President Clinton's Fiscal 2001 Funding Proposal

(Dollars In Thousands)

The following table compares President Clinton's fiscal 2001 proposals for certain education programs with appropriations from fiscal 1997-2000.

Program	Fiscal 1997 Funding	Fiscal 1998 Funding	Fiscal 1999 Funding	Fiscal 2000 Funding	President's Fiscal 2001 Proposal
Class-size reduction	--	--	$1,200,000	$1,300,000	$1,750,000
Goals 2000 (total)	$ 491,000	$491,000	491,000	491,000	0
State, local education grants	476,000	464,500	461,000	461,000	0
Parental assistance	15,000	25,000	30,000	30,000	0
Evaluation	0	1,500	0	0	0
School-to-work opportunities[1]	199,973[1]	200,000[1]	125,000[1]	55,000[1]	0[1]
Title I (local grants total)	7,194,099[2]	7,375,200[2]	7,732,397[2]	7,941,397[2]	8,357,500
Basic grants	6,191,350	6,273,212	6,574,000	6,783,000	5,683,100
Concentration grants	999,249	1,022,020	1,158,397	1,158,397	1,002,900
Targeted grants	0	0	0	0	
Comprehensive Reform	0	120,000	120,000	170,000	190,000
Impact aid	730,000	808,000	864,000	863,200	770,000
Eisenhower professional development state grants	310,000	335,000	335,000	335,000	0
Innovative education program strategies state grants	310,000	350,000	375,000	380,000	0
Safe, drug-free schools (total)	555,978	556,000	566,000	605,750	650,000
State grants	530,978	531,000	441,000	445,000	439,250
National programs	25,000	25,000	90,000	110,750	200,750
Technology for Education			540,000	571,255	620,000
Teacher quality (HEA Title II)			72,212	98,000	98,000
Magnet Schools			104,000	110,000	110,000
Charter schools	50,987	80,000	100,000	145,000	175,000
Reading Excellence Grants			260,000	260,000	286,000
Bilingual, immigrant education	261,700	354,000	380,000	406,000	460,000
Special ed (state grants total)	4,035,979	4,808,900	5,054,685	5,754,685	6,053,252
State grant program	3,783,685	3,801,000	4,310,700	4,989,685	5,279,685
Preschool grants	360,409	373,985	373,985	390,000	390,000
Early intervention grants	315,754	350,000	370,000	375,000	383,567
Vocational education					
Basic state grants	998,056	1,027,550	1,030,650	1,055,650	855,650
Tech prep education	100,000	103,000	106,000	106,000	306,000
Adult education, literacy	354,551	360,600	385,000	470,000	555,500
Research	123,567	128,567	143,567	168,567	198,567
Statistics (NESA)	50,000	59,000	68,000	68,000	84,000
Assessment	32,617	35,471	40,000	40,000	42,500
After-school Programs	1,000	40,000	200,000	453,710	1,000,000
Pell Grants[3]	5,919,000[3]	7,344,900[3]	7,704,000[3]	7,700,000[3]	8,356,000
Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants	583,407	614,000	619,000	631,000	691,000
Work-Study	830,000	830,000	870,000	934,000	1,011,000
Perkins Loans capital contrib.	178,000	135,000	100,000	100,000	100,000
Leveraging Educational Assistance (formerly SSIG)	50,000	25,000	25,000	40,000	40,000
TRIO programs	499,994	529,700	600,000	645,000	725,000
GEAR UP			120,000	200,000	325,000
Education Department administration	413,741	435,656	461,763	488,384	525,684

[1] *Receives equal funding through the Labor Department.*

[2] *Excludes advance appropriations that become available the following fiscal year.*

[3] *The maximum Pell Grant award was $2,470 in 1996, $2,700 in 1997, $3,000 in 1998, $3,125 in fiscal 1999, and $3,300 in 2000. President Clinton proposes increasing the maximum award to $3,500 in 2001.*

Source: Education Department.

Need better explanation of early childhood programs — how they coordinate

Resource book on child development / Head Start

School Leadership messages: how do we highlight effective practices bolstering school leadership.

College Opp. Tax Cut — opportunity for teachers to get graduate degrees b/c they're eligible for tax credits.

Social Security — lock away SS surplus. Use it for debt reduction. Take interest savings on debt reduction / service and dedicate it back to SS for solvency purposes.

