware of exciting work that is underway in a number of schools across the country using research-based methods to transform entire schools into high-performing learning centers that have challenging academic standards, engaged teachers, and strong parental and community support. Effective whole school models such as the School Development Program developed by Yale University's psychiatrist James Comer, the Success for All and Roots and Wings programs developed by Johns Hopkins University, the Modern Red Schoolhouse developed by the Hudson Institute are demonstrating that comprehensive, whole school reform can lead to increased student achievement. While each of these approaches is unique, these reform initiatives share several common characteristics that are integral to their success:

Obey

they are based on solid research,
 they are known to be replicable in schools with diverse characteristics,
 they have a comprehensive vision for transforming entire schools,
 they have high academic standards,
 they require the active engagement of the entire school community, including teachers and parents, and
 they involve intensive and ongoing teacher and staff development and training.

The recent *Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children* evaluation sponsored by the Department of Education documented that several whole school models, properly implemented and adapted to local communities, can make dramatic differences in student academic achievement. The study also concluded that: " * * * after a third of a century of research on school change, we still have not provided adequate human and fiscal resources, appropriately targeted, to make large-scale program improvements a reliably consistent reality." The Committee believes that the time is right for a significant federal investment focused on applying these innovative schoolwide reform approaches on a broad scale in a large number of schools.

Accordingly, the bill includes language allocating \$150,000,000 to support the initial investment costs for Title I schools that wish to apply research-based, whole school models to increase student achievement. The Committee intends that the Secretary of Education make these funds available to SEAs that apply for the funding based on the formula for distributing Title grants under section 1124. In cases where an SEA declines to apply for its formula-based allocation, the Committee directs that the Secretary use the funds to make discretionary grants to other SEAs that have a need for additional funding for whole school reform in Title I schools.

The Committee intends that SEAs use these funds to make competitive subgrants to school districts on behalf of individual schools that require additional funding to implement comprehensive, research-based reform models. SEAs should give special consideration to district applications that include well-defined plans, using rigorous methodological designs and techniques including control groups and random assignment to the extent practicable, to evaluate the results achieved with this funding. The Committee intends that school districts shall use their subgrants to provide awards to individual schools on a competitive basis; such awards be of sufficient size and scope to support the initial start-up costs of the particular reform model chosen by the school but not less than \$50,000; and that awards be renewable for two additional years after the initial award, subject to the availability of appropriations. The Committee also intends that Title I schools receiving funds under this initiative:

Identify an effective, research-based whole school model the school will adopt that provides a blueprint for reform of the entire school;

Describe how training and external expert technical assistance to facilitate implementation of reform activities will be secured.

States have networks through which school systems for all

see p. 176

abs received in extra 45 million above admin request for this

SEAs apply

SEAs make subgrants

will be diff to implement

a lot of it will be required

cured (e.g. from regional laboratories, external developers, etc.);

Demonstrate support from teachers and staff, and parents;
Identify how other federal/state/local resources provided to the school will be utilized to provide coordinated services to support the reform effort; and

Include a plan for evaluating the implementation of the reform initiative and results achieved.

The Committee directs the Secretary of Education to make available to SEAs, school districts and schools information about proven and promising whole school reform models and their implementation costs so that schools can make an informed choice about what will work best in their jurisdiction. The Committee directs the Secretary to issue program guidance, after consultation with the Committee, no later than 60 days after enactment of the bill to assist SEAs, school districts and schools in implementing this new initiative.

Capital expenses for private school students

The Committee provides \$41,119,000 for capital expenses grants for private schools. This amount is the same as both the Administration's request and the fiscal year 1997 amount.

Capital expenses grants are authorized to pay some of the additional costs of providing title I services to children who attend nonpublic schools. As a result of a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1985, in the case of *Aguilar v. Felton*, public school teachers or other employees can not be sent to sectarian nonpublic schools for the purpose of providing title I services. The capital expenses grants are allocated to states in proportion to the number of nonpublic school pupils they serve. Purposes for which these funds may be used include rental of classroom space in neutral sites (i.e., locations other than private or public schools), rental of mobile vans used for title I instruction, or transportation of nonpublic pupils to public schools or neutral sites.

The United States Supreme Court recently reconsidered, and reversed, its decision in the *Aguilar* case. The Committee expects the Department to provide it with an estimate of the impact of this decision on the need, and level of funding for this account prior to the conference on the fiscal year 1998 bill.

Even Start

The Committee provides \$108,000,000 for Even Start, \$6,008,000 above last year and the same as the request. Even Start provides demonstration grants for model programs of joint education of disadvantaged children, aged 1-7 years, who live in title I target school attendance areas, plus their parents who are eligible to be served under the Adult Education Act. These parents are not in school, are above the state's compulsory school attendance age limit, and have not earned a high school diploma (or equivalent). At appropriations levels above \$50,000,000, Even Start funds are allocated to the states, generally in proportion to title I basic grants.

Assistant Secretary is authorized to support activities to increase the participation of minority researchers and institutions as well as research and development centers, in order to support the objectives of the national research institutes. A new national education dissemination system is established to coordinate various dissemination activities, including an electronic network linking various offices and activities at the Department of Education; maintain the 16 Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouses (ERIC); identify successful educational programs and disseminate information about them; provide contracts for the operation of regional educational laboratories to conduct research and development, provide technical assistance, promote education reform, and assist rural education; including learning grant institutions and district education agents; support a teacher research dissemination demonstration program; and operate the National Library of Education.

The Committee has included \$58,500,000 for the regional educational laboratories. This amount is \$7,500,000 over the 1997 level and \$5,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee believes that the regional educational laboratories are well suited to help schools in each of their regions to implement the whole school reform initiative for which the Committee has provided \$200,000,000 under the title 1 program and under the Fund for the Improvement of Education. Research sponsored by the Department of Education indicates that effective implementation of schoolwide reform is critical to achieving improved student performance. The laboratories are the Department's primary agent for translating sound educational research into effective practice in the field.

Accordingly, the bill includes an additional \$5,000,000 to expand, within the laboratories, a support system of technical experts for schools that elect to implement research-based, whole school reform models. The additional funds shall be made available to the ten regional laboratories according to each laboratory's share of 1997 funding. The funds shall be used to provide schools with expertise to assist them in choosing, implementing and evaluating whole school reform strategies. Services the laboratories can include, but are not limited to, are providing research-based expert advice to support a school initiating and implementing schoolwide reform, training school personnel, disseminating information on whole school reform and establishing partnerships with non-laboratory developers of whole school models. The Committee also intends that the laboratories work with schools to assist them in designing an appropriate, long-term and rigorous evaluation of their schoolwide reform strategy that will assist the school during its implementation to obtain increasing levels of student success and measure the results achieved. To the extent practicable, these evaluations should include control groups and random assignment. To the extent that a laboratory declines to accept the additional funding due to other priorities set by its local governing board, the Committee intends that such funds be distributed to other laboratories to support piloting of new research-based approaches to whole school restructuring. The Committee intends that all laboratory funds provided be released no later than December 1, 1997.

Oxy

education has a broad portfolio of activities related to the national education goals and systemic education reform. Under the fund, the Secretary of Education supports activities that identify and disseminate innovative educational approaches.

The Committee has included \$50,000,000 for a new whole school reform initiative under the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE). Together with \$150,000,000 distributed under the Title 1 program, a total of \$200,000,000 is provided for whole school reform initiatives.

The Committee strongly believes that all schools, not just Title 1 schools, can benefit from these comprehensive, research-tested models that allow schools to set and achieve their own school reform goals. Therefore, the Committee intends that \$50,000,000 be awarded by the Secretary on a competitive basis to local educational agencies (LEAs) for schools that are not eligible for Title 1 funding but could benefit from comprehensive schoolwide reform. The Secretary should give special consideration to LEA applications that include well-defined plans, using rigorous methodological designs and techniques including control groups and random assignment to the extent practicable, to evaluate the results achieved with this funding. The Committee directs that the Secretary announce a competition, after consultation with the Committee, that provides discretionary awards based on criteria similar to that outlined by the Committee under Title 1 demonstrations of innovative practices.

The Committee is aware of a promising school-based program, Jump Start, designed to maintain gains made by students and parents involved in Head Start programs. These gains include higher levels of parental involvement in schools and improved student readiness to deal with their school responsibilities. The Committee encourages the Department to fund the evaluation, expansion and dissemination of information on the Jump Start program.

The Committee is also aware that the women in Natural Sciences program provides science enrichment for talented minority and underserved female high school students. The Committee encourages the Department to support the evaluation, expansion and dissemination of this program.

The Committee is aware of concerns that have been raised about the President's proposals for voluntary national tests of reading in English at the fourth grade and mathematics at the eighth grade. These concerns include questions about the Administration proceeding with the testing initiative without adequate Congressional oversight and review, concerns that the Administration has not planned sufficient time to develop high quality tests, concerns about the impact of the national tests on standards and accompanying assessments that many states have recently developed, and concerns that not all students will have an equal opportunity to be successful on these tests. Given the fact that United States has never before had national tests that yield results for individual students, the Committee believes that many of these concerns are justified. In order to provide a better base of information on which the Congress can consider this Presidential initiative, the Committee has included bill language requiring the Department of Education to contract with National Academy of Sciences to conduct a

Obey

Voluntary
National
Tests

J

**ADDITIONAL VIEWS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE
DAVID OBEY AND THE HONORABLE JOHN PORTER**

THE ROAD TO BETTER AMERICAN SCHOOLS

No topic has more consistently been the focus of public debate over the last two decades than the reform of our educational system. Parents know that the competition for jobs and pay which their children will face will be quite different from what they themselves faced only a few years ago. How they fare will be determined not just by how their skills stack up against other workers in their own community but how those skills compare with those of workers around the globe. The relationship between living standards and work skills will become increasingly direct.

As a result improvement has been a central agenda item at local school board meetings across the country. It absorbs much of the deliberative time of each state legislature. It is a frequent topic of debate here in Congress and it is a matter of great concern to not only parents and students but corporate leaders and tax payers as well.

Yet the road to school reform has proven elusive. Teachers in many schools complain with apparent justification that students are spending so much time taking newly mandated standardized tests that it has significantly cut back the time available for instruction. In some classrooms, computers purchased with the promise of revolutionizing instruction sit idle day after day serving only as icons of the difficulty of changing the fundamental problems which face our schools. Some thoughtful school board members have reluctantly concluded that the only two things that will really bring positive change to our schools is an infusion of more talented teachers and an infusion of more disciplined and motivated students—two things that they ultimately feel powerless to change.

But in the midst of this debate and the many failed efforts to revolutionize public instruction, a promising set of ideas about school organization has taken hold and begun to produce extremely promising results. There is no single father to these new ideas. In fact, they include more than half a dozen detailed models developed separately by educators at universities in different parts of the country. Each of these models for reforming schools has its own special set of characteristics, but all of the models would significantly change the way that the overwhelming majority of American schools now operate. Strikingly, all of these models have a great deal in common with one another.

Among those who have brought forth proposals for change are James Comer at Yale, Henry Levin at Stanford, TedSizer at Brown and Robert Slavin at Johns Hopkins. Each has his own special area of emphasis. The Comer *School Development Program* for instance focuses on the organization of school decision making. Lev-

in's *Accelerated Schools* puts forth a curriculum proposal for challenging students identified for remediation. Sizer's *Coalition of Essential Schools* focuses on the "triangle of learning," the relationship between students, teachers and curriculum. Slavin's *Success for All* and *Roots and Wings* call for reallocating resources into the most essential elements for school success, curriculum, instruction and family support.

While the area of emphasis differs from one model to the next, all of these models are based on the concept that effective reform is a school wide proposition. In other words, you can't make sufficient progress by working on one classroom or one teacher or the curriculum for one subject area at a time, the whole school has to be the target for change. All share the concept that parents have to be centrally engaged at every step of the decision making and evaluation process. All concur that a great deal of autonomy is needed for individual schools and that the current top down authority structure existing within most schools has got to go. Each of these concepts requires principals to significantly redefine their roles. They must become consensus builders rather than autocratic directors. They must learn to bring teachers and parents into the decision making process and create a community wide commitment to the behavioral and academic standards of the school.

All argue that the school boards, superintendents and other administrators in the School system have to be aware of the need for these changes and actively support schools attempting change. All are supported by an outside set of experts who are available to advise and help the schools, teachers and principals to successfully retool their school. Finally, each of these concepts is far more than an academic treatise on what people living in the real world should be doing. Each of these models has been developed into real functioning programs being used in a cross section of communities with very specific and detailed guidelines for approaching the real life—every day problems of teaching and learning.

Over the last three decades the principal tool for raising educational performance nationwide has been the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and specifically Title I of that Act. Through Title I, the federal government has focused substantial additional resources on underachieving children in lower income schools. What we have learned from these new "whole school" models is that the improvements in academic performance of Title I children can be more broadly based and more long lasting if the focus on individual children takes place in an environment in which parents and teachers are working together for goals they both agree with and played a role in developing.

The most remarkable fact about these models is the extent to which they have succeeded in improving school and student performance without becoming better known to the public or even to many in the education community. Among the organizations that have recognized the potential such models hold for improving the effectiveness of American schools are the Annenberg Foundation, the Edison Project and New American Schools. New American Schools was created by business leaders from a number of the nation's largest corporations and began working with local school districts in 1992 to help certain selected schools adapt to one or an-

other of seven selected school reform models—each representing a different version of “whole school” reform. More than 500 schools in 25 states have participated for much of that period and another 200 schools have been added recently. While that is a tiny fraction of the more than 100,000 elementary and secondary schools across the country, it is providing a solid information base for examining the potential of these reforms. The Rand Corporation has been hired to evaluate this information. While understanding the long term impact of alternate education approaches on student achievement necessarily takes many years, the early results from these experiments have in many instances been dramatic.

A number of schools in Prince Georges County, Maryland using the *ATLAS* model (a variation on the *Comer School Development Program*) raised their reading scores by 30% on the Maryland Performance Assessment Program. The proportion of students scoring satisfactory or excellent on the exam tripled within a three year period beginning in 1992. Most schools experienced a dramatic decline in discipline problems and a dramatic increase in levels of school attendance.

The John F. Kennedy Elementary School in Louisville, Kentucky increased its scores on the Kentucky statewide assessment by 43% in reading and 48% in math using the *National Alliance* reform model. In three years, the school rose from among the lowest-scoring schools in the state to the top 10%.

The *Success for All* model developed at Johns Hopkins University appears to have been particularly successful in boosting achievement among language minority students. In six schools located in Baltimore and Philadelphia, first grade students were three months ahead of their counterparts in other elementary schools by the end of their first year. By the end of second grade they were almost a year ahead of their counterparts.

The Hansberry Elementary School in the Bronx increased the percentage of student who passed the New York State essential skills test from 22% to 50% in reading and from 47% to 82% in math in only two years beginning in 1993. Hansberry used a model developed by the Hudson Institute known as the *Modern Red Schoolhouse*.

The Rand Corporation noted that “By any number of measures, New American Schools has accomplished a great deal in its first four years of programmatic activity . . . What began as an effort to create small number of outstanding designs for schools has expanded to a comprehensive strategy to reform education.”

While these new approaches to improving schools may represent fundamental change from the way most schools now operate, it is important to recognize that these approaches are very consistent with the kinds of organizational changes being brought about in numerous other institutions in society. Just as American business has learned that enhancing the role and input of workers and suppliers creates a common commitment that improves the product and boosts productivity, the full engagement of teachers and parents in the learning process can and is producing similar results in schools. In fact, one might well argue that the standard structure of American schools has changed so little in the last half century that these types of institutional reforms can have an even

greater impact on the classroom than businesses have managed to produce in factories or offices.

We do not know all that we would like to know or should know in order to fully revolutionize the nation's schools. We do not know for certain which of these models works best or which is best suited for particular types of schools or to meet particular types of problems. But we certainly do know enough to know that we should begin. We have sufficient experience to know that many more schools should be participating—that we should not only be experimenting with these approaches in all of the states instead of only half, but that we should have a number of schools working with these reforms in each region of every state.

