

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION ROLE

Question: Why do we need a Department of Education?

Answer: Education is a national concern; critical to a competitive national economy and vibrant democracy.

We are in an information age. Need for education and skills greater than ever. Eliminating department today would be like eliminating the defense department during the cold war.

Education is primarily a responsibility of State and local governments. But, because education is an area of critical national importance, a Department of Education has an important role:

- being a national voice for education;
- building partnerships in support of critical issues (ex: religious leaders and others in support of family involvement);
- being a supportive partner to states, local communities, schools, and colleges in improving education; *Facilitate state & local efforts*
- being a clearinghouse of the best ideas about improving education; *Research; technology*
- ensuring equity so that no children are left behind. *-disabled, poor LEP*

National Purposes

- challenging standards
- teacher training
- safe schools
- getting folks into college
- school to work transitions

~~GOODLING~~ GUNDERSON PROPOSAL

Question: What is your position on the ~~Goodling~~ Gunderson proposal?

Answer: I did not come to Washington to defend bureaucracy. I came to create a lean and effective Department.

- We are moving on our own to reduce bureaucracy, streamline, consolidate, and save taxpayers' dollars. We are interested in any proposal to help improve teaching and learning.
- The ~~Goodling~~⁶ Gunderson proposal would create a "mega-bureaucracy" by combining the Departments of Education, Labor and EEOC. (It shifts and consolidates some functions, but does not set forth any steps to improve education.) It downgrades the importance of education and eliminates the "bully pulpit".
- Such a "mega-bureaucracy" would decrease accountability and efficiency, make education information and programs less accessible to customers, and excessively concentrate decision making.
 - For example, it would establish an Assistant Secretary for Workforce Preparation and Policy who would have responsibility for over \$38 billion in program funds, more than the entire Department of Education budget.
- Such massive bureaucracy building would distract attention from our important task of improving education. We would spend years rearranging organizational boxes rather than continuing our efforts at streamlining the Department.

- Would focus too much on regulatory functions
- Education about more than work force preparation – vibrant democracy
- less accountability, bad for our customers
- Can get savings without consolidation

Mr. Gunderson estimates that his proposal would save \$4 billion a year. However, most of this savings would be from eliminations and consolidations of programs – savings that can be – and are being – achieved by Education and Labor.

- Claimed savings of \$4 billion:

- \$900 million cut from the consolidated total of \$1.9 billion for Eisenhower Professional Development, Charter Schools, Impact Aid, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and Innovative Education Programs

- \$100 million by reducing Bilingual Education

- \$100 million by reducing Title III Developing Institutions

- \$600 million by eliminating funding for 29 programs from ED, Labor, and other agencies

- \$200 million by reducing Workplace Safety and Employee Benefit programs

- \$2.3 billion cut from a total of \$12 billion for Workforce Preparation and Life-Long Learning programs which could be combined into 4 block grants

- \$100 million from reducing duplicate staff offices and cutting civil rights unit

ALEXANDER/BENNETT/COATES PROPOSAL

Question: What is your position to the Alexander/Bennett/Coates proposal to abolish the Department?

Answer: I understand that they have proposed making education an office within a larger department and distributing many functions of the Department to other agencies. For example, student financial aid for college would go to the Treasury Department, vocational education to Labor, educational research to NSF, and so on.

- Need a national voice for education. Without a Cabinet level department education would be deemphasized at time in our history when it is more important than ever before.
- Proposal would create a bureaucratic nightmare for schools, communities, and States. Now, States, communities and others concerned with education can look to one agency. Under the proposal they would have to go all over the government. ~~to many~~

• *Less accountability; no coherent policy, fragmentation*
Creating an office in a larger agency is not necessarily more efficient or more responsive to local concerns. When Education was in HEW

- The Office of Education had 7,700 employees. The Department currently has ~~one third fewer~~ ^{5,000} employees;
- The Secretary of HEW could not devote much attention to education;
- The lack of attention and large HEW bureaucracy resulted in a lack of coherence and responsiveness that impeded State and local educators.

During Congressional Hearings in 1979, on whether a Department of Education should be created, Terrel Bell testified that for these reasons creating a Department of Education would reduce Federal control of education and Federal red tape.

• religious conservative antedote → know where need to go

OPPORTUNITIES FOR SAVINGS

Question: What do you see as opportunities for cost savings over the next few years?

Answer:

- Changing law to 100 percent Direct Loans will save \$5.2 billion more through 2000. This, added to the \$6.8 billion from Student Loan Reform Act of 1993, will total \$12 billion through 2000.
- Eliminating 41 programs as proposed in the President's Budget will save \$4.1 billion by 2000.
- The reduction of 8.4 percent of Department employees will save \$110 million by 2000. *from 1995*

• *Savings that do not hurt students*

MANAGEMENT IMPROVEMENTS

Question: How are you improving management of the Department?

Answer: When I came to the Department there were significant management problems. GAO identified problems in the areas of leadership, program monitoring, financial management, and student aid administration.

Full-scale effort to improve management includes:

- strategic plan -- which includes detailed performance indicators. 2 - 16
- successfully implemented the Direct Student Loan program to save at least \$12 billion by FY 2000; simplified the loan process for students, their parents, and schools.
- strengthening the student financial aid "gatekeeping" process -- as a result defaults are down (22 percent to 15 percent) and loan collections are up. *by half a billion a year.*
- shifting the emphasis of program monitoring from compliance, which focuses on reporting requirements, to performance, which focuses on technical assistance to improve student outcomes. *performance*
- streamlining the Department's grants process. The Department has improved the timeliness of grantee notification, distributed funds electronically, simplified review procedures, and eliminated unnecessary requirements.
- Improved customer service by reducing regulations and paperwork in new programs such as Goals 2000, which is operated without any regulations and minimal paperwork, and Title I, where regulations will be dramatically reduced.
- Reducing the size of the Department. Even as we hire additional staff to implement Direct Loans, we are able to reduce overall staffing. In areas other than Direct Loans, we will reduce staff by 221 in 1996 and by another 386 by 1999 -- for a 16 percent total reduction between 1993 and 1999.

• NPR II

STATE BURDEN TO ADMINISTER FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Question: States and districts complain about how much personnel they need to apply for and administer Federal programs. What are you doing about this?

Answer:

- Reducing the time required to complete applications and plans in a number of ways.
- New legislation greatly reduces requirements and increases flexibility. Also reducing regulations.
- Shorter, simpler applications – Goals 2000 was 4 pages.
- Fewer applications. Reduction is being achieved through a number of strategies:
 - longer-term plans, so that States and districts submit plans less frequently.
 - single plan to cover many programs. Under new ESEA, States and districts have option to submit only one plan that covers various ESEA programs and, if they want, Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the School to Work Opportunities Act, the Perkins Vocational Education basic state grant program, and other programs that the Secretary may designate.
 - multi-year grants to reduce the number of times States and districts must apply.

