

1963 level. And when baby boomers retire, unless further changes are made, they could consume 20% of the national output.

The big question is whether discretionary spending caps imposed by this budget deal will hold in 2001 and 2002, when the crunch comes. There is plenty of reason to believe they won't. Even Republicans have lost their appetite for discretionary-spending cuts. In the final budget negotiations, GOP leaders raised those caps to allow extra billions of highway spending. "It's very important to us," House Majority Leader Dick Armey explained.

"You couldn't get Republicans to

vote" for cuts needed to make the targets, says Democrat David Obey of Wisconsin. "much less Democrats."

Still, discretionary caps have been in place since 1990 and have held firm to date. Living with them in coming years will be much tougher, but House Appropriations Committee Chairman Bob Livingston vows his panel will do its job.

As the caps tighten, there will be more pressure to work around them. One escape will be so-called emergency spending bills like the \$8.4 billion measure the Senate passed Thursday.

Another gambit was suggested in the president's February budget, which would have devoted about \$40 billion of new and increased user fees to offset discretionary spending. That approach, however, was rejected in the budget talks by Republican leaders who wanted user fees to fund their tax cuts, not more spending.

If the caps do hold, Congress and the president — or his successor — will have to make some tough decisions about the federal government's role in society. And as the 21st century begins, that role could be very different than in the last half of the 20th. ■

85. San Diego Union-Tribune

May 12, 1997

Challenge school districts lead the way

By Delaine Eastin

As state superintendent of public instruction, I visit an average of at least one school a week. Despite recent math test results reminding us of how far California must climb to compete with other states and nations, I see positive changes at our schools. There is momentum, hope, and a promise of better things to come.

I am very proud of our class-size reduction program in California and our comprehensive effort to teach every child to read by the end of third grade. But I'd like to tell you about still another program, the Challenge Initiative, which has quietly been gaining momentum during the past 18 months.

At Galileo High School in San Francisco and at Pasadena High School in Pasadena in September 1995, I challenged California schools and school districts to join me in a Challenge reform effort as volunteers to build the prototype for the 21st century.

Districts that wanted to volunteer had to bring all their key stakeholders to the table to agree to the reform — teachers, classified staff, board members, administrators, parents and business partners.

The Challenge reform is bold and comprehensive and includes 10 elements for schools: (1) content and performance standards, (2) assessment and accountability, (3) a safe and healthy school environment, (4) up-to-date

facilities and 21st Century technology, (5) family-school partnerships, (6) student learning plans, (7) site-based decision making, (8) staff and community training, (9) higher graduation requirements and (10) a Golden State Achievement Certificate, a diploma that requires examinations to validate course mastery.

In all, 56 districts from 29 counties throughout California — representing over 450,000 students — have taken up the Challenge. I have visited Challenge districts in all parts of the state; students, parents and staff in these districts know that they are doing very important work. There is tangible enthusiasm and commitment to excellence. These districts receive no extra resources or special favors. They are taking on the Challenge on their own nickel and through their own persistence.

That's why I know this is the "real" reform in California. This reform will not disappear (like so many other efforts) when the grant money runs out, or if another education fad arrives. These Challenge elements are carefully developed based on policy studies of the past five years.

All the major education groups, the Education Commission of the States, Policy Analysis for California Education (PACE), Goals 2000, and now President Clinton's education goals focus on the same elements called for in the

Challenge.

The Challenge finally puts into practice what policy-makers and pundits have been saying we should do for years. I finally said (with deference to Nike), "Just Do It." These intrepid districts have worked with me to write California's first content and performance standards.

The results are impressive. The Challenge Standards were rated highly in the American Federation of Teachers' national study on standards, and they are being seriously considered for adoption by California's newly created Standards Commission.

Because of their forward thinking, Challenge districts were ready to implement class-size reduction when the program first began last fall.

They also are leaders in safety and technology.

For example, the San Benito High School District has such a high standard of cleanliness and safety in a 100-year-old building that, when I visited there recently, I asked to meet the maintenance crew to thank them for their impressive work. Another Challenge district, Orcutt Union, has recognized how crucial technology is to the workplace, and has incorporated technological tools into its curriculum at all grade levels so that students will be prepared for the future.