That is why we encouraged the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Human Services and Education to provide \$200 million to start such a whole school reform effort in the education appropriation bill for the coming school year. These funds would be apportioned by state education officials and the Department of Education to school districts interested in making a serious commitment to school improvement. Schools with differing ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds would be selected at would schools facing differing problems in improving academic performance. Each participating school would receive a grant of at least \$50,000 a year to implement a research tested model for whole school reform. The funds would be used to help the school get the necessary outside expertise, hire the staff necessary to facilitate change and train existing personnel to meet the challenges of making fundamental changes in the manner in which the schools operate. The effort would provide a large number of school districts across the country with first hand experience and information to determine whether they wish to provide additional schools with the resources necessary to make the proposed changes.

We have had an extended debate in this country about school reform and that debate will no doubt continue. But it is time to do more than debate. We now have proposals to reform our schools that are not just academic theories but are producing real results in real classrooms across America. With a relatively small amount of outside resources, communities can restructure schools in ways that make them significantly more effective. We should now move to insure that a broader spectrum of our nation's schools have a chance to move forward with these reforms and determine for themselves the impact these changes have on student learning and school effectiveness.

EXAMPLES OF WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM MODELS

Accelerated schools

Accelerated Schools, developed at Stanford University, is a whole school reform model that focuses on an accelerated curriculum that emphasizes challenging and exciting learning activities for students who normally are identified for remediation. One of the key ideas behind Accelerated Schools is that rather than remediating students' deficits, students who are placed at risk of school failure must be accelerated—given the kind of high-expectations curriculum typical of programs for gifted and talented students. The pro-

gram's social goals include reducing the dropout rate, drug use, and teen pregnancies.

The Accelerated Schools model is built around three central principles. One is unity of purpose, a common vision of what the school should become, agreed to and worked toward by all school staff, parents, students and community. A second is empowerment coupled with responsibility, which means that staff, parents and students find their own way to transform themselves. A third element, building on strength, means identifying the strengths of students, of staff and of the school, and then using these as a basis for reform. School staff are encouraged to search for methods that help them to realize their vision. There is an emphasis on reducing all uses of remedial activities and on adopting engaging teaching strategies, such as project-based learning. The schools implement these principles by establishing a set of cadres which include a steering committee and work groups focused on particular areas of concern. Accelerated schools are located in 39 states, including Colorado, Texas and California.

ATLAS (authentic teaching, learning and assessment of all students)

The ATLAS Program, builds on concepts embodied in the School Development Program and the Coalition of Essential Schools, but adds other unique elements. One of these is a focus on pathways—groups of schools made up of high schools and the elementary and middle schools that feed into them—whose staff work with each other to create coordinated and continuous experiences for students. Teams of teachers from each pathway work together to design curriculum and assessments based on locally defined standards. Teachers collaborate with parents and administrators to form a learning community that works together to set and maintain sound management policies.

The intent of the model is to change the culture of the school to promote high institutional and individual performance. The emphasis of the design is on helping school staffs create classroom environments in which students are active participants in their own learning. Project-based learning is extensively used. Assessment in ATLAS schools emphasize portfolios, performance examinations, and exhibitions. Community members are active participants on the school governing teams and the schools develop programs to encourage parental involvement. ATLAS schools are operating in Norfolk, Virginia; Prince Georges County, Maryland; Gorham, Maine; Seattle, Washington; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Audrey Cohen College of System of Education

Audrey Cohen College of System of Education is based on the teaching methods used at the Audrey Cohen College in New York City. This whole school reform model focuses student learning on the study and achievement of meaningful "purposes" for each semester's academic goals. A holistic and purpose-driven curriculum is the centerpiece of the model. Curriculum and instruction are organized around a single, developmentally appropriate purpose for each semester, cumulating to 26 purposes in a K-12 system. Embedded in each purpose are content areas such as English and

math, and essential skills such as critical thinking and researching. Each purpose culminates in a "constructive action" undertaken by the class to serve the community. For example, in fourth grade, one purpose is "we work for good health." Students achieve their purpose by using their knowledge and skills to plan, carry out, and evaluate a "constructive action" to benefit the community and larger world. Leadership is emphasized. These fundamental changes in the curriculum and instruction become the organizing principles for all other school activities. The total effect is intended to make the school and its programs more coherent and focused.

The purposes help the school and its officials identify key community resources to involve in the educational enterprise. The constructive actions help to bring the community into the school and the school into the community—making schools, parents and children active partners in improving the community. Schools are implementing the Audrey Cohen model in San Diego, California; Phoenix, Arizona; Miami, Florida; Hollandale, Mississippi; Seattle, Washington; and Dade County, Florida.

Coalition of essential schools

The Coalition of Essential Schools is based at Brown University. The Coalition is not a reform model per se, but an organization dedicated to "Nine Common Principles of Essential Schools". The Nine Principles involve certain ideas about school reform that include building support and collaboration among teachers, students and the families of those students in the community. The Coalition focuses on the relationship between students, teachers and the curriculum—the "triangle of learning".

In order to become a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools, a school submits a statement of its long-term goals and an action plan. The action plan must state how structures, pedagogy, curriculum and assessment will change, and it must include a statement of faculty commitment to student learning and engagement. Community support must be solicited throughout the process and a school-site coordinator is identified to work as a liaison between the school, and regional or state coordinator, and the Coalition. Membership in the Coalition includes a responsibility to participate in a network with other Coalition Schools, and to meet expectations that include commitment, whole-school involvement, documentation and assessment of progress, and funds to support school reform activities over a multi-year period.

Co-NECT schools

Co-NECT schools focus on complex interdisciplinary projects that extensively incorporate technology and connect students with ongoing scientific investigations, information resources, and other students beyond their own school. Co-NECT uses technology to enhance every aspect of teaching, learning, professional development, and school management. Cross-disciplinary teaching teams work with clusters of students. Most students stay in the same cluster with the same teachers for at least two years. Teaching and learning center of interdisciplinary projects that promote critical skills and academic understanding. Teams of educators and parents set goals. Performance-based assessments are extensively used. In ad-

dition to understanding key subject areas, graduates of the Co-NECT schools demonstrate the acquisition of specific critical skills, identified as sense-maker, designer, problem-solver, decisionmaker, communicator, team worker, product-oriented worker, and responsible, knowledgeable citizen.

A school governance council, which includes teachers, parents, business/community representatives, and administratives, runs the school. In addition, the school design team provides local input concerning the implementation, performance assessment, and accountability of the Co-NECT approach at that particular school. The Community Support Board fosters access to the local community to support the Council and design team. Mentoring and volunteers are encouraged and community input sought for standard-setting. Co-NECT schools are operating in Cincinnati, Ohio; Dade County, Florida; Memphis, Tennessee; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; San Antonio, Texas; and Worcester, Massachusetts.

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB)

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB) is built on ten design principles and operates on the belief that learning is an expedition into the unknown. Expeditionary Learning draws on the power of purposeful, intellectual investigations—called learning expeditions—to improve student achievement and build character. Learning expeditions are long-term, academically rigorous, interdisciplinary studies that require students to work inside and outside the classroom. In Expeditionary Learning schools, students and teachers stay together for more than one year, teachers work collaboratively through team teaching and shared planning, and there is no tracking.

Schools using this whole school reform model are in Baltimore County, Maryland; Boston, Massachusetts; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dade County, Florida; Decatur, Georgia; Denver, Colorado; Dubuque, Iowa; Memphis, Tennessee; New York City, New York; San Antonio, Texas; and Portland, Oregon.

Modern Red Schoolhouse

The Modern Red Schoolhouse whole school reform model helps all students achieve high standards through the construction of a standards-driven curriculum; employment of traditional and performance-based assessments; effective organizational patterns and professional-development programs; and implementation of effective community-involvement strategies. The model focuses on high standards in core academic subjects—English, geography, history, mathematics and science. Students master a rigorous curriculum designed to transmit common culture, develop character, and promote the principles of democratic government. Modern Red Schoolhouses are divided into three divisions, rather than 12 grades: primary, intermediate and upper. To advance to the next division, students must meet defined standards and pass “watershed assessments”. Students complete investigations, give oral reports, answer essay questions and take multiple choice exams. Student progress is monitored through an Individual Education Compact, negotiated by the student, parent and teacher. This compact establishes goals,

details parent and teacher responsibilities, and lists services the school, parents or community should provide.

Schools using this model are in Indianapolis, Columbus, and Beech Grove, Indiana; Franklin and Lawrence, Massachusetts; New York City, New York; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Memphis, Tennessee, and San Antonio, Texas.

National Alliance for Restructuring Education (NA)

The National Alliance for Restructuring Education is a partnership of states, districts, schools and expert organizations created to change the educational system through a five-point set of priorities called "design tasks": the design tasks are standards and assessments, learning environments, high-performance management, community services and supports, and public engagement. The model uses results-based, high performance management at the school and district levels with decentralized decisionmaking to restructure the learning environment to support student achievement and provide professional support to teachers and schools.

Alliance sites adapt for education the principles and techniques developed by American business known as high-performance management. These include strategic management, total quality management, decentralized decisionmaking and empowerment, and accountability and incentive systems. At the school level, principals are trained in these areas to better support the integration and implementation of design tasks. Alliance sites at the state, district and school levels are tasked with developing methods for informing and involving parents and the public in the school and restructuring process. Schools in the National Alliance are in Arkansas; Kentucky; Vermont; Rochester, New York; San Diego, California; and Chicago, Illinois.

Roots and Wings

Roots and Wings is a comprehensive, whole school reform model for elementary schools to ensure that all children leave elementary school with the skills required for success. It is based on the Success For All reading program developed at Johns Hopkins University and incorporates science, history, and math to achieve a comprehensive academic program. The premise of the model is that schools must do whatever it takes to make sure all students succeed. Roots and Wings schools provide at-risk students with tutors, family support, and a variety of other services aimed at eliminating obstacles to success.

The Roots component of the model is aimed at preventing failure. It emphasizes working with children and their families to ensure that children develop the basic skills and habits they need to succeed. The Wings component emphasizes a highly motivating curriculum with instructional strategies that encourage children to grow to their full potential and aspire to higher levels of learning. The design reallocates resources into a system of curriculum, instruction and family support designed to eliminate special education and low achievement.

Roots and Wings provides schools with innovative curricula and instructional methods in reading, writing, language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. The curriculum emphasizes the

use of cooperative learning throughout the grades. In each activity, students work in cooperative groups, do extensive writing, and use reading, mathematics, and fine arts skills learned in other parts of the program. Schools using this model are in Anson County, North Carolina; Memphis, Dade County, Cincinnati, Elyria and Dowson-Bryant, Ohio; Columbus, Indiana; Everett, Washington, Flint, Michigan; Modesto, Pasadena and Riverside, CA; Rockford, Illinois, St. Mary's, Baltimore and Baltimore County, Maryland.

School Development Program

The School Development Program is a comprehensive, whole school approach to reform based on principles of child development and the importance of parental involvement. The program was developed at Yale and implemented initially at two elementary schools in New Haven, Connecticut.

Each school creates three teams that take particular responsibility for moving the whole school reform agenda forward. A School Planning and Management Team, made up of teachers, parents and administration, develops and monitors implementation of a comprehensive school improvement plan. A Mental Health Team, composed of school staff concerned with mental health such as school psychologists, social workers, counselors and teachers, plans programs focusing on prevention, building positive child development, positive personal relations, etc. The third major component of the model is a Parent Program designed to build a sense of community among school staff, parents, and students. The Parent Program incorporates existing parent participation activities (such as the PTA) and implements additional activities to draw parents into the school, to increase opportunities for parents to provide volunteer services, and to design ways for having the school respect the ethnic backgrounds of its students.

The three teams in School Development Program schools work together to create comprehensive plans for school reform. Schools take a holistic approach in looking for ways to serve children's academic and social needs. The School Development Program is operating in schools in 25 states, including Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

Talent Development Model for High Schools

The Talent Development Model for High Schools was developed at Johns Hopkins University to fill a major current void in American education—a dearth of proven models of high school effectiveness. The Talent Development Model provides a comprehensive package of specific high school changes for at-risk students based on the proposition that all students can succeed in school given appropriate school organization, curriculum, instruction, and assistance as needed to assure their success. The model focuses on a common core curriculum of high standards for all students and emphasizes the creation of small learning communities through the establishment of career-focused academies as schools-within-the-school.

Essential components include (1) making schoolwork relevant by providing a career focus, (2) providing increased opportunities for academic success, (3) providing a caring and supportive learning

environment through enhanced teacher-student interactions, and (4) providing help with student problems, including academic, family problems, substance abuse, disciplinary problems, and employment needs. The Talent Development High School provides assistance to students from social workers and mental health professionals on the school staff and by referrals to an alternative after-hours school in the building designed to meet the needs of students who present the most difficult disciplinary problems. The first Talent Development High School was established at Patterson High School in Baltimore, Maryland. Additional Talent Development sites are being evaluated in Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Chicago and Los Angeles.

DAVID OBEY
JOHN PORTER

Whole school reform

cc: Cohen
Martin

House 98

- Edo for David (p 138 &)
- CERI (p 175)
- Addtl views (p 275 & 4)

Union Calendar No.

105TH CONGRESS
1st Session

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

REPORT
105-205

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1998

JULY 25, 1997.—Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. PORTER, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

[To accompany H.R. 2264]

The Committee on Appropriations submits the following report in explanation of the accompanying bill making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services (except the Food and Drug Administration, Indian Health Service, and the Office of Consumer Affairs), and Education, Armed Forces Retirement Home, Corporation for National and Community Service, Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, Federal Mine Safety and Health Review Commission, National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, National Council on Disability, National Education Goals Panel, National Labor Relations Board, National Mediation Board, Occupational Safety and Health Review Commission, Physician Payment Review Commission, Prospective Payment Assessment Commission, Railroad Retirement Board, the Social Security Administration, and the United States Institute of Peace for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes.

Obey
begin
p. 139
176, 178,
275
162 (?)

Voluntary National
Tail
p. 178

HSI, p. 180
21st C. Univ
Univ
p. 180

Act. Funds are distributed to local education agencies on the basis of competitive sub-grants. States receive funding on the basis of a state plan describing its long term strategies for financing technology education in the State, involving the private sector and assisting school districts with the greatest needs.

The Committee has consolidated funding for several small technology programs funded in the Office of Education Research and Improvement into this account. Total amounts available for technology (in accounts where technology expenditures are known) are the same as the President's request, although they are distributed into larger accounts to provide maximum impact for the funding and maximum discretion to the Secretary.

The Committee is concerned by the rapid increase in funding in this program in addition to other funding provided in title I, title VI, Special Education, and other programs of the Department of Education as well as funding made available to elementary and secondary schools from the Telecommunications Act of 1994 (P.L. 104-104). This concern is enhanced by the fact that the Department still cannot provide the Committee with a statement of obligations of the amounts of Departmental funds spent on technology. In testimony before the Committee, the Administration could only estimate that Federal spending for technology was \$825 million. As a result, the Committee expects that the Department will continue to abide by, and supply the data required by the conference report on P.L. 104-208.

There still seems little overall direction as to the Federal commitment to improving the use of technology in elementary and secondary education. It is unclear whether the Department views the Federal role as establishing the infrastructure for using technology and training teachers to employ it; purchasing the initial hardware and software; or purchasing and maintaining software and hardware—a policy requiring replacement of hardware and upgrading software every two to four years. Neither policy statements by the Administration nor the Department's strategic plan address this policy vacuum. The Committee, therefore, directs the Secretary to provide the Committee with an overall plan for education technology, including all funds for technology available from the Department and giving recognition to other Federal funds and funding, discounts and subsidies available under the Telecommunications Act.

