"TRANSFORMING THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: HEARING ON H.R. 1, H.R. 340, AND H.R. 345"

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 29, 2001

Serial No. 107-10

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and the Workforce

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2002

77-903 pdf

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: (202) 512-1800 FAX: (202) 512-2250
Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402-0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE

JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
MICHAEL N. CASTLE, Delaware
SAM JOHNSON, Texas
JAMES C. GREENWOOD, Pennsylvania
LINDSEY O. GRAHAM, South Carolina
MARK E. SOUDER, Indiana
CHARLIE W. NORWOOD, JR., Georgia
BOB SCHAFFER, Colorado
FRED UPTON, Michigan
VAN HILLEARY, Tennessee
VERNON J. EHLERS, Michigan
THOMAS G. TANCREDO, Colorado
ERNIE FLETCHER, Kentucky
JIM DeMINT, South Carolina
JOHNNY ISAKSON, Georgia
BOB GOODLATTE, Virginia
JUDY BIGGERT, Illinois
TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
PATRICK J. TIBERI, Ohio
RIC KELLER, Florida
TOM OSBORNE, Nebraska
JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON, Texas

GEORGE MILLER, California
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
PATSY MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT, Virginia
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
LYNN N. RIVERS, Michigan
RUBEN HINOJOSA, Texas
CAROLYN McCARTHY, New York
JOHN F. TIERNEY, Massachusetts
RON KIND, Wisconsin
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California
HAROLD E. FORD, JR., Tennessee
DENNIS KUCINICH, Ohio
DAVID WU, Oregon
RUSH D. HOLT, New Jersey
HILDA L. SOLIS, California
SUSAN DAVIS, California
BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota

Paula Nowakowski, Chief of Staff
John Lawrence, Minority Staff Director

Table of Contents

Table of Contents iii

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JOHN BOEHNER, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. 2

STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER GEORGE MILLER, EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, WASHINGTON, D.C. 2

STATEMENT OF KEITH E. BAILEY, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT, & CEO, WILLIAMS, ON BEHALF OF THE BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. 6

STATEMENT OF KENNETH L. CONNOR, PRESIDENT, FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C. 8

STATEMENT OF GAIL E. FOSTER, FOUNDER, TOUSSAINT INSTITUTE FUND; BOARD MEMBER, BLACK ALLIANCE FOR EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS, NEW YORK, N.Y. 9

STATEMENT OF RANDI WEINGARTEN, PRESIDENT, UNITED FEDERATION OF WORKERS; VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, NEW YORK, N.Y. 11

STATEMENT OF PAUL HOUSTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 13

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. WHITE, CHAIRMAN, CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION, FLINT, M.I. 16

APPENDIX A – WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JOHN BOEHNER, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. 49

APPENDIX B – WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KEITH E. BAILEY, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT, AND CEO, WILLIAMS, ON BEHALF OF THE BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. 53

APPENDIX C - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KENNETH L. CONNOR, PRESIDENT, FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C. 69

APPENDIX D - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF GAIL E. FOSTER, FOUNDER, TOUSSAINT INSTITUTE FUND; BOARD MEMBER, BLACK ALLIANCE FOR EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS, NEW YORK, N.Y. 79

APPENDIX E - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF RANDI WEINGARTEN, PRESIDENT, UNITED FEDERATION OF WORKERS; VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, NEW YORK, N.Y. 89

APPENDIX F - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PAUL HOUSTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, WASHINGTON, D.C. 103

APPENDIX G - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. WHITE, CHAIRMAN, CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION, FLINT, M.I. 117

APPENDIX H – SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, PRESS RELEASE, "BUSINESS LEADERS GIVE HIGH MARKS TO HOUSE EDUCATION BILL" 129

APPENDIX I – SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY KEITH E. BAILEY, SUMMARY OF REPORT, "INVESTING IN TEACHING". 133

APPENDIX J – SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, "THE 'RECEPTIVITY FACTOR', DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES OF ACCOUNTABILITY", EDUCATION WEEK, BY DAVY McCLAY, Ph.D. 137

Table of Indexes 141

HEARING ON "TRANSFORMING THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY: HEARING ON H.R. 1, H.R. 340, AND H.R. 345"

Thursday, March 29, 2001

U.S. House of Representatives

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:10 a.m., in Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Chairman John Boehner presiding.

Present: Representatives Boehner, Roukema, Hoekstra, McKeon, Souder, Norwood, Schaffer, Hilleary, Tancredo, Fletcher, Biggert, Platts, Tiberi, Keller, Osborne, Culberson, Miller, Kildee, Owens, Payne, Andrews, Roemer, Scott, Woolsey, Rivers, Hinojosa, McCarthy, Tierney, Kind, Ford, Wu, Holt, Solis, Davis, and McCollum.

Staff present: Christie Wolfe, Professional Staff Member; Kent Talbert, Professional Staff Member; Ben Peltier, Professional Staff Member; Whitney Rhoades, Staff Assistant; Deborah L. Samantar, Committee Clerk/Intern Coordinator; Jo-Marie St. Martin, General Counsel; Dan Lara, Press Secretary; Patrick Lyden, Professional Staff Member; Michael Reynard, Deputy Press Secretary; Charles Barone, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Mark Zuckerman, Minority General Counsel; Denise Forte, Minority Legislative Associate/Education; Ruth Friedman, Minority Fellow; Cheryl Johnson, Minority Counsel/Education and Oversight; Maggie McDow, Minority Legislative Associate/Education; Joe Novotny, Minority Staff Assistant/Education; and Brendan O'Neil, Minority Legislative Associate/Education.

Chairman Boehner. A quorum being present, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will come to order. We are meeting today to hear testimony on ``Transforming the Federal Role in Education for the 21st Century'' and under Committee Rule 12-B, opening statements are limited to the Chairman and Ranking Member. Therefore, if other members have statements, they will be included in the record. And with that, I ask unanimous consent for the hearing record to remain open for 14 days to allow members' statements and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing today to be submitted in the official record. And without objection, so ordered.

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JOHN BOEHNER, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Our hearing today will focus on proposals to transform the federal role in education for the 21st century. We have a distinguished bipartisan panel to discuss three different education bills, including the President's ``No Child Left Behind'' proposal.

I think the need for change in our nation's education system is undeniable. Nearly 70 percent of inner city and rural fourth graders cannot read at a basic level. This means they are unable to read a paragraph one would find in a children's book. Low-income students lag behind their counterparts by an average of 20 percentile points on national assessment tests. And fully one-third of all incoming college freshmen must enroll in a remedial writing or math class. And despite over $100 billion worth of spending at the federal level over the last 35 years, and $85 billion just in the last ten years, we have not seen any significant change in the performance of our students.

We will be hearing testimony today on three bills that seek to improve the quality of the nation's education system: H.R. 1, the President's ``No Child Left Behind'' bill; H.R. 340, the Excellence and Accountability in Education Act introduced by Mr. Miller and Mr. Kildee; and H.R. 345, the Public Education Reinvestment, Reinvention and Responsibility Act, or, as my friend from Indiana likes to call it, the three R's bill, introduced by Mr. Roemer, Mr. Dooley and Mr. Smith.

And with that, I would like to yield to my friend and Ranking Member, George Miller from California.

WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JOHN BOEHNER, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX A

STATEMENT OF RANKING MEMBER GEORGE MILLER, EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Miller. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I, too, want to welcome all of our witnesses. And Ms. Weingarten, I want to welcome you, and look forward to your testimony on efforts made to get qualified teachers into difficult schools, something that we are all trying to do.

I would simply say this: that all of these bills that are before us, proposals for legislation, have a common purpose. Clearly we would like to have all of our schools, no matter what their economic situation, become high-performing schools. There is some disagreement about how we would get here, but clearly the intent is the same.

I think the President has made it very clear that he wants to try and make every effort to see that the poorest children in the poorest-performing schools have the same opportunity at a high-quality education as other children do in this nation, and that he wants to be able to hold schools accountable for that effort. I think many of us up here share that desire. We have put in excess of $150 billion into this system over the last three decades. I would have to say that we are probably not happy with the results that we have received. That is not a punitive statement; it is a statement of fact, and we seek to do better.