CHANGES IN REGULATIONS PROCESS

Question: Could you describe changes in how the Department deals with regulations since you became Secretary?

Answer:

- Developed a set of simple criteria for when and how to regulate. We are applying these common sense criteria to all our programs. The result will be far fewer, shorter, less prescriptive regulations.
- **Whether to regulate:**
 - When essential to promote quality and equality of opportunity in education.
 - When a demonstrated problem exists and cannot be resolved without regulation.
 - When entities or situations to be regulated are so different that a uniform solution does more harm than good.
 - When necessary to provide legally binding interpretation to resolve ambiguity.
- **How to regulate:**
 - Regulate no more than necessary.
 - Minimize burden and promote multiple approaches to meeting statutory requirements.
 - Encourage federally-funded activities to be integrated with State and local reform activities.
 - Ensure that benefits justify costs of regulation.
 - Establish performance objectives, rather than specify the manner of compliance.
 - Encourage flexibility so that institutional forces and incentives achieve the desired result.

APPLICATION OF NEW REGULATORY PRINCIPLES

Question: How are you applying these new regulatory principles?

Answer:

- No regulations for Goals 2000 or School to Work
- NO regulations to implement Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug-Free Schools program, and waiver provisions of the Improving America's Schools Act.
- Minimal regulations for Title I – most of which are being developed through a statutorily-mandated negotiated rule-making process which included parents, teachers, principals and state leaders.
- Eliminating obsolete and unnecessary regulations – *a thorough review*
- Making regulatory process more customer friendly
 - internet
 - voluntary negotiated rulemaking ("reg neg")
 - regional meetings on regulations (1994-elementary and secondary, bilingual, special ed and student aid)

• *Better than a moratorium*

NEW WAIVER AUTHORITY

Question: Can you explain more about the new waiver authority you keep mentioning?

Answer:

- **Goals 2000: Educate America Act** permits us to waive many statutory and regulatory requirements applicable to key department programs. Waivers may be granted when the Secretary determines that a requirement impedes the applicant's ability to carry out a Goals 2000 State or local improvement plan. The Secretary can grant waivers to States, school districts and schools.
- **IASA** provides for broad waivers to States, school districts and schools of IASA statutory and regulatory requirements, with narrow exceptions similar to those in Goals 2000. There is an especially broad waiver authority for public charter schools – extending to any ED statutory or regulatory requirement.
- **School-to-Work Opportunities Act** provides for waivers of statutory and regulatory requirements of JTPA and Perkins as well as of relevant IASA programs.
- Created a Waiver Action Board that will provide "one-stop shopping for education waivers".

ED-FLEX

Question: What is Ed-Flex?

Answer:

- Under Goals 2000, States with approved plans may apply to be Ed-Flex States.
- The Secretary may authorize up to six selected States to have the full power to waive the ESEA and Perkins requirements, without having to seek the Secretary's approval.
- A notice inviting applications under this program has been published and provided to every Governor and Chief State School Officer.

BLOCK GRANTS TO STATES

Question: Why not just give States and communities the resources to do the job and get out of their way? Why not just use block grants?

Answer: I support "responsible blockgrants," by which I mean programs with the following elements:

- clear national priorities
 - flexibility for states and localities over how they achieve those goals
 - ensuring equity for students most at-risk
 - accountability for results
- Our new legislation – Goals 2000, the School to Work Opportunities Act – can be considered block grants of this sort.
- Since the Federal Government provides only 6 percent of education spending, it must be used strategically. Simply giving Federal money to schools without clear goals or focus or accountability is a poor use of the taxpayer's money.
- Typical blockgrants have no focus or accountability. The pressure is to give a little something to everyone and there is little assurance that they will address the fundamental problems of our schools. Our recent evaluation of the Chapter 2 blockgrant shows that the impact of Federal dollars in that program is barely discernable and it is not possible to evaluate the effectiveness of the expenditures.
- Blockgrants will not produce cost savings, unless combined with significant cuts, because the cost of administering the Federal programs is not high.
 - ED's administrative expenses are only about 2 percent of our budget
 - for higher education, only 1 percent of funds are used by colleges and universities for administration
 - for K-12, States use only an average of 6 percent for administration and districts use only 4 percent for administration. On average, a higher percent of Federal Title I dollars goes to the classroom than does State education dollars.

TALKING POINTS ON BLOCK GRANTS

1. When people say "block grant" they mean very different things

- consolidation of other programs
- programs with greater flexibility and fewer requirements

2. People advocate block grants for very different reasons

- cut paperwork
- more flexibility
- consolidation of programs
- eliminate programs
- cost savings

3. I support what helps students -- Responsible block grants

Elements of a responsible "block grant:

- clear national priorities
- flexibility for states and localities on how to achieve them
- accountability for results
- ensuring equity for those most at risk

Goals 2000, School to Work, ESEA are "responsible block grants."
(Governor Tommy Thompson described School-to-Work as a block grant.)

Responsible block grants can cut paperwork, increase flexibility, consolidate programs to make them more effective and eliminate programs that are no longer needed.

We are already doing this:

- o reduced paperwork (Goals application 4 pages);
- o increased flexibility (Goals and STW are state-generated reforms; waivers; charter schools);
- o reduced regulations (Goals and STW none; ESEA fewer; doing thorough review of all regulations);
- o proposed eliminating 41 programs for a savings of \$700 million by FY96 and consolidating an additional 27 into broader authorities

4. The problems with "irresponsible" block grants

A. No clear national priorities or accountability

Without clear purpose, there can be no accountability and, often, no improvement in teaching and learning. Money is used on unconnected activities and key elements of school improvement can be lost. Examples:

In the early 1970's, studies showed Title I funds were being spent to carpet principals' offices, buy band uniforms and build swimming pools. Title I was then focused on basic skills instruction. As a result, disadvantaged and minority students began to close the previously existing gap in basic skills test scores.

In tight budgets, professional development is first thing to be cut because it is not tied to jobs and fails to produce immediate tangible results. This occurs even though the critical role of professional development in school reform is widely recognized. The new Title II program is designed to respond to this reality.

A Chapter 1 director in KY had a room full of computers, but no one knew how to use them or teach their students how.

However, high poverty schools often have been able to use the clear focus in Title I schoolwide to leverage overall reforms. By asking schools to look at upgrading entire program, develop alternatives to what they are doing, and adopt research based strategies, schoolwides can make it easier for those who want to, to do the right thing.