The Committee urges the Secretary, when awarding educational technology grants, to give consideration to school districts around the country that exemplify: (1) high concentrations of at-risk youth; (2) empowerment zones and enhanced enterprise communities; and (3) significant investment to establish infrastructure with aggressive plans to utilize educational technology. The Houston Independent School District in Houston, Texas is an example of such a school that has made a substantial effort in this area.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

The bill includes \$8,204,217,000 for education for the disadvantaged programs. This amount is \$126,951,000 more than the Administration's fiscal year 1998 budget request and \$404,644,000 more than the fiscal year 1997 appropriation. This appropriation

account includes compensatory education programs authorized under title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Grants to local educational agencies

Of the amounts provided for Title I programs, \$6,191,350,000 is available for basic grants to local education agencies and state administration. This is \$81,862,000 below the amount for the 1997-98 school year and the same as the request. Funding for concentration grants, which targets funds to Local Education Agencies in counties with high levels of disadvantaged children, is \$949,249,000, \$72,771,000 below last year and \$50,000,000 below the request level. The Committee provided \$400,000,000 under Targeted Grants which focuses even more funding on the most disadvantaged local educational agencies. This level is \$50,000,000 above the request level and \$400,000,000 above last year.

Financial assistance flows to school districts by formula, based in part on the number of school-aged children from low-income families. Within districts, local school officials target funds on school attendance areas with the greatest number or percentage of children from poor families. Local school districts develop and implement their own programs to meet the needs of disadvantaged students. About 14,000 local school districts participate in the program, which served an estimated 6.2 to 6.5 million pupils in 1995.

Funds under this account will also be used to pay the Federal share of state administrative costs for title I programs. The maximum state administration grant is equal to 1 percent of title I local educational agency plus state agency grants to the state, or \$400,000, whichever is greater. These funds are included in the grants to local educational agencies account, rather than being a separate line item.

Demonstrations of innovative practices

The bill includes \$150,000,000 for demonstrations of innovative practices; this is \$150,000,000 more than provided in 1997 and in the budget request. The Committee provides these funds to accelerate the wide-scale application of effective approaches to whole school reform in Title I schools. With \$50,000,000 provided under the fund for the improvement of education for similar demonstrations at non-Title I schools, the bill provides a total of \$200,000,000 for whole school reform initiatives.

The Committee has become aware of exciting work that is underway in a number of schools across the country using research-based methods to transform entire schools into high-performing learning centers that have challenging academic standards, engaged teachers, and strong parental and community support. Effective whole school models such as the School Development Program developed by Yale University's psychiatrist James Comer, the Success for All and Roots and Wings programs developed by Johns Hopkins University, the Modern Red Schoolhouse developed by the Hudson Institute are demonstrating that comprehensive, whole school reform can lead to increased student achievement. While each of these approaches is unique, these reform initiatives share several common characteristics that are integral to their success:

Obey

they are based on solid research,
 they are known to be replicable in schools with diverse characteristics,
 they have a comprehensive vision for transforming entire schools,
 they have high academic standards,
 they require the active engagement of the entire school community, including teachers and parents, and
 they involve intensive and ongoing teacher and staff development and training.

The recent *Special Strategies for Educating Disadvantaged Children* evaluation sponsored by the Department of Education documented that several whole school models, properly implemented and adapted to local communities, can make dramatic differences in student academic achievement. The study also concluded that: " * * * after a third of a century of research on school change, we still have not provided adequate human and fiscal resources, appropriately targeted, to make large-scale program improvements a reliably consistent reality." The Committee believes that the time is right for a significant federal investment focused on applying these innovative schoolwide reform approaches on a broad scale in a large number of schools.

Accordingly, the bill includes language allocating \$150,000,000 to support the initial investment costs for Title I schools that wish to apply research-based, whole school models to increase student achievement. The Committee intends that the Secretary of Education make these funds available to SEAs that apply for the funding based on the formula for distributing Title grants under section 1124. In cases where an SEA declines to apply for its formula-based allocation, the Committee directs that the Secretary use the funds to make discretionary grants to other SEAs that have a need for additional funding for whole school reform in Title I schools.

The Committee intends that SEAs use these funds to make competitive subgrants to school districts on behalf of individual schools that require additional funding to implement comprehensive, research-based reform models. SEAs should give special consideration to district applications that include well-defined plans, using rigorous methodological designs and techniques including control groups and random assignment to the extent practicable, to evaluate the results achieved with this funding. The Committee intends that school districts shall use their subgrants to provide awards to individual schools on a competitive basis; such awards be of sufficient size and scope to support the initial start-up costs of the particular reform model chosen by the school but not less than \$50,000; and that awards be renewable for two additional years after the initial award, subject to the availability of appropriations. The Committee also intends that Title I schools receiving funds under this initiative:

Identify an effective, research-based whole school model the school will adopt that provides a blueprint for reform of the entire school;

Describe how training and external expert technical assistance to facilitate implementation of reform activities will be se-

States have networks
 through accredited school
 systems for all

See p. 176

also received
 an extra
 \$5 million
 above admin
 request for
 this

SEA
 apply

SEA make
 subgrants

will be
 app to
 implement

a lot of it will be required

cured (e.g. from regional laboratories, external developers, etc.);

Demonstrate support from teachers and staff, and parents;

Identify how other federal/state/local resources provided to the school will be utilized to provide coordinated services to support the reform effort; and

Include a plan for evaluating the implementation of the reform initiative and results achieved.

will need
The Committee directs the Secretary of Education to make available to SEAs, school districts and schools information about proven and promising whole school reform models and their implementation costs so that schools can make an informed choice about what will work best in their jurisdiction. The Committee directs the Secretary to issue program guidance, after consultation with the Committee, no later than 60 days after enactment of the bill to assist SEAs, school districts and schools in implementing this new initiative.

Capital expenses for private school students

The Committee provides \$41,119,000 for capital expenses grants for private schools. This amount is the same as both the Administration's request and the fiscal year 1997 amount.

Capital expenses grants are authorized to pay some of the additional costs of providing title I services to children who attend non-public schools. As a result of a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court in 1985, in the case of *Aguilar v. Felton*, public school teachers or other employees can not be sent to sectarian nonpublic schools for the purpose of providing title I services. The capital expenses grants are allocated to states in proportion to the number of non-public school pupils they serve. Purposes for which these funds may be used include rental of classroom space in neutral sites (i.e., locations other than private or public schools), rental of mobile vans used for title I instruction, or transportation of nonpublic pupils to public schools or neutral sites.

The United States Supreme Court recently reconsidered, and reversed, its decision in the *Aguilar* case. The Committee expects the Department to provide it with an estimate of the impact of this decision on the need, and level of funding for this account prior to the conference on the fiscal year 1998 bill.

Even Start

The Committee provides \$108,000,000 for Even Start, \$6,008,000 above last year and the same as the request. Even Start provides demonstration grants for model programs of joint education of disadvantaged children, aged 1-7 years, who live in title I target school attendance areas, plus their parents who are eligible to be served under the Adult Education Act. These parents are not in school, are above the state's compulsory school attendance age limit, and have not earned a high school diploma (or equivalent). At appropriations levels above \$50,000,000, Even Start funds are allocated to the states, generally in proportion to title I basic grants.

State agency programs: migrant

The bill includes \$305,473,000 for the migrant education program, \$14,027,000 below the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 1997 appropriation. This program supports formula grants to state agencies for the support of special educational and related services to children of migratory agricultural workers and fishermen. The purpose of this program is to provide supplementary academic education, remedial or compensatory instruction, English for limited English proficient students, testing, plus guidance and counseling.

State agency programs: neglected and delinquent

For the state agency program for neglected and delinquent children, the bill includes \$39,311,000; this is \$1,022,000 less than the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 1997 appropriation. This formula grant program provides services to participants in institutions for juvenile delinquents, adult correctional institutions, or institutions for the neglected.

State school improvement

The Committee provides no funding for state school improvement, the same as fiscal year 1997 and \$8,000,000 below the request. Provisions of the underlying statute permit State and local education agencies to use their title I funds for school improvement activities.

Evaluation

The Committee provides \$10,000,000 for evaluation, the same as the budget request and \$3,023,000 above the 1997 appropriation. Title I evaluation supports large scale national evaluations that examine how title I is contributing to improved student performance at the state, local education agency, and school levels; short term studies that document promising models; and other activities to help states and local education agencies implement requirements in the title I statute.

The Committee is concerned that there remains little firm, empirical data on the effectiveness of the title I program, particularly since reauthorization. The Congressional Research Service noted in a recent analysis of title I evaluations that "There are numerous, substantial limitations to the significance of evaluations of aggregate impact of title I that are currently available." The Committee intends that these funds be used to support the development of evaluation techniques and data on the impact of title I on both a local and national basis.

Migrant education, high school equivalency program

The bill includes 7,634,000 for the high school equivalency program. This amount is \$193,000 above the fiscal year 1997 amount and the same as the request.

College assistance migrant programs

The bill includes \$2,081,000 for the college assistance migrant programs. This amount is \$53,000 above the fiscal year 1997 and

IMPACT AID

The bill provides \$796,000,000 for Federal impact aid programs in fiscal year 1998, an increase of \$66,000,000 above the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$138,000,000 above the budget request. The appropriation funds the impact aid program at the same level as it was funded in fiscal year 1994. This account supports payments to school districts affected by Federal activities and is authorized under title VIII of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. During the most recent school year, payments were made to approximately 1,800 school districts on behalf of 1,400,000 children.

The bill does not adopt the President's proposal to amend the authorizing statute to reduce by 800 the number of school districts receiving payments and to reduce by 1,000,000 the number of children on behalf of whom payments are made. The Committee regards impact aid as an obligation of the Federal Government and has included funds sufficient to adequately reimburse school districts adversely impacted by Federal activities.

The Committee notes that the President proposes to substantially increase funding for general Federal assistance to school districts at the same time it proposes to dramatically reduce impact aid payments which represent an obligation of the Federal government to mitigate the adverse effects of its activities on local school districts.

The Committee notes that in addition to the funding provided in this bill, the House Committee version of the National Security Appropriations bill includes \$35,000,000 for payments to school districts experiencing heavy military impact.

Basic support payments

The bill includes \$667,000,000 for basic support payments to local educational agencies, an increase of \$51,500,000 over the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$83,000,000 over the budget request. This amount is estimated to be sufficient to fully fund learning opportunity threshold payments for the first time. The Committee rejects the Administration proposal to eliminate over 1,000,000 children and 800 school districts from the impact aid program. Basic support payments compensate school districts for lost tax revenue and are made on behalf of Federally-connected children such as children of members of the uniformed service who live on Federal property.

Payments for children with disabilities

The bill provides \$40,000,000 for payments on behalf of Federally-connected children with disabilities, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 1997 appropriation. These payments compensate school districts for the increased costs of serving Federally-connected children with disabilities.

The Committee rejects the Administration proposal to reduce from 63,000 in fiscal year 1997 to 31,000 in fiscal year 1998 the number of children with disabilities on behalf of whom payment are made.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAPITAL AND FINANCING PROGRAM

Federal administration

The bill provides \$104,000 for the administration of the historically black college and university capital financing program authorized under part B of title VII of the Higher Education Act, the same as the budget request and the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation. The program is intended to make capital available for repair and renovation of facilities at historically black colleges and universities. In exceptional circumstances, capital provided under the program can be used for construction or acquisition of facilities.

Bond subsidies

Under the HBCU capital program, a private, for-profit "designated bonding authority" issues construction bonds to raise capital for loans to historically black colleges and universities for construction projects. The Department provides insurance for these bonds, guaranteeing full payment of principal and interest to bond holders. Federally insured bonds and unpaid interest are limited by statute to \$357,000,000. The letter of credit limitation establishes the total amount of bonds which can be issued by the designated bonding authority. The credit limitation must be explicitly stated in an appropriation Act according to the authorizing legislation.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

The bill includes \$508,752,000 for education research, statistics, and improvement programs. This amount is \$1,941,000 less than the budget request, and \$110,626,000 above the fiscal year 1997 level. This account supports education research authorized under the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994, title IX of P.L. 103-227; the National Center for Education Statistics and the National Assessment of Educational Progress authorized by the National Education Statistics Act of 1994, title VI of P.L. 103-382; titles II, III, VIII, and X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act; and title IV of Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Research

This bill includes \$139,535,000 for educational research, an increase of \$5,000,000 over the budget request and \$15,968,000 over the fiscal year 1997 amount. The Office of Educational Research and Improvement conducts research and development activities, which are authorized under the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994, title IX of P.L. 103-227. The 1994 Act established a National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board within the Office of Educational Research and Improvement, and authorizes five new national research institutes for the following subject areas: (1) student achievement, curriculum, and assessment; (2) education of at-risk students; (3) educational governance, finance, policymaking, and management; (4) early childhood development and education; and (5) postsecondary education, libraries, and lifelong learning. The

Assistant Secretary is authorized to support activities to increase the participation of minority researchers and institutions as well as research and development centers, in order to support the objectives of the national research institutes. A new national education dissemination system is established to coordinate various dissemination activities, including an electronic network linking various offices and activities at the Department of Education; maintain the 16 Educational Resources Information Center Clearinghouses (ERIC); identify successful educational programs and disseminate information about them; provide contracts for the operation of regional educational laboratories to conduct research and development, provide technical assistance, promote education reform, and assist rural education; including learning grant institutions and district education agents; support a teacher research dissemination demonstration program; and operate the National Library of Education.

The Committee has included \$58,500,000 for the regional educational laboratories. This amount is \$7,500,000 over the 1997 level and \$5,000,000 over the budget request. The Committee believes that the regional educational laboratories are well suited to help schools in each of their regions to implement the whole school reform initiative for which the Committee has provided \$200,000,000 under the title 1 program and under the Fund for the Improvement of Education. Research sponsored by the Department of Education indicates that effective implementation of schoolwide reform is critical to achieving improved student performance. The laboratories are the Department's primary agent for translating sound educational research into effective practice in the field.

Accordingly, the bill includes an additional \$5,000,000 to expand, within the laboratories, a support system of technical experts for schools that elect to implement research-based, whole school reform models. The additional funds shall be made available to the ten regional laboratories according to each laboratory's share of 1997 funding. The funds shall be used to provide schools with expertise to assist them in choosing, implementing and evaluating whole school reform strategies. Services the laboratories can include, but are not limited to, are providing research-based expert advice to support a school initiating and implementing schoolwide reform, training school personnel, disseminating information on whole school reform and establishing partnerships with non-laboratory developers of whole school models. The Committee also intends that the laboratories work with schools to assist them in designing an appropriate, long-term and rigorous evaluation of their schoolwide reform strategy that will assist the school during its implementation to obtain increasing levels of student success and measure the results achieved. To the extent practicable, these evaluations should include control groups and random assignment. To the extent that a laboratory declines to accept the additional funding due to other priorities set by its local governing board, the Committee intends that such funds be distributed to other laboratories to support piloting of new research-based approaches to whole school restructuring. The Committee intends that all laboratory funds provided be released no later than December 1, 1997.

Obey

The Committee has also included \$2,500,000, as requested, for the legislatively mandated third-year evaluation of the laboratories.

The Committee reiterates its intent, expressed in the Conference Report on the fiscal year 1996 bill (Report No. 104-537) that all work of the Regional Education Laboratories be based on the priorities established by their regional governing boards.

As noted elsewhere in this report, the Committee is concerned by the lack of data on the effectiveness of programs within the Department of Education and encourages the Office to include within its planning process activities that will develop evaluation techniques for Federally funded education programs and to begin to develop and fund projects to evaluate the Department's programs. These activities should be carried out in conjunction with the performance measures being developed under the Government Performance and Results Act.

Statistics

This bill includes \$66,250,000 for the activities of the National Center for Education Statistics, exclusive of the National Assessment of Educational Progress. This amount is \$16,250,000 above the fiscal year 1997 amount, and the same as the budget request. Statistics activities are authorized under the National Education Statistics Act of 1994, title VI of P.L. 103-382. The Center collects, analyzes, and reports statistics on all levels of education in the United States. Activities are carried out directly and through grants and contracts. Major publications include "The Condition of Education" and "Digest of Education Statistics." Other products include projections of enrollments, teacher supply and demand, and educational expenditures. Technical assistance to state and local education agencies and postsecondary institutions is provided. International comparisons are authorized.