—

Congressional Justification/Budget Documents on FY2001 Education Initiatives

The Challenging Coursework On-Line

The Challenging Coursework On-Line initiative will support the development of high quality, Web-based Advanced Placement, Second Language, and other challenging courses. Today, students in many high schools in poor rural and inner city schools lack access to the challenging coursework that all students need and deserve. Increased access to the Internet and advanced telecommunications systems can help solve the problem, but only if students have access to high quality content. Unfortunately, few such high-quality courses exist today. The Challenging Coursework On-Line program will provide funding to stimulate innovative research and development efforts in partnership with local schools. This initiative complements other investments to make information technology and the Internet accessible for all schools, provide technology training for teachers, improve ESL instruction, and build the capacity of high schools to make AP courses accessible for all their students. The program will provide grants of up to three years to partnerships for research, development and evaluation of innovative technologies such as on-line simulations and other web-based instruction that can help provide high-quality learning experiences for all students no matter where their school is located. Once the AP courses are developed, States would be able to use Advanced Placement Incentives program funds to support their use for low-income students or in schools with high concentrations of low-income students.

College Test Preparation for Low-Income Students

Ensuring equal access to higher education is essential in today's economy, when advanced education is so often the key to economic success. For many low-income students, however, admissions tests remain a stumbling block. Low-income students tend to score lower on admissions tests like the SAT and ACT, and they do not have the same access to quality test preparation programs as their wealthier classmates. The College Test Preparation for Low-Income Students initiative will provide funding to pay the costs of rigorous preparation programs, including on-site programs, online programs, PC-based systems, and course materials for low-income students. Competitive grants would be given to local educational agencies or schools, which would be expected to establish partnerships with test preparation companies or community-based organizations with proven track records, including an established curriculum, for preparation services. Students would be eligible for the program if they had a family income no greater than 200 percent of the poverty line and had demonstrated a commitment and level of achievement necessary for college entrance. For example, applicants could require students to have satisfied minimum college entrance requirements. A competitive priority would be given to applicants that couple test preparation with other relevant services such as college counseling, application assistance, and financial aid counseling. The request for FY 2001 is $10 million.

Recognition and Reward

Recognition and Reward
(Elementary and Secondary Education of 1965, Title X, Part A)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined[1]

Budget authority ($000s):

2000	2001	Change
0	$50,000	+$50,000

[1]The GEPA extension expires September 30, 2000; new authorizing legislation is proposed.

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2001, the Administration requests $50 million for a new Recognition and Reward activity. This activity would be initiated under the broad authority for the Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) reauthorization proposal of the Fund for the Improvement of Education (FIE). It would also be the first step toward implementing the vision, embeded in Title XI of the Department's ESEA reauthorization proposal, of providing financial incentives to States to fully implement the types of standards-based accountability systems that have proven effective in improving student achievement.

Fiscal year 2001 funds would be used to reward States that: (1) demonstrate significant statewide gains in student achievement; and (2) reduce the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students in mathematics, as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). The Department would use NAEP results because NAEP is the only nationally representative and continuing assessment of what America's students know and can do in various subject areas. In addition, in making awards the Department could also take into consideration other criteria it considers appropriate, such as whether States have in place rigorous examinations to help ensure that all students have met prescribed standards before graduating from secondary school.

By requiring that States (1) demonstrate increases in student achievement in the core academic subjects over an extended period of time, and (2) simultaneously narrow the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students, the Administration's proposal deliberately sets a high standard for States to achieve to before receiving an award. As a result, the Department expects that a small number of States would be eligible for an award in any year.

This would be a forward-funded program. Funds would become available for obligation July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

Since 1994, with the passage of the Improving America's Schools Act (IASA) and the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the Administration has committed to the idea that all students can achieve to challenging standards. To help ensure that all students are prepared to meet challenging standards, the Administration has focused on promoting academic equity and excellence through such strategies as:

! **Implementing high standards in every classroom.** To enable States, districts, and schools to implement high standards, the Administration initiated the Class Size Reduction program to reduce average class size in the early elementary grades to 18 students per classroom so that students can receive the individual attention they need to learn to read independently and well by the end of third grade.

- **Improving teacher and administrator quality.** Research has shown that teacher quality is the most important in-school factor affecting student learning. The Administration is committed to ensuring that all children have a talented, dedicated, well-prepared teacher in their classroom. Title II of the Higher Education Act is supporting State and local efforts to take comprehensive approaches to improving teacher quality.

The Administration's 1994 reauthorization of the ESEA required that States develop challenging content and student performance standards and assessments aligned to those standards. There are encouraging signs that States have made progress as a result those accountability provisions. For example, 48 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico have developed State-level standards. Recent data also indicate that the accountability provisions in Title I are driving higher standards to poor districts and schools. States and school districts are developing accountability systems that identify and reward high-performing schools, provide assistance to low-performing schools, and sanction persistently low-performing schools. In addition, States are developing strategies to end the practices of retention and social promotion and are, instead, providing low-achieving students with opportunities to participate in high-quality learning environments that build on the regular school program.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Desired targets will be identified after a baseline has been established. Achievement of targets will be based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan and Annual Program Performance Report.

