

SAVE THE DEPARTMENT STRATEGY

LEAD:

1. Message

- o Why we need a Department of Education
- o Why it is costly to dismantle and/or merge

2. Communications

- o op ed's
- o speeches
- o press
- o surrogates

3. Legislative

4. Constituencies

- o education groups
 - higher ed
 - elementary and secondary
- o business
- o governors
- o advocacy groups
- o religious groups

5. Administration

- o White House and OMB
- o DOL
- o HHS
- o others???

6. Reinvention of Department

- o NPR II--how muc/when do we reinvent ourselves

7. Coordination with:

- o Budget Issues
- o Reauthorization/Block grant proposals

INITIAL THOUGHTS ON SAVING THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

By Jennifer Davis

1. Need a team and staff support to pull this off. Must include a full-time OPA person who can write as well as a OLCA person who really knows the Hill.
2. Need to get on top of the Workforce Preparation proposals and implications for the merger.
3. Need to talk about CEO and Governors strategy--
 - * follow-up with Jim B.; Michael Jackson; Democratic Governors staff
 - * BRT meeting on June 19--can we use that in any way???
4. Need to discuss broader constituency group strategy.(e.g. OERI Board offer, key ed groups, Terrell Bell--other surrogates...)
5. How can we use the new poll re: American public support for Department??? Need to think about press events including real people who have benefited from our programs and client service orientation.
6. Need to be thinking about other options...too many people think the merger is a good idea, including Department staff and some in OMB.
7. Need to be connected with Reinventing Govt. proposals and meet with Paul Dimond and appropriate White House staff. **(Secretary to meet with the President.)**
8. Need to review all vehicles we have to get our message out about what we do! (e.g. Community Update to 100,000 people a month.)

SAVING THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT

KEY STEPS

1. FORM STEERING COMMITTEE

Palst
Mike Cohen, Mike Smith, Terry Peterson, Kay Kahler, Kay Casstevens, Susan Frost, Jennifer Davis, Mario Moreno, Frank Holleman

Weekly meetings of steering committee.

Weekly meetings with Secretary and Deputy

2. PUBLIC ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

- Step*
- o Message
 - Need to keep those who want to abolish ED on the defensive; put the burden on them to explain and defend the cost and impact of their proposals
 - Need to tie positive case for ED to overall argument for federal role; show importance of fed role and that proposals to eliminate ED are part of larger effort to cut investments and eliminate or shrink federal involvement
 - o Rapid Response Team in OPA
 - 24 hour response time to critical articles and op-eds
 - o Surrogates
 - National--Lowell Weiker?
 - Regional--local sup's, business, etc. (SRR's and constituency groups help find)
 - o RWR Outlook op-ed piece--tied to federal role overall (...We are beginning a great debate about the federal role in education
 - o Polling data
 - need good summary
 - strategy with Carville, Greer, Lake, etc. on 'how do we best sustain, deepen and capitalize on high levels of public support

3. CONGRESSIONAL STRATEGY

- o House
 - Which committee(s) will have jurisdiction?
 - What is likely timing and scenarios for action?
 - Need champions on committee(s) and for floor
(Dem's--Kildee, Reed, Sawyer, ???)
(R's--Mike Castle???)
- o Senate
 - Any real interest beyond Dole and Gramm?
 - Which committee(s) will have jurisdiction
 - What is likely timing and scenarios for action
 - Need champions
(Dems--Kennedy, Harkin ???)
(R's--Jeffords, Hatfield???)

4. CONSTITUENCY GROUPS

- o Update from Susan Frost
 - Association President's meetings--where are we
 - Strategy meeting(?)
- o Business groups
 - GET OP ED PIECE OUT
 - RWR letter to business leaders making case for ED???
- o We need some kind of grass roots strategy--op ed's, hill focus etc.