Assessment

This bill includes \$38,367,000 for the National Assessment of Educational Progress, \$5,750,000 above the fiscal year 1997 amount, and \$6,000 below the budget request. The Assessment is authorized under section 411 of the National Education Statistics Act of 1994, and is the only nationally representative survey of educational ability and achievement of American students. The primary goal of the Assessment is to determine and report the status and trends of the knowledge and skills of students, subject by subject. Subject areas assessed in the past have included reading, writing, mathematics, science, and social studies, as well as citizenship, literature, art, and music. The Assessment is operated by contractors through competitive awards made by the National Center for Education Statistics; a National Assessment Governing Board formulates the policy guidelines for the program. Within the amounts provided, \$2,865,000 is for the National Assessment Governing Board.

Fund for the improvement of education

The bill includes \$80,000,000 for the fund for the improvement of education which is \$40,000,000 above both the budget request and the fiscal year 1997 amount. The fund for the improvement of

education has a broad portfolio of activities related to the national education goals and systemic education reform. Under the fund, the Secretary of Education supports activities that identify and disseminate innovative educational approaches.

The Committee has included \$50,000,000 for a new whole school reform initiative under the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE). Together with \$150,000,000 distributed under the Title 1 program, a total of \$200,000,000 is provided for whole school reform initiatives.

The Committee strongly believes that all schools, not just Title 1 schools, can benefit from these comprehensive, research-tested models that allow schools to set and achieve their own school reform goals. Therefore, the Committee intends that \$50,000,000 be awarded by the Secretary on a competitive basis to local educational agencies (LEAs) for schools that are not eligible for Title 1 funding but could benefit from comprehensive schoolwide reform. The Secretary should give special consideration to LEA applications that include well-defined plans, using rigorous methodological designs and techniques including control groups and random assignment to the extent practicable, to evaluate the results achieved with this funding. The Committee directs that the Secretary announce a competition, after consultation with the Committee, that provides discretionary awards based on criteria similar to that outlined by the Committee under Title 1 demonstrations of innovative practices.

The Committee is aware of a promising school-based program, Jump Start, designed to maintain gains made by students and parents involved in Head Start programs. These gains include higher levels of parental involvement in schools and improved student readiness to deal with their school responsibilities. The Committee encourages the Department to fund the evaluation, expansion and dissemination of information on the Jump Start program.

The Committee is also aware that the women in Natural Sciences program provides science enrichment for talented minority and underserved female high school students. The Committee encourages the Department to support the evaluation, expansion and dissemination of this program.

The Committee is aware of concerns that have been raised about the President's proposals for voluntary national tests of reading in English at the fourth grade and mathematics at the eighth grade. These concerns include questions about the Administration proceeding with the testing initiative without adequate Congressional oversight and review, concerns that the Administration has not planned sufficient time to develop high quality tests, concerns about the impact of the national tests on standards and accompanying assessments that many states have recently developed, and concerns that not all students will have an equal opportunity to be successful on these tests. Given the fact that United States has never before had national tests that yield results for individual students, the Committee believes that many of these concerns are justified. In order to provide a better base of information on which the Congress can consider this Presidential initiative, the Committee has included bill language requiring the Department of Education to contract with National Academy of Sciences to conduct a

Obey

Voluntary
National
Tests

study and report to the Committee on the voluntary national testing initiative. The Committee directs that the National Academy of Sciences evaluate:

1. The technical quality of the work performed under the test development contracts, based on an examination of the item specifications, frameworks and test content; linking activities; and contracts for providing the tests to states and school districts;

2. The adequacy of the administration of the field tests, based on the contractors' administration plans and observation of selected field test administrations;

3. The validity and reliability of the data produced by the field tests, based on examination and analysis of the contractors' validity studies;

4. The reasonableness and validity of the contractors' design for linking test results to student performance levels, based on data from the field tests; and

5. The degree to which the tests can be expected to provide valid and useful information to the public.

The Committee also would like the study to suggest other options to provide national comparisons of achievement in reading in English at the fourth grade and mathematics at the eighth grade based on existing achievement tests or other appropriate assessment tools.

The Committee has included bill language directing that a preliminary report be completed by no later than June 30, 1998 and a final report by August 31, 1998, and prohibiting the administration of the tests on a national basis until the final report is completed. The Committee directs the Secretary of Education to make available information to the National Academy of Sciences as the voluntary testing initiative progresses in order to expedite the National Academy of Sciences review.

The Committee is aware of a \$500,000 proposal for enhanced teacher training for the Foorman, Frances, and Fletcher NICHD approved longitudinal project "Early Interventions for Children with Reading Problems" involving nine public elementary schools in the District of Columbia. Such a project will focus upon research-based components critical to success in learning to read and spell-phonemic awareness, alphabetic and orthographic knowledge, and comprehension strategy instruction-all within a literature rich environment. The teacher training will involve five activities: general coordination/training, generic teacher training, comprehension training, teacher processes and curriculum-based assessment. The Secretary is instructed to give careful consideration to applications for funds for this activity.

The Committee has included within the funds available in this account, \$125,000 for the national student and parent mock election.

The Committee believes that the Empire State College International Center for Educational Technology and Distance Learning is a particularly worthwhile project and urges the Department to give careful consideration to any applications submitted to fund this project.

Similarly, the Committee is aware that the Woman in Natural Sciences programs provides science enrichment for talented minority and under-served female high school students. The Committee encourages the Department to support the evaluation, expansion, and dissemination of this program.

The Committee encourages the Office of Education Research and Improvement to support a model youth concert demonstration program to provide additional information on the contribution of music to learning.

The Committee understands the unique and difficult challenges faced by urban school systems as they attempt to effectively educate Hispanic students in areas of science and mathematics. The Committee notes that, in the face of these challenges, there are Hispanic Serving Institutions of Higher Education that have developed model curricula and programs that have improved the performance of Hispanic students in these disciplines. The Committee recognizes, however, that these resources have not been made available to relevant public school systems with a large Hispanic enrollment, like those found in New York City, Chicago, Miami, San Antonio and El Paso. The Committee believes that support for institutions which have developed successful models should be a high priority for the Fund and urges the Secretary to give applications from such institutions a high priority.

International education exchange

This bill includes no funding for the international education exchange program authorized under title VI of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which is \$5,000,000 below both the budget request and the fiscal year 1997 amount. This program provides to educators in eligible countries overseas selected curricula and teacher training programs in civics and economic education that have been developed in the United States.

The United States Information Agency reports that there are 130 programs in 38 Departments and Agencies that provide international exchange and training opportunities.

21st century community learning centers

The bill provides \$50,000,000 for 21st century community learning centers, \$50,000,000 above the budget request and \$49,000,000 above the fiscal year 1997 level.

The President has proposed to vastly expand this program: essentially to create new demonstration grant program to stimulate and expand significant after-school learning programs available to young people. The request would support a grant competition for 200-300 new learning centers. These after-school learning centers would help rural and inner-city public schools to stay open after school hours and serve as safe, neighborhood learning centers where students can do their homework and obtain tutoring and mentoring services. The centers would provide learning activities in safe and constructive environments, under adult supervision.

While the Committee supports the development of these programs, it is concerned about the ability of the Committee to sustain funding in future years for this new initiative in light of growing elementary and secondary enrollments, which may generate addi-

re: HSI's
699

21st C.
Community
Learning
Centers

tional funding requirements for core education programs like compensatory education for the disadvantaged and education for children with disabilities. It is in the intent of the Committee to discontinue funding after fiscal year 1999 in the absence of a new authorization specifically addressing after-school learning centers.

The Committee believes that this program could best achieve its goals if schools are given the freedom to develop consortia with public libraries. Accordingly, the Committee encourages the Secretary to give favorable consideration to consortia that involve the innovative programs of libraries. In addition, the Committee believes that applicants that propose to use community learning centers as a place where extra reading and literacy help can be provided to children who are at risk of falling behind in their reading skills should have a high priority for funding, consistent with the goals of the President's reading initiative.

While the Committee recognizes that consistent with the authorization of the 21st Century Community Learning Centers, it is the intention of the Department to award grants to rural and inner-city public schools, the Committee urges the Secretary to consider, in addition, applicants from non-rural or inner city schools that will use these funds to serve at-risk communities.

Civic education

This bill includes \$4,500,000 for the civic education program, the same as both the budget request and the fiscal year 1997 level. Under this program, a sole source award is made to the Center for Civic Education for its "We the People" program.

Eisenhower professional development national activities

This bill includes \$21,000,000 for the Eisenhower professional development national activities, which is \$9,000,000 below the budget request and \$7,658,000 above the fiscal year 1997 amount. Funds made available in this account are solely for the purpose of funding the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards to carry out activities outlined in the budget justification which accompanied the President's fiscal year 1998 request.

Eisenhower regional mathematics and science education consortia

This bill includes \$15,000,000 for the Eisenhower regional mathematics and science education consortia, the same as the budget request and the fiscal year 1997 amount. The purpose of the consortia is to disseminate exemplary mathematics and science instructional materials and provide technical assistance in the use of improved teaching methods and assessment tools.

Javits gifted and talented education

This bill includes \$6,000,000 for the Jacob K. Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Act, \$1,000,000 below the budget request and the \$1,000,000 above the fiscal year 1997 amount. This program provides assistance to state and local education agencies, higher education institutions, and other agencies for research, demonstration, training, and other activities to identify and meet the educational needs of gifted and talented students.

National Writing Project

The bill provides \$3,100,000 for the National Writing Project which is the \$3,100,000 above the budget request and the same as the fiscal year 1997 level. These funds are awarded to the national writing project which, in turn, funds projects in 45 States to train teachers of all subjects how to teach effective writing.

Educational technology: innovative challenge grants

This bill includes \$75,000,000 for the innovative challenge grants, the same as the budget request and \$18,035,000 above the 1997 amount. Funding under this account provides support for partnerships among educators, business and industry, and other organizations in the community to develop innovative new applications of technology and community plans for fully integrating technology into schools.

The Committee is aware of a public-private partnership which is developing maritime history learner-based software and teacher training. The Committee encourages the Department to continue to place a high priority on this initiative within the funds provided.

When the Secretary is awarding local innovation challenge grants, considerations should be given to projects relating to core academic areas such as mathematics and reading. In light of the findings of the Third International Math and Science Study (TIMSS), The Committee urges the Secretary to place a high priority on improving the mathematics skills of our nation's youth through the effective use of educational technology. In pursuit of this goal, the Committee directs the Secretary to fund an effort at a level of \$7,300,000 to integrate technology into eighth grade algebra classrooms, the "I Can Learn" project which the Committee feels would be ideally suited to receive funding.

Educational technology: regional technology in education consortia

The bill includes \$10,000,000 for regional technology in education consortia, the same as the President's request and the fiscal year 1997 amount. These regional consortia provide regional programs of information and resource dissemination, professional development, and technical assistance.

Educational technology: star schools

The bill includes no funding for the star schools program, \$26,000,000 less than the budget request and \$30,000,000 less than the fiscal year 1997 amount. This program supports the development of statewide or multi-state telecommunications partnerships. Among other activities, these partnerships have sought to increase the availability of courses in mathematics, science, and foreign languages; serve educationally disadvantaged students; and train teachers in the use of telecommunications equipment.

The \$26,000,000 requested for this account has been used to provide increased funding above the President's request for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, funded in the Education Reform account.

Educational technology: ready to learn television

The bill includes no funding for ready to learn television, \$7,000,000 less than the budget request and the 1997 amount. Program objectives include the development and distribution of educational and instructional video programming for preschool and elementary school children and their parents.

The Committee believes that this activity can be carried out by the Corporation for Public Broadcasting with the Federal payment it receives in this bill. The \$7,000,000 requested for this account has been re-allocated to provide increased funding above the President's request for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, funded in the Education Reform account.

Telecommunications demonstration projects for mathematics

The Committee has provided no funding for this demonstration program. This amount is \$1,035,000 below the fiscal year 1997 amount and \$2,035,000 below the budget request. The funds requested for this account have been re-allocated to provide increased funding above the President's request for the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund, funded in the Education Reform account.

LIBRARIES

The bill includes \$142,000,000 for library programs, an increase of \$5,631,000 above the budget request and the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation. Pursuant to the 1996 reauthorization of the library programs, the bill provides a consolidated appropriation for libraries which will be transferred from the Department of Education to the independent Institute of Museum and Library Services. The authorization provides that a minimum of 91.5 percent of the appropriation is allocated for grants to States, up to 3 percent may be allocated for administration, 4 percent is allocated for discretionary national grants, and 1.5 percent is allocated for Indian libraries.

Departmental management

The bill includes \$415,170,000 for departmental management (salaries and expenses) at the Department of Education. This amount is \$4,110,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$19,369,000 less than the Administration's 1998 budget request. These activities are authorized by the Department of Education Organization Act, P.L. 96-88, and include costs associated with the management and operations of the Department as well as separate costs associated with the Office for Civil Rights and the Office of the Inspector General.

Program administration

The bill includes \$329,479,000 for program administration, an amount \$3,262,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and a decrease of \$11,560,000 from the 1998 budget request. These funds support the staff and other costs of administering programs and activities at the Department. Items include personnel compensation and health, retirement and other benefits as well as travel, rent, telephones, utilities, postage fees, data processing, printing, equip-

ment, supplies, technology training, consultants and other contractual services.

The Department is instructed to continue to provide information on revenues resulting from the actions of the inspector general as required in last year's House report.

Each of the departments under the Committee's jurisdiction is statutorily required to have audited financial statements covering all the department's accounts and activities. Congress enacted this requirement in the Government Management Reform Act of 1994 after having observed the benefits of the pilot program of audited financial statements that had been required by the Chief Financial Officers (CFO) Act of 1990. An audited financial statement is like a "scorecard" that reflects a department's progress in achieving the significant financial management reforms required by the CFO Act, and in providing effective stewardship and management of government funds. Accordingly, the Committee expects the Department to work vigorously towards obtaining a clean opinion on its financial statements. The transfer and reprogramming authority the Committee has granted provides substantial flexibility to the Department and is particularly valuable during periods of increasing fiscal constraints. However, the Committee questions the extent to which agencies can properly exercise such authority and accurately account for affected funds if they have not made substantial progress towards achieving the CFO Act's financial management reforms. Accordingly, in subsequent years, the Committee will consider the Department's progress in making such reforms and in obtaining a clean opinion on its financial statements when scrutinizing requests for current appropriations and in deciding whether to continue, expand or limit transfer and reprogramming authority.

The Committee is impressed with the important accomplishments reported from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) research program on reading development and disability, and is eager to have this information brought to the attention of educators, policy makers, and parents. Noting the fact that the Department of Education is already collaborating with the NICHD, the Committee urges the Secretary to work with the Director of the NICHD in convening a national panel to assess the current status of research-based knowledge, including the effectiveness of various approaches to teaching children to read. Based on its findings, the panel shall present a report to the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Education, the House and Senate Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education Appropriations Subcommittees, and the appropriate House and Senate authorizing committees. The report shall present the panel's conclusions, indicating the readiness for application in the classroom of the results of this research, and, if appropriate, a strategy for rapidly disseminating this information to facilitate effective reading instruction in schools.

The Committee is concerned by the seeming lack of coordination of programs among the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. The Departments have no forum in place for continuous interdepartmental collaboration. The Working Group on Comprehensive Early Childhood Family Centers, headed by the Department of Education, recommended that the Depart-

ments create such a forum, and this has yet to occur. Therefore, the Committee urges the Departments to institutionalize interdisciplinary collaboration at all levels, and requests a progress report on steps taken to accomplish such departmental collaboration and program coordination no later than March of 1998.