I believe there is going to have to be accountability. I think clearly there is going to have to be meaningful assessment and diagnosis of what children need on a real-time basis, so that they don't fall behind. There is going to have to be the rapid deployment of resources to those children in need. Whether that is summer school or Saturday school or a tutor or a mentor, or a better teacher, that is going to have to be a real-time decision. In many schools, and certainly in the poorer schools in this country, if you fall a year behind or two years behind, the chances are you are going to drown and the school simply does not have the resources.

Which brings me to the final point. To achieve the results that the President says that he wants, and to achieve them for the children that he says that he wants to serve, I believe there is going to have to be significant new resources committed to this effort. I do not believe you are going to get high-quality, capable teachers with the full capacity to teach these children in difficult schools unless you are fully prepared to pay them, provide professional development opportunities, and provide time that you are going to have to buy, if somebody took my time, I would like them to buy it; I am not willing to give it. I think that we have to understand that these are simply the rules of the marketplace, and that we all know that those very same teachers today have many, many more options in the marketplace than they did 30 years ago or 50 years ago or 100 years ago.

So time is money, and it is about time that the Congress figured that out. If we want professional development, if we want continuous improvement, we are going to have to make every effort to purchase that.

A number of my colleagues have said it is not a mystery why some schools do better than others - just simply go to them. They are completely different schools. In my district, I represent the poorest, some of the worst performing schools; the worst performing school in one case; in the state. I also represent some of the best-performing schools. If you go to those schools, they are entirely different schools; entirely different

physical facilities; entirely different types of staff; entirely different settings for those students, entirely different types of credentials, capacity, competency; and available resources. In one case there are reading specialists; in the other case there are barely teachers who can teach reading.

We understand what it takes to provide a first-class education: a quality school, first-class curriculum, and a well-qualified teacher. This is a chance, at the beginning of this millennium, to do it differently. But if you think you are going to impose the testing, the assessments, and all the rest of that, and not provide the resources where the poorest children in the poorest-performing schools reside a good portion of their day, I think we would be making a critical mistake. I think the President will be very disappointed four or five years down the road when he looks back if this happens.

The previous administration was real big on money and not very good on quality. This administration likes to say they are going to be really good on quality, but it doesn't appear they are going to be very good on money. At some point, we have got to stop that debate and put the resources and the quality assurances in the same place, and move forward for America's children and their education, an education that all of their parents and we would expect on behalf of our children.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing.

Chairman Boehner. Thank you, George. And I think it should be pretty clear to those who have watched these hearings over the last several months, and our activities, that there is not a great deal of difference between the goals set out by Mr. Miller and the goals set out by myself. And while we have spent a great deal of money over the last ten years, I think it is clear that the system has to change. And if we can get the system to change, and begin to add more resources, then I think we can in fact make serious progress.

But we are not alone in this. Nor do we want to become the national school board. The states and local communities have their own responsibilities. And as I see this; and George, I think you see it as well; there has to be a partnership and a division of responsibilities.

With that, let me introduce our witnesses this morning. First, we have Keith Bailey. Mr. Bailey is a member of the Business Coalition for Excellence in Education, a coalition of leading U.S. companies and business organizations dedicated to educational excellence. He was named board chair of the National Alliance of Business in November of 2000. Mr. Bailey is Chairman, President, and CEO of Williams, a global leader in energy and communications headquartered in Tulsa, Oklahoma. He has served as the Chairman of the Board of Trustees of the University of Tulsa, and he is currently the Chair of the Board of Trustees at the University of Missouri in Rolla.

Secondly, we have Mr. Ken Connor. Mr. Connor is the head of the Family Research Council, a pro-family public policy organization located here in Washington. Previously, Mr. Connor was a trial attorney in Florida, and has served as the Chairman of the State of Florida Commission on Ethics, and as a member of the State Constitution Revision Commission. He has been involved in state and national political affairs, and he

has had a leading role in presidential, congressional, and gubernatorial campaigns. In 1994, Mr. Connor was a contender for the Republican nomination for governor of the state of Florida. We want to welcome you.

And we have Dr. Gail Foster with us. Dr. Foster is a former high school teacher, and has been working for over a decade on behalf of parental choice. She founded the Toussaint Institute Fund in 1988 in response to the pleas of low-income and struggling working-class families, helping them to find and access good public or private schools for their children. Dr. Foster is also a Board member of the Black Alliance for Educational Options, a national organization which seeks to create, promote and support efforts to empower black parents to exercise choice in determining options for their children's education.

We have Ms. Randi Weingarten. Ms. Weingarten is President of the United Federation of Teachers, representing more than 140,000 active and retired non-supervisory educators in the New York City public education system. She is also Vice President of the more than 1 million member AFT, the UFT's national affiliate, and a member of the Boards of Directors of the New York State United Teachers and New York City's Central Labor Council. And she is here this morning testifying in favor of Mr. Miller's bill.

Then we have Dr. Paul Houston. Dr. Houston has served as an Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators since 1994. He has served schools in North Carolina, New Jersey and Alabama, prior to serving as Superintendent of Schools in Princeton, New Jersey, Tucson, Arizona, and Riverside, California.

And then lastly we will have Mr. William White. Mr. White has served as Chairman of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation since 1988. The Mott Foundation of Flint, Michigan, funds and supports commitment and school partnerships designed to help meet the needs of children and families in local communities.

Sorry, I was going to introduce you, Mr. Kildee, to do that. Anything else you would like to add about Mr. White?

Mr. Kildee. Well, I appreciate your good introduction there, too. Bill White has been a great friend of mine for many, many years. I knew Charles Stewart Mott, the founder of the Mott Foundation, very well, too. Mr. White received his B.A. and his M.B.A. from Dartmouth College, and his experience includes work on Wall Street. He happens to live in my district, Mr. Chairman, and that makes him very special to me, of course.

The Mott Foundation began the community school movement long before the 21st Century Community Learning Centers program ever existed. Efforts to encourage and enact community schools have been the mission of the Mott Foundation since the mid-1930s. My brothers and I, my mother and the whole family, benefited from the work of the Mott Foundation.

The Mott Foundation has built upon this base of experience by spending considerable time and resources totaling over $100 million in working with the U.S.

Department of Education in providing technical assistance to 21st Century program grantees. Mr. White has been here in Washington many times, working with the Secretary of Education, and has committed his time, his talent and his work to the 21st Century programs.

The work of the Foundation, and his work in particular, Mr. Chairman, has been essential in both expanding the quality and quantity of local programs. And I am very pleased to have my friend Bill White here this morning.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. Dale, thank you. And I am sorry; I had this very big print, ``Mr. Kildee to introduce." Why I did not see it, I don't know. I must have a reading problem this morning.

I would remind all of our witnesses that your entire written testimony will be made part of the record. You have five minutes this morning, and you will have a green light, the last minute you will have a yellow light, and when it turns red, it is time to wrap it up.

With that, Mr. Bailey, would you like to begin?

STATEMENT OF KEITH E. BAILEY, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT, & CEO, WILLIAMS, ON BEHALF OF THE BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Bailey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to be here to represent the Business Coalition for Excellence in Education. As you said, it is a large coalition of business corporations and organizations. We believe it is the largest ad hoc coalition that has been formed by the business community around the topic of education, and we are chaired by the CEOs of Intel, Texas Instruments, IBM and State Farm.

On a personal level, you mentioned some of my involvement, including National Alliance of Business. I also serve on the Business Roundtable education committee. I am a member of the board of Achieve. I am a founding member of the board of the Oklahoma Business Education Coalition. And on an intensely personal level, three of our four children are classroom teachers. So I come to you with a great commitment, both personal and corporate, and on behalf of the business community, on the topic at hand.

The Coalition issued a press release on March 22nd applauding the efforts of this Committee and the introduction of H.R. 1. And I would suggest that the press release also be made part of the record. The press release compliments the Committee, and we are particularly pleased with some of the emphasis on teaching that is contained in the bill. And there was a report issued about a month ago that I would also submit for the record on investing in teaching, which represents the view of the business community in

this area.

Certainly we believe that education should, as you have said, be a nonpartisan issue and a bipartisan effort on the part of this Committee and Congress. And the business community is prepared to work constructively with all of those involved to achieve legislation that embodies the principles that we have outlined with regard to the topic of education.