B. No targeting of resources on those most at risk

In 1981, the emergency school aid program was consolidated into the new Chapter 2 "block grant" authority that did not contain specific targeting provisions. The result: Chapter 2 funds were spread across all districts, and the high poverty schools lost significant funding. In response, Congress created yet another targeted federal education program: the magnet schools program.

Historically, school districts have tended to distribute Title I funds to as many schools as possible, which often results in many high poverty schools receiving amounts too small to make a difference. Without some

targeting parameters, districts often cannot withstand the pressure to serve as many schools as possible.

5. I do not support cutting investment in education because these cuts will hurt students

Re-naming grants as "block grants" should not be used as a veil to conceal cutbacks in aid.

The notion in Congress today is that you can block grant programs and then cut funding without having any negative affect on students. The theory is that education programs are bureaucratic and costly to run -- and that if we blockgrant them states and district can be more efficient and cuts in funding will not hurt children.

This is a myth. There is no big administrative cost for states and districts. Chapter 1 is an example:

Dollars spent on federal program implementation at the local level tend to be lower than the costs of administering non-categorical state and locally-supported efforts.

-- Districts devoted a greater percentage of their Chapter 1 expenditures to classroom services (73%) than other district funds (62%).

Moreover, data from GAO, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Department of Education show that the costs associated with administering federal programs vary widely across states and districts. This suggests that the costs depend in large part on choices that each state and district makes in how they administer their programs.

6. Quotes from local educators

March 8 article in Education Week raises points made by various local educators:

- o Without targeting and accountability, districts may use funds intended for poor children to buy everything from airplanes to carpeting.

An elementary school principal in Tennessee says: "I'm telling you. I've been there. I know."

A local superintendent in Wisconsin says: "I'd like to do away with the paperwork. . . . But if it involves millions and millions of dollars, someone has to administer it."

o Need to go slowly.

A deputy state superintendent in Utah who is a former aide to Orrin Hatch says: Congress is "just moving so rapidly. They ought to take a year out and study what they are doing."

7. Most Department funding is directed at a few critical national purposes

We have about 140 elementary and secondary education programs; about 45 percent of our total budget.

Most of this funding goes to States and school districts through just a few major programs focused on critical needs: helping all children learn to high standards, ensuring schools are safe and drug free, training teachers, preparing students for the transition from school to work, and serving children with disabilities.

Just eight major formula grant programs — Goals 2000, Title I, Eisenhower Professional Development, Safe and Drug Free Schools, Impact Aid, Innovative Education Program Strategies, Vocational Education Basic Grants and Special Education state grants — account for 80 percent of Federal elementary and secondary education funding.

The same is true of Federal support for postsecondary education. We administer about 70 postsecondary programs funded at more than \$15 billion in 1995.

More than 90 percent of our postsecondary dollars are delivered through just six student aid programs: Pell Grants, Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, Work-Study, Perkins Loans, Federal Family Education Loans, and Direct Loans.

What this means is that most of our dollars are already delivered in essentially block grant form, but with some targeting on important national purposes as defined by Congress, and with accountability that allows us to tell taxpayers in California, for example, how their money is being used in South Carolina.

VOUCHERS

Question: Why not give vouchers to parents so they can choose the school that best meets their children's needs?

Answer: The purpose of any school improvement idea should be to invite effective innovation in more schools, particularly those schools lagging behind. The Federal Government shouldn't dictate how local communities organize schools. Requiring vouchers would be the most intrusive Federal mandate.

We support expanded choice within the public school system through charter schools, private management of public schools and public school choice. We are supporting investments in teams of teachers, students, parents and school and community leaders to develop quality solutions.

Private school vouchers are an expensive experiment that detract from our fundamental mission in education – helping to ensure that all students have access to challenging instruction to reach challenging standards.

Using taxpayer funds to subsidize vouchers for all students could:

- **Increase by billions of dollars the cost to the government even if no public school students transferred to private schools.**
- **Create a two-tiered educational system in which private schools will be able to choose their students and could attract the best and the brightest, leaving behind the public schools with the most difficult-to-educate students.**
- **Increase regulation of private schools to make them more accountable to the public, once they get taxpayers' money – effectively ending their important independence.**
- **Provide no assurance of higher student performance.** The few studies done show no increase in student performance. For example, in the Milwaukee voucher experiment, the achievement of participating students did not improve significantly from their previous achievement in public schools.

Private school vouchers also lack widespread popular support. Private school vouchers have been rejected by voters in California, Pennsylvania, and Colorado. The latest Gallup poll shows that less than 24 percent support allowing private school choice at public expense.

GOALS 2000

Question: Are States really ready for \$750 million, a \$403 million increase, for Goals 2000?

Answer: Yes.

- To date, 45 States and thousands of communities have elected to participate. Three States have moved to the second stage of participation — submission of a comprehensive statewide reform plan that they are ready to implement.
- Goals 2000 provides incentives for States to devise their own strategies. States have great flexibility in how they implement reform.
- The 1996 increase would become available at the time most States and communities will be ready to institute widespread reforms that need seed money to get off the ground.

Examples of How States Are Using the Money

- In Oklahoma, Goals 2000 funds will help the State carry out recommendations of the Oklahoma Commission for Teacher Preparation to improve the preparation of new teachers in Oklahoma and provide support to those already in the teaching force.
- Massachusetts is creating 14 charter schools.
- Kentucky is using part of its funds to engage the public and encourage parental involvement in its reform efforts.
- Oregon is supporting Oregon Benchmarks — a citizen-based vision of education for the 21st century, of which the State's School-to-Work effort is also an integral part.
- Illinois is building on the Illinois School Accountability Act, state legislation that charges schools with reviewing student performance measures to ascertain whether all students are learning and being served.
- Kansas is making a subgrant to the Lawrence School District for strategic planning, development of curriculum aligned to academic outcomes and goals, and staff time to work on developing new teaching skills.

SCHOOL-TO-WORK

Question: You're proposing \$200 million, an increase of \$75 million, for School-to-Work, with another \$200 million requested by the Department of Labor. Where do you stand on implementing this program?

Answer: School-to-Work is a highly popular initiative, as has been evidenced by enthusiastic and bipartisan support from many Governors.