Office for Civil Rights

The bill includes \$55,449,000 for the salaries and expenses of the Office for Civil Rights, an amount \$549,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$6,051,000 below the budget request. Consistent with the policy carried out in many of the salary and expense accounts in the bill, the account has been increased by 1% over last year's funding level. This Office is responsible for enforcing laws that prohibit discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin, sex, handicap, and age in all programs and institutions that receive funds from the Department. These laws extend to 50 State educational agencies, 16,000 local educational agencies, 3,500 institutions of higher education, as well as to proprietary schools, State rehabilitation agencies, libraries, and other institutions receiving Federal funds. These institutions and agencies generated over 5,000 discrimination complaints in 1993, according to the Office for Civil Rights. In addressing these complaints, the Office's duties include monitoring and performing compliance reviews, investigating allegations, offering advice on corrective and remedial actions, and providing technical assistance to help recipients achieve voluntary compliance.

Office of the Inspector General

The bill includes \$30,242,000 for the Office of the Inspector General, an amount \$299,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$1,758,000 less than the fiscal year 1998 budget request. This Office has authority to inquire into all program and administrative activities of the Departments as well as into related activities of grant and contract recipients. It conducts audits and investigations to determine compliance with applicable laws and regulations, to check alleged fraud and abuse, efficiency of operations, and effectiveness of results.

The Committee instructs the Inspector General to continue reporting to the Committee on actual collections made as a result of the Office's actions and investigations and the specific uses to which "funds put to better use" were put.

TITLE IV—RELATED AGENCIES

ARMED FORCES RETIREMENT HOME

The bill provides authority to expend \$71,177,000 from the Armed Forces Retirement Home Trust Fund for operations and capital activities at the United States Soldiers' and Airmen's Home and the United States Naval Home, an increase of \$15,682,000 above the comparable fiscal year 1997 authority and \$8,200,000 below the budget request.

NATIONAL COMMISSION ON LIBRARIES AND INFORMATION SCIENCE

The bill provides \$1,000,000 for the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, an increase of \$103,000 above the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$123,000 below the request.

The Commission is charged with advising the President and Congress on national policy in the library and information fields, developing overall plans for meeting national library and information needs, and coordinating activities at the Federal, State and local levels. Pursuant to the 1996 reauthorization of Federal library programs, the Commission advises the Institute on Museum and Library Services regarding implementation of the new library legislation.

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON DISABILITY

The bill provides \$1,793,000 for the National Council on Disability (NCD), the same as the request and an increase of \$2,000 above the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation.

The Council monitors implementation of the Americans with Disabilities Act and makes recommendations to the President, the Congress, the Rehabilitation Services Administration, and the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research on public policy issues of concern to individuals with disabilities.

The Committee continues to encourage NCD to augment its appropriation with other sources of Federal and non-Federal revenues including grants and contracts.

NATIONAL EDUCATION GOALS PANEL

The bill provides \$2,000,000 for the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP), the same as the budget request and \$505,000 above the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation. The NEGP was established in 1990 following the National Education Summit held in September 1989 and is charged with reporting on National and State progress toward achieving the National education goals, working with states to develop high academic standards and assessments, identifying promising and effective practices at the local level, assisting states and communities with their progress reports, and building a bipartisan consensus for education improvement.

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

The bill provides \$174,661,000 for the National Labor Relations Board, the same as the comparable fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$11,773,000 below the budget request.

The NLRB receives, investigates, and prosecutes unfair labor practice charges filed by businesses, labor unions, and individuals. It also schedules and conducts representation elections. The five-member Board considers cases in which administrative law judge decisions are appealed.

The Committee is concerned about the potential impact on small employers of the NLRB proposed rule regarding the appropriateness of single location bargaining units. Accordingly, the bill contains a limitation included in each of the last two Appropriation:

J

**ADDITIONAL VIEWS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE
DAVID OBEY AND THE HONORABLE JOHN PORTER**

THE ROAD TO BETTER AMERICAN SCHOOLS

No topic has more consistently been the focus of public debate over the last two decades than the reform of our educational system. Parents know that the competition for jobs and pay which their children will face will be quite different from what they themselves faced only a few years ago. How they fare will be determined not just by how their skills stack up against other workers in their own community but how those skills compare with those of workers around the globe. The relationship between living standards and work skills will become increasingly direct.

As a result improvement has been a central agenda item at local school board meetings across the country. It absorbs much of the deliberative time of each state legislature. It is a frequent topic of debate here in Congress and it is a matter of great concern to not only parents and students but corporate leaders and tax payers as well.

Yet the road to school reform has proven elusive. Teachers in many schools complain with apparent justification that students are spending so much time taking newly mandated standardized tests that it has significantly cut back the time available for instruction. In some classrooms, computers purchased with the promise of revolutionizing instruction sit idle day after day serving only as icons of the difficulty of changing the fundamental problems which face our schools. Some thoughtful school board members have reluctantly concluded that the only two things that will really bring positive change to our schools is an infusion of more talented teachers and an infusion of more disciplined and motivated students—two things that they ultimately feel powerless to change.

But in the midst of this debate and the many failed efforts to revolutionize public instruction, a promising set of ideas about school organization has taken hold and begun to produce extremely promising results. There is no single father to these new ideas. In fact, they include more than half a dozen detailed models developed separately by educators at universities in different parts of the country. Each of these models for reforming schools has its own special set of characteristics, but all of the models would significantly change the way that the overwhelming majority of American schools now operate. Strikingly, all of these models have a great deal in common with one another.

Among those who have brought forth proposals for change are James Comer at Yale, Henry Levin at Stanford, Ted Sizer at Brown and Robert Slavin at Johns Hopkins. Each has his own special area of emphasis. The Comer *School Development Program* for instance focuses on the organization of school decision making. Lev-

in's *Accelerated Schools* puts forth a curriculum proposal for challenging students identified for remediation. Sizer's *Coalition of Essential Schools* focuses on the "triangle of learning," the relationship between students, teachers and curriculum. Slavin's *Success for All* and *Roots and Wings* call for reallocating resources into the most essential elements for school success, curriculum, instruction and family support.

While the area of emphasis differs from one model to the next, all of these models are based on the concept that effective reform is a school wide proposition. In other words, you can't make sufficient progress by working on one classroom or one teacher or the curriculum for one subject area at a time, the whole school has to be the target for change. All share the concept that parents have to be centrally engaged at every step of the decision making and evaluation process. All concur that a great deal of autonomy is needed for individual schools and that the current top down authority structure existing within most schools has got to go. Each of these concepts requires principals to significantly redefine their roles. They must become consensus builders rather than autocratic directors. They must learn to bring teachers and parents into the decision making process and create a community wide commitment to the behavioral and academic standards of the school.

All argue that the school boards, superintendents and other administrators in the School system have to be aware of the need for these changes and actively support schools attempting change. All are supported by an outside set of experts who are available to advise and help the schools, teachers and principals to successfully retool their school. Finally, each of these concepts is far more than an academic treatise on what people living in the real world should be doing. Each of these models has been developed into real functioning programs being used in a cross section of communities with very specific and detailed guidelines for approaching the real life—every day problems of teaching and learning.

Over the last three decades the principal tool for raising educational performance nationwide has been the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and specifically Title I of that Act. Through Title I, the federal government has focused substantial additional resources on underachieving children in lower income schools. What we have learned from these new "whole school" models is that the improvements in academic performance of Title I children can be more broadly based and more long lasting if the focus on individual children takes place in an environment in which parents and teachers are working together for goals they both agree with and played a role in developing.

The most remarkable fact about these models is the extent to which they have succeeded in improving school and student performance without becoming better known to the public or even to many in the education community. Among the organizations that have recognized the potential such models hold for improving the effectiveness of American schools are the Annenberg Foundation, the Edison Project and New American Schools. New American Schools was created by business leaders from a number of the nation's largest corporations and began working with local school districts in 1992 to help certain selected schools adapt to one or an-

other of seven selected school reform models—each representing a different version of “whole school” reform. More than 500 schools in 25 states have participated for much of that period and another 200 schools have been added recently. While that is a tiny fraction of the more than 100,000 elementary and secondary schools across the country, it is providing a solid information base for examining the potential of these reforms. The Rand Corporation has been hired to evaluate this information. While understanding the long term impact of alternate education approaches on student achievement necessarily takes many years, the early results from these experiments have in many instances been dramatic.

A number of schools in Prince Georges County, Maryland using the *ATLAS* model (a variation on the *Comer School Development Program*) raised their reading scores by 30% on the Maryland Performance Assessment Program. The proportion of students scoring satisfactory or excellent on the exam tripled within a three year period beginning in 1992. Most schools experienced a dramatic decline in discipline problems and a dramatic increase in levels of school attendance.

The John F. Kennedy Elementary School in Louisville, Kentucky increased its scores on the Kentucky statewide assessment by 43% in reading and 48% in math using the *National Alliance* reform model. In three years, the school rose from among the lowest-scoring schools in the state to the top 10%.

The *Success for All* model developed at Johns Hopkins University appears to have been particularly successful in boosting achievement among language minority students. In six schools located in Baltimore and Philadelphia, first grade students were three months ahead of their counterparts in other elementary schools by the end of their first year. By the end of second grade they were almost a year ahead of their counterparts.

The Hansberry Elementary School in the Bronx increased the percentage of student who passed the New York State essential skills test from 22% to 50% in reading and from 47% to 82% in math in only two years beginning in 1993. Hansberry used a model developed by the Hudson Institute known as the *Modern Red Schoolhouse*.

The Rand Corporation noted that “By any number of measures, New American Schools has accomplished a great deal in its first four years of programmatic activity . . . What began as an effort to create small number of outstanding designs for schools has expanded to a comprehensive strategy to reform education.”

While these new approaches to improving schools may represent fundamental change from the way most schools now operate, it is important to recognize that these approaches are very consistent with the kinds of organizational changes being brought about in numerous other institutions in society. Just as American business has learned that enhancing the role and input of workers and suppliers creates a common commitment that improves the product and boosts productivity, the full engagement of teachers and parents in the learning process can and is producing similar results in schools. In fact, one might well argue that the standard structure of American schools has changed so little in the last half century that these types of institutional reforms can have an even

greater impact on the classroom than businesses have managed to produce in factories or offices.

We do not know all that we would like to know or should know in order to fully revolutionize the nation's schools. We do not know for certain which of these models works best or which is best suited for particular types of schools or to meet particular types of problems. But we certainly do know enough to know that we should begin. We have sufficient experience to know that many more schools should be participating—that we should not only be experimenting with these approaches in all of the states instead of only half, but that we should have a number of schools working with these reforms in each region of every state.

That is why we encouraged the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Human Services and Education to provide \$200 million to start such a whole school reform effort in the education appropriation bill for the coming school year. These funds would be apportioned by state education officials and the Department of Education to school districts interested in making a serious commitment to school improvement. Schools with differing ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds would be selected as would schools facing differing problems in improving academic performance. Each participating school would receive a grant of at least \$50,000 a year to implement a research tested model for whole school reform. The funds would be used to help the school get the necessary outside expertise, hire the staff necessary to facilitate change and train existing personnel to meet the challenges of making fundamental changes in the manner in which the schools operate. The effort would provide a large number of school districts across the country with first hand experience and information to determine whether they wish to provide additional schools with the resources necessary to make the proposed changes.

We have had an extended debate in this country about school reform and that debate will no doubt continue. But it is time to do more than debate. We now have proposals to reform our schools that are not just academic theories but are producing real results in real classrooms across America. With a relatively small amount of outside resources, communities can restructure schools in ways that make them significantly more effective. We should now move to insure that a broader spectrum of our nation's schools have a chance to move forward with these reforms and determine for themselves the impact these changes have on student learning and school effectiveness.

EXAMPLES OF WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM MODELS

Accelerated schools

Accelerated Schools, developed at Stanford University, is a whole school reform model that focuses on an accelerated curriculum that emphasizes challenging and exciting learning activities for students who normally are identified for remediation. One of the key ideas behind Accelerated Schools is that rather than remediating students' deficits, students who are placed at risk of school failure must be accelerated—given the kind of high-expectations curriculum typical of programs for gifted and talented students. The pro-

gram's social goals include reducing the dropout rate, drug use, and teen pregnancies.

The Accelerated Schools model is built around three central principles. One is unity of purpose, a common vision of what the school should become, agreed to and worked toward by all school staff, parents, students and community. A second is empowerment coupled with responsibility, which means that staff, parents and students find their own way to transform themselves. A third element, building on strength, means identifying the strengths of students, of staff and of the school, and then using these as a basis for reform. School staff are encouraged to search for methods that help them to realize their vision. There is an emphasis on reducing all uses of remedial activities and on adopting engaging teaching strategies, such as project-based learning. The schools implement these principles by establishing a set of cadres which include a steering committee and work groups focused on particular areas of concern. Accelerated schools are located in 39 states, including Colorado, Texas and California.

ATLAS (authentic teaching, learning and assessment of all students)

The ATLAS Program, builds on concepts embodied in the School Development Program and the Coalition of Essential Schools, but adds other unique elements. One of these is a focus on pathways—groups of schools made up of high schools and the elementary and middle schools that feed into them—whose staff work with each other to create coordinated and continuous experiences for students. Teams of teachers from each pathway work together to design curriculum and assessments based on locally defined standards. Teachers collaborate with parents and administrators to form a learning community that works together to set and maintain sound management policies.

The intent of the model is to change the culture of the school to promote high institutional and individual performance. The emphasis of the design is on helping school staffs create classroom environments in which students are active participants in their own learning. Project-based learning is extensively used. Assessment in ATLAS schools emphasize portfolios, performance examinations, and exhibitions. Community members are active participants on the school governing teams and the schools develop programs to encourage parental involvement. ATLAS schools are operating in Norfolk, Virginia; Prince Georges County, Maryland; Gorham, Maine; Seattle, Washington; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Audrey Cohen College of System of Education

Audrey Cohen College of System of Education is based on the teaching methods used at the Audrey Cohen College in New York City. This whole school reform model focuses student learning on the study and achievement of meaningful "purposes" for each semester's academic goals. A holistic and purpose-driven curriculum is the centerpiece of the model. Curriculum and instruction are organized around a single, developmentally appropriate purpose for each semester, cumulating to 26 purposes in a K-12 system. Embedded in each purpose are content areas such as English and

math, and essential skills such as critical thinking and researching. Each purpose culminates in a "constructive action" undertaken by the class to serve the community. For example, in fourth grade, one purpose is "we work for good health." Students achieve their purpose by using their knowledge and skills to plan, carry out, and evaluate a "constructive action" to benefit the community and larger world. Leadership is emphasized. These fundamental changes in the curriculum and instruction become the organizing principles for all other school activities. The total effect is intended to make the school and its programs more coherent and focused.

The purposes help the school and its officials identify key community resources to involve in the educational enterprise. The constructive actions help to bring the community into the school and the school into the community—making schools, parents and children active partners in improving the community. Schools are implementing the Audrey Cohen model in San Diego, California; Phoenix, Arizona; Miami, Florida; Hollandale, Mississippi; Seattle, Washington; and Dade County, Florida.

Coalition of essential schools

The Coalition of Essential Schools is based at Brown University. The Coalition is not a reform model per se, but an organization dedicated to "Nine Common Principles of Essential Schools". The Nine Principles involve certain ideas about school reform that include building support and collaboration among teachers, students and the families of those students in the community. The Coalition focuses on the relationship between students, teachers and the curriculum—the "triangle of learning".

In order to become a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools, a school submits a statement of its long-term goals and an action plan. The action plan must state how structures, pedagogy, curriculum and assessment will change, and it must include a statement of faculty commitment to student learning and engagement. Community support must be solicited throughout the process and a school-site coordinator is identified to work as a liaison between the school, and regional or state coordinator, and the Coalition. Membership in the Coalition includes a responsibility to participate in a network with other Coalition Schools, and to meet expectations that include commitment, whole-school involvement, documentation and assessment of progress, and funds to support school reform activities over a multi-year period.