We believe that standards, assessment, student achievement, accountability, and flexibility are all critical elements. But one of the things we also are concerned about and would observe is that while many of these have been addressed individually in the past, there has been perhaps too little effort around the topic of alignment of these various components that are critical. And we would certainly encourage that anything that moves forward emphasize the issue of alignment among the various elements that are essential to an effective education system.

The other area that we would really place some emphasis on is continuing to highlight math and science as topics that are critical to our emerging economy in a knowledge-based future. And we would also encourage the integration of technology into the classroom. And I think that is included for two reasons. One, it certainly is a need that students will have. We see that our company, and the other companies represented in the Coalition, recognize that technology is becoming just part of virtually any job that we have. And not only do the students need to have fluency in technology, but we believe technology can offer resources that extend the available money that is being committed to the school system through things such as distance learning, use of the Internet for supplements to curriculum and that sort of thing.

I would close by saying that as we look at H.R. 1 we are very encouraged with what we see. We would urge that the Committee spend some time strengthening the elements that deal with the issue of alignment and standards within the bill. We do believe, as you stated, that the flexibility, and the involvement and the role of the local communities, is important, but that the Federal Government can play a role as well in helping establish benchmark expectations. And finally, with regard to student achievement, we would hope that the final bill would include more in the way of specific help for students that are lagging behind, and that this would be an element that would be incorporated.

With that I will, in the interest of the size of the panel and the time this morning, stop before my five minutes are up, and look forward to your questions. Thank you.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KEITH E. BAILEY, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT, AND CEO, WILLIAMS, ON BEHALF OF THE BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX B

Chairman Boehner. A most unusual circumstance in this Committee. Thank you. Mr. Connor, you may begin.

STATEMENT OF KENNETH L. CONNOR, PRESIDENT, FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Connor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Miller, and members of the Committee. I appreciate this opportunity to come and share some thoughts on behalf of the Family Research Council about the proposals embodied in H.R. 1, the *No Child Left Behind* Act of 2001.

Let me say first and foremost that the Family Research Council has been, and continues to be, unswervingly committed to the notion that parents ought to be the primary education decision makers for their children, and that by extension educational decision making ought to be made first and foremost at the local level and the state level. I am here today to commend members of this Committee, and indeed, the President, for many of the proposals that are embodied in this bill. I would like to sound a note of caution, if I may, as we move forward, and make some suggestions about ways in which we think a very good bill can be improved as we go forward.

In doing so, I would like to focus, if I may, on four aspects that are embodied in this bill: flexibility, accountability, consolidation, and choice.

First of all, we are most appreciative of the provisions for flexibility that are accorded to state and local school districts by virtue of the provisions of this bill. This bill does increasingly repose educational decision making at the state and local level, and we applaud and appreciate that very much. We are grateful that the emphasis in this bill is on the product, and not the process; that this bill is a results-driven and results-oriented bill, rather than one that focuses on the rigmarole of the process that educrats would be required to go through because of the imposition of rules and regulations from the national level.

This bill recognizes that there are different ways to skin a cat, and that depending on the area in which educational decisions are being made, that in some cases those programs may thrive because of particular people; in other areas they may thrive because of particular programs. And this bill grants states and local school districts the flexibility to make those kinds of decisions.

We applaud the inculcation of the Straight A's process into this proposal, and the recognition that there are other ways in which monies may be transferred from one program to another, ultimately to benefit the students in a particular area.

In the area of accountability, we recognize and appreciate the fact that this bill imposes strict accountability requirements, not only for students, but for school systems as well, and that parents, teachers and school administrators are afforded the benefit of a report card, which ought to inform their educational decision making for the future. We believe that this kind of feedback is critical to the success of educational advancement in the future.

We would sound a note of caution and we appreciate the fact that this Committee and these proposals permit a state to have the discretion to evaluate what assessments will be used to measure and evaluate progress. And we encourage the continuation of that kind of language, and we urge you to eschew any notions that the state should impose any kind of uniform national test, which we fear may ultimately lead to a nationalized curriculum.

We believe strongly that these tests ought to focus on reading, writing and arithmetic, and ought to eschew standards for science and history, many of which cause controversial issues about the origin of the universe and the nature of man, and we think students would not be benefited by these kinds of tests.

We applaud the efforts at consolidation that have been made, the reduction from numerous conflicting and often confusing programs into a minimum number of funding streams, and believe that to be very helpful.

In the area of school choice, we appreciate the fact that parents are granted greater opportunities for decision making on behalf of their children, but we believe that they ought to be granted even greater decision making authority, and would encourage the Congress to move forward in the area of educational savings accounts and tax credits modeled after those that have been adopted by the state of Arizona.

I am grateful for the opportunity to share our thinking with you, and I look forward to discussing our views further. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KENNETH L. CONNOR, PRESIDENT, FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX C

Chairman Boehner. Thank you, Mr. Connor.
Dr. Foster?

STATEMENT OF GAIL E. FOSTER, FOUNDER, TOUSSAINT INSTITUTE FUND; BOARD MEMBER, BLACK ALLIANCE FOR EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Ms. Foster. Thank you. Good morning, Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. Thank you for inviting me to testify at this hearing of great national importance.

I am here today representing the Black Alliance for Educational Options, as well as the Toussaint Institute Fund. I am also a board member of the Council on American Private Education. In addition to being a former public high school teacher in New York City, I also have done quite a bit of research on inner-city private schools, Catholic schools, for the Rand Corporation, for the Institute for Independent Education, and just published a study on black independent schools in a book edited by Diane Ravitch and

Joseph Viteritti called ``City Schools." There are over seventy black independent schools in New York City; these schools serve those parents who are desperately seeking options from their poor-performing public schools.

There are millions of African-American parents, and untold numbers of African-American educators, who support school choice. The Toussaint Institute Fund, which I founded in 1988, was founded as a spontaneous response to the desperate cries of parents in New York. It was a grassroots effort; it was funded by the grass roots. It was the first scholarship program of its kind in the country, founded by the grass roots to save black male children from low-performing public schools and place them in black independent schools. These children, second and third graders, were being labeled ``special ed," ``emotionally disturbed," ``learning disabled," and placed in these special ed classes when, maybe it was a behavior issue, maybe they just needed a little tutoring. And they would be sentenced to special education. In New York, the dropout rate for students in special education, the high school dropout rate, is well over 90 percent, if you just look at the Board of Ed's own statistics on that. So these were prison sentences; these children went from special ed to juvenile detention.

Parents were desperate, and we offered them scholarships to go to black independent schools, where suddenly these children who were labeled ``learning disabled" and ``emotionally disturbed" started learning, and started achieving, and started doing very well. They went on, some of them, to attend some of the top public high schools in the city of New York, and some of our top boarding schools around the country.

The reason African-American parents support; and every poll that is taken shows it; school choice is because in their neighborhoods, if a child is a bright kindergarten student, you can predict that in two or three years that student will be two years behind in reading or math. Parents know this, but they are forced by zoning laws to send their children to these schools, where they know their children will fall behind because these schools are failing. They do not have any choices.

If a child is a very achieving child, very bright, does their homework every day, get A's in school every day, and the parents have a dream of their child maybe going to the Bronx High School of Science, which is a great public high school in New York, they do not know that you can not get there from here. I do not care how many A's you get and how much of your homework you do. If you attend a low-performing public elementary school in New York, and then go to a low-performing public junior high school; and you are tracked from low-performing to low-performing, there is no way you can get into the Bronx High School of Science, because you have not been prepared academically. So these parents discover that these wonderful dreams they had for their child of becoming a doctor, and this child who was always getting great grades, suddenly they do not have a chance, because the schools that their child attended at the elementary and intermediate level did not prepare them for Bronx Science.

Then you have parents whose children are just average achievers and have dreams of going away to college. Well, low-performing public high schools do not have college counselors, and where they do, they have a load that is incredible, and they do not think of these children as going away to college. They are all prepared to go to community

colleges, if they graduate at all. And it is as if, going away to a four-year college is not part of the high school experience. In many of these high schools SATs are not even part of the school culture. Students have not heard about the SAT exam until it is too late.

These parents want the same choice that all of us in this room have. All of us in this room have the resources, either the financial resources or the connections, to place our children either in a good private school or in a good public school. Teachers send their children to good public schools, not low-performing public schools. They do that because they have choices that African-American parents, low-income and working-class, do not have.