- Every State has elected to participate and has received planning and development funds. In the first competition for State implementation grants, 8 States received awards and have begun to implement their State systems: Wisconsin, Kentucky, Oregon, New York, New Jersey, Michigan, Maine, and Massachusetts. Twenty-two States applied for funds.
- We have also held two competitions for direct grants to localities that are ready to put school-to-work systems in place but may be located in States that are still in the planning stages. Of the 36 grants awarded to local partnerships, 21 are in urban and rural areas with high poverty.
- Our ED-DOL joint administration is a highly innovative undertaking, and I believe what we are doing will serve as a model for joint ventures between other agencies. We have set up a single School-to-Work office that is staffed by people from both Departments, and Secretary Reich and I both participated in selecting the staff Director.

TITLE I BUDGET POLICY

Question: What is your budget policy for Title I?

Answer:

- \$7 billion request, an increase of \$302 million or 4.5 percent, for LEA grants, with \$1.7 billion targeted to poorest communities and schools.
- Program currently serves 6.4 million students.
- Objective: Help high-poverty children meet challenging academic standards.
- New enhancements include schoolwide programs, enriched curriculum, and eliminating universal testing.
- \$25 million request for new demonstration program to identify, test, and disseminate innovative ways to teach lowest-achieving children.
- \$102 million Even Start program, which prepares young children for school and educates their parents, has accomplished its demonstration purpose and is proposed to be folded into the Adult Education consolidation.

PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT POLICY

Question: What is the expected impact of your proposal to more than double, to \$735 million, the Eisenhower Professional Development program?

Answer:

- Will help achieve two of the National Education Goals: (1) all students will demonstrate mastery of challenging subject matter, and (2) U.S. students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement by the year 2000.
- Program has expanded to provide professional development in all core academic subjects (not just mathematics and science) and to provide more sustained and intensive training.
- State educational agencies would receive an average of \$11.8 million to develop and implement a comprehensive professional development strategy to support local district reform efforts.
- Funds at the local district level, with the required one-third local match, should provide, on average, over \$50,000 for professional development activities for every school district.

GAO REPORT ON TEACHER TRAINING PROGRAMS

Question: What is our response to the GAO report?

Answer:

- The GAO report identifies 60 programs as teacher training programs funded by the Department of Education in 1993. Since 1993, we have taken steps to eliminate or consolidate more than half of the 60 programs.
- In 1994, the Department proposed elimination of more than 17 of the listed programs as part of our legislative proposal to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and we were successful in eliminating 10 of these.
- In our 1996 budget request, we have proposed termination of 9 programs, and we have proposed 1995 rescissions for 2 of these. In 1996, we are also proposing to replace 5 special education programs that are listed with a single professional development program, and we are proposing to consolidate 5 other programs in vocational and adult education.
- Of the remaining programs, the vast majority of funds requested are for the Eisenhower State Grants program, which provides formula assistance to States, school districts, and schools to address their teacher training needs.
- The remaining programs provide some teacher training as part of a broader program objective (e.g., Education for Homeless Children, Gifted and Talented Education).

SAFE AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

Question: What is your budget policy for Safe and Drug-Free Schools?

Answer:

- Sustained funding at \$500 million, an \$18 million increase, is essential if the Federal Government is to support seriously the National Education Goal that, by the year 2000, all schools in America will be free of drugs and violence and offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.
- Through expenditure of limited funds at the National level, the Department can lead the way in the development, testing, and dissemination of new approaches to tackling school drug abuse and violence problems. Activities undertaken through these efforts can have a "multiplier" effect when the results are shared with States and localities nationwide.
- \$31 million for Family and Community Endeavor Schools (FACES), an increase of \$20 million, for comprehensive programs to prevent violence and crime by at-risk children and youth. This program will be coordinated closely with the Community Schools program in HHS. Both programs are authorized under the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act of 1994.
- Drug use is on the rise. Most recent national survey indicates overall use of drugs by 8th, 10th, and 12th graders increased for the third year in a row. 13 percent of 8th graders used marijuana in 1994 -- more than twice the level in 1991. 46 percent of 12th graders had tried an illegal drug.
- The public now rates school crime and violence as the most serious problem facing America's schools. Nearly 3 million thefts and violent crimes occur on or near school campuses every year -- almost 16,000 incidents per day. Nearly 500,000 teenagers are victimized annually by violent crime occurring at or near school.

(FORMER) CHAPTER 2 POLICY

Question: Why is the Department proposing to zero-out the Innovative Education Program Strategies program (the successor to Chapter 2)? Isn't the program a very flexible vehicle for supporting State and local reforms?

Answer:

- Program, like former Chapter 2, is not well designed to support the State and local efforts most likely to result in real improvements in teaching and learning, as Goals 2000 will.
- More effective use of scarce resources lies in targeting funds on comprehensive systemic reform and areas of high need such as Goals 2000, Eisenhower Professional Development, and Title I.
- A Spring 1994 evaluation of the Chapter 2 program concluded that the program had not been an impetus for systemic reform activities.
- Of local Chapter 2 funds, only 9 percent went to educational reform projects, 40 percent went to the purchase of instructional materials, and 13 percent of local funds went for educator professional development, in amounts too small to provide effective professional development (average district level amount was \$3,510).

BILINGUAL AND IMMIGRANT EDUCATION

Question: What is your budget for Bilingual and Immigrant Education?

Answer:

- Budget doubles Immigrant Education funding, to \$100 million, to help school districts meet the expenses of educating over 800,000 recent immigrants.
- Bilingual request is \$200 million, almost a \$5 million increase.
- Grants continuing at \$156 million will enable school districts, using the instructional approach best suited to their own situations, to help over 700,000 limited English proficient students learn English and meet challenging State standards.
- Major emphasis on educator professional development, because of the growing need for trained bilingual teachers.
- Funding for State educational agencies would also increase to meet new accountability requirements.
-

INDIAN EDUCATION

Question: What is your budget policy for Indian Education?

Answer:

- Indian Education budget is \$85 million, a \$1.4 million or 1.7 percent increase.
- Focuses on improving educational services for almost 410 thousand Indian students through an increase for the reauthorized LEA Formula Grants program. As recently authorized, program emphasizes achieving to higher standards for Indian students.
- Includes funding to obtain better data on the educational status and needs of the Indian population.
- A total of \$546 million will benefit Indians through all Department programs such as Title I, Impact Aid, Vocational Education, and Student Aid.

IMPACT AID OVERALL POLICIES

Question: What are the Administration's Impact Aid budget policies for 1996?

Answer:

- We are better targeting dollars to districts with students whose presence in LEAs creates a significant and uncompensated burden; this allows us to reduce our request by 15 percent from the 1995 level, to \$619 million.
- \$550 million for Basic Support Payments to make payments on behalf of only those children living on Indian lands, and children of members of the uniformed services who live on Federal property.
- \$40 million for Payments for children with disabilities, to assist LEAs with the additional costs of educating these particular federally connected children.
- \$20 million for additional payments for the most heavily impacted LEAs.
- Eliminate Payments for Federal Property, which are made to school districts without regard to the presence of federally connected children.