Co-NECT schools

Co-NECT schools focus on complex interdisciplinary projects that extensively incorporate technology and connect students with ongoing scientific investigations, information resources, and other students beyond their own school. Co-NECT uses technology to enhance every aspect of teaching, learning, professional development, and school management. Cross-disciplinary teaching teams work with clusters of students. Most students stay in the same cluster with the same teachers for at least two years. Teaching and learning center of interdisciplinary projects that promote critical skills and academic understanding. Teams of educators and parents set goals. Performance-based assessments are extensively used. In ad-

dition to understanding key subject areas, graduates of the Co-NECT schools demonstrate the acquisition of specific critical skills, identified as sense-maker, designer, problem-solver, decisionmaker, communicator, team worker, product-oriented worker, and responsible, knowledgeable citizen.

A school governance council, which includes teachers, parents, business/community representatives, and administratives, runs the school. In addition, the school design team provides local input concerning the implementation, performance assessment, and accountability of the Co-NECT approach at that particular school. The Community Support Board fosters access to the local community to support the Council and design team. Mentoring and volunteers are encouraged and community input sought for standard-setting. Co-NECT schools are operating in Cincinnati, Ohio; Dade County, Florida; Memphis, Tennessee; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; San Antonio, Texas; and Worcester, Massachusetts.

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB)

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB) is built on ten design principles and operates on the belief that learning is an expedition into the unknown. Expeditionary Learning draws on the power of purposeful, intellectual investigations—called learning expeditions—to improve student achievement and build character. Learning expeditions are long-term, academically rigorous, interdisciplinary studies that require students to work inside and outside the classroom. In Expeditionary Learning schools, students and teachers stay together for more than one year, teachers work collaboratively through team teaching and shared planning, and there is no tracking.

Schools using this whole school reform model are in Baltimore County, Maryland; Boston, Massachusetts; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dade County, Florida; Decatur, Georgia; Denver, Colorado; Dubuque, Iowa; Memphis, Tennessee; New York City, New York; San Antonio, Texas; and Portland, Oregon.

Modern Red Schoolhouse

The Modern Red Schoolhouse whole school reform model helps all students achieve high standards through the construction of a standards-driven curriculum; employment of traditional and performance-based assessments; effective organizational patterns and professional-development programs; and implementation of effective community-involvement strategies. The model focuses on high standards in core academic subjects—English, geography, history, mathematics and science. Students master a rigorous curriculum designed to transmit common culture, develop character, and promote the principles of democratic government. Modern Red Schoolhouses are divided into three divisions, rather than 12 grades: primary, intermediate and upper. To advance to the next division, students must meet defined standards and pass "watershed assessments". Students complete investigations, give oral reports, answer essay questions and take multiple choice exams. Student progress is monitored through an Individual Education Compact, negotiated by the student, parent and teacher. This compact establishes goals,

details parent and teacher responsibilities, and lists services the school, parents or community should provide.

Schools using this model are in Indianapolis, Columbus, and Beech Grove, Indiana; Franklin and Lawrence, Massachusetts; New York City, New York; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Memphis, Tennessee, and San Antonio, Texas.

National Alliance for Restructuring Education (NA)

The National Alliance for Restructuring Education is a partnership of states, districts, schools and expert organizations created to change the educational system through a five-point set of priorities called "design tasks": the design tasks are standards and assessments, learning environments, high-performance management, community services and supports, and public engagement. The model uses results-based, high performance management at the school and district levels with decentralized decisionmaking to restructure the learning environment to support student achievement and provide professional support to teachers and schools.

Alliance sites adapt for education the principles and techniques developed by American business known as high-performance management. These include strategic management, total quality management, decentralized decisionmaking and empowerment, and accountability and incentive systems. At the school level, principals are trained in these areas to better support the integration and implementation of design tasks. Alliance sites at the state, district and school levels are tasked with developing methods for informing and involving parents and the public in the school and restructuring process. Schools in the National Alliance are in Arkansas; Kentucky; Vermont; Rochester, New York; San Diego, California; and Chicago, Illinois.

Roots and Wings

Roots and Wings is a comprehensive, whole school reform model for elementary schools to ensure that all children leave elementary school with the skills required for success. It is based on the Success For All reading program developed at Johns Hopkins University and incorporates science, history, and math to achieve a comprehensive academic program. The premise of the model is that schools must do whatever it takes to make sure all students succeed. Roots and Wings schools provide at-risk students with tutors, family support, and a variety of other services aimed at eliminating obstacles to success.

The Roots component of the model is aimed at preventing failure. It emphasizes working with children and their families to ensure that children develop the basic skills and habits they need to succeed. The Wings component emphasizes a highly motivating curriculum with instructional strategies that encourage children to grow to their full potential and aspire to higher levels of learning. The design reallocates resources into a system of curriculum, instruction and family support designed to eliminate special education and low achievement.

Roots and Wings provides schools with innovative curricula and instructional methods in reading, writing, language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. The curriculum emphasizes the

use of cooperative learning throughout the grades. In each activity, students work in cooperative groups, do extensive writing, and use reading, mathematics, and fine arts skills learned in other parts of the program. Schools using this model are in Anson County, North Carolina; Memphis, Dade County, Cincinnati, Elyria and Dowson-Bryant, Ohio; Columbus, Indiana; Everett, Washington, Flint, Michigan; Modesto, Pasadena and Riverside, CA; Rockford, Illinois, St. Mary's, Baltimore and Baltimore County, Maryland.

School Development Program

The School Development Program is a comprehensive, whole school approach to reform based on principles of child development and the importance of parental involvement. The program was developed at Yale and implemented initially at two elementary schools in New Haven, Connecticut.

Each school creates three teams that take particular responsibility for moving the whole school reform agenda forward. A School Planning and Management Team, made up of teachers, parents and administration, develops and monitors implementation of a comprehensive school improvement plan. A Mental Health Team, composed of school staff concerned with mental health such as school psychologists, social workers, counselors and teachers, plans programs focusing on prevention, building positive child development, positive personal relations, etc. The third major component of the model is a Parent Program designed to build a sense of community among school staff, parents, and students. The Parent Program incorporates existing parent participation activities (such as the PTA) and implements additional activities to draw parents into the school, to increase opportunities for parents to provide volunteer services, and to design ways for having the school respect the ethnic backgrounds of its students.

The three teams in School Development Program schools work together to create comprehensive plans for school reform. Schools take a holistic approach in looking for ways to serve children's academic and social needs. The School Development Program is operating in schools in 25 states, including Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

Talent Development Model for High Schools

The Talent Development Model for High Schools was developed at Johns Hopkins University to fill a major current void in American education—a dearth of proven models of high school effectiveness. The Talent Development Model provides a comprehensive package of specific high school changes for at-risk students based on the proposition that all students can succeed in school given appropriate school organization, curriculum, instruction, and assistance as needed to assure their success. The model focuses on a common core curriculum of high standards for all students and emphasizes the creation of small learning communities through the establishment of career-focused academies as schools-within-the-school.

Essential components include (1) making schoolwork relevant by providing a career focus, (2) providing increased opportunities for academic success, (3) providing a caring and supportive learning

environment through enhanced teacher-student interactions, and (4) providing help with student problems, including academic, family problems, substance abuse, disciplinary problems, and employment needs. The Talent Development High School provides assistance to students from social workers and mental health professionals on the school staff and by referrals to an alternative after-hours school in the building designed to meet the needs of students who present the most difficult disciplinary problems. The first Talent Development High School was established at Patterson High School in Baltimore, Maryland. Additional Talent Development sites are being evaluated in Washington, D.C., Philadelphia, Chicago and Los Angeles.

DAVID OBEY
JOHN PORTER

○

FILE

105TH CONGRESS }
1st Session }

SENATE

REPORT
105-58

PPB

State
no whole school
no form

Edw. Rivera - PP 16255
OERI - PP 20157

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1998

JULY 24, 1997.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. SPECTER, from the Committee on Appropriations,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 1061]

The Committee on Appropriations reports the bill (S. 1061) making appropriations for Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, reports favorably thereon and recommends that the bill do pass.

Amount of budget authority

Total bill as reported to Senate	\$269,050,387,000
Amount of adjusted appropriations, 1997	279,398,355,000
Budget estimates, 1998	268,405,783,000
The bill as reported to the Senate:	
Under the adjusted appropriations for 1997 ...	10,347,968,000
Over the budget estimates for 1998	644,604,000

*look file
condition
of Obj*

least one local education agency, at least one college of education, private sector education technology firms, and nonprofit education organizations. Each State should be allowed to submit no more than one proposal. In forming the consortium for inclusion in its application, each State department of education should select those programs of preservice teacher preparation and professional development for educators that has been proven most effective and innovative. The review of proposals should consider: explicit evidence of innovation and effectiveness; the extent to which the members of the applicant consortium have sought to establish high standards for training in education technology and its use in schools; and specific efforts by applicant State and local education agencies to be publicly accountable for improving education through the use of technology. Awardees should use grant funds to improve, expand, and disseminate these successful models throughout the State and Nation. Recipients of the awards shall be required to share in the cost of the supported activities, from non-Federal sources, in an amount equal to twice the amount of the Federal share awarded.

EDUCATION FOR THE DISADVANTAGED

Appropriations, 1997	\$7,799,573,000
Budget estimate, 1998	8,077,266,000
Committee recommendation	7,807,349,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,807,349,000 for education for the disadvantaged. This is \$7,776,000 more than the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$269,917,000 less than the administration request. In fiscal year 1997, \$1,298,386,000 was made available for this account in the fiscal year 1998 funds. This year, the Committee forward funded this same amount for fiscal year 1999. The Committee took this action because of the severe budget constraints facing the Committee in fiscal year 1998.

Programs financed under this account are authorized under title I (formerly chapter 1) of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) and section 418A of the Higher Education Act. ESEA title I programs provide financial assistance to State and local educational agencies (LEA's) to meet the special educational needs of educationally disadvantaged children, migrant children, neglected and delinquent children in State institutions, and juveniles in adult correctional institutions. In addition, the Even Start Program supports projects that integrate early childhood education with parenting and adult literacy training. Funds for each of these programs, except for Even Start, are allocated through formulas that include the number of eligible children and each State's average per-pupil expenditure. Even Start funds are allocated according to each State's proportion of title I grants to LEA's.

Grants to local educational agencies

Title I grants to local educational agencies provide supplemental education funding to LEA's and schools, especially in high-poverty areas, to help low-income, low-achieving students learn to the same high standards as other children. The program currently provides services to more than 9 million children. The formula for basic grants is based on the number of children from low-income families in each county, weighted by per-pupil expenditures for education in

the State. States in turn make suballocations from the county to the LEA level using the best data available on the number of poor children. States are also required to reserve funds generated by counts of children in correctional institutions to make awards to LEA's for dropout prevention programs involving youth from correctional facilities and other at-risk children. By law, 1 percent of the total LEA grant appropriation is set aside for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the outlying areas.

For title I basic grants, including the amount transferred to the Census Bureau for poverty updates, the Committee recommends an appropriation of \$6,273,712,000. This amount is \$500,000 more than appropriated in fiscal year 1997 and \$82,362,000 more than the budget request.

The Committee has provided no funding for the targeted grants program. The administration requested \$350,000,000 for this program which distributes funds in a manner that provides higher per-children amounts for counties with the highest percentage of poor children.

The Committee recommends \$1,022,020,000 for concentration grants, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 and \$22,771,000 more than the budget request. Funds under this program are distributed according to the basic grants formula, except that they only go to counties and LEA's where the number of poor children equals at least 6,500, or 15 percent, of the total school-aged population. Approximately 66 percent of counties nationally receive funds.

The Committee has included bill language which provides that in allocating the 1998 appropriations for basic and concentration grants under title I, part A of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, the Secretary shall apply a 100-percent hold harmless based on total 1997 grants under this part, including supplemental 1997 appropriations provided under Public Law 105-18. The Committee has taken this action because it is very concerned about the accuracy of updated estimates of school-age children in poor families that were released by the Census Bureau in March 1997. In accordance with recommendations in an interim report by an advisory panel of the National Academy of Sciences, these updated population estimates were combined with 1990 population estimates in the allocation of most 1997 appropriations for title I, part A. However, the Committee has been, and remains, concerned about the accuracy of these updated population estimates, in part because the National Academy of Sciences advisory panel has not yet completed its full analysis and report on the estimation process, and in part because of a consistent pattern whereby use of the updates reduces the share of title I, part A funds that is allocated to States with the highest school-age child poverty rates. The Committee understands that the full National Academy of Sciences advisory panel report on the population estimation methods will be made available during the next several months. The Committee directs that when this report is completed, the Secretary shall consult with the Committee on the panel's findings, and on possible ways to use more up-to-date population estimates without reducing the share of title I funds that is allocated to States and local educational agencies with high rates of poverty among school-age children. The Commit-

tee's recommendation of a 100-percent hold harmless for 1998 grants will avoid further shifting of title I funds away from high poverty States while the Committee considers further steps to better target title I aid on States and local educational agencies in greatest need.

Capital expenses for private school students

The Committee recommends \$41,119,000 for the Capital Expenses Program, the same as the 1997 appropriation and the budget request.

The Supreme Court's 1985 *Aguilar v. Felton* decision prohibited districts from sending public schoolteachers or other employees to private sectarian schools for the purpose of providing title I services. The Capital Expenses Program has helped districts comply with *Felton* by paying a portion of the additional capital costs associated with serving religious school students outside school premises. Funds are used by districts for noninstructional goods and services such as renting classroom space in neutral sites, renting or purchasing mobile vans for title I instruction, or transporting private schoolchildren to the place of title I instruction.

On June 23, 1997, the Court reversed its earlier ruling, and districts may now provide title I instruction in private schools. However, many school districts will continue, over the short term, to incur costs as a result of the original 1985 decision. For example, some may have entered into multiyear leases for vans, portable classrooms, or other neutral instructional sites. The Committee, therefore, has recommended continuation of this program until an assessment has been made as to what the final costs are for *Felton* compliance.

Funds are allocated to States according to the proportion of non-public school students served under the title I LEA Grants Program in the most recent year for which satisfactory data are available.

Even Start

For the Even Start Program, the Committee recommends \$108,000,000, an increase of \$6,008,000 more than the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and the same as the budget request.

The Even Start Program provides grants for family literacy programs that serve disadvantaged families with children under 8 years of age and adults eligible for services under the Adult Education Act. Programs combine early childhood education, adult literacy, and parenting education.

States receive funds on the basis of their proportion of title I LEA grant allocations and make competitive 4-year grants to partnerships of local educational agencies and community-based organizations. Grant funds must be equitably distributed among urban and rural areas and the local share of program costs increases from 10 percent in the first year to 40 percent in the fourth year.

Migrant

For the State Agency Migrant Program, the Committee recommends \$305,473,000, the same amount appropriated in fiscal

year 1997. The administration requested \$319,500,000 for this program.

The title I migrant program authorizes grants to State educational agencies for programs to meet the special educational needs of the children of migrant agricultural workers and fishermen. Funds are allocated to the States through a statutory formula based on each State's average per-pupil expenditure for education and counts of migratory children aged 3 through 21 residing within the States. Only migratory children who have moved within the last 3 years are generally eligible to be counted and served by the program. Currently, this program serves approximately 610,000 migrant students.

This appropriation also supports activities to improve interstate and intrastate coordination of migrant education programs.

Neglected and delinquent

The Committee recommends \$40,333,000 for the title I Neglected and Delinquent Program, an increase of \$1,022,000 over the amount appropriated in 1997 and the same amount recommended by the administration.

This program provides financial assistance to State educational agencies for education services to neglected and delinquent children and youth in State-run institutions and for juveniles in adult correctional institutions.

Funds are allocated to individual States through a formula based on the number of children in State-operated institutions and per-pupil education expenditures for the State.

States are authorized to set aside up to 10 percent of their neglected and delinquent funds to help students in State-operated institutions to make the transition into locally operated programs. Transition activities are designed to address the high failure and dropout rate of institutionalized students and may include alternative classes, counseling and supervisory services, or educational activities in State-supported group homes.