Challenge districts engage parents in their children's learning. The districts are

developing student learning plans to help all students, and their parents know exactly where they stand and what they have to do to improve. In Cupertino Union School District, parents have the opportunity for more substantial involvement in their children's education through participation in the development of reading and math standards.

Challenge districts are raising graduation requirements to prepare their students for the global competition they will encounter.

San Francisco Unified School District is leading the way in graduation requirements; it is moving on a plan to adopt requirements that exceed the Challenge's requirements.

Farther north, the Shasta Union High

School District is holding an academic summit to discuss graduation requirements; in all their community forums, parents are saying "go higher."

The Education Round Table — which I belong to along with the presidents of the University of California and the California State University Systems, the chancellor of the Community College System, and the executive director of the California Postsecondary Education Commission — has developed graduation standards for all California students in language arts and mathematics.

These standards are aligned with the Challenge Standards and Challenge graduation requirements.

The Education Round Table

graduation standards have been endorsed by the Academic Senates of all segments of higher education, the Regents of the University of California, the Trustees of the California State University System and the PTA. Challenge districts have found powerful allies.

At Challenge districts, you will see happy, enthusiastic students who are serious about learning and competing with the best schools in the world. I urge you to keep your eye on the Challenge. The 56 districts and those who follow in their footsteps will lead the way for all schools in California to climb toward the top in student performance.

EASTIN is the state superintendent of public instruction. ■

86. San Diego Union-Tribune

May 12, 1997

School law borders on ridiculous

By Logan Jenkins

Vista High School — a National Blue Ribbon School, according to the telephone greeting — is in the middle of a civics class.

Let's slip in the back as the teacher reviews the reported facts:

Three Vista High students who crossed the border into Tijuana on a May 1 humanitarian mission were turned back by the Immigration and Naturalization Service after admitting they were not legal U.S. residents.

One of the boys since has returned to Vista with a visa after proving his family is near citizenship.

For background, the teacher explains the legal requirement of public schools to teach all resident children no matter what their immigration status, as affirmed in Plyler vs. Doe, a 1982 Supreme Court decision based on the 14th Amendment's equal-protection clause.

Bear in mind, the teacher says, that Proposition 187, which allows California's public educators to inform authorities if they suspect a student is illegal, would tear a hole in that blanket obligation — if the 1994 initiative survives legal challenge.

A student raises her hand and asks,

"How could these guys have been so stupid to go down to TJ if they didn't have papers?"

The teacher explains that the students were warned before the day trip to Colonia Panamericana.

"Yes, but who wants to admit they're illegal?" says another student. (The class nods.)

Obviously, the teacher says, these students miscalculated when they piled into the back of a counselor's pickup.

"All right, so two of them are down there now," a concerned student says. "What can we do to get them back here?"

There are ways to enter legally, the teacher says. Perhaps student visas can be arranged. Or if they remain residents of Mexico, the students can come here to school, but then they must pay tuition. (The students look at each other skeptically.)

"What is to keep the students from cutting a hole through the red tape and re-entering the Blue Ribbon School?" asks a college-bound girl who plans to be a lawyer.

"Say the two find a coyote and sneak across the border, the way generations of immigrants have done. Can they come

back to school as if nothing has happened? Now the school knows they are illegals, right? It's not a matter of being ignorant. Now we know. What happens then?"

The teacher winces.

"Yeah," says a boy with round glasses, "that Plyler vs. Doughboy decision (the class chuckles) says schools must remain ignorant. Are administrators supposed to pretend they don't know even if everyone else knows these guys are breaking the law?"

The teacher says that, for now, the Vista district's reading of the law goes like this: The high school must welcome the undocumented students even if they are well-publicized fugitives from the INS.

"That's totally crazy," says a frustrated student. "How can we respect the law when it's in conflict with itself?"

The bell sounds, much to the relief of the teacher, who has contracted a headache only ibuprofen will touch.

"We'll take this up next class. For homework, I'd like you start an American classic that might help the discussion.