I see the stop button. I would just like to conclude by saying that African-American educators also in large numbers support school choice. They are the ones who are trying to set up alternative public schools and black independent schools, so that black children in these communities can have a chance.

Thank you, and I will be happy to answer any questions.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF GAIL E. FOSTER, FOUNDER, TOUSSAINT INSTITUTE FUND; BOARD MEMBER, BLACK ALLIANCE FOR EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS, NEW YORK, N.Y. – SEE APPENDIX D

Chairman Boehner. Thank you, Dr. Foster. Ms. Weingarten?

STATEMENT OF RANDI WEINGARTEN, PRESIDENT, UNITED FEDERATION OF WORKERS; VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Ms. Weingarten. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Miller and the members of the Committee.

Let me just say, because I want to talk a little bit about what we have done in New York on some of these issues, particularly turning around low-performing schools, which, by my count, in the last three years we have now turned around about 60 of them. But I want to talk about both turning around low-performing schools and attracting and retaining qualified teachers, and I want to talk about it from the perspective of not just my union role, but as a former high school teacher for six years in an inner city high school, and as a former Wall Street lawyer.

Obviously, you know that the AFT believes that the federal role in education is critical; particularly for urban areas lacking adequate property wealth these federal supplements are essential. We have often seen that the poor kids get the least resources, and I see that every day, since I am in schools three times a week.

Federal education programs have to promote quality public education for all of our nation's children. They should promote high standards in curriculum, and I particularly want to emphasize that point because if the district has the same standards in school by school by school, then you do not get to the problem that Dr. Foster just mentioned. So high standards in curriculum, they have to level the playing field through targeting low income areas, they have to reflect the national priorities, and they have to be, as both the Chairman and Mr. Miller have said, accountable for results.

We saw that Title I changes in 1994 started pushing us in that direction, and attached to my testimony you will see some of the nascent results. Over the course of the last six years, we have turned around at least eight city school districts. They have shown sustained improvement for the last three years. I will not go through that because time does not permit.

But what we want to do is we want to build on that success, and particularly, not just, with all due respect, talking about these big long bromides, but getting into the meat of the sandwich. We have talked about how to create the sandwich; now we have to get into the meat of it.

In terms of the pending legislation, the AFT is very pleased that President Bush's new administration has put so much effort into the reauthorization and making education the top priority. And his proposal, as reflected in the Chairman's bill, as well as in Miller-Kildee bill, and as well as the Roemer-Dooley bill, they all reflect several common themes that the AFT believes are very important themes: accountability, flexibility, choice, teacher quality and targeting. And obviously the devil is going to be in the details.

Let me tell you why the AFT believes that the Miller-Kildee bill incorporates most of those key elements, and is the bill that we are focusing on. First, it increases funding and targeting for Title I. It continues key programs, like class size reduction, like comprehensive school reform, like reading, like technology, like afterschool programs and school safety. And it addresses new areas of need, areas that I see every single day in New York City, including school construction; since we still need, in our borough of Queens, for example, seats for 80,000 kids right now; and alternative services for suspended or expelled kids.

The AFT particularly appreciates H.R. 340's emphasis on improving the quality of teaching by providing teachers with high quality professional development, and ensuring that all teachers are qualified to teach in the field in which they are teaching. And we are especially pleased with the new focus on assisting high poverty schools to provide adequate compensation for their teachers, which will help high-need schools struggling to attract qualified teachers.

Now, the Chairman's bill also incorporates, as I said before, the recommendations of the administration. But it maintains the basic stricture and structure of Title I, and that is very important, and we very much appreciate that.

Let me just focus on one thing. When you turn around low-performing schools, which we have done in New York City, it takes several things, several important things.

It takes creating professional development, lowering class size, getting a quality teacher in every single class.

What we did in the last several years is we have taken the best practices that we have seen, and we have molded them together, and we have turned around 60 low-performing schools. We have done that by extending the school week by a week, by extending the school day by 40 minutes, by requiring that these low-performing schools can only hire certified teachers, by giving those certified teachers the curriculum, including Success For All and a good math curriculum, and by making sure that everything is aligned in the right direction.

But what it also did, to do all of that, was it cost about $1.6 million in additional resources and revenues per school. So what we are saying is this. Accountability restrictions and constrictions are fine; we are up to that challenge. But you cannot just lift the bar, as Diane Ravitch says. You have to put the ladder steps in there, too. And what we have done in New York in the last few years; and I invite Dr. Foster to see what we have done; we know how to turn around schools. You help us with the resources and with the accountability standards and the alignment, we will do it. Thank you.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF RANDI WEINGARTEN, PRESIDENT, UNITED FEDERATION OF WORKERS; VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, NEW YORK, N.Y. – SEE APPENDIX E

Chairman Boehner. Ms. Weingarten, thank you for your testimony. And for those of you that heard the bells go off, we have ten minutes before a vote, and after that vote will be followed by another vote. And so I think we will take a break here. Sorry to tell you it will be at least 20 minutes, so cool your heels, and we will be back.

We stand in recess.

Chairman Boehner. We apologize to our witnesses and our guests for our absence. Unfortunately, this is how we do business here, and we are all trying to do too much in too little time.

And with that, Dr. Houston, you may begin.

STATEMENT OF PAUL HOUSTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Houston. Chairman Boehner, Members of the Committee, I am pleased to have the opportunity to address H.R. 345, otherwise called the Three R's Bill, introduced by Mr.

Roemer and others. My name is Paul Houston; I am the Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators, which is an organization of about 15,000 local school system leaders. I bring to the testimony about 35 years of experience as a teacher, principal and superintendent, as was noted, in a variety of different kinds of districts, those who have and those who have not. I also have three daughters; one is a private school teacher, one is a public school teacher, and one is still in public school. So I have a personal interest in what goes on as well.

We are here to support H.R. 345 for essentially four reasons. We believe it targets funds to schools with large concentrations of high-needs students and schools with low resources. We feel that it deserves support because it sets high goals for student achievement, and places clear accountability for achievement on schools and school districts, and not on the students themselves. It also takes steps towards creating a bigger funding stream to drive a percentage of federal funds to the local level. It also promotes school choice while rejecting vouchers.

In terms of targeting, targeting we feel is the single most important issue in the reauthorization of ESEA for our organization. It is the first priority because we feel the state funding systems tend to provide more money to middle-income and wealthier school districts in proportion than they do with schools where families from low-income, or schools that rely on property taxes from agriculture. Since 1970, the state courts have begun to reduce that gap, but it is still unconscionably high in most states. And we are on record as encouraging further litigation, in fact, at the state level that would produce not just equal funding, but sufficient funding to meet the needs of all students.

We feel the Federal Government is more able to target funds than local or state government. My own experience as a local superintendent, I have found that while school boards worry about that sort of thing, it is sometimes hard for them to equalize funding within a district. And certainly we know that many states and state legislatures are controlled by suburban areas and not by the areas where the greatest needs are.

The January 1998 GAO study of state and federal efforts to target poor students found that states averaged spending an additional 62 cents for every dollar they spent on students, while the Federal Government spends $4.73 for poor students for every dollar they spend on other students. So it is very clear the federal record is much better at targeting than at the state level, despite the fact that there have been efforts made to improve that.

Title I has essentially always been a targeted program, and we feel that moving Titles II and IV in that direction is appropriate. Currently in the proposed bill, 60 percent of the Title II money would be targeted for poverty. That is better than the 50 percent that is currently. We would like to see most if not all of it targeted that way, but it is certainly a step in the right direction.

We also applaud the efforts at making support for small rural schools, again, that are dependent upon the lower taxes from agricultural areas, and where the isolation is sometimes a problem. In summary on this part, we would be supportive, because it does move a greater percentage of federal funds to districts for high-needs students, and we

think that is a good start.

We are also supportive because of accountability. We recognize the Congress, state legislatures and local boards need to hold school districts accountable, and we strongly support provisions that require clear evidence of student achievement, and that schools are progressing towards new standards. We believe that accountability for results is the largest part of the new covenant between schools and the communities that they serve.

But we think accountability, while it has to include test scores, has to be more than just test scores. And we believe that the tests used must be used properly. They need to be used for the purposes for which they were validated. And we also support the disaggregation of data, which would help focus on where the real needs in schools are.