State school improvement grants

The Committee recommends no funds for State school improvement grants. The administration requested \$8,000,000 for this purpose. No funds were appropriated in fiscal year 1997 for this program. Funds are used to help States stimulate school-based change and hold local educational agencies accountable for making significant progress in the education of disadvantaged children. Funds for this purpose can be sustained through administrative set-asides in the title I program and other State and local funding sources.

Evaluation

The Committee bill includes \$6,977,000 for title I evaluation activities, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997. The amount recommended is a decrease of \$3,023,000 below the budget request.

Evaluation funds are used to support large-scale national surveys that examine how the title I program is contributing to student performance. The recommended amount will provide sufficient funds to design, implement, and produce multiyear evaluations

hat will assess the effects of the changes made in the reauthorization of the title I program.

High School Equivalency Program

The Committee bill includes \$7,634,000 for the High School Equivalency Program (HEP). This amount is \$193,000 above the amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 and is the same amount requested by the administration.

This program provides 5-year grants to institutions of higher education and other nonprofit organizations to recruit migrant students aged 16 and over and provide the academic and support services needed to help them obtain a high school equivalency certificate and subsequently gain employment, win admission to a postsecondary institution or a job-training program, or join the military. Projects provide counseling, health services, stipends, and placement assistance. HEP will serve about 3,600 migrants in 1997.

College Assistance Migrant Program

For the College Assistance Migrant Program (CAMP), the Committee agrees with the House and the administration and recommends \$2,081,000. The amount recommended is \$53,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation.

Funds provide 5-year grants to institutions of higher education and nonprofit organizations for projects that provide tutoring, counseling, and financial assistance to migrant students during their first year of postsecondary education. Projects also may use up to 10 percent of their grants for followup services after students have completed their first year of college, including assistance in obtaining student financial aid. CAMP will serve about 375 students in 1997.

IMPACT AID

Appropriations, 1997	\$730,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	658,000,000
Committee recommendation	794,500,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$794,500,000 for impact aid for the Department of Education. This amount is \$4,500,000 above the 1997 amount and \$136,500,000 above the administration request.

Impact aid provides financial assistance to school districts for the costs of educating children when enrollments and the availability of revenues from local sources have been adversely affected by the presence of Federal activities. Children who reside on Federal or Indian lands generally constitute a financial burden on local school systems because these lands do not generate property taxes—a major revenue source for elementary and secondary education in most communities. In addition, realignments of U.S. military forces at bases across the country often lead to influxes of children into school districts without producing the new revenues required to maintain an appropriate level of education. During the current school year, approximately 2,000 school districts will receive payments on behalf of 1.2 million eligible children.

The Committee has turned down the administration's language as follows: Language specifying that payments shall be made only for children living on Indian lands and children of members of the uniformed services living on Federal property; language overriding the eligibility requirements under section 8003; language specifying the maximum basic support payment for which an LEA is eligible; language overriding the learning opportunity threshold and language overriding the hold-harmless provision of the statute so that all payments would be distributed by formula.

It has come to the Committee's attention that two school districts in Texas and one in New Jersey which receive funding under this subsection have been adversely affected by definitions used by the Department of Education in determining the amount of revenue available for general fund expenditure. The result of this definition problem is that all three school districts will be required to pay back a portion of the funds they have received under this subsection or its predecessor section 3(d)(2)(B) of Public Law 81-874. These are three of the neediest school districts in the impact aid program and, if compelled to make repayment to the Department, would be placed under a tremendous hardship. The Committee requests that the Department review its actions with regard to supplemental payments made to the Killeen Independent School District, the Copperas Cove Independent School District (Texas), and the North Hanover Township public schools (New Jersey).

The Committee is aware of the financial problems that the Centennial School District in Warminster, PA, is experiencing due to the closure of the Warminster Naval Air Warfare Center. In addition, the school district is now responsible for educating children whose parents reside in naval housing, but are assigned to the Naval Air Station Joint Reserves in Willow Grove, located in a neighboring school district. The Committee requests that the Department review its actions with regard to payments made to the Centennial School District and take steps to ensure that the school district is given adequate payments to provide a quality education for all of the district's children, including the 300 children from the Willow Grove Naval Air Station.

It has been brought to the Committee's attention that the Portsmouth School District in Rhode Island has been unsuccessful in its recent application for impact aid payments due to a misinterpretation of changes in the law. The Committee urges the Department to work with the Portsmouth School District to rectify the problem.

Basic support payments.—The Committee recommends \$623,500,000 for basic support payments, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1996 and \$39,500,000 above the amount recommended by the administration. Under statutory formula, payments are made on behalf of all categories of federally connected children.

Payments for children with disabilities.—Under this program additional payments are made for certain federally connected children eligible for services under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. The Committee bill includes \$80,000,000 for this purpose, an increase of \$40,000,000 above the 1997 level. The Committee has included this increase due to the rising costs of providing educational services to special needs children.

ided in fiscal year 1997 to conduct education, archival, and preservation activities of the Foundation.

avits fellowships

The Committee concurs with the administration in not recommending separate funding for Javits fellowships but provides \$5,931,000 under the graduate assistance in areas of national need [GAANN] program to fund the Javits fellowships at the same level as in fiscal year 1997. The funds will provide an estimated \$2,556,000 for new awards and an estimated \$3,375,000 for non-competing continuation awards.

This program provides fellowships to students of superior ability for doctoral study in the arts, humanities, and social sciences. The fellowships are awarded through a national competition and recipients pursue graduate study at the institutions of their choice.

graduate assistance in areas of national need

The Committee recommends \$30,000,000 for graduate assistance in areas of national need, the same as the budget request and \$5,931,000 above the 1997 level. This program awards competitive grants to graduate academic departments and programs for fellowship support in areas of national need as determined by the Secretary. The program is currently supporting study in mathematics, physics, biology, chemistry, engineering, and computer and information sciences. Recipients must demonstrate financial need and academic excellence, seek the highest degree in their fields, and plan teaching or research careers.

The Committee provides \$5,931,000 to fund the Javits fellowships at the same level as in fiscal year 1997 under the GAANN program. The Javits Program is of particular importance as a mechanism for supporting America's next generation of leaders in the arts, humanities, and social studies and although the Committee has consolidated funding within the Graduate Assistance Program, this action was taken to streamline programs. It is the Committee's intention that the merit-based Javits Fellowships Program remain an active and identifiable program.

HOWARD UNIVERSITY

Appropriations, 1997	\$196,000,000
Budget estimate, 1998	196,000,000
Committee recommendation	198,000,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$198,000,000 for Howard University, which is \$2,000,000 above the 1997 appropriation, and the budget request. Howard University is located in the District of Columbia and offers undergraduate, graduate, and professional degrees through the 16 schools and colleges. The university also administers the Howard University Hospital, which provides both inpatient and outpatient care, as well as training in the health professions. Federal funds from this account support about 50 percent of the university's projected educational and general expenditures, excluding the hospital.

Undistributed.—The Committee bill provides \$168,511,000 in undistributed funds, which is \$2,000,000 above the 1997 level and the administration request. Of the \$168,511,000 in undistributed

funds, Howard must allocate at least \$3,530,000 for the endowment program. The Committee directs that Howard notify the Congress of any transfer from the regular appropriation to the endowment at least 15 days prior to execution of the transfer. The Committee notes that the authority under which funds are appropriated for Howard permits expenditures for, among other things, academic services, financial support of students, contribution to the university endowment, or construction.

Howard University Hospital.—The Committee recommends \$29,489,000 for the Howard University Hospital, the same as the 1997 level and the budget request. The hospital serves as a major acute and ambulatory care center for the District of Columbia and functions as a major teaching facility attached to the university that trains physicians in 17 specialty areas. The Federal appropriation provides partial funding for the hospital's operations.

COLLEGE HOUSING AND ACADEMIC FACILITIES LOANS

Appropriations, 1997	\$698,000
Budget estimate, 1998	1,069,000
Committee recommendation	698,000

Federal administration.—The Committee bill includes \$698,000 for Federal administration of the CHAFL program, the same as the 1997 level and \$371,000 below the administration request.

These funds will be used to reimburse the Department for expenses incurred in managing the existing CHAFL loan portfolio during fiscal year 1998. These expenses include salaries and benefits, travel, printing, contracts (including contracted loan servicing activities), and other expenses directly related to the administration of the CHAFL Program.

HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGE AND UNIVERSITY CAPITAL FINANCING PROGRAM

Appropriations, 1997	\$104,000
Budget estimate, 1998	104,000
Committee recommendation	104,000

Federal administration.—The Committee recommends \$104,000 for Federal administration of the Historically Black College and University [HBCU] Capital Financing Program, the same as the administration request and the 1997 level.

The HBCU Capital Financing Program makes capital available to HBCU's for construction, renovation, and repair of academic facilities by providing a Federal guarantee for private sector construction bonds. Construction loans will be made from the proceeds of the sale of the bonds.

EDUCATION RESEARCH, STATISTICS, AND IMPROVEMENT

Appropriations, 1997	\$331,161,000
Budget estimate, 1998	425,693,000
Committee recommendation	362,225,000

The bill includes \$362,225,000 for educational research, statistics, assessment, and improvement programs. This amount is \$31,064,000 above the 1997 appropriation and \$63,468,000 below the administration request. This account supports education re-

search, statistics, and assessment activities, as well as a variety of other discretionary programs for educational improvement.

Research

The Committee recommends \$72,567,000 for educational research, the same as the 1997 appropriation and \$8,468,000 below the budget request. Research activities are conducted by the Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI), which was reauthorized by the Educational Research, Development, Dissemination, and Improvement Act of 1994.

These funds support research, development, dissemination, and technical assistance activities which are aimed at expanding fundamental knowledge of education and promoting the use of research and development findings in the design of efforts to improve education.

The Committee has included \$53,500,000 for regional educational laboratories, the same as the administration request and \$2,500,000 above the 1997 appropriation.

Statistics

The Committee recommends \$52,000,000 for data gathering and statistical analysis activities of the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), the same as the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and a decrease of \$14,250,000 below the administration request.

NCES collects, analyzes, and reports statistics on education in the United States. Activities are carried out directly and through grants and contracts. The Center collects data on educational institutions at all levels, longitudinal data on student progress, and data relevant to public policy. Technical assistance to State and local education agencies and postsecondary institutions is also provided by the Center.

Assessment

The Committee recommends \$29,752,000 for assessment, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 and \$5,750,000 below the administration request.

The National Center for Education Statistics uses these funds to administer the national assessment of educational progress (NAEP), a 20-year-old congressionally mandated assessment created to measure the educational achievement of American students. The primary goal of NAEP is to determine and report the status and trends over time in educational achievement, subject by subject. NAEP has been expanded in recent years to include State representative assessments as well.

Also included is \$2,871,000 for the National Assessment Governing Board, the same amount requested by the administration and \$6,000 more than the fiscal year 1997 appropriation.

Fund for the improvement of education

The Committee bill provides \$50,000,000 for the fund for the improvement of education (FIE), which is \$10,000,000 more than the 1997 appropriation and the administration request. This program provides the Secretary with broad authority to support nationally significant programs and projects to improve the quality of edu-

cation, help all students meet high academic standards, and contribute to the achievement of the national education goals. The statute also authorizes support for specific activities, such as counseling and mentoring, comprehensive health education, and environmental education.

The Committee encourages the Department to provide \$750,000 for a demonstration project to assist second grade students who need help with reading. This project should address the problems of reading fluency and comprehension before a pattern of continued long-term failure is established, and identify and eliminate the gap between students with reading problems and skilled readers. The reading together USA project has been training fifth grade tutors to assist second grade students to improve their reading skills and would be especially suited to carry out a demonstration in this area.

The Committee recognizes that there continues to be a gap in the reading and writing scores of African American students and other student populations. According to research at the University of Pennsylvania, no matter what teaching methods are used and even when minority children from inner cities begin school at the same level as all others, they do progressively worse until graduation. For those who stay in school until graduation, the research has found that the majority are in the lowest 16th percentile. This performance differential is particularly pronounced for African American children. Preliminary findings suggest that this differential, in part, may be explained by the language usage patterns of African Americans. The Committee urges the Department to provide \$1,000,000 to support a university-based research project with an emphasis on university consortium efforts which target inner-city, public schools, that would evaluate the relationship between the language usage patterns of African American students and their ability to read and write standard English. The University of Pennsylvania would be especially suited to carry out such a project.

The Committee concurs with the administration request and has included within the total provided \$6,520,000 for character education partnership grants. These funds will continue the existing 12 grants as well as provide for approximately 16 new grants. Funds are used for the design and implementation of programs that incorporate the six elements of character identified in the statute: caring, civic virtue and citizenship, justice and fairness, respect, responsibility, and trustworthiness.

The Committee urges the Department to provide \$1,000,000 for a demonstration project designed for children in grades three through nine who are educationally and/or socially at risk for school failure. The program should focus on students whose educational success is impaired due to difficulties in peer and adult relationships, who lack self esteem or the ability to make decisions. The project should focus on a program which provides a challenging educational environment including social, emotional, and academic support which will enable students to take full advantage of educational opportunities. A joint venture between the Newport News Public Schools System, the city of Newport News, the local business community and the nonprofit Achievable Dream Founda-

tion is currently operating a program and would serve as an excellent model to demonstrate such a program.

The Committee is aware that the Women in Natural Sciences Program, developed and managed by the Academy of Natural Sciences, provides science enrichment for talented minority and underserved 9th and 10th grade female students. Participants must be financially needy, be enrolled in a Philadelphia public school and live in a household where one or both parents are absent. The Committee encourages the Department to provide \$1,000,000 to support an expansion of the program, which will permit the dissemination of information and an evaluation component.

The Committee urges the Secretary to provide \$3,000,000 for activities to extend the time for learning within or beyond the school year or day. Funds will be used to provide grants to schools and local education agencies to conduct outreach to and consult with parents, teachers, community leaders, and other stakeholders including students, where appropriate, to determine the feasibility of extending time for learning. The Committee notes that several Iowa school districts, including the Sioux City Community School District, the Creston Community School District, and the Ankeny Community School District, are looking at ways to extend the time for learning and would be ideally suited to receive such grants.

The Committee urges the Department to provide \$5,000,000 for a demonstration project designed to improve student achievement through curriculum improvement and the effective use of information technology. Funds would be used to meet high levels of standards and assessments, and create multimedia courses and course modules. The Committee understands that the State of Washington Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction is currently operating a program in this area. The Committee urges the Secretary to give consideration to projects such as the one described above.

It has been brought to the Committee's attention that a recent study offers documentation about the low level of average literacy within State and Federal prisons, relative to the population at large, and raises some questions about the effectiveness of prison education programs. The Committee notes that among the responsibilities of the Institute on Postsecondary Education, Libraries, and Lifelong Learning, is a study of instructional programs and practices which are effective in correctional settings. Such a study would be of great importance to State and Federal prison officials, as well as to educators and policymakers, when making decisions regarding prison education programs. The Committee urges the Department to use \$500,000 to begin a national study of correction education programs.

The Committee was highly dismayed to learn of the Department's use of fiscal year 1997 funds to begin a new testing initiative without securing prior approval through the regular appropriations process. This initiative was not included in the Department's justification material, nor was it brought to the Committee's attention during the fiscal year 1997 hearings. The Committee directs the Department to contract with the National Academy of Sciences to do a study and report to the Committee on the voluntary national testing initiative. This study should include the technical quality of the work performed under the test development con-

tracts, the frameworks and test content, the adequacy of field tests, the reliability of the data produced by the field tests, and the degree in which the tests can be expected to provide valid and useful information to the public. The Committee further directs that a preliminary report be completed by no later than August 31, 1998, and a final report be issued by September 15, 1998. The Committee further prohibits the Department from administering national tests until the final report is completed.