Performance goal: To increase the number of States that increase student achievement in the core academic subjects, narrow the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students, and have in place strategies for continuous improvement.

Objective: The achievement gap between high- and low-performing students will be reduced.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The number of States that are able to demonstrate increased student achievement and a reduction in the gap between high- and low-performing students will increase annually. *Baseline to be established.*				

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Estimated number of awards	0	0	10
Estimated average amount of award	0	0	$5,000

School Leadership

Professional development and program innovation: School leadership initiative
(Proposed legislation)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined

Budget authority ($000s):

2000 Predicted Appropriation	2001 Request	Change
0	$40,000	+$40,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The School Leadership program would be a new initiative carried out under the authority of the proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA) Title II (Teaching to High Standards) National Programs.. It would provide superintendents, principals, and prospective principals -- particularly individuals who serve in high-poverty, low-performing districts and schools -- with professional development opportunities to improve their ability to function as leaders. The capacity of a school or district to improve teaching and learning is dependent to a great extent upon the quality of the leadership exercised by its principal or superintendent, but too often individuals who become educational leaders do not possess the skills or experience necessary to meet the challenge of creating an environment conducive to preparing all children to achieve to challenging standards.

Under the proposal, the Department would award grants to consortia that would include at least one local educational agency (LEA) and a State educational agency (SEA), institution of higher education (IHE), for-profit business, or other organizations with the expertise to provide professional development to school administrators. Each consortium would be required to include at least one LEA serving a concentration of children living in poverty and at least one organization that is not an LEA, SEA, or IHE. Grantees would use their funds to establish a leadership development center that would serve a State or region. Grantees serving regions would have to ensure that participants were provided training that is aligned with the State standards where they are employed. Each grant would be for a period of up to 5 years. The Federal share of funding would not exceed 50 percent of the cost of the project.

The types of professional development activities offered by each center would vary according to the needs of the areas served by each grant, but would be geared to helping sitting and prospective superintendent and principals meet the new demands of the job, in such areas as instructional leadership, budgeting, data-driven decision-making, site-based management, meeting the needs of a diverse student population, maintaining a safe and orderly school environment, and making effective use of technology in instruction and administration. Grantees would be encouraged to use effective leadership practices from fields other than education when developing their activities.

bullet - bolstering capacity of current ranks of school leaders

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2001, the Department is requesting $40 million for the School Leadership Initiative. Program funds would assist consortia to provide current and prospective superintendents and principals, particularly individuals who serve in high-poverty, low-performing districts and schools, with sustained and intensive training to improve their capacity to serve as effective leaders and successfully implement standards-based reforms in their schools and classrooms. This program would be the first significant Federal investment in improving the skills of district- and school-level administrators.

Standards-based reform and school leaders

Standards-based reform has raised the demands and pressures on superintendents and principals to produce improved student achievement. Effective leadership can improve teaching and learning. Studies have found that effective superintendents: set goals and established expectations and standards; establish an instructional and curricular focus to ensure consistency in curriculum and instruction; and monitor curriculum and instruction. In addition, successful superintendents are able to improve morale disrictwide by cutting through bureaucratic obstacles to secure quick solutions to pressing problems and promoting closer relationships between district and site administrators.

Leadership matters bullet #3

Research has shown that what principals do on a daily basis makes a difference in how much and how well students learn. Principals influence teaching and classroom practice through such activities as formulating school goals, setting and communicating high achievement expectations, organizing classrooms for instruction, allocating resources, supervising teachers' performance, monitoring student progress, and promoting a positive, orderly environment for learning. An effective principal can create an environment that focuses on and facilitates student learning and leads to increased student achievement.

Recruiting talented individuals

In recent years, local educational agencies have had increasing difficulty finding well-qualified candidates to fill superintendent and principal vacancies. A 1991 survey found that almost half of superintendents surveyed on been on the job for less than 5 years. Many districts are finding that the number of well-prepared candidates to fill superintendent positions is dwindling. A 1998 report by the Educational Research Service (ERS), *Is There A Shortage Of Qualified Candidates For Openings In The Principalship?*, found that half of districts surveyed reported a shortage of candidates at all levels -- elementary, middle, and high school. In addition, ERS found that only about one-fourth of surveyed districts reported the existence of an aspiring principals program to recruit and prepare candidates.

Once on the job, new principals find that their previous experiences have not prepared them adequately for the demands of the job. Principals are increasingly being held accountable for student achievement in their schools, but frequently lack training in such areas as: using achievement data to inform instruction and curriculum choices; determining the alignment of comprehensive school reform designs with State or local content and performance standards and assessment structures; and strategies for engaging parents and families in their child's education. Few districts have formal programs for providing principals with such training. The ERS report found that fewer than half of the surveyed districts had a formal induction or mentoring program for new principals.