5. WHITE HOUSE AND ADMINISTRATION

- o Carol Rasco meeting
- o DOL
- o HHS--build visible RWR/Shalala ties
- o What do we want/can get from POTUS

Mary Ann Richards

-DOL

Mike met with:

- o Jack Jennings**
- o Carol Rasco**
- o Tim Barnicle**

Public Engagement (Communication & Outreach)

- Message

- Rapid Response team

 - articles / op-eds

- Surrogate

 - ~~Ho~~ Landed Welton

 - Regional (SFPD)

- Packet of Materials

 - what CD does

 - why shut up.

Videos

- Letters to CEOs?

- Cast Corps

local op-ed piece -

local stories & EP letter

- 1st world cigarette

- family visit with

- La Crosse

local success stories with OP

help - turned into a

ed piece

- Disaster City

over next 2-4 months

① Constituting Groups

7 - Susan Frost mly

5 - Need overview of count sheets

② White House

- met with Rasco

MC mly - Rasco

Jack Jennings

Tim Barnard

① Public Engagement

① Message

- How do we keep those who want to eliminate us on the defensive - make them explain the cost of change

- Strengthen case for exit - tie into Fed role overall

② Need a Rapid Response Team in OPA

- 24 hr response to article & q-ets.

③ Surrogates

- Lowell Weicker?
- Regionally - SPA's (others found regional m

④ Business

- op ed
- Fed's letter to CEO's

⑤ Run Post Family Op-ed's

- tie to Fed role
- longer

⑥ ~~St. meet~~

⑥ Polls -

① need good analysis/summary

② pull together Conville, Frank Green, Celinda Lile, etc.
- how do we sustain & capitalize on public support?

③ Congressional

④ House - ① which Committee(s) have jurisdiction

② Champions

Dem -

R's - Mike Castle?

⑤ ~~Hearings~~ RWR only with - leadership
- Committee chairs
- Com. mem - D's

Senate - any interest outside Dole & Gramm?

- who will lead

- who are our champions

Kennedy

Tellus

Save the Department Strategy

~~Key K~~ (1) Message - Why we need a department
Why should we change? Play offense

Key K (3) Communications

- op ed's
- speeches
- press

Key C (3) Legislative

- House
- Senate

me (4) Constituencies

- Education - higher, el/sec
- Business
- Gov's (D's)
- Advocacy
- Religious, etc.

JP
SF
MM
TP

Mike S. (5) Administration

- White House - Communication
- Veto
- DOJ
- HHS

RWR

Mike S (6) Budget Issues

Mike S (7) Reinvention / WPA II

- How much will we scale down / reinvent ourselves?

Secretary

Deputy

Mike Smith

* Susan Frost

Frank Holleman

Jennifer Davis

Terry Peterson

Mike Cohen

David Stevens

Michelle Canastota

Fritz Edelstein

Kay C.

Tom Wollmann

Kay K.

"Gar"

Kevin

Workey Group

War Room

Mario M.

- SRA's

- Town Mts

Key Programs

- OESO - Tom P

- OSERS - Judy

- OPE - David

[478] From: Susan Frost at WDCT02 6/14/95 7:57PM (2439 bytes: 1 ln)
Priority: Urgent
To: Mike Cohen at WDCB01, Mike Smith at WDCT01
Receipt Requested
Subject: Meeting at 2pm Thursday...

----- Message Contents -----

Attending: Gordon Ambach, Dale Lestina, Mike Resnick, Dick Kruse,
Becky Timmons, Sarah Flanagan (NAICU now, up until last
year she worked for Dodd), Al Sumberg

Folks I'll try to get to attend: Arnie Fege, Gerry Morris, Jack
Jennings

The focus of this meeting is on the Department of Ed issue but we can
spend some time on the President's budget proposal.

My understanding is that Gordon and Dale have been the most active on
the DOE issue. They have held some meetings with Dick, Arnie, Becky
and others to discuss strategy. Months ago Gordon tried to pull
together a more formal group to work on a joint statement but failed
to get consensus.

Al Sumberg (now retired from AAUP) was the leader of the coalition
that helped create the Department and is willing to do work as a
volunteer this time. He is trusted by the groups and keeps on task
when others get distracted.

I'm not sure where NAICU stands but Sarah is very good and very active
on the higher ed scene and someone we should be working with closely.

Jack is doing a lot of work on this issue as you know.