We also have to make sure that we build an accountability system that students understand, and that the information is given back to the schools and school districts in a timely manner. It is no good to have a testing system that does not provide information back so it can be used properly. And it needs to be built on state standards, and also providing this regular feedback so that both quantitative and qualitative information is available.

We also recommend that every time a state uses a test for multiple purposes, that it be valid for those purposes. Unfortunately, what we are seeing is many states using tests for many reasons when the test was only validated for one of those. And as I said, we believe that the feedback needs to be timely and be given back in a fashion where it can be used.

We also believe that disaggregation is a very positive approach which allows you to focus particularly on those with high need and low income. And we feel that if we are serious about serving these students, we need to rate the schools based upon the lowest group recorded, not all groups put together.

We also found in our research that in many cases states tend to buy the cheapest test package from test developers, or buy tests from off the shelf, and sometimes those do not reflect the standards that have been set for the state. And if that is the case, we would urge you to allow states, schools, school districts or consortiums of school districts to use alternative assessments, and not just those that have been purchased for cost purposes.

We are also very supportive of consolidation. We believe that there is a difference between block granting and consolidation, and unfortunately that sometimes gets lumped together, or consolidated, if you will. We support rolling similar programs together if they create a larger funding stream, and if they are carefully targeted to high-needs students in low-resource schools. We will support consolidated programs that have a clear purpose, are focused on high-needs students, and also that hold schools accountable.

I see my red light is on, so I will sum up by saying that we support the issue of choice, public school choice, and programs that promote more public school choice. We have serious reservations about sending public money to private schools, and we feel that

in an era where we want to make sure we leave no child behind, we also need to make sure we leave no school behind in the process. And when we have students who leave and take part of the resources with them, that is a problem.

Again, thank you very much for allowing me to share some of our thoughts with you this morning.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PAUL HOUSTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX F

Chairman Boehner. Dr. Houston, thank you very much. Mr. White?

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. WHITE, CHAIRMAN, CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION, FLINT, M.I.

Mr. White. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee. My name is William S. White, and I am President of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, located in Flint, Michigan. Like the others, I have a daughter who is a public school teacher and a son who is a student. I have come here today to be contrarian, and urge you to maintain the 21st Century Community Learning Center initiative as a separate program with a separate appropriation as set forth in current law. In the meantime, examine the data from the graduating programs, and then make your decision.

The Mott Foundation has more than 75 years of experience in funding and supporting community/school partnerships designed to help meet the needs of children and families in local communities. And it has committed more than $100 million to support the 21st Century after-school initiative, which began at the local level only three years ago. In those 75 years we have gained some insight on what works.

I believe that the proposals before you could seriously undermine the program that, while only in its infancy, is bearing important results. In debating these proposals, I would ask that you consider three fundamental points.

One: scale and momentum. The program has momentum. It has grown very rapidly from a pilot program to its current funding level of $846 million. This scale is the best chance we have ever seen to make a permanent difference in how communities and schools work together. It is too soon to make wholesale changes in the program. If we do, we risk losing a lot.

Two: leverage. The federal dollars and Mott's involvement have leveraged millions of dollars in the private sector, as well as local and state dollars.

Three: public will. Data shows that after-school programs are popular and make sense to the American people. That base of public will can be the foundation for building long-term support for public education.

If the program must change, there are several things to consider. Education and Accountability: the 21st Century program first and foremost is about education. Its other benefits and byproducts, such as keeping kids safe, reducing juvenile crime in after-school hours, opening schools and giving parents flexibility to work, are important too.

The program has substance, content, focus, and a commitment to quality through competition. After all, competition breeds quality and requires planning. Evaluations are in place to measure impact. Like the Congress, as a funder I want this program to be accountable for helping kids succeed.

School-based, or school-linked: the contributions that community-based organizations bring to education are priceless, and long overdue. But to keep the initiative focused on education, to build public will for education, and to be accountable for performance, the link to school is absolutely essential.

Local partnerships: local partnerships have been the cornerstone of the 21st Century after-school program, sparking new partnerships between schools and all facets of their communities, including faith-based organizations and the business community. Requiring these partnerships helps promote local sustainability.

Public-private partnership: the Mott Foundation has been able to do things the Department of Education couldn't do. We funded training for after-school providers. We funded the identification of promising practices. We have supported advocacy in state policy work. We have supplemented the federal evaluation dollars. We have served as a convener at the national and state levels, bringing folks together who otherwise wouldn't be talking to each other about what is best for kids. We have helped bring other private funders to the table, including major philanthropies and Fortune 500 companies.

All this has been possible because the 21st Century after-school initiative is a competitive, targeted, extended-day learning program based on accountability. Local programs are helping kids find the hero within. Thank you.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. WHITE, CHAIRMAN, CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION, FLINT, M.I. – SEE APPENDIX G

Chairman Boehner. Thank you, Mr. White. Let me thank all of our witnesses for their excellent testimony.

Mr. Bailey, can you tell us a little bit about your coalition, and what the goals of the coalition are?

Mr. Bailey. Yes, Mr. Chairman. The Coalition consists of a group of both individual businesses, as well as business organizations, which have a very simple goal. We want

the school systems to have higher standards, we want high quality assessments against those standards, and we want the schools to be held accountable for results, and we want students to be given the opportunity to succeed.

It is an ad hoc coalition. As I mentioned in my earlier comments, I believe it is the largest single business coalition that has been put together around the topic of education. And the business community generally, I believe, has built on our long history of involvement in education, but it has gotten much more pronounced in recent years as our concerns have grown with regard to the quality of education, and therefore the ability of our education system to produce the kind of fluency in students that we need to populate our companies as we move forward into the next century.

I can speak specifically for my company in that the three major business unit heads last year each identified finding qualified work force as their primary concern for the next decade.

Chairman Boehner. How active do you expect the Coalition to be beyond later this spring or early summer, when we expect to complete this bill, when it comes to actually implementing the bill and doing the work that is necessary at the state level?

Mr. Bailey. Well, I think the Coalition in its current form is created to principally work through the federal legislation, but I would not expect either the enthusiasm or the energy level or the commitment of the business community to wane once we get into the balance of the challenge of improving education. Our commitment is in the bottom line; the commitment is to improve education.

We recognize that the Federal Government has an important role, but a limited role. As my recollection is, federal money represents around seven percent of the total spent with regard to K through 12 education, and so it is clear that it is an important amount of money, but a lot of what happens will and should happen at the local and state level. And we will be involved at that level as well.

Chairman Boehner. That is really the point of my questioning, is that as you heard the slight differences in approach between Mr. Miller and I in our opening statements, there is a role that the Federal Government has played, and there is a role the Federal Government is going to play as we move into this process.

But if we are going to be successful, it is a limited role that we are going to play. And if we are going to actually solve this problem, a lot more action is going to have to happen at the state and local level to target resources, sufficient resources. I would just encourage you to not do what a lot of coalitions do: come to town, help pass a bill, and then they are gone. Real work in the states would be very helpful, I think, for all of America's children.

Dr. Foster, I appreciate your testimony. After you, Ms. Weingarten gave her testimony. You are both from the same area, you both taught in the same schools. What do you think about the approach that Ms. Weingarten presented the Committee?

Ms. Foster. I am glad you mentioned I was from New York City. Because I said Toussaint Institute Fund, some people thought Arizona. So we have cleared that up.

Chairman Boehner. I was listening closely to your testimony.

Ms. Foster. Thank you. You know, there are two problems. One is time. Ms. Weingarten talked about turning these schools around. You see, for a kindergarten student, if you spend three years turning the school around, that child is now two years below grade level. Whereas if that parent would have had the choice, the option to transfer to another good public or private school, that child would be on grade level or above. In just three short years, in that much time, a child maybe who acts out a little gets placed in special ed. Statistics and every study shows, every parent knows, every black parent, that you never get out of special ed. It's a tracking. Special ed leads to the juvenile justice system. So that child's life is gone.

So parents are losing their children's lives. Three years in a low-performing elementary school means that this bright, gifted child has blown the chance to go to the Bronx High School of Science, or Stuyvesant High School, one of the city's top public high schools.

So when you are talking about parents trying to save their children's lives and futures, it is really the time thing that is an issue.

The other thing is that for years and years and years, well-meaning people have talked about changing the school systems. The Toussaint Institute Fund has been around 12 years; thousands of parents have been coming through our doors trying to escape these schools that lots of well-meaning people like Ms. Weingarten have been working to change. So we have no confidence that these changes will take place.