The amount requested would support approximately 20 centers that would provide professional development opportunities for approximately 10,000 current or prospective school administrators. Participants would be provided training in such areas as:

- Defining the mission of the district or school. An administrator who is an effective instructional leader clearly envisions the district or school's purpose and what it seeks to accomplish, and creates a climate of high expectations for all staff and students.

- Managing the instructional program. An effective principal needs to be able to work with teachers in the evaluation, development, and implementation of the school's curriculum and instructional programs.

- Promoting a positive climate. A principal or superintendent can create a positive climate by establishing clear, explicit standards that embody high expectations and creating a system of rewards that reinforces academic achievement.

Recruitment

In addition, centers could develop programs to recruit prospective principals and superintendents (particularly individuals who would serve in high-need schools an districts), including candidates with managerial and leadership experience in fields other than education, and to develop alternative pathways to administrative positions.

In 2001, the Department would reserve $100,000 to conduct a peer review of applications. In addition, the Department would reserve $200,000 to evaluate activities undertaken with program funds. **Do we want to reserve more? There is a distinct lack of data on what type of profession development for principals works.**

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Desired interim and end targets will be identified for indicators when a baseline has been established. Achievement of targets is based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this and other programs supporting the performance goals and objectives.

Other performance indicators and strategies for this program are included in the Department's Annual Performance Plan.

Performance goal: To improve the quality of school building leadership, particularly in high-poverty, low-performing schools.

Objective: Provide principals with the skills necessary to create school environments conducive to preparing all students to achieve to challenging standards.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
Increasing percentages of teachers whose principals participate in program activities will report that their principal creates a school in which organization, staffing arrangements, and the use of time all support continuous improvement of instructional practices and student achievement. *Baseline to be established.*				

Research has shown that a teacher's perception of the principal as a strong instructional leader is linked indirectly to student achievement. To be a strong instructional leader, a principal must possess knowledge of curriculum and instructional matters and be able to communicate that knowledge to teachers in order to improve instruction. But data in the 1993-94 Schools and Staffing Survey found that fewer than half of teachers surveyed talked to their principal about instructional practices. Program funds would enable districts, particularly high-poverty districts, to provide current and prospective principals with training in curriculum and instruction and in skills necessary to communicate with teachers to improve instruction. Data for this indicator will be collected through a planned evaluation of the Department's professional development programs.

Indicator	1999	2000	2001	2002
The percentage of individuals who participate in high-quality professional development activities. *Baseline to be established.*				

Research has shown that principals can benefit from high-quality professional development. To be effective, the professional development must provide participants with opportunities to develop and practice new knowledge and skills. The training must be sustained and focus on specific outcomes, and provide participants with an opportunity for reflective practice and honest feedback. Program funds would allow districts to provide current and prospective principals with the type of research-based professional development that has been proven effective. Data for this indicator would be collected through an evaluation of the Department's professional development programs.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	1999	2000	2001
Number of centers	0	0	20
Estimated number of participants	0	0	10,000
Average award	0	0	$1,985
Peer review of new award applications	0	0	$100
Evaluation	0	0	$200

High Standards in the Classroom: National Programs: Teacher Quality Initiatives
(Proposed legislation)

FY 2001 Authorization ($000s): To be determined

Budget authority ($000s):

	2000	2001	Change
Hometown Teachers	0	$75,000	+$75,000
Higher Standards, Higher Pay	0	50,000	+50,000
Teacher Quality Incentives	0	50,000	+50,000

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

These three programs will support Federal leadership activities that contribute to the improvement of teaching in our Nation's schools. Hometown Teachers; Higher Standards, Higher Pay; and Teacher Quality Incentives will help to promote high standards in the classroom by encouraging young adults to become teachers and supporting them in their undergraduate teacher training and first years of teaching, by helping school districts to reform their teacher evaluation practices, and by rewarding school districts for hiring fully certified teachers and reducing out-of-field teaching.

These teacher quality initiatives will encourage school districts to focus on the quality of teaching and learning in our classrooms because they reinforce high-quality, standards-based reform efforts. Recent research has found that teachers' expertise can have a greater impact on students' achievement than any other in-school factor. In total, these initiatives will support school districts' efforts at recruiting, training, supporting, evaluating, and hiring fully qualified teachers who have a solid academic background in the subject matter they are teaching in order to help ensure that all students can learn to challenging State standards.