He writes the short title on the blackboard — "Catch-22." ■

Recent
immigrants



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

67028
Immigration

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE DIVISION
ECONOMICS , SCIENCE , AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT BRANCH

TO:

Bill Kincaid

FROM: INGRID SCHROEDER
phone: (202) 395-3883
FAX: (202) 395-3109

DATE: 7/23/97

NUMBER OF PAGES (including this cover sheet):

9

COMMENTS:

- ① Justice testimony on HR 1534 + HR 2172
- ② copies of the bills
- ③ Education coms on the testimony

Please call (202) 395-3454 to report any difficulties with transmission of this fax.

H. Judiciary Subcommittee on Immigration

7/24/97

DRAFT TESTIMONY ON H.R. 1543 AND H.R. 2172

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

On behalf of the Immigration and Naturalization Service (INS), I am pleased to provide our views relating to H. R. 1543, by Mr. Dellums, and H.R. 2172, by Mr. Frank. Both of these bills would amend section 214(l) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) by allowing certain exceptions to the restrictions, adopted in 1996, which apply to the conditions under which alien students can attend public schools in the United States. These bills have arisen out of certain unique circumstances and individual hardships which we believe were not anticipated by the U. S. Congress when it passed the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (IIRIRA).

In general, the INS agrees with the intent of these two bills that there is a need for more flexibility under section 214(l), provided that the U.S. taxpayers are not responsible for subsidizing the cost of nonimmigrant students. Although these amendments would provide relief for some students, the INS believes that other meritorious situations would not be covered by these bills. We believe that the circumstances giving rise to these two bills, and other cases which have come to our attention, will be best dealt with by a general statutory exception to section 214(l), to be implemented through regulations promulgated by the Attorney General, which would allow students, on a case-by-case basis, to apply for an exception to the 214(l) provision.

To explain, I believe we should briefly review the history of the passage of Section 214(l) and the events which have transpired since its passage in 1996.

History of Section 214(l)

Section 625 of the IIRIRA amended the Immigration and Nationality Act (INA) by adding a new subsection (l) to section 214. The new 214(l) provision prohibits the classification of an alien as a foreign student under section 101(a)(15)(F)(i) of the INA if the alien seeks to attend public elementary school or publicly-funded adult education programs or to attend public secondary school without reimbursing the school system for the total, unsubsidized costs of education. The provision also limits attendance at a public secondary school to one year and prohibits transfer from a private secondary school to a public secondary school unless the reimbursement condition and one year limitation are applied.

Congress' intent was two fold: (1) To put an end to the practice of F-1 nonimmigrant students who entered or obtained status to attend private elementary, secondary or English as a Second Language (ESL) schools, transferring (or parachuting) over to a public elementary/secondary school or ESL adult education program; and (2) to stop the practice that resulted in aliens who were admitted for, or changed status to, that of an F-1 student with the primary purpose of going to school in the U.S., from being subsidized by U.S. taxpayers through attendance at public schools and adult education programs.

Developments Since the Enactment of Section 214(l)

Section 214(l) went into effect on November 30, 1996, a time when many foreign students had departed from the United States to celebrate end of the year holidays with their families abroad. Upon return to the United States in January to resume their studies, many unaccompanied minor children and others were found no longer to be admissible as nonimmigrant students. Many of these children had personal effects in the United States at the residences where they were living during the first semester of the academic year. On a case-by-case basis, INS deferred inspection to enable such aliens to enroll in a service approved school to be eligible for admission to F-1 status, considered parole of some of these aliens to allow them to complete the academic year, considered other appropriate visa classifications or allowed them to finalize their affairs in the United States.

Since enactment of the 214(l) provision, INS has learned of many situations which could not have been foreseen at the time the provision was drafted and debated. The following examples provide an illustration of the unintended consequences of the 214(l) provision:

O Along the Alaska-Yukon and Alaska-British Columbia border there is often but one school serving remote communities on both sides of the border. After enactment of the 214(l) provision, Canadian students were no longer eligible to enter the United States to attend the local public elementary school even though the provincial government reimbursed the local school district in Alaska for the education costs of the Canadian students.