CHRISTA McAULIFFE FELLOWSHIPS POLICY CHANGE

Question: Why did the Department change its original policy not to fund this program in 1996?

Answer:

- There is no real change in policy regarding this program.
- Rather than fund the program under the authority in Title V of the Higher Education Act, (the current Christa McAuliffe Fellowships program), the Department plans to continue providing fellowships in honor of Christa McAuliffe for outstanding, experienced teachers using \$2 million in funds requested under Eisenhower Professional Development National Programs.
- The Department's proposal eliminates funding under a duplicative program authority and streamlines the program by eliminating some of the burdensome requirements imposed on States under the current law. For example, under the broad Eisenhower Professional Development National Programs authority, States would not be required to use 7-member panels to select fellows; and chief State school officers would be given the authority, under appropriate circumstances, to waive or defer the post-fellowship teaching requirement without the approval of the Secretary of Education.

EDUCATION INFRASTRUCTURE POLICY CHANGE

Question: Why has the Administration changed its mind about rescinding the \$100 million for Education Infrastructure?

Answer: We reconsidered our original budget request, and propose instead that \$35 million be provided each year in FY 1995 and FY 1996, for Education Infrastructure.

- The recent GAO report highlighted the need to improve the infrastructure of our local schools, and while we may have some methodological concerns with this report, it is clear that some LEAs have a serious need for construction assistance.
- We are exploring alternative means to assist LEAs in financing construction, including possibly expanding the authority of Connie Lee to make and guarantee loans to LEAs.
- Until other appropriate assistance can be identified and authorized, the \$70 million we have proposed over two years will allow us to begin to address the infrastructure problems in a few of the neediest schools.

CONSOLIDATION OF FEDERAL JOB TRAINING PROGRAMS

Question: How is the President proposing to consolidate Federal job training programs?

Answer: The President is proposing a far-reaching consolidation and restructuring of 70 Federal education and training programs.

For adults, more than three dozen separate Federal programs are being consolidated into flexible grants to States for the following purposes:

- **New Skill Grants** provided through the States directly to individuals would help low-income and displaced workers to upgrade their skills (**Pell Grants** would continue to be available for those in degree programs) at the institution of their choice.
- A network of **One-Stop Career Centers** would help individuals to choose appropriate and effective training, by providing comprehensive **Labor Market Information and Consumer Report Cards** on training providers. To be eligible to enroll students receiving Federal funds, providers would have to show that students in their programs actually acquired skills, completed their studies, and, where appropriate, got jobs after graduation.
- A streamlined **Adult Education and Family Literacy** system would integrate a dozen existing Federal programs into a single State grant which States could tailor to meet local needs.

For youth, the President proposes to streamline more than 30 programs and set-asides (now authorized under the Perkins and Job Training Partnership Act) into just two flexible grants to States: one for **in-school youth** and one for **out-of-school youth**. States would use both grants to strengthen and broaden the coverage of the **school-to-work systems** that they currently are developing. While the School-to-Work Opportunities Act provides short-term "venture capital" that States and communities are using for initial implementation of School-to-Work systems, the Perkins Act and JPTA will be restructured to provide for further expansion, development, and improvement.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Question: What are the Department's legislative and budget proposals for vocational education?

Answer:

- Vocational education budget request is \$1.2 billion.
- Perkins reauthorization focuses on consolidating 9 current ED programs and set-asides into two simple programs:
 - State Grants (with Indian Programs set-aside)
 - National Programs
- Key feature: help to prepare young people with the knowledge and skills they need for further education and training and for first jobs in high-skill, high-wage careers.
- Builds on the foundation of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act and the reforms of the Department of Labor's youth program.
- Emphasis on giving States and schools flexible resources to improve the quality of their vocational education programs.

ADULT EDUCATION

Question: What are the Department's legislative and budget proposals for reauthorization of the Adult Education Act?

Answer:

- \$490.5 million request, a \$2.1 million increase for comparable activities.
- New focus: Adult education and family literacy.
- Key feature: Consolidation of eight programs, from various offices within ED and from DOL, into a single grant to States and one activity for national programs.
- Eases burden on States: Replaces complicated Federal application requirements with one application and one set of simplified rules.
- Promotes greater access and choice for learners: Adults would access services directly or through referrals from One-Stop Career Centers, allowing them to choose the program best suited to their needs.

SPECIAL EDUCATION BUDGET POLICY

Question: What is your budget policy for Special Education?

Answer:

- \$2.8 billion, \$89 million or 3.3 percent increase, requested for State Grants for Special Education is sufficient to maintain Federal per-child contribution at 1995 levels of \$426 for children 3 - 21 and \$693 for children 3 - 5, and to support additional children receiving services. Proposed legislation would emphasize achievement of high standards, promote best practices, and eliminate unnecessary burdens on educational agencies, schools, and teachers.

The single amount requested for Grants to States (children 3 - 21) and Preschool Grants (children 3 - 5) is not for a block grant; rather, it is a placeholder pending final decisions on formula allocations under our reauthorization proposal.

- \$316 million, level funding, requested for Grants for Infants and Families to support early intervention services for children birth through 2.
- \$254 million, level funding, requested for discretionary activities. Reauthorization proposal would consolidate 14 discretionary programs into 5 coordinated Program Support and Improvement programs that include research and demonstrations, technical assistance and systems change, professional development, parent training, and technology development. These activities are more effectively or economically conducted at the national level and can help States address areas of critical need.
- New legislation expected to be sent to Congress by May. Our preference is for Congress to enact new legislation for fiscal year 1996.

REHABILITATION SERVICES BUDGET POLICY

Question: What is your budget policy for Rehabilitation Services?

Answer:

- \$2.5 billion request, an increase of 2.7 percent, will increase employment and independent living opportunities for over 1 million individuals with disabilities, particularly those with the most severe disabilities.
- The increase will help States respond to the dramatic increase in the number of eligible individuals in the Vocational Rehabilitation (VR) system and to offset the increased costs of providing VR services to a more severely disabled population. 42 percent of State VR agencies have reported they will not be able to serve all eligible individuals in 1995.
- These funds are classified as mandatory under the Budget Enforcement Act; they are not counted against ED's discretionary total.

IMPLEMENTATION OF DIRECT STUDENT LOANS

Question: How is the implementation of direct lending going?

Answer: We have been very pleased with the success of direct lending thus far, and are confident that we can handle the more rapid phase-in proposed in our budget request.