If I can just say, the Black Alliance for Educational Options, which is a national organization of African-Americans that really supports empowering parents to have choice and options, we support public and private school vouchers, and charter schools, and tuition tax credits. But we are really concerned about the low-income and the struggling working-class parents who are stuck. So this is not a philosophical or political debate for those parents, and my concern is that for many, it is the political or philosophical issue they are trying to defend.

You know, philosophically we must defend unions, and unions are so important, so important in the history of our country, that you get concerned, well, what happens to teachers if parents start going, using their voucher dollars to go to private schools? And that is a philosophical discussion someone might want to have, but in terms of parents trying to save their children's lives, it just doesn't hold up.

Chairman Boehner. Thank you. My time has expired.

Ms. Foster. Thank you.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Miller.

Mr. Miller. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you to all the panelists.

Ms. Weingarten, the Chairman and myself had an opportunity to spend a weekend with your superintendent of schools, and he threw out the challenge that he would be fully prepared to take some of the Chancellor schools that you discussed and compare them to the suburban schools, because of the kinds of changes that have taken place. I was quite struck with your testimony, in pages six through nine, the extent to which the response has really been customized in terms of differential pay for teachers, assignments of teachers, giving first priority to the low-performing schools for the properly certified and qualified teachers. I just wondered if you might want to expand on that, because I think a lot of us are concerned that big districts get into a cookie-cutter mentality and aren't able to change. I share all of Ms. Foster's concerns about the urgency of time in a young child's life.

Ms. Weingarten. Right. I want to say this very publicly; Chancellor Crew and I took a big risk in June of 1999, then-Chancellor Crew. The new state assessment tests in New York for fourth graders had just been implemented. And we had seen what we had done in terms of the Chancellor's district. I actually wish Dr. Foster would come with me to some of these schools, because the 60 schools that I have talked about, the 12 elementary schools that first went into the Chancellor's district, within a year of them going into the Chancellor's district, all of them were on the ``off the SUR" list, which is our low-performing list.

But the real issue becomes; and we see this both with the Catholic schools, who, by the way, in New York the Catholic schools are unionized. So the issue about unionization is not an issue. But we have seen this in both the Catholic schools and the public schools; we see the same things. Reading, we do about the same in the early grades. Both school systems do a not very good job in terms of math, and that gets punctuated as the years go on. Same in terms of the suburban-city split.

So what we have been trying to do is do a lot of this analysis, as you are seeing, and customizing the analysis to different schools. What Chancellor Crew and I realized was that we had to do several things at the same time; that we had to do different things in different schools, yet there were certain things that had to stay constant.

We both took the responsibility; we took over 40 schools at one time, which is a lot of schools to take over at one time. And now we are prepared to do another 40 schools, now that we have done the first 40. What we tried to do was first realize that if you do not have a quality teacher in every single classroom, and a quality principal, you are not going to have the staff support to really do all the work you need to do.

And we needed to increase the number of certified teachers in these places, because we know that in order to have a quality teacher in each of these classrooms, you are going to have to start with state certification. And so what we initially did was we increased compensation by 15 percent. But we also said to folks, you are going to have to work more of an organized day. Most of these folks were working well beyond their six hours and 20 minutes anyway, but we were going to organize more time.

And so the organized time came in two ways, a week before the start of the school year, and 40 minutes a day every single day. And we used it in two ways. We used it for professional development at the school site, done by really good people who knew their stuff. And we also used it to help kids who were falling behind, so that we could really catch kids who needed that safety net. So we used it for professional development and that.

Then we also reduced class size. Then we also instituted, along with the professional development, a core curriculum, first Success For All, and then a Math Trailblazers curriculum in math. And then we also had after school programs, and then we had parental participation.

We did all of that at the same time, and what we saw in the first year of those 40 schools, even after Chancellor Crew left; I was very concerned when he left that it would get destabilized, because this was the Chancellor's district; was that we had enough traction so that the people at the school levels really kept moving forward. And in the first year, we saw basically a nine point increase in reading scores.

Mr. Miller. Thank you. Mr. Bailey.

Ms. Foster. May I clarify something?

Mr. Miller. Mr. Bailey, I am a little concerned, when I look at the Republican legislation, the bill that was introduced on the Administration's behalf, and even with some concern by the Administration, that there is backsliding on the use of the NAEP to try to see how we are doing in these various states. We do have a national exam that is, I think, considered by most people to be pretty good in measuring educational attainment and achievement.

I will express my concern. If the Chair will let you respond, I would appreciate it. When I look at the members of the Coalition for Education, whether it is Apple or AOL or your own company, or Boeing or others, and you are in worldwide production, these companies that produce in China and Malaysia, the United States, Mexico, have a world standard. You don't turn out a phone that is good enough for England, but it is not good enough for the United States, or it is not good enough for Japan but it is good enough for Mexico.

I am a little concerned that we are slipping back on this idea of a benchmark, because historically students have done pretty well on state tests, and then when they come to take the NAEP, they drop rather dramatically. This suggests that maybe the state test is a test that can be taught to, or maybe is very narrow in its measurement. I would hope that the business alliance would keep in mind that we need some manner; I am not talking about a national curriculum or mandated state tests; we need some way, if we are going to put up another $150 billion in this system, that we are getting the same high quality results in Nevada and Louisiana and California that all parents should expect. I am worried that we are backsliding on that component.

I raise that, because I think it is very similar to what many of your executives might understand in trying to keep a very disparate system together to turn out a product

that is of equal quality wherever you turn it out, if you are presenting it to the public.

Mr. Bailey. Well, we certainly agree that there is merit in having a yardstick that is understood, that people can make valid comparisons across the population. And certainly NAEP has served that purpose, as I appreciate that. It has been around for around 30 years. It is a statistical sampling; it is not student-specific in terms of the way data is presented. But it does allow 41 states that use it to have a measure that is again common among them.

We are supportive of the flexibility that H.R. 1 provides. We do think, as Ms. Weingarten has talked about in New York, that individual districts and individual school systems can creatively meet the ultimate objective, which is to have a student population that is performing at the level that everyone would like them to perform at.

Certainly from a business point of view, we would think that the Federal Government could exercise leadership in encouraging efficiency in establishing assessments. We would not argue that NAEP is perfect, but certainly it is the one test that is there today, or the one assessment that is there today that is somewhat uniform across a number of the states, and certainly in 30 years hasn't led to any national curriculum. And I understand that that is a sensitive issue, and it is not something we would support either.

But again, quality assessment is critical, and I think because the Federal Government participation is substantial in absolute terms but at the margin in the total scheme of things, that it can encourage benchmarking and quality assessment that does provide some comparability of measurement across various states.

We operate as a company in 49 states, and we would be very happy to see the quality be uniform across those states. But even within individual school systems, as some of the professionals have pointed out, the quality is not uniform.

Mr. Miller. Thank you.

Mr. Bailey. And what we want to do is see all students have the opportunity, if you follow the principles we have outlined; we don't think it is a smorgasbord. We think the principles knit together into a coherent whole. We think that all students can learn at a higher level, and that the output of our school systems can enable individual students, and ultimately the measure is individual, that a youngster has the opportunities to succeed and fully realize their potential in life. And we think that is doable if the principles are followed.

Mr. Miller. Thank you. Thank you, Ms. Weingarten.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Hoekstra, for five minutes.

Mr. Hoekstra. I thank the Chair. Mr. Bailey, the statement that you have submitted today is silent on the issue of parental choice and parental involvement. It is a key component of the President's plan. Has the Business Coalition for Excellence in

Education evaluated the choice component? And have you taken a position on it?

Mr. Bailey. We certainly have taken a position on the issue of choice. We believe that, as some of the other witnesses have said, the parents ought to have the ability to make choices that they see as being correct for their children. And we are certainly sensitive to the time dimension as well.

We have not taken a position on any particular mechanism, with regard to how to achieve that. But we certainly believe choice is an element that is important in the overall context of the legislation.

Mr. Hoekstra. Good, thank you. In terms of standing up for America's families, standing up for our parents, standing up for our kids, Dr. Foster, your organization is awesome.

Ms. Foster. Thank you.