O In Michigan, INS learned of the predicament befalling foreign (Canadian) students attending a private school which could no longer afford to operate as a private institution. When the school changed hands in the middle of the academic year and fell under the jurisdiction of the local school system, the Canadian students were no longer eligible to commute to the United States daily to go to school. Although the childrens' local government combined with their families were willing to continue paying for their education, under the new statute, they were not able to be accorded F-1 status for purposes of attending a public elementary school. The INS granted parole to these ten students for the remainder of the 1996-97 school year, but the current law still requires that they no longer commute across the border when the 1997-98 school year begins in September.

O There are many "Sister City" arrangements between American cities and cities in foreign countries. One component of the sister city arrangements is a valuable exchange program for high school students enabling American youth to spend a year in a foreign high school while a student from abroad is spending a year in one of our high schools. No tuition is exchanged under these sister city arrangements. The 214(l) provision requires that a foreign student reimburse the total, unsubsidized costs of a public secondary education for the academic school year.

O Finally, INS has learned of some public schools' tuition-supported Adult Education Programs which aliens are no longer eligible to receive F-1 student visas to attend. Under the 214(l) provision, these tuition-supported programs are treated in the same manner as public Adult Education programs for which no tuition costs are reimbursed. To date, INS is acquainted with such programs in Utah and in Berkeley, California. ~~Apparently it was the Berkeley program which has instigated the introduction of H.R. 1543 by Mr. Delbaum.~~ INS continues to examine how these tuition-supported programs operate to determine whether adult students pay a fee for the direct costs only or both the direct and indirect costs of the adult education.

INS Proposal for Corrective Legislation

With regard to H.R. 1543 and H.R. 2172, the INS believes that there is a need to amend Section 214(l) to make allowances for exceptional circumstances which may arise which require special consideration. We believe, however, that instead of addressing each new circumstance with a new amendment to the statute, as with these two bills, it would be preferable to address all of these instances with one statutory change. The change which we support would authorize the Attorney General to accommodate exceptional circumstances where the Attorney General may exercise discretionary authority to waive section 214(l) for otherwise qualified aliens when: (1) the alien's public education in the U. S. results from a government-to-government agreement between U. S. and foreign entities at the federal, state or local governmental level; (2) waiving 214(l) would be in the public interest. The INS believes that a general statutory exception, implemented through regulations promulgated by the Attorney General, would preserve the original intent of Section 214(l) while still allowing the degree of flexibility needed to address exceptional circumstances which may arise involving our nation's public school systems. It would allow students to apply, on a case-by-case basis, for an exception to the 214(l) provision.

Piecemeal solutions may also introduce new problem areas into the law. For example, H.R. 2172 prohibits a school system from using any federal funds to pay any cost associated with such enrollment. The question of whether federal funds are involved may not be easily determined. Since enactment of the 214(l) provision, INS has learned a considerable amount about the manner in which per capita costs of public education are computed. Cost computations for federal funding and cost computations for state funding are necessary to arrive at the total per capita cost. We defer, of course, to the Secretary of Education on this matter. However, we understand that costs may be computed on one of several models and may be computed differently by school districts. We are concerned about the enforceability of the legislation if no reimbursement of federal funds is required, and there is only a prohibition on the use of federal funds.

We appreciate the opportunity to testify before you on this issue, and welcome any questions.

Date: Fri, 18 Jul 1997 10:37:11 -0400 (EDT)
From: John Trasvina <trasvina@usdoj.gov>
To: trasvina@slaeey.usdoj.gov
Subject: query

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Help
	Doc Contents	

References to this bill in the Congressional Record

Digest and Status Information About this Bill.

Download this bill. (2,002 bytes).

GPO's PDF version of this bill

To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain nonimmigrant aliens to study in publicly funded adult education programs if the alien provides reimbursement for such... (Introduced in the House)

HR 1543 IH

105th CONGRESS

1st Session

H. R. 1543

To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain nonimmigrant aliens to study in publicly funded adult education programs if the alien provides reimbursement for such study.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 7, 1997

Mr. DELLUMS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

A BILL

To amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit certain nonimmigrant aliens to study in publicly funded adult education programs if the alien provides reimbursement for such study.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. NONIMMIGRANT ALIEN STUDY IN PUBLICLY FUNDED ADULT EDUCATION

PROGRAMS.