Hometown Teachers

Many school districts experience difficulty recruiting and hiring enough fully qualified teachers, and students who attend schools with large numbers of poor children are less likely than children in wealthier districts to be taught by teachers who are fully licensed or certified and who have a solid background in the subject matter they teach. This program would provide competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to develop a comprehensive approach to teacher recruitment and retention, including both long- and short-term strategies to expand and maintain their teaching staffs.

One long-term strategy that school districts could use to address their teacher shortage is to implement programs that begin to develop and support potential teachers as early as middle school. At the high school level, the program would provide incentives and opportunities for student participants to become acquainted with the teaching profession, and the most promising students would receive college scholarships at the end of high school. In college, participants would be encouraged to major in a high-need subject area and would be required to maintain a certain grade point average and earn a teaching certificate.

After participants successfully complete college and become fully licensed or certified, they would receive priority for obtaining a job in their own or another participating high-poverty school district and would be required to work in one of these districts for a specific number of years in exchange for their college scholarships. Participants would be required to pay back their scholarships if they do not meet this service requirement.

Short-term strategies that school districts could use to address their teacher shortages include scholarships to undergraduates who agree to teach in the school district for a certain number of years, signing bonuses, and streamlined hiring practices. In addition, because part of the teacher shortage problem is caused by high teacher turnover rates, many districts also need to develop effective strategies for retaining their teachers. These strategies could include mentoring programs, increasing teacher salaries, and creating more desirable working conditions.

Higher Standards, Higher Pay

This program would award competitive grants to high-poverty school districts to help them attract and retain high-quality teachers and principals through better pay. In order to be eligible for funding, partnerships involving school districts, local businesses, and teachers' unions would be required to develop and implement reforms to raise teacher performance, including (1) regular, rigorous peer evaluations of every teacher that include student performance as one measure; (2) professional development and intensive support to help all teachers and principals succeed; and (3) streamlined, but fair, systems to improve or remove teachers identified as low-performing through their peer evaluation. Participating partnerships would have to agree on steps to recruit talented new teachers, evaluate new teachers, reward good teaching, provide mentors for new teachers and principals, and adopt better ways to identify and to improve or remove low-performing teachers.

All teachers in participating school districts would receive a salary increase when their district implemented the program, and new teachers recruited to the district would also be eligible for the higher pay level in order to encourage talented teachers to teach in these high-poverty districts. Teachers who get advanced certification through the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards Certification could receive an additional salary increase.

Teacher Quality Incentives

This competitive grant program would provide reward money to high-poverty school districts that demonstrate significant progress in improving teacher quality against two criteria -- increasing the percentage of certified teachers and decreasing the percentage of secondary teachers who are teaching out-of-field. Districts that successfully compete for these funds would use them to supplement funds from other Federal programs that focus on improving teacher quality. Districts would compete against other districts of similar size, and those districts in each of three categories that had made the most progress over a specified time period would receive grants. These programs would be forward-funded programs. Funds would become available for obligation from July 1 of the fiscal year in which they are appropriated and remain available through September 30 of the following year.

FY 2001 BUDGET REQUEST

For fiscal year 2001, the Administration proposes to fund Hometown Teachers at $75 million; Higher Standards, Higher Pay at $50 million; and Teacher Quality Incentives at $50 million.

The Hometown Teachers initiative would provide competitive grants to approximately 100 high-poverty school districts to develop a comprehensive approach to teacher recruitment and retention.

Approximately $2 million of Higher Standards, Higher Pay funds would be used for national activities, including a national evaluation of the program. The remaining $48 million would be used to make competitive awards to 10 to 12 local educational agencies.

The Teacher Quality Incentives initiative would provide competitive grants to schools districts in three categories, based on their size. Approximately $15 million would be awarded to 5 to 7 large-size school districts, $30 million to 15 to 60 medium-size school districts, and $5 million to 10 to 200 small-size school districts.

SELECTED PROGRAM PERFORMANCE INFORMATION

This section presents selected information on performance goals and objectives and selected performance indicators and strategies for measuring the progress made toward achieving program results. Desired targets will be identified after a baseline has been established. Achievement of targets will be based on the cumulative effect of the resources provided in FY 2001 and future years, and the resources and efforts invested by those served by this program.

Performance Goal: To help States and school districts raise the performance of educators in our Nation's schools.

Objective: The Hometown Teachers initiative will recruit and train highly motivated and talented students to become teachers in high-poverty school districts.

Indicator	**1999**	**2000**	**2001**	**2002**
District administrators will report that program participants they hire as teachers are better prepared, on average, than other newly certified teachers hired by the school district. *Baseline to be established in 2002.*				

Data for this indicator will come from surveys of the program.