- At the end of last month, the 104 schools participating in the 1994-95 academic year had disbursed more than 342,000 loans totaling nearly \$1 billion.
- Reports from participating schools and students have been overwhelmingly positive; the speed of loan processing actually encourages students to borrow less, because they can get additional loan funds quickly if needed.
- 1,495 schools have been accepted for 1995-96, and there is a waiting list for 1996-97. ED provides training and technical assistance, including software, to participating institutions.

PROPOSED CAP ON DIRECT LENDING

Question: Why shouldn't direct lending be capped?

Answer:

- Direct Loans provides tangible benefits to students and schools. Students can obtain loans more quickly and easily, and take advantage of income-contingent and other flexible repayment plans; schools have less paperwork and more control within a far simpler loan system. Capping Direct Loans would deny these benefits to millions of students and thousands of schools.
- Capping Direct Loans perpetuates the flaws of the cumbersome, costly FFEL system, with its thousands of lenders, guaranty agencies, and other Federally subsidized "middlemen."
- The President proposes to save \$12 billion by the year 2000 by fully implementing Direct Loans. Capping the program at 40 percent would cut those savings by almost \$7 billion.

COLLECTING ON DIRECT STUDENT LOANS

Question: You have gotten credit for Direct Loans being disbursed to students faster than under the FFEL system. But actually collecting the loans is much harder. What steps are you taking to ensure a strong collection effort once the Direct Loans go into payment?

Answer:

- The same measures that have helped us reduce defaults in the FFEL program—cracking down on schools with high default rates, strengthening gatekeeping, improving our data systems, and going after defaulters with IRS tax refund offsets and wage garnishment—will help our collection efforts and limit defaults in the Direct Loan program.
- Collecting student loans will be easier under Direct Loans. Repayment will be much simpler for Direct Loan borrowers, who need only send a single monthly check for all their loans to a single servicer. In addition, Direct Loan borrowers can take advantage of income-contingent repayment and other flexible repayment options to avoid default.
- The Department and its private sector contractors (currently the same one used by many banks and guarantee agencies) have substantial experience in collecting student loans, with nearly \$500 million collected last year alone.

DIRECT LOANS AND THE PRIVATE SECTOR

Question: With the current emphasis on increasing the use of partnerships with the private sector, why are you proposing to replace the current FFEL private lending with a huge Federal bureaucracy?

Answer: Direct lending involves a more efficient, less costly partnership with the private sector than under FFEL.

- Only the loan capital is "private" under FFEL—the risks and costs of lending FFEL funds are almost entirely assumed by Federal taxpayers, providing little or none of the performance-based accountability characteristic of private sector enterprises.
- Direct Loans will not be administered by a huge Federal bureaucracy, but by private sector servicing and collection contractors selected through competitive bidding and held accountable for their performance.
- In fact, we expect to hire some of the same private contractors now used by FFEL lenders, guaranty agencies, and secondary markets, but without having to reimburse any of these "middlemen."
- Fewer Department staff will be required to administer Direct Loans than are currently needed to merely monitor the more complex FFEL system. As a result, the Department will be able to reduce its overall FTE level once the transition to Direct Loans is completed.

THE IN-SCHOOL INTEREST SUBSIDY ON STUDENT LOANS

Question: What is your position on elimination of the in-school interest subsidy for Stafford Loan borrowers?

Answer:

- The President and I strongly oppose this proposal, which at over \$2 billion per year would amount to the greatest student aid cut in history.
- Some 5 million needy students now benefit from this means-tested program; 50 percent of Stafford Loan borrowers report family incomes under \$12,000 and 76 percent have incomes under \$30,000.
- The total debt of an average Stafford Loan borrower borrowing the maximum at a four-year college could increase by 18 percent. Graduate and professional students would feel an even greater burden.
- With increased debt, needy borrowers would be more vulnerable to default and may feel more restricted in their school and career choices.

STUDENT AID FRAUD AND ABUSE

Question: How are you addressing concerns about waste, fraud, and abuse in the student financial aid program?

Answer: We have undertaken a variety of measures to reduce fraud in the student aid programs, particularly in the student loan programs.

- Lowering the default rate cutoff (now 25 percent) for institutions participating in the student aid programs has eliminated many shoddy schools from the student aid programs, helping to reduce default claims from \$3.6 billion in 1991 to \$2.4 billion in 1994, and the default rate from 22 percent in 1990 to 15 percent in 1992.
- We have increased collections of defaulted loans by working with the IRS to offset income tax refunds. We also using new authority to garnish the wages of defaulters.
- We have increased our own reviews of institutions participating in the student aid programs and are working with States and accrediting agencies to tighten up their standards as well.
- The State Postsecondary Review Program would assist States in their oversight efforts, but the rescission bill proposed by the House Appropriations Committee would eliminate the \$20 million appropriated in 1995 for this program.

PELL GRANTS COST ESTIMATES

Question: Just a short while ago you were saying that the Pell Grant program had a \$2 billion shortfall. Now you're saying that you have a surplus of nearly half a billion dollars. What is going on?

Answer:

- Two years ago, we were confronted with a projected shortfall of over \$2 billion.
- We requested additional funds in 1993 and 1994 to cover the shortfall, successfully sought appropriations language permitting the reduction of awards in the event of future shortfalls, and established an internal review group to monitor trends in program costs.
- While we took these aggressive steps, program growth slowed because of the strong economy. As a result, the amounts appropriated in previous years now exceed current cost projections.
- Our budget proposes to spend only \$372 million of the estimated \$472 million cumulative surplus in Pell Grant budget authority to pay 1996 program costs. In view of the size and potential volatility of program costs, we believe it is prudent financial management to maintain a \$100 million "cushion" at this time.

STATE POSTSECONDARY REVIEW PROGRAM

Question: Why do you continue to support funds for the State Postsecondary Review Program in light of strong opposition to this program from the postsecondary community. What is your 1996 budget request?

Answer: This program is key to our efforts to eliminate fraud and abuse in the student aid programs and to protect students from unscrupulous schools. For 1996, we are requesting \$25 million, a \$5 million or 25 percent increase.

- Congress created the State Postsecondary Review Program in 1992 as the key consumer protection component of the program integrity "Triad."
- This program is an insurance policy to protect the \$39 billion in aid that will be available in 1996. The premium on that policy—\$25 million—is only 6 cents for every \$1,000 of aid that we provide.
- I recognize and appreciate the concerns of the postsecondary education community over the impact this program may have on their institutions.
- To alleviate this anxiety, both Assistant Secretary David Longanecker and I have expressed our willingness to work with the community to reduce unnecessary burdens. This work has just begun and is likely to continue throughout this year.
- If the \$20 million 1995 appropriation for this program is rescinded, as proposed by the House Appropriations Committee, I fully expect that the current State activities will be terminated—resulting in more fraud and abuse at the expense of students and taxpayers.