Mr. Hoekstra. Your statement today was awesome, standing up for parents. Listening to Ms. Weingarten talk about, you know, that they have taken over 40 schools and you have improved the performance; congratulations. And you are ready to take over 40 more. What happened to the kids in those schools for this year? Those 40 failing schools?

Dr. Foster, I think you wanted to respond to what was being said earlier. That is what I am concerned about. Those kids were locked into that school for this year with no opportunity. Dr. Foster?

Ms. Foster. Well, what I wanted to clarify was that when Ms. Weingarten talked about a school getting taken off the SUR list, that the Chancellor works hard with these public schools to turn them around and works with the teachers, and that they get taken off the SUR list, you have to understand that to be removed from the SUR list does not mean that you are suddenly a performing school. It only means that you are not considered the lowest of the lowest of the lowest-performing schools. So you are still a low-performing school. A child still can't get there from here, or get here from there.

And so it is really important that we make that clear. And that was what I wanted to clarify. A school has to fail for several repeated years in a row, and fail to show improvement year after year after year after year, in order to get on the SUR list.

Mr. Hoekstra. Yes, I just wanted to say that in the hearings that we have held, ``Education at a Crossroads,'' we have been in New York City, we have been in Tampa, Cleveland, Milwaukee, Chicago. And in almost every situation, we have heard the voice that you articulated today, of a parent coming in and saying, my child has been in a failing school for two years, three years. There was a five-year plan to improve the schools; this was what we heard in New York the first time. A father came in and said, you know, my daughter was in a failing school for five years. They had a five-year plan, and the schools aren't any better now. Now they have a new five-year plan.

Ms. Foster. That's right.

Mr. Hoekstra. I have lost five years, and if this new plan does not work, I have lost my child. You know, I have not gotten help from the school system.

So I will tell you, we met with Virginia who is heading up the effort for the BAEO, and working with BAEO here in Washington, D.C.

Ms. Foster. Yes, Virginia Walden, a member of the board.

Mr. Hoekstra. And I just applaud the voice that you are bringing to this process, in speaking eloquently not as a Democrat or a Republican or a conservative or a liberal, but speaking up for a parent's right to be a full partner in this process, and that the way to do that is to bring about, not only accountability, which is the assessments and the tests and those types of things, but bringing up the message that says, you know, let's make room for parents in this process, in a process that for too long parents have been moved out of the process.

The work that you guys are doing, the standards that you are setting, thank you very much for that. I applaud you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Kildee.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. White, you mentioned in your testimony your opposition to consolidating the 21st Century Community Learning Center programs with other programs. This bill, H.R. 1, consolidates it with the Safe and Drug-Free Schools program. Could you expand upon your opposition to that consolidation?

Mr. White. I am basically talking from the viewpoint of the after school initiative. And I am speaking as a funder. We fund programs all the time. We work with community-based organizations. We work with all sorts of organizations. And we have to make tough decisions from time to time about where the dollars go.

And one of the things I have found, regardless of the program area, whether it is education, the environment, or working in Central or Eastern Europe, I have found that it takes a minimum of five years, really, to get a good program in place. So speaking as a funder, I come at this program, really, you are not going to get your first results out of this program until this June. And yet you are going to change the program. As a funder, that, to me, does not make any sense. So that is where I am coming from.

I am not saying anything about Safe and Drug-Free Schools. I am not an expert on that. All I do know is that these programs, from the limited data that we have been able to get from the first round of grantees, is they are reducing pregnancy, they are reducing crime, they are increasing achievement in reading and math, and we are increasing attendance. And I expect that if those types of things are happening, the odds are that probably the schools are working, they are a little safer, and maybe they are drug-free. So I look at it as a separate type; that is why I am looking at it separately.

The other thing I would say is, there is some census data that has recently been done, and the Census Department studied schools in about 1992-1994, in that period. And they found out that if you were a kid engaged in sport, engaged in some club, some after school program, some type of positive, productive, engaged activity, the odds are you had a chance of being on grade. Seventy-five percent of those kids are on grade. And if you were not engaged, you only had a 60 percent chance of being on grade.

So I think there is beginning to be compelling evidence. And I would just like to see the data come in, and then if the program is no good, pitch it. If it is good, let's stick with it and improve it.

Mr. Kildee. I know the Mott Foundation. I've known it virtually all my life. The Foundation is a little older than I am. Your approach is a very objective, result-oriented manner, I know that.

Do you feel that five years' experience is a good benchmark to determine whether a program is working well? And if you consolidate it with another program, that the results are not that easily measured?

Mr. White. I have found that wherever I go, the five years works. Whether it is with a community-based organization, a neighborhood organization, whatever it might be, it takes a while to get the leadership team in place. And if you are working in the school as my daughter is, and you get different educational philosophies, it takes a year or two to sort it out at the local level.

So it just takes a while to get that done, yes. So I find that is worthwhile.

I had one other point, but I can't think of it right now.

Mr. Kildee. You answered my question there. You have traveled throughout the world. You traveled through the Soviet Union. I think you gave a talk, recently, on 21st Century Learning Centers in London. Can you give us some examples of some positive results of this three-year experiment we have had so far, which you have helped fund significantly?

Mr. White. Well, yes, I have mentioned the reductions in juvenile delinquency, and I have mentioned the increase in grades and attendance.

Years ago, I was in a school in Utah. And the principal thought it was so important that that school be open after hours to meet the needs of the community. So he was doing it himself, with no funding.

And we were walking through the school, and a little girl came up to him. She was in tears about the seventh grade. She says, I don't know what to do. I have a friend, and this friend, her parents are getting divorced, and she is thinking of taking drugs.

Mr. Hoekstra. [Presiding] Excuse me for just a second. I am not interrupting your time, but we were informed, Ms. Weingarten, do you need to leave?

Ms. Weingarten. Yes, I do.

Mr. Hoekstra. All right. So they asked me to interrupt and say you have got permission to leave. If you are catching a plane or wherever you need to go, feel free to leave.

Ms. Weingarten. Thank you. We have a math commission in New York today, and we wanted to really focus on that.

Mr. Hoekstra. Okay.

Ms. Weingarten. So I need to be there. Thank you.

Mr. Hoekstra. Great. Thank you very much for being here, as a part of this panel.

Ms. Weingarten. Thank you, I appreciate it. Thank you.

Mr. Hoekstra. Mr. White?

Mr. White. Fine.

Mr. Hoekstra. Excuse my interruption, and please continue.

Mr. White. I once worked on the floor of the New York Stock Exchange. You would always start a joke, and you know, two months later you would finish the punch line. So anyway, this little girl is in tears, and so obviously I step aside. But that principal was there for that kid when they needed him, and to me, we need to be there for kids. And all this testing, we know which kids in the first grade know their letters; we know which kids don't recognize words. We know that. And we have got to figure out how to be there for the kids.

One of the reasons I like to support the public schools is that all kids pass through them. We need to make them the best. I would like to get rid of all buildings. Turn it into a real estate investment trust. Get school boards out of the building business, it is not their business. Their business is education, and they ought to be working to figure out, with all the community agencies; whether they are churches, whether they are Y's, whether they are someone else. I have seen great programs in YMCAs. But they ought to be working the whole community to make sure every kid is taken care of.

One of my board members was Alonzo Crim, with the Atlanta school district; some of you probably knew him. Alonzo, as superintendent, he had a kid he mentored for three solid years, to try to save that kid. So that seems one of the things. We need to bring the community in and do everything we can to help that kid. And if that kid is in one of those schools we heard about, where they are trapped and they can't get to where they want to be, we need someone there advocating for that kid. So that is where I come from.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you very much, Mr. White.

Mr. Hoekstra. Thank you. Mr. Schaffer?

Mr. Schaffer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Dr. Houston, my first question is for you. Reading through your testimony, and you are here on behalf of the American Association of School Administrators, you have a statement on page three, which is just one sentence. It says, ``the Federal Government is more able to target funds than either local government or state government." Is that the position of the Association?

Mr. Houston. I think it is more our history than our position.

Mr. Schaffer. So it is not your position?

Mr. Houston. Well, I think the reality is that we have not seen the targeting done at the state level historically, despite efforts.

Mr. Schaffer. Okay. I just want to get it, is this the position of the Association?

Mr. Houston. Yes.