PROGRAM OUTPUT MEASURES
($000s)

	2001
Hometown Teachers	
School districts	100

Peer review costs for new applications	$30

Higher Standards, Higher Pay

Grants	$47,970
National Activities	$2,000
Peer review costs for new applications	$30
Partnerships	10-12
Teachers per site	800

Teacher Quality Incentives

Total amount available, by category:	
Large-Size School Districts	$14,990
Medium-Size School Districts	$29,990
Small-Size School Districts	$4,990
Range of awards, by category:	
Large-Size School Districts	$2,000-$3,000
Medium-Size School Districts	$500-$2,000
Small-Size School Districts	$25-$500
Number of awards, by category:	
Large-Size School Districts	5-7
Medium-Size School Districts	15-60
Small-Size School Districts	10-200
Peer review costs for new applications	$30

Appropriation Language for Rewards and for 21st century CCLC that will not be sent up to Hill at this time)

Rewards and Recognition. Provided further, that $50,000,000 shall be for financial rewards to States that demonstrate statewide achievement gains and a narrowing of the achievement gap between high- and low-performing students in mathematics achievement between 1996 and 2000; as measured by the National Assessment of Educational Progress, and meet any additional criteria determined by the Secretary; Provided further, that such funds shall be used by States to carry out activities consistent with the purposes of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

21st Century CLCC . *Provided* further, That not withstanding any other provision of part I of Title X of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the Secretary shall first reserve an amount necessary to make continuation grants to existing grantees under that part and shall reserve not more than 2.5 percent of the remaining amount available for that part of for technical assistance, evaluation, dissemination of information, carry out activities to encourage the spread and adoption of successful extended learning opportunities programs, and other national activities to support programs under that part, and; *Provided further,* That the Secretary shall award the remaining funds under that part to States applying for them by formula in proportion to the amount each State received under part A of Title I of that Act for the previous fiscal year;

Provided further, That each State shall award at least 95 percent of its allocation competitively to local educational agencies on behalf of schools in communities that lack resources to establish or expand after-school centers that provide extended learning opportunities; *Provided further,* That applications shall include a description of the collaborative efforts to be undertaken by community-based organizations, related public agencies, businesses, or other appropriate organizations; *Provided further,* That in making such awards, States shall give priority to applicants that intend to serve students who attend schools identified for corrective action under section 1116(c)(5) of such Act and to applicants that intend to serve students who attend schools identified as in need of improvement under section 1116(c)(1) of such act; *Provided further,* That each application on behalf of a school that is eligible to receive a priority shall identify at least one entity with expertise in providing extended learning opportunity programs that would assist the school in operating its program; *Provided further,* That each State may use up to 10 percent of its allocation for subgrants to community-based organizations that provide evidence that the affected local educational agencies concur with the project, to carry out projects consistent with this part; *Provided further,* That all programs under this part shall be conducted primarily in a public elementary or secondary education building.

EDUCATION DAILY

The education community's independent daily news service

Put Surplus To Work For Education, Says Clinton

Capping a month's worth of sizeable budget requests, President Clinton last week proposed another $3.8 billion in additional education spending—including a broad new $1 billion teacher-quality plan.

Budget 2001

Speaking at his annual State of the Union address, the president also asked Congress to vastly expand existing programs, like his cherished class-size reduction initiative, after-school programs and Head Start.

"To 21st-century America, let us pledge these things: Every child will begin school ready to learn and graduate ready to succeed," the president said, to widespread Democratic applause.

The president's proposals were greeted less warmly across the aisle.

"The Clinton-Gore administration continues to believe that every issue requires a federal initiative, and they have a growing list of proposals this year," said Rep. Bill Goodling, R-Pa., chairman of the House education committee.

"I believe that we should use federal funds carefully, and for quality programs that have a proven track record. Likewise, federal involvement should support state and local efforts, not supplant them," Goodling added, echoing the sentiments of several of his GOP colleagues.

Clinton's new proposals would run up his education tab for fiscal 2001 by about $10 billion (*see chart, p. 3*), following his recent calls to reduce the size of high schools, make postsecondary education tax deductible, renovate old and crowded schools, and combat youth violence (ED, Jan. 21).

(more on p. 3)

In This Issue

Vol. 33, No. 18 ■ Monday, January 31, 2000

Suspended Kan. Student Sues Over Free Speech ....Page 2

San Diego Schools Drop Race In Admissions ....Page 4

AASCU: Merit Scholarships Mostly Helping Well-Off

State-funded merit scholarships are helping well-off students who already have access to college, but they are failing to meet some critical needs of students more at-risk of dropping-out, says a forthcoming report.

The scholarships—often awarded to applicant students with a B average or better—tend to go to students from more affluent suburban backgrounds, says the report by the American Association of State Colleges and Universities.