STRENGTHENING POSTSECONDARY INSTITUTIONS

Question: Why are you proposing to continue support for Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Hispanic-Serving Institutions while phasing out Title III, Part A support for other institutions serving large numbers of disadvantaged and minority students?

Answer:

- Our budget continues support for HBCUs in recognition of their success in enrolling and graduating African-American students. The request includes \$109 million for 100 undergraduate HBCUs and \$20 million for 16 Historically Black Graduate Institutions.
- Additional support for HBCUs is provided by a \$2 million Endowment Challenge Grant program and the HBCU Capital Financing Program, which will provide an estimated \$170 million in loans for facilities renovation and construction.
- The \$12 million request for the Hispanic-Serving Institutions program will help increase Hispanic postsecondary enrollment, which lags behind that of both black and white students.
- Eliminating Title III funding for other institutions would not be a major loss because these funds account for only 3.5 percent of the budgets of institutions participating in the program.
- 72 percent of Part A funds go to publicly-supported colleges, and responsibility for supporting such colleges rests primarily with States.

EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY

Question: You are requesting double the funding for educational technology. What are these funds for?

Answer: Two Learning Challenge programs (totalling \$70 million) would support consortia of public educational institutions and business, especially institutions and businesses that contribute their own resources:

- The K-12 Technology Learning Challenge (\$50 million) would support significant partnerships to develop and apply technology to help students learn to higher standards. Projects would involve school districts with technology providers, to demonstrate direct services to students and develop marketable products.
- The Adult Technology Learning Challenge (\$20 million) would support partnerships to develop and apply educational technology for adults. The Department of Labor would make available an additional \$15 million of JTPA funds.

EDUCATION RESEARCH

Question: How much are you requesting for research in OERI and throughout the Department, and how will you avoid duplication?

Answer:

- OERI Research request is \$97.6 million, an increase of \$11.4 million or 13 percent. Of this total, \$67.6 million would support research and development, and \$30 million would support dissemination and technical assistance.
- Department-wide, education research and development request is \$129 million—\$67.6 million in OERI, \$45 million in OSERS, \$11.4 million in OVAE, \$3.7 million in OPE, and \$1.4 million in OBEMLA.
- New National Educational Research Policy and Priorities Board will help develop a research agenda that will guide research and development throughout the Department, not just in OERI.

SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION ASSESSMENT

Question: What is your budget policy for the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)?

Answer:

- \$38 million request, an increase of \$5.2 million or 16 percent.
- An appropriate and important Federal activity: provides data about student achievement widely used to judge effectiveness of national educational improvement efforts.
- State NAEP is voluntary; in 1996 about 5,000 students in each of 45 States will be tested.
- Increase for NAEP:

Better measures of what students know and can do, but more costly.

Frequent and regular testing: given more costly testing, the increase is needed to continue regular testing in the critical subjects of reading, mathematics, science, and writing.

Biennial assessments in 3 subjects in 3 grades at the national level and in 2 subjects in 2 grades at the State level.

INCREASE FOR EDUCATION STATISTICS

Question: Why should there be an increase in funding for statistics?

Answer:

- \$57 million request, an increase of \$8.8 million or 18 percent for statistics.
- Objective: general statistics about the condition of, and trends in, education; data to monitor the effects of reforms and to support OERI's research agenda.
- Core program increase: \$1.6 million, to continue the core statistics program.
- Additions to the core statistics program: \$7.2 million.

More frequent surveys and additional data: Additional data in four areas related to current reform efforts: adult literacy, workplace literacy skills, postsecondary education skills assessment, and instructional practices at the elementary and secondary levels. Also new procedures to include students with limited English proficiency and students requiring special education services in every aspect of education statistics.

New technology to reduce burden in the collection of data.

LIBRARIES

Question: Public Library Construction is recommended for elimination in the National Performance Review. Why are you terminating support for the Interlibrary Cooperation program and requesting support for Public Library Construction?

Answer:

- The Public Library Construction program permits States to purchase technology for public libraries – the wiring and equipment to bring public libraries into the National information infrastructure – making information and learning opportunities more accessible.
- The Public Library Services program can support most of the activities of the Interlibrary Cooperation program.

OCR

Question: Why should OCR exist? If it should, why shouldn't the enforcement of civil rights in education belong in the Department of Justice? Isn't the existence of an OCR in Education duplicative and unduly bureaucratic?

Answer: The Federal civil rights laws have helped bring about major changes in American education and improved educational opportunities for millions. Many barriers that once prevented minorities, women and disabled individuals from freely choosing educational paths and careers have been brought down.

There are two particular advantages of having OCR in the Department of Education.

- First, it permits a close relationship and constant communication between those enforcing civil rights and others whose business is the promotion of educational excellence and equality for all of our students. This helps shape a unified direction for the promotion of sound educational and civil rights policies and practices.
- Second, unlike the frequently adversarial posture of cases in litigation handled by DOJ, most of the work of OCR in the Department of Education is nonadversarial. For example, OCR handles over 5000 complaints a year. Over 95 percent of these are resolved by agreement, without the need for court or administrative hearing proceedings, most within the same school year.

Examples:

- High school graduation rates of African Americans has doubled in past 20 years.
- Undergraduate enrollment rates of African Americans has increased 25 percent in last decade.
- Since Title IX was enacted in 1972, the number of degrees awarded to women in medicine rose from 9 percent to 43 percent
- The number of children with mental retardation who are institutionalized has decreased 63 percent since enactment of IDEA – with tremendous cost savings.

TITLE IX

Question: In its enforcement of Title IX, does the Department require institutions sponsoring intercollegiate and interscholastic athletics programs to have programs that exactly reflect the proportions of male and female students enrolled?

Answer: No. The Department's position continues to be that an institution will be in compliance with the Title IX provision requiring nondiscriminatory participation opportunities to male and female athletes if it meets any one part of a three-part test:

- a) by providing athletic participation opportunities in numbers that are substantially proportionate to enrollment;
- b) by establishing a history and continuing practice of program expansion for members of the underrepresented sex; or
- c) by fully and effectively accommodating the interests and abilities of the underrepresented sex.

No one of these three is preferred or used exclusively by the Department or its Office for Civil Rights (OCR).

IMPACT OF EVALUATIONS

Question: How do you ensure that your programs are effective?