The Committee has included \$2,000,000 for a program to develop a common infrastructure plan for multiple college campuses. The plan will include the installation of a fiber-optic system which would support voice, data, and video applications, a library automation program to improve access and facilitate use by the campuses; implementation and improvement of intracampus networking and remote access, and expanding access to the Internet to members of the college community. The Pennsylvania Consortium for Higher Education is in the process of carrying out a project such as the one described above and could act as a model for other projects around the nation. The Committee urges the Secretary to give full and fair consideration to the Consortium when awarding this project.

The Committee urges the Department to provide \$1,000,000 to conduct a demonstration project using state-of-the-art technology to help students learn English. The National Science Center Foundation, in Augusta, GA, is developing a program such as the one described above, and would be especially suited to develop such a software program.

International education exchange

The Committee has provided \$5,000,000 for the International Education Exchange Program authorized by section 601(c) of Public Law 103-227. These funds are the same amount recommended by the administration and appropriated in fiscal year 1997. The program provides funds to support democracy and free market economies in Eastern Europe, the Commonwealth of Independent States, and other countries that formerly were part of the Soviet Union, by providing educators and other leaders from those countries curricula and teacher training programs in civic and economic education, as well as the opportunity to exchange ideas and experiences with teachers in the United States and other participating countries. The 1998 funds would support continuation of grants awarded to two independent nonprofit organizations with significant expertise in civics education and economic education.

Civic education

The Committee recommends \$4,500,000 for the Center for Civic Education, the same amount as appropriated in fiscal year 1997 and the administration request. This program provides a course of instruction at the elementary and secondary level on the basic principles of our constitutional democracy and the history of the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. Funds also may be used to provide advanced training for teachers concerning the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Eisenhower professional development Federal activities

The Committee recommends \$25,000,000 for the Eisenhower Professional Development Federal Activities Program, \$5,000,000 below the budget request and \$11,658,000 above the 1997 appropriation.

This program supports activities of national significance contributing to the development and implementation of high-quality professional development in the core academic subjects. Projects may include development of teacher training programs, or dissemination of information about exemplary programs of professional development.

The Committee has included \$16,000,000 for the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards, an increase of \$11,000,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation and \$5,000,000 below the administration request. The Committee has included this increase for assessment development, but has included no funding for teacher subsidies.

Consistent with the budget requests, the Committee has included \$4,621,000 for the National Clearinghouse for Mathematics and Science Education, the same amount appropriated for this purpose in 1997. The clearinghouse maintains a permanent repository of mathematics and science education instructional materials and programs for elementary and secondary schools; disseminates information, programs, and instructional materials to the public, information networks, and regional consortiums; and coordinates with existing data bases containing mathematics and science curriculum and instructional materials.

Eisenhower regional mathematics and science education consortia

The Committee has included \$15,000,000 for the Eisenhower regional mathematics and science education consortia, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 and the same amount recommended by the administration. This program supports grants to establish and operate regional consortia to disseminate exemplary mathematics and science instructional materials and provide technical assistance in the use of improved teaching methods and assessment tools to benefit elementary and secondary school students, teachers, and administrators.

21st century community learning centers

The Committee has included \$1,000,000 for the 21st century community learning centers, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997. The administration requested no funding for this purpose. This program supports grants to rural and inner-city public elementary or secondary schools, or consortia of such schools, to enable them to plan, implement, or expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of a rural or inner-city community.

Projects that place schools at the center of the community are contributing to rural renewal both culturally and economically. They also bring the community into the school in the areas of curriculum reform, school organization, planning, teacher and administrator education, and fiscal and tax policy. The Committee urges

the Department to place a high priority on schools-at-the-center projects.

Javits gifted and talented students education

The Committee has included \$7,000,000 for the Javits Gifted and Talented Students Education Program, the same amount recommended by the administration and \$2,000,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation.

This program authorizes awards to State and local education agencies, institutions of higher education, and public and private agencies for research, demonstration, and training activities designed to enhance the capability of elementary and secondary schools to meet the special educational needs of gifted and talented students. Priority is given to projects that identify and serve gifted and talented students who may not be identified and served through traditional assessment methods, including those who are economically disadvantaged or limited English proficient, or have disabilities. Some funds are set aside for a national center for research and development in the education of gifted and talented children and youth, which researches methods and techniques for identifying and teaching gifted and talented students.

Star schools

For the Star Schools Program, the Committee recommends \$30,000,000, an increase of \$4,000,000 above the administration request and the same as the 1997 appropriation.

The Committee has included sufficient funds to continue a statewide fiber optic demonstration project.

This program is designed to improve instruction in math, science, foreign languages, and other subjects such as vocational education, primarily by means of telecommunications technologies and to serve underserved populations. The program supports eligible telecommunications partnerships to develop and acquire telecommunications facilities and equipment, instructional programming teacher training programs and technical assistance.

The Committee is aware of the important work being carried out by the National Center on Adult Literacy at the University of Pennsylvania. The Center is currently operating a program entitled "LiteracyLink" which provides online services to assist adults in obtaining a high school diploma or a general education diploma. The Committee has included sufficient funds to continue this program.

National writing project

The Committee bill provides \$5,000,000 for the national writing project, an increase of \$1,900,000 above the 1997 appropriation. The administration requested no funds for this program.

These funds are awarded to the national writing project in Berkeley, CA, which in turn funds projects in 45 States to train teachers of all subjects how to teach effective writing.

The Committee remains strongly supportive of the efforts of the national writing project (NWP) to improve the skills of our Nation's teachers. The NWP trained more than 166,000 teachers across the country at a cost of less than \$22 per teacher in Federal funds. The

Committee believes that funds for the NWP represent an important investment in our Nation's teachers and students.

After school learning centers

The Committee bill includes no funding for this new initiative. The administration requested \$50,000,000 for this program. Funds would support grants to rural and inner-city public elementary and secondary schools, or consortia of such schools, to enable them to plan, implement, or expand projects that benefit the educational, health, social service, cultural, and recreational needs of a rural or inner city community.

Ready to learn television

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$7,000,000 for the Ready to Learn Television Program, the same amount appropriated in fiscal year 1997 and requested by the administration.

This program supports the development and distribution of educational television programming designed to improve the readiness of preschool children to enter kindergarten and elementary school, consistent with the first national education goal that all children should start school ready to learn. The program also supports the development, production, and dissemination of educational materials designed to help parents, children, and care givers obtain the maximum advantage from educational programming.

Telecommunications demonstration project for mathematics

The Committee recommends \$2,035,000 for the telecommunications demonstration project for mathematics, the same amount recommended by the administration and an increase of \$1,000,000 above the fiscal year 1997 appropriation. Funds are used to carry out a national telecommunication-based demonstration project designed to train elementary and secondary school teachers in preparing all students for achieving State content standards in mathematics.

CHILD LITERACY INITIATIVE

Appropriations, 1997	
Budget estimate, 1998	\$260,000,000
Committee recommendation	260,000,000

The Committee recommends \$260,000,000 for a child literacy initiative. The administration requested \$260,000,000 to begin the new America reads challenge program which would train 30,000 reading specialists and coordinators to mobilize 1 million volunteer reading tutors over the next 5 years. The funds recommended have been provided only if authorized by subsequent legislation enacted by April 1, 1998. Funds have been provided on an advance funded basis and will not become available until October 1, 1998 and shall remain available through September 30, 1999.

The Committee expects the Department to work with parents and educators to complement and support other programs with literacy components, such as Head Start, Even Start, and title I, so they can be even more effective in helping children increase their skills and achievement levels.

The Committee recognizes that the national service programs, especially the Volunteers in Service to America, Foster Grandparent, and the Retired Senior Volunteer Programs could serve as a valuable resources in accomplishing the goal of having all children read well and independently by the third grade. The Committee urges the Department to establish a comprehensive approach to implement the child literacy initiative.

The Committee urges the Department, when drafting legislation, to give special consideration to a professional development initiative designed to teach teachers and other education professionals methods in instructing children how to read. The Committee further encourages the Department to implement this initiative using the 10-regional educational laboratories, which have particular expertise in the area of professional development.

INSTITUTE OF MUSEUM AND LIBRARY SERVICES

Appropriations, 1997	\$136,369,000
Budget estimate, 1998	136,369,000
Committee recommendation	146,369,000

The Committee recommends an appropriation of \$146,369,000 for the Institute of Museum and Library Services, an increase of \$10,000,000 above the budget request.

Office of Library Services State Grants

The Committee recommends \$126,824,000 for State grants. Funds are provided to States by formula to carry out 5-year State plans. These plans must set goals and priorities for the State consistent with the purpose of the act, describe activities to meet the goals and priorities and describe the methods by which progress toward the goals and priorities and the success of activities will be evaluated. States may apportion their funds between two activities, technology and targeted services. For technology, States may use funds for electronic linkages among libraries, linkages to educational, social and information services, accessing information through electronic networks, or link different types of libraries or share resources among libraries. For targeted services, States may direct library and information services to persons having difficulty using a library, underserved urban and rural communities, and children from low income families. Within the total recommended, \$2,045,000 has been provided for services to Indian tribes.

National leadership projects

The Committee recommends \$15,455,000 for national leadership projects, an increase of \$10,000,000 above the administration request. These funds support activities of national significance to enhance the quality of library services nationwide and to provide coordination between libraries and museums. Activities are carried out through grants and contracts awarded on a competitive basis to libraries, agencies, institutions of higher education and museums. Priority is given to projects that focus on education and training of library personnel, research and development for the improvement of libraries, preservation, digitization of library materials, partnerships between libraries and museums and other activities that enhance the quality of library services nationwide.

Obey

Fund for the Improvement of Education

The Conferees have included \$50,000,000 for a new whole school reform initiative under the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE). The Conferees strongly believe that all schools, including high schools, and not just Title I schools, can benefit from comprehensive schoolwide reforms. The Secretary shall conduct a competition that provides discretionary awards consistent with the criteria provided in House Report 105-205. The Secretary should give special considerations to LEA applications that benefit high schools that set high academic standards, link academics to real-world experiences, and successfully preparing students for college and careers.

that are not participating in Title I

Alternative 1--State Competition

In lieu of the intent expressed in House Report 105-205, the Conferees direct that: the Secretary of Education make funds available to State educational agencies (SEAs) based on the formula for ~~distributing Fiscal Year~~ ^{the prior fiscal year} 1997 Title I grants under section 1124 to accelerate the wide-scale application of effective approaches to whole school reform in ESEA Title I schools; the Secretary also make funds available to local educational agencies (LEAs) consistent with section 304(e) of Public Law 103-227, as amended ; SEAs notify the Secretary of their intent to request the funds; SEAs , using peer review, make competitive subgrants using peer review to LEAs on behalf of individual Title I schools identified for program improvement, SEAS give special consideration to applications proposing to use well-defined models, such as those developed by the New American Schools Development Corporation, in high-poverty and schoolwide schools; the models address identified school-level needs; SEAs may reserve up to 5 percent of funds for administration; applications to SEAS identify how LEAs will support model implementation in addition to the school criteria in House Report 105-205. The Secretary also shall conduct a national evaluation of the wide-scale application of effective approaches to whole school reform on student achievement in Title I schools.

Draft Alternative 2 -- ED competition

In lieu of the intent expressed in House Report 105-205, the Conferees direct that: the Secretary of Education make funds available to State educational agencies (SEAs) on a competitive basis, using peer review, to accelerate the wide-scale application of effective approaches to whole school reform in ESEA Title I schools; SEAs submit an application to the Secretary in partnership with local educational agencies (LEAs) on behalf of individual Title I schools identified for program improvement; the Secretary gives special consideration to applications proposing to use well-defined models, such as those developed by the New American Schools Development Corporation, in high-poverty and schoolwide schools; the models address identified school-level needs; and the application describes how LEAs will support model implementation in addition to the criteria in House Report 105-205. The Secretary also shall conduct a national evaluation of the wide-scale application of effective approaches to whole school reform on student achievement in Title I schools.

*Try to be clear
to Obey report language*

*State competes on behalf
of party of LEAs -
mod. bid charter schools*

Obey/Porter Report Language

Alternative 1-State Competition

Alternative 2- ED Competition* 1

The Committee intends that the Secretary of Education make these funds available to SEAs that apply for the funding based on the formula for distributing 1997 Title I grants under section 1124.	Clarifies that Secretary is to base SEA allocations on the formula used to distribute FY 1997 Title I funds instead of FY 1998. (States need advance notice of their allocations in order to plan and run State-level competitions under this authority. Basing allocations on the FY 1998 Title I formula would delay competitions since FY 1998 Title I formula allocations will not be finalized before May 15, 1998.	Secretary distributes funds on a competitive basis using a peer review process to States that apply in partnership with specified LEAs and Title I schools identified for program improvement. (This approach could limit the number of awards to 52 or fewer, as opposed to a potential for 3,000 grant awards at \$50,000 each to LEAs.)
In cases where an SEA declines to apply for its formula-based allocation, the Committee directs that the Secretary use the funds to make discretionary grants to other SEAs. . . .	SEAs notify Secretary of intent to request funds. LEAs in States that decline to participate apply to ED directly (same model as <u>Goals 2000</u> nonparticipating states) SEA submits application to ED which describes process to be used to run the competition to LEAs including peer review.	Not applicable

SEAs make competitive subgrants to school districts on behalf of individual schools SEAS give special consideration to district applications that include well-defined plans, using rigorous methodological designs and techniques including control groups and random assignments to the extent practicable, to evaluate the results achieved with this funding. School districts provide awards of at least \$50,000 to school on a competitive basis to support the initial start-up costs of the particular reform model chosen by the school. Awards may be renewable for two additional years subject to appropriations.	SEAs make competitive grants to school districts on behalf of (in consultation with?) schools identified for program improvement. SEAs give special consideration to district applications proposing to use well-defined models, such as those developed by the New American Schools Development Corporation, in high-poverty and schoolwide schools. No separate LEA to school competition. Up to 5% of funds reserved by SEA to administer competition. Reservation of funds for LEAs for TA?	Special consideration is given to applications where high-poverty and schoolwide schools have identified well -defined models, such as those developed by the New American Schools Development Corporation.
--	--	--

Title I schools receiving funds under this initiative: --identify an effective, research-based whole school model the school will adopt that provides a blueprint for reform of the entire school; --describe how training and external expert technical assistance to facilitate implementation of reform activities will be secured (e.g. from regional labs, external developers, etc.) --Demonstrate support from teachers and staff, and parents; --Identify how other federal/state/local resources provided to the school will be utilized to provide coordinated services to support the reform effort; --Include a plan for evaluating the implementation of the reform initiative and results achieved.	In application, LEA identifies how the district will provide technical assistance to support implementation of the whole school reform models the schools select. Schools --Identify an effective, researched-based whole school model the school will adopt that provides a blueprint for reform of the entire school <i>and addresses needs identified through a school's needs assessment.</i> Same Same Same Same	Same as first alternative
Secretary is directed to make available to SEAs, school districts and schools information about proven and promising whole school reform models and their implementation costs. . .	No legislative authority needed for ED to do this.	Same

Secretary is to issue program guidance, after consultation with the committee, no later than 60 days after the date of enactment.	ED to issue nonregulatory guidance. Regulations not necessary because of detail in report language.	Use GEPA authority which enabled ED to issue final regulations without public comment for first competition of a new or substantially revised grant authority. (Note: Would still require paperwork clearance.)
	National evaluation of wide scale application of effective approaches to whole school reform on student achievement in Title I schools.	Same as Alternative 1.

*Alternative 2 also could provide an alternative approach if the appropriation falls below a certain level. For example, at \$50 million (the level at which Even Start converted from a Federal discretionary to State formula program) based on the FY 1007 Title I formula, 7 States, including Vermont, would receive \$125,000 or less, and only 13 States would receive between \$1 and \$5.7 million (Wisconsin's share would be \$906,000). With a \$75 million appropriation, these 7 small States, including Vermont, would receive between \$1 - \$8.6 million (Wisconsin's share would be \$1.36 million.)