It says programs that award the scholarships often fail to meet one of their primary goals: Getting at-risk students to perform better in college once they get there.

A 'New Generation'

"We are seeing a considerable interest in state funding for merit scholarships, tax credits and tax deductions at the state level, so we want to make sure that the issues related to access and affordability—particularly for those groups most at-risk—stay on the table," said Travis Reindl, a policy analyst for AASCU who worked on the project.

The study focuses on a "new generation" of state student financial aid programs that includes a wide range of grants, scholarships, tax credits and tax deductions that have become popular with state lawmakers in recent years.

(more on p. 2)

AASCU: Merit Scholarships Mostly Helping Well-Off (Cont.)

It identifies the Georgia Helping Outstanding Pupils Educationally (HOPE) Scholarships, established in 1993, as the genesis for a series of state initiatives designed to make higher education more accessible and affordable.

"Programs like these new class of merit scholarships ... do accomplish some objectives. There is no doubt that they have some benefits," Reindl said. "The question we are asking is, what is the price states are going to pay for those policy choices?

"If you put those dollars into programs that are going to end up flowing primarily toward students who will qualify for other scholarships, or who can finance a significant part of the education instead of putting the money in programs that will focus attention to those close to the edge ... then the question is, where do we end up in terms of preserving access to higher education?" he asked.

A spokesman for the Georgia Student Finance Commission, Steve Tompkins, has challenged some of the report's findings. Tompkins said HOPE scholarships have proved successful at focusing families and students on academic achievement.

Reindl emphasized that the report is not meant to discredit programs such as HOPE scholarships, which began in 1993 in Georgia and has been copied by many other states.

Instead, he said, it aims to stimulate discussion on whether the programs are accomplishing the policy goals that were touted when they were created by lawmakers.

The report acknowledges that HOPE scholarships have worked successfully. SAT scores and graduation rates of Georgia high school students have risen since the program took effect, and the percentage of college freshmen that need remedial instruction has declined.

"HOPE scholarships provide a powerful incentive for students to get a B average in high school ... but the statistics show that once [students] are in college ... (looking at students' GPA and the percentage who are losing their scholarships), they may not provide as powerful an incentive to perform above the threshold," Reindl said. —Joe Cutbirth

Suspended Kan. Student Sues Over Free Speech

A Kansas student suspended for posting artwork on a school door that said "I'll kill you all!" is suing school officials who she said violated her free speech rights.

The Jan. 25 suit, filled by attorneys for the Bluestem High School students in U.S. District Court in Wichita, requests that she be reinstated immediately and asks the court to decide whether she is entitled to damages and attorneys fees.

Paul Rebein, an attorney for the American Civil Liberties Union who is representing student Sarah Boman, said school officials overreacted when they suspended the 17-year-old.

But school attorney David All said, given the current "climate of school violence, I think the administration acted appropriately."

The Bluestem school board voted Jan. 24 to lift the suspension, which was imposed until the end of this school year, provided Sarah submits to a mental health evaluation to ensure she is not a threat to students or faculty.

The high school senior defended her work as conceptual art depicting the twisted thoughts of a fictional madman. —Esmeralda Barnes

Aspen Publishers, Inc.

Published every business day by Capitol Publishing Group, a division of Aspen Publishers, Inc., a **Wolters Kluwer** Company (ISSN: 0013-1261), P.O. Box 1453, Alexandria, Va. 22313-2053; Editorial: (703)683-4100; Subscriber Services: (800)655-5597; Publisher: Jane Garwood Associate Publisher: Jo Gulledge ▪ Executive Editor: Dave Harrison ▪ Deputy Editor: Jane McKee Editorial Staff: Esmeralda Barnes, Michael Cardman, Hannah R. Gladfelter, Robert Margolis, Pam Moore, Linda Connolly ▪ Annual subscription rate: $598. Six-month subscription rate: $352.

Put Surplus To Work For Education, Says Clinton (Cont. from p. 1)

New Proposals

Most of the $1 billion Clinton is seeking for his "Teaching to High Standards Initiative" would go to grants to states and districts to fund standards-based professional development for teachers. The grants would be awarded on a half-competitive, half-formula basis, according to White House policy aide Andy Rotherham.

The new initiative would also fund several smaller programs, including:

- **Higher Standards-Higher Pay for Teachers**, which would award $50 million in grants to high-poverty districts to give raises to their best teachers, as assessed by their peers;
- **Teacher Quality Rewards**, which would make available another $50 million to school districts that have made exceptional strides in reducing the number of uncertified teachers and teachers teaching outside their subject area;
- **Hometown Teacher Recruitment**, under which $75 million would go to districts for developing programs to recruit teachers locally;
- **Transition to Teaching**, which would put $25 million toward recruiting and preparing mid-career professionals to become teachers where they are needed most; and
- **School Leaders Initiative**, which would front $40 million to fund non-profit partnerships for recruiting and training superintendents and principals.