Possible "agenda":

- Status of DOE issue on the hill from their perspective
- Action that groups have taken and what is expected
- Their ideas on what we should be doing
- What they plan to do
- Budget -- importance of selling the Clinton package outside the beltway
- what are they planning to do to generate action, what can we do?

To Jerry

①

I thought it might be helpful if I did a summary of where we are on the budget and appropriations issues as of this moment and some "educated" guesses on where things are headed.

At the end of the details, I attempted to step back from all of this and define where we want to end up.

Those of us who can will meet on THURSDAY at 11:45 to discuss "strategy" -- Secretary's Dining Room.

→ RESCISSIONS

Congress will send the conference report on rescissions to the White House when they return next week. They didn't want to give us the opportunity to get the press on the veto while they were out of town.

The Administration made every attempt to cut a deal short of accepting the education cuts before the House and Senate passed the report. There is still a very small chance for Congress to amend the report and avoid a veto -- technically it can be done but very unlikely.

It appears that Livingston is adamant about keeping the ED cuts for two reasons: first, they want to make a political statement about the FEDERAL programs and reinforce the freshman view that ed should be dismantled at the national level.

Second and probably more important to them is the numbers game they have to play. The only way to get outlay reductions in FY1996 from forward funded ed programs is to rescind funds from the previous year. (\$600 million in rescissions translates into about \$500 million of outlay reductions in FY96 -- the same \$600 million cut out of this year's appropriation bill, only yields about \$100 million in outlays. Unlike budgeteers, appropriators only think in one year compartments. They have to meet their outlay targets for FY 1996 -- period -- and they believe our rescissions are essential.

Fortunately the White House has kept the focus on the message and not fallen for the numbers game. Livingston has threatened that if the White House does not sign the bill, he will double or triple the cuts in their priorities in the FY96 bill. Most folks believe he was going to that anyway.

What's next?

- The President is being advised to make a BIG DEAL of vetoing the rescission bill in order to send a clear message outside the beltway that (1) he's very relevant--he can stop this bill from becoming law (2) he's standing up for education at all levels --one of the three issues he's outlined that any budget must address.
- Hopefully we will be able to highlight or "amplify" that message from here using examples of what cuts would do in Safe and Drug-free, Goals and School to Work. As you know we are trying to expand that list just a bit to cover technology and TRIO cuts for different reasons.
- Its hard to get the groups and the press to focus on a potential veto. If the real thing happens we should try to get as much credit as possible for standing firm on education.
- Once the veto occurs, there is an 80 to 90 percent chance of a new rescissions package that all sides agree to -- White House will (should) stand firm on education numbers. The problem with passing a new bill is how to get the votes. Republican freshmen have vowed to vote against a compromise and Democrats are loathe to vote for any package of cuts. But most folks are assuming it will happen.

RECOMMENDATION: Discuss ways to get credit for veto -- press and groups.

→ HOUSE/SENATE BUDGET CONFERENCE

We expect the House and Senate to go into conference as soon as they return. The tax cut is the big issue and the one that divides Republicans the most. Gingrich has said that a fast conference is a must and is trying to figure out a way to accommodate Kasich, Dole and Gramm and others. The Senate has set aside \$170 billion for tax cuts to become available when spending cuts are passed. The House has \$350 billion for tax cuts.

Defense would get \$92 billion more over 7 years in the House version than the Senate version (the Senate follows the Administration's numbers).

Medicare (-\$250 billion) and Medicaid (-\$175 billion) are cut dramatically in both versions.

Domestic appropriations is cut \$190 billion over seven years from a FREEZE in both versions. This would translate into about 30 percent cuts in all ed programs over the same period. There is not much we can do about the overall Function 500 cut in conference since the Senate failed to pass the \$40 and \$28 billion restoration amendments.

BUT -- Student Loans is another matter. Inschool interest subsidy is eliminated in the House version (-\$18 billion) and restored by the Snowe/Simon amendment in the Senate version (-\$4.4 billion remaining that may have to be taken out of the loan program in other ways -- increasing percent of direct lending would be our solution!). The final number ---- reconciliation instruction to save "x" to the authorizing committees ---- is a BIG conference item for us. Chances of saving interest subsidy in reconciliation bill depends on that number.