(a) IN GENERAL- Section 214(1)(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(1)(1) (as added by section 625(a) of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996; Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009--1820) is amended--

(1) in subparagraph (A) by striking 'or in a publicly funded adult education program';

(2) in subparagraph (B) --

(A) by inserting 'or in a public adult education program' after 'secondary school'; and

(B) by inserting 'or program' after 'school' each place it appears.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE- The amendment made by subsection (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of section 625 of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996.

Date: Fri, 18 Jul 1997 10:31:15 -0400 (EDT)
From: John Trasvina <trasvina@usdoj.gov>
To: trasvina@sleepy.usdoj.gov
Subject: query

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	HomePage
Hit List	Best Sections	Help
	Doc Contents	

References to this bill in the Congressional Record

Digest and Status Information About this Bill.

Download this bill. (2,996 bytes).

GPO's PDF version of this bill

To amend Immigration and Nationality Act to make the restrictions on foreign student study at a public elementary or secondary school inapplicable in cases where the school evidences... (Introduced in the House)

HR 2172 IH

105th CONGRESS

1st Session

H. R. 2172

To amend Immigration and Nationality Act to make the restrictions on foreign student study at a public elementary or secondary school inapplicable in cases where the school evidences a desire for such result, and to prohibit the use of Federal funds to pay the cost of such study.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

July 16, 1997

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts introduced the following bill, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary

A BILL

To amend Immigration and Nationality Act to make the restrictions on foreign student study at a public elementary or secondary school inapplicable in cases where the school evidences a desire for such result, and to prohibit the use of Federal funds to pay the cost of such study.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SEC. 1. APPLICATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON FOREIGN STUDENTS AT OPTION OF SCHOOL.

(a) IN GENERAL- Section 214(1) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1184(1)) is amended--

(1) in paragraph (1), by striking 'An alien' and inserting 'Subject to paragraph (3), an alien';

(2) in paragraph (2)--

(A) by striking 'public elementary school,' and inserting 'public elementary school (unless the requirements of paragraph (3) are met),'; and

(B) by inserting 'or (3)' after '(1)(B)'; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

'(3)(A) Paragraph (1) shall not apply to an alien with respect to studies at a public elementary or secondary school, if the alien submits to the Attorney General, in such time and manner as the Attorney General shall specify, credible evidence that the school desires to enroll the alien, or continue the enrollment of the alien, in a course of study at the school without the alien's being subject to the limitations under the paragraph.

'(B) A public elementary or secondary school enrolling an alien accorded status as a nonimmigrant under section 101(a)(15)(F)(i) pursuant to subparagraph (A) may not use any Federal funds to pay any cost associated with such enrollment.'

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE- The amendments made by subsections (a) shall take effect as if included in the enactment of the Illegal Immigration Reform and Immigrant Responsibility Act of 1996 (Public Law 104-208; 110 Stat. 3009-546).

THIS SEARCH	THIS DOCUMENT	GO TO
Next Hit	Forward	New Search
Prev Hit	Back	Home Page
Hit List	Best Sections	Help
	Doc Contents	

ED Staff Comments on INS Testimony on H.R. 1543
(LRM: IMS 122)
July 23, 1997

We concur with the INS statement in so far as it opposes both bills, though we doubt that testimony--rather than a letter--is the appropriate vehicle for such esoteric matters and wish that ED were involved earlier in the process. Neither are we predisposed to favor the delay and paperwork associated with a waiver approach (More Washington bureaucracy! Moreover, is it likely that ED or DOJ would often disagree with a request for enrollment where the school is willing?), and would rather let individual public school systems enroll such students if they perceive an educational benefit in doing so (i.e., the Frank amendment, but without the prohibition on use of Federal funds), although we would agree that a waiver approach is generally preferable to specific legislative fixes for each local problem. We do not support the DOJ amendment, however, because we think it premature to recommend a waiver solution; the testimony should point out the problems inherent in the two bills and indicate a willingness to work with ED and the Committee to develop an appropriate solution.