Answer: We evaluate our programs carefully – and evaluation findings directly influence policy and legislation.

- Chapter 1 – What the evaluations found. National Assessment of Chapter 1 gave evidence Chapter 1 was no longer working to close the learning gap between disadvantaged children and other students. Program was categorical and prescriptive; operating outside of the regular instruction and school systems' regular accountability.
- The Department's response. Major changes to: (1) align the Federal program with the same challenging standards states and local school systems are setting for all students; (2) focus on whole school approaches in high poverty schools; and (3) provide the additional supports the evaluations show are needed.
- Eisenhower Professional Development – What the evaluations found. Federally-supported professional development tended to be relatively brief and not part of a comprehensive plan to improve curriculum and instruction. Example: while the Eisenhower program reached large numbers of teachers, training averaged only 6 hours annually.
- The Department's response. The reauthorized Eisenhower program focuses on *intensive, sustained* professional development.
- Vocational Education – What the evaluations found. High school graduates who complete a coherent sequence of vocational courses are more likely than general education graduates to find training-related jobs and to earn more in these jobs, and are less likely to be unemployed over time. However, high school graduates were less likely to concentrate their vocational coursework in an occupational area in 1990 than in 1987.
- The Department's response. In School to Work and Perkins reauthorization building a framework for a coherent sequence of courses. Also, the President's recently announced Education, Training and Reemployment (ETR) initiative will further streamline the federal role consolidating 58 categorical programs.

EFFECTIVENESS OF MAJOR FEDERAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS

Question: What do we know about the effectiveness of major federal education programs?

Answer: Federal programs have been effective in increasing access to higher education, increasing access of minorities and low-income students to quality education; and supporting a national effort for challenging standards for all children.

- **The Higher Education Act of 1965 made financial aid widely available for college students, particularly those from middle and low-income families, fueling a dramatic rise in college enrollments.**
 - Enrollment in postsecondary education increased four-fold between 1958 and 1990, from 3.2 million to 13.8 million.
 - Minority enrollments in higher education have risen dramatically, with black enrollments increasing by 600 percent from 1970 to 1990.
- **Title I and IDEA increased the access of low-income, minority and disabled students to quality education.**
 - Minority students achieved substantial gains in science, reading, and math between the 1970's and 1992. (The achievement gap for black 9-year-olds was reduced by 36 percent in science, 32 percent in reading, and 24 percent in math, according to NAEP).
 - Prior to the enactment of the IDEA in 1975, when one million children with disabilities were excluded from school altogether. To today, graduation rates are up; 57 percent of youth with disabilities are competitively employed within 5 years of leaving school.
- **Federal education initiatives in the 1980's and 1990's have focused attention on the need for excellence and high standards in education.**
 - The proportion of high school graduates taking the core curriculum recommended in *A Nation at Risk* tripled between 1982 and 1990, from 13 percent to 40 percent.
 - Participation in Advanced Placement (AP) courses tripled from 1982 to 1994 (to 450,000).
 - Overall student performance in science, math, and reading has increased. For example, math proficiency for 9-year olds increased from an average score of 219 in 1978 to 230 in 1992.

FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION

HISTORY

Important federal role for over 100 years in K-12 and post-secondary.

- o land grant college system (Morrill Act, 1862)
- o established office of education in 1867 (research & statistics)
- o vocational education (Smith Hughes Act, 1917)
- o GI bill (1944 – sent 2.2 million veterans to college)
- o National Defense Education Act for math and science (1958)

NATIONAL DEFENSE

- o Armed Forces this year will recruit almost 200,000 young americans
- o To preserve military preparedness their goal is for at least 90% to have a high school diploma and at least 60% to have above average skills

STRONG ECONOMY

- o **Education foundation of better economic performance.** In this century, educational increases in the workforce accounted for almost 30% in the growth of the nation's wealth; advances in knowledge (better education, R&D, and new technologies) accounted for 55%.
- o **High returns to education for individuals.** In 1992, the average annual earnings for those with a bachelor's degree were almost twice those with only a high school diploma; and two and one-half times those who did not finish high school.
- o **America's mobile population.** Almost one-tenth of our population moves across state lines every five years. This the local quality of education has national implications—whether dealing with unemployment or promoting economic growth. Weak schools have consequences all across the nation.

EQUITY AND CIVIL RIGHTS

- o Children who are disadvantaged, disabled or have limited english proficiency must not be left behind.

IMPORTANCE OF DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

- o National Voice for Education
 - Challenging standards for all children -- National Goals/Charlottesville
 - Nation at Risk
 - A seat in the Cabinet
- o Access to higher education: creating the middle class
 - 75% of all student aid is from federal government
 - in last 20 years, 40 million have received a federal student loan
 - college enrollments have risen
- o A clearinghouse of good ideas: catalyst for solutions
 - research (AskEric; demonstrations; charter schools)
 - technology
 - facilitating exchanges of information between 50 states and 16,000 school districts
 - seed money for effective strategies (ex: Tech Prep has spread widely; federal support has spurred states to adopt this strategy with their own funds)
- o A supportive partner to states, communities, schools and colleges
 - Goals 2000
 - School to Work
- o Supporting elements essential to good schools
 - safe and drug free schools
 - high standards
 - teacher training
 - family involvement
- o Ensuring no children are left behind
 - Disadvantaged, disabled, limited english proficient

- o Given competing needs and fiscal strains at state and local level, assist communities by targeting resources to the most needy.
- o ESEA focuses to raise academic achievement of poor and disadvantaged students. Since the law was enacted in 1965, achievement gap between black and white students narrowed substantially.
- o 20 years ago, close to a million children with disabilities were entirely excluded from school. Now they are in school, and many are in the regular classroom.
- o Student financial aid has helped millions of poor and middle-class students go to college.

FOUNDATION FOR DEMOCRACY AND RESPONSIBLE CITIZENSHIP

- o About 44% of welfare recipients are school drop outs.
- o 82% of all people locked up in jail and prisons are drop outs.
- o Education is a powerful welfare and crime elimination program. America simply cannot afford *not* to invest in education.

TODAY IS THE EDUCATION ERA: ADDRESSING THE "HUMAN DEFICIT"

- o New Demands: technology, international competition
- o In this decade, 89% of jobs being created require some form of post secondary training. Even more require a high school diploma.

PUBLIC SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION

- o 79% oppose reducing funding for the Department of Education while only 15% support this. Wall Street Journal poll, March 1995.
- o 81% support the balanced budget amendment. But, only 22% favor balancing the budget by cutting spending on education -- a drop of 59%. New York Times/CBS poll, December 1994.