RECOMMENDATION: Work with authorizers and bipartisan group that voted for Snowe amendment to hold Senate position in conference. Get credit with Democrats and moderates on this issue!!

→ FY1996 APPROPRIATIONS

See Sally's memo on 602b allocations.

Given the \$2.2 billion outlay cut to the subcommittee, we can assume that the appropriations cuts will have to total between \$5 and \$7 billion. NIH is Porter's and Hatfield's first priority -- no cuts. Hatfield's budget amendment that passed with 85 votes restored the 10 percent cut to NIH by doing an across-the-board cut on all other subcommittees -- hopefully the Senate subcommittee allocation will reflect that amendment.

Its too early to predict what the subcommittees will cut and by how much. Unlike the rescissions bill, Hatfield does not have much room to modify the House cuts. But he will mark up his bill much later -- probably September -- and alot can happen between now and then.

Porter is much more supportive of education than his committee. The House will mark up on July 10th -- tentatively. They will move the bill to the floor before the August recess. Word has it that Goals is really in deep trouble. Special Ed and Pell Grants and Impact Aid are somewhat protected. All other programs are vulnerable. Most that we proposed to eliminate are gone but they will outdo us by making sure they eliminate many more.

RECOMMENDATION: Set some parameters and develop strategy for appropriations -- HOUSE AND SENATE

→ THE PRESIDENT

The White House has made it clear that Republican cuts in Medicare and Education are unacceptable. Tax cuts for the wealthy are also unacceptable.

Republicans counter with the fact that the President's budget makes no attempt to go to zero deficit by "x" time and therefore he lacks credibility on the issue.

At some point, everyone expects the President and Congress to make some sort of overall budget deal. That could come at any time BUT most believe that we have to get the word out on the Republican plan and how bad it is before we negotiate something else.

RECOMMENDATION: Get as much information out as possible on what the Republican budget looks like for education -- both in terms of this year and the downward path for the next seven years. Coordinate this message with OMB and White House.

STEPPING BACK ----- *where are we headed - what's "Success"?*
FOR THE PURPOSE OF DISCUSSION -- Setting goals, measuring performance, being accountable!!
Given the political reality -- Where do we want to end up when the first session of Congress ends?

GOAL #1: PRESIDENT SEEN AS CHAMPION OF EDUCATION AS A NATIONAL PRIORITY

- o Major Elementary and Secondary Programs Aimed at Disadvantaged held harmless, i.e. Title 1, Special ED, Bilingual, Indian Ed, Pell Grants, SEOG, College Work Study, TRIO

- o President's initiatives intact and minimal cuts from last year's level, i.e. Goals 2000, School to Work, Technology ("minimal to be defined")

- o Other school improvement programs -- Safe and Drug-free Schools, Eisenhower Professional Development either in a combined form that runs through SEAs and is accountable or as free standing programs -- no more than 10 percent cut overall.

- o Need to define overall objectives for Perkins and IDEA

- o Department of Education remains the structure to run the programs

GOAL #2 -- PRESIDENT SEEN AS MODERATE WHO CAN ACHIEVE DEFICIT REDUCTION (balanced budget), SAVE TAXPAYER'S MONEY, AND INVEST IN PEOPLE AND THE FUTURE (middle-class) -- Our contribution to this effort:

- o At least a net of 60 programs (line items) are eliminated from our recommendations including any revised recommendations

- o Direct Lending moves to at least 60 percent this year to achieve additional savings of at least \$3 billion; defaults continue downward path to save "X" millions

- o Student Loan inschool interest subsidy is saved from the chopping block -- limited savings applied from grace period or other changes if absolutely necessary

GOAL #3 -- PRESIDENT'S ACTION ON EDUCATION TRANSLATES INTO VOTES IN 1996

- o We accomplish the above AND get credit for it in the press, in Congress, with government and business leaders and with groups

- o FY 1997 PRESIDENT'S BUDGET continues to define him as the "Education President"