We also find the last substantive paragraph of the testimony to be confusing and suggest the following alternative:

"Piecemeal solutions may also introduce new, unforeseen problems into the law. For example, H.R. 2172 would prohibit a school system from using federal funds to pay any cost associated with such enrollment. However, the question of whether federal funds are involved may not be easy to determine. For example, we are advised by the Department of Education that it administers programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 under which Federal grants are available for "school-wide" support of a school's entire instructional program; attempting to sort out federal from non-federal expenditures for particular students in these and other cases would pose a large, and largely fruitless, accounting and administrative burden on public schools that would not otherwise be necessary."

Tulane Reworks Aid To Boost Enrollment (Cont.)

"The marketplace forced Tulane to hunt for students who need financial aid," said Whiteside, who spoke to administrators at a conference on student retention in Washington, D.C., last Friday, sponsored by USA Group, the nation's largest loan guarantor and servicer.

Sagging enrollment and poor retention are national problems at colleges and universities, according to statistics compiled by USA Group (ED, Nov. 14, 1996).

Since 1991, the rate of converting freshman inquiries into applications has dipped from 37 percent to 28 percent at public universities and 16 percent to 9 percent at private institutions, according to a survey by USA Group that traces enrollment woes to those factors.

The number of Tulane freshmen dropped from 1,472 in 1989 to 1,239 in 1995, while the cost of attendance more than doubled, from \$18,680 in 1989 to \$26,390 in 1995.

Tulane was competing against similarly expensive Ivy League schools for top students. Meanwhile, staff cuts caused by stagnant revenues hurt the effectiveness of some departments, Whiteside said. Faculty positions were not cut.

Financial Aid Changes

To lure top students above—and slightly below—the Ivy League cut, Whiteside retailored Tulane's financial aid program to help more students. Fewer full-tuition merit awards were granted, and instead, more eligible students received merit awards of about \$10,000, or about half of tuition.

The result of the process he calls "financial aid leveraging" was a savings of about \$1 million for Tulane, and increased access for students who might have gone elsewhere if not for the aid. The number of freshmen starting this fall is a resurgent 1,410.

Retention and Admissions Overhaul

But financial aid wasn't the only area to be overhauled. Nearly every facet of the school's operations was re-worked to boost retention and admissions, Whiteside said.

For example, the admissions department became more assertive with direct mail, promotions and high school relations, and faculty

were required to become more involved with student advising.

The increased revenue from greater enrollment is now being used to strengthen academic programs. In the long run, Whiteside said, investment in academics is far more important than administrative changes and aid flexibility. "The only thing that will keep that surge [of students] up is perception of value," he said.

For more information, contact Sara Murray-Plumer, USA Group Public Affairs, H769, P.O. Box 7039, Indianapolis, IN 46206-7039, (317)262-9823, or Richard Whiteside, Office of Undergraduate Education, Tulane University, New Orleans, LA 70118, (504)865-5000, ext. 5739. —Jonathan Fox

Congress Names Members Of College Cost Commission

The 10 congressional appointees to a commission charged with studying college costs were announced yesterday. The Education Department named its sole appointee last week.

The members of the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education—six appointed by the Republican leadership, four by the Democratic leadership and one by ED—is to report to the education policy committees rewriting student aid programs within four months.

ED named Barry Munitz, chancellor of the California State University System (ED, July 7).

The other appointees are: George Waldner, president, York College; Jonathan Brown, president, Association of California Independent Colleges and Universities; Martin Anderson, fellow, Hoover Institute; Blanche Touhill, chancellor, University of Missouri; and William Massey, president, Morehouse College.

Also, Bill Hansen, executive director, Education Finance Council; Frances Norris, vice president, Dutko Group; William Troutt, president Belmont University; Robert Burns, political science professor, South Dakota State University; and Claire Cotton, president, Association of Independent Colleges and Universities of Massachusetts. —Rebecca S. Weiner