President Clinton also unveiled another new initiative, this one to provide $50 million in bonuses to states that make extra progress in improving student performance and in closing the gap between high- and low-performing students.

American Federation of Teachers President Sandra Feldman applauded the initiatives, saying, "Clinton's proposals will provide resources for high-poverty districts that now can't compete with their higher paying counterparts for good teachers."

(more)

Proposed Increases In Education Funding, To Date

(dollars in thousands)

The table below shows the tally for the handful of education-funding proposals the President has revealed to date. Numerous Education Department programs are not included, but will be when Clinton unveils his fiscal 2001 budget plan early next month.

Education Initiative	Fiscal 2000 Funding	President's Estimated Fiscal 2001 Request	Net Increase
After-school/Summer-school programs	$ 453,000	$1,000,000	$ 547,000
Head Start	5,267,000	6,267,000	1,000,000
Accountability fund	134,000	250,000	116,000
Closing the achievement gap	0	50,000	50,000
Early Learning Fund	0	600,000	600,000
Teaching to High Standards Initiative	0	1,000,000	1,000,000
Class-size reduction	1,300,000	1,750,000	450,000
College Opportunity Tax Cut	0	3,000,000	3,000,000
Federal Pell Grants	7,639,717	8,639,717	1,000,000
GEAR UP and TRIO programs	845,000	1,445,000	600,000
Small, Safe and Successful High Schools	0	120,000	120,000
Renovating old and crowded schools	0	1,300,000	1,300,000
Total	**$14,638,717**	**$24,421,717**	**$9,783,000**

Source: The White House

Put Surplus To Work For Education, Says Clinton (Cont.)

She also noted that "using incentives to prod districts to stop hiring uncertified teachers and assigning teachers to courses outside their field will go a long way to putting a qualified teacher in every classroom."

More Of The Same Old, Same Old

Among the largest proposed increases to existing programs, Clinton would request an additional $1 billion for Head Start, providing services for about 950,000 children. He also proposed a $600 million "Early Learning Fund" to improve child care and early childhood education for children under five.

But the chairman of the House Education and the Workforce Committee claimed the enlargement is unmerited. "It would be a terrible waste to throw that kind of money at Head Start," Goodling said, "without assurances that it's an investment in quality."

While there hasn't been a careful, rigorous long-term evaluation of Head Start, per se, there have been some vigorous studies of programs similar to Head Start, noted Isabel Sawhill, a senior fellow at the Brookings Institution, a nonpartisan think tank.

"Many people look at the results to these smaller, model programs and say, 'They're effective; let's put more money into Head Start,'" she said. "I'm inclined to believe them. It's likely to produce somewhat comparable, if not quite as dramatic, results."

The House's top education lawmaker took a similar tack in objecting to Clinton's proposal to roughly double funding for after-school and summer school programs to a total of $1 billion.

Clinton claims that level of funding would allow every student in the nation attending a failing school to participate in such programs, which have been shown to improve student achievement in reading and math (ED, Feb. 22, 1998).

But, Goodling warned, "before we expand mediocrity, we need to know what is going on in these programs currently. We are sorely lacking in information on quality and participation to nearly double the funding for these programs."

Clinton's proposal to enlarge class-size reduction funding by $450 million to $1.75 billion will also likely meet Republican resistance when he formally unveils his fiscal 2001 budget early next month.

Finally, Clinton also proposed doubling, to $250 million, funds for turning around or closing failing schools (ED, Jan. 20, 1999).

The full text of the President Clinton's speech is available online at www.whitehouse.gov.
—Michael Cardman

San Diego Schools Drop Race In Admissions

The San Diego Board of Education voted last week to exclude race as a factor in admitting students to magnet schools.

The 20-year-old policy had been aimed at maintaining diversity in school enrollments while offering various educational programs.

But recent court decisions have held such programs unconstitutional. So, like many officials from other cities, the board opted to revise the policy on Jan. 25.

"We may not escape litigation, but what we have done, we have done in a manner of consensus," Superintendent Alan Bersin told the *San Diego Union-Tribune.*

The new policy divides the city into four clusters. Students now get priority in admissions based on residence and socioeconomics.

"The challenge has been in creating a program that eliminates race as a criteria but would not segregate our schools," said the district's integration program manger, Pat Trandal.

"I think you will find a close correlation across the country between race, socioeconomics and geography," she added.

Students will get higher priority in enrollment if they apply to a magnet school in a cluster with different demographics than the one in which they live. —Esmeralda Barnes