Mr. Schaffer. It is? Okay, thank you. You also said that the Association is strongly opposed to public money ending up in private schools through a voucher program. Yet, that is really one of the central features of H.R. 1 and the Bush plan. And you know, we really cannot envision the bill getting to the President's desk without this important provision. In fact, the option of eventually, for Title I students, being able to take their Federal Government money to a private school, is something many of us have been waiting for a long time to even be able to discuss. The door has finally been opened on private school vouchers. And it is an important, in fact a central, part of this bill.

You know, this is the real opportunity to get our foot in the door on private school choice. Why would you want to deny any family the opportunity to send their child to a school that offers more promise and a better opportunity for that child with federal funds any longer?

Mr. Houston. Well, I agree with you. I think it is an extremely important issue, and deserves probably a lot more discussion and study than it will likely get in the process of being buried within a larger bill. It is interesting, from my standpoint, from my association, which is made up of members, about half and half between the two parties, we are also made up of people from urban, suburban and rural. So we are split all over the place on almost every issue you can think of.

Except this one. This is the one issue where the whole membership almost en masse comes together in opposition. And it is because, I think there are so many issues involved. It is very difficult at one level to argue for the one parent who has a child who wants to get out and move that child, it is very difficult to make that argument to say it is a bad thing for that parent. But you have the issue of the children who are left behind in that school that is failing, and what is to be done with those children that are still there?

You have the whole tension between whether education is a public good or a private good, and the issue of public policy played out as to what is the responsibility.

Mr. Schaffer. So a private school isn't capable of contributing to a public good? Is that kind of the conclusion?

Mr. Houston. No, it is what the public money is used for. As I said, I have a daughter who teaches at a private school, and she has a wonderful experience there. A lot of my friends are private school educators. One of the issues with vouchers is it may be one of those things, you have to be careful what you wish for because you might get it, because once you start having public funds going to private education, then the issue of accountability comes into effect. How are you going to hold the schools accountable for the use of that money? Not all private schools are wonderful; some of them aren't.

Mr. Schaffer. Thank you. That brings up one of the questions I want to make sure I ask of Mr. Connor. When it comes to the private school voucher, as some have called it; I really don't regard it as a voucher so much. But eventually, if a child is in a failing school long enough, they would be able to choose to take their Title I funds to a private school, which, under H.R. 1, would obligate that private school to test the child under the new federal testing mandates in the bill. Does your organization support that notion of the Federal Government requiring a testing, having a testing mandate for private schools?

Mr. Connor. No, we do not.

Mr. Schaffer. Thank you.

Mr. Connor. And may I say simply that on the choice issue, we would like to see the bill be more aggressive, and we share Dr. Foster's concern about leaving the child in a failing school.

Mr. Schaffer. Thank you. Dr. Foster, you have indicated your passion; I agree with Congressman Hoekstra. I think your testimony, of all those who have come here today, speaks directly to children and looking at children first, and institutions perhaps second or even later. In order to get the real liberty in this bill, the school choice, a child has to languish in a failing school for three years before they are able to choose. My first question, is that about right? Too long? Too short?

Ms. Foster. That is absolutely too long.

Mr. Schaffer. And secondly, the Department of Education has identified 8,000 schools today that are failing, some of which have been failing for five years, others for a shorter period of time. I would like you to comment on the amount of time a family and a child has to endure a failing school before they get choice, and ask you just your organization's opinion on that time period.

Ms. Foster. Yes, I am very disappointed in the three-year time period. That kind of falls into some of the comments you have heard other people make about, you know, just give us time, we will improve the school, and children are losing their futures in that time.

You know, when people say; and I just want to respond to this ``dumping ground'' issue; the lowest performing schools are already dumping grounds. That is what they are. All of us in this room have escaped those schools. So now we are saying, close the hatch and don't let the rest escape. That is an issue.

Accountability? These parents want respect. They don't have respect in the public schools they are in now, because they are the lowest low-income parents, they are the least empowered parents. But when they can say, listen, I can take my $8,000 that the state gives per child, and I can take it to any public or private school of my choice. I can take it to the charter school across the street, or the black independent school down the street, or any other private or public school, then I get respect. Then I can stand up and I can get that principal and get those teachers to work with me to turn that failing public school around.

Mr. Schaffer. Thank you. I hope we can advance your dreams and goals in education.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair would attempt to correct the record that in current federal law, where services are provided by a private school for Title I services, assessments are in fact required. And we leave it to, under current law, between the local public school and the private school that is providing the services. And in H.R. 1, the provision does not change at all from current law.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, one of the authors of the Three R's Bill, Mr. Roemer.

Mr. Roemer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate you studying up on the Three R's Bill as well, too. In our meetings, I know we have been going over that.

Chairman Boehner. And I appreciate the testimony from your witness here, Dr. Houston, today. And it will be beneficial as we continue to sit down and discuss the issues of consolidation. I thought Dr. Houston did a great job.

Mr. Roemer. Tom did a great job. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Foster, you have talked about a voucher that would be $8,000 that might help a child go from one school that is failing to maybe a private school. The Bush proposal is not $8,000. It's not $5,000. It's not $3,000. It's not $2,000. It's $1,500. And as a product of Catholic schools myself, and of public schools, both of which do a very good job, we have all kinds of new accountability provisions in the Three R's bill and in the Bush bill. And we are trying to figure out more about testing, we are trying to make teachers more accountable, we are trying to make entire schools more accountable.

But then we have this provision in this bill that says you can take $1,500 from a public school and a taxpayer-funded school, and that $1,500 can then disappear and go to a private school; I attended many of these private schools, but my parents and I paid for those choices; and then we don't have the accountability.

As a product of Catholic schools, I am not sure that some of the Catholic schools want to be in a position that they start taking this money, and then the Federal

Government starts to say to them, we are not sure we want this curriculum taught in your school the way you are doing it anymore. I think there is a host of very interesting First Amendment questions, accountability questions, church and state questions. I hope we get into these when we debate this bill.

I have a different question that I would like to ask Dr. Houston initially. We have three bills, as the Chairman has talked about. We have the Bush bill, which has approximately a $500 million increase for this program. We have the Miller bill, which has approximately a $20 billion increase in resources per year for this program, and the Three R's bill, which has about a $7 billion increase in assets and resources and investments for this bill.

I do not know that I will support mandates to our states and our local schools to do more tests, including NAEP tests, if we do not have sufficient resources in this bill to remediate the kids and help them with tutoring and after school programs to then pass the tests. Do you think that $500 million, as opposed to the $7 billion that you have endorsed, what is the difference there, in terms of implementing, and then addressing and remediating, these tests?

Mr. Houston. Well, there is no question in my mind, having served in districts that served wealthy children where they had a lot of resources, and districts where we served poor children where we did not have a lot of resources, that resources do in fact make some difference. And it is very difficult for me to envision a lot of these inner city school districts, or these very poor rural school districts, being able to make the kinds of leaps that need to be made for their children without having sufficient resources.

Actually, there are things in all three of the bills that are being discussed today that we like. There are some things in at least two of them we are not as happy about. But I think the challenge before you folks is to figure out how to shape a bill that really does do what everybody is saying they want done, which is to focus on improving education for America's children, to making sure that we change a system where we historically designed a system that was meant to leave children behind. Our historic design was to sort children out. We have now, as a nation, come to realize that is not a very good model in today's world, that we cannot afford to leave some children out of the mix and behind while other children are moving ahead.

But to make that kind of shift is going to require dramatic resource reallocation, or changing allocation of resources, so that you can target those resources on the children that need them.

There was a discussion about the number of schools that are failing in America. How many of those are failing in rich, suburban communities? Very few.

Mr. Roemer. They have the money. Thank you very much. Let me ask Mr. Bailey a quick question. We have, now, states testing. In Indiana, we do three tests between grade three and grade eight. And we also have this national NAEP test. Now, we have also found that there might be 70 or 80 percent of students passing the state test, but maybe 30 percent of the students passing the NAEP test. So there is a 40 or 50 point spread between those students passing a state test and those passing the NAEP, the

National Assessment of Educational Progress test.

Now, in the Bush bill it says that you can take the NAEP test or another similar test, that you can go ahead and take a Stanford 9, and we never really find out the difference between these states passing their own state tests, and then the comparative tool to align the assessments that you talked about in your testimony, with a NAEP test.

Are you going to support language that merely says the NAEP or similar testing? Or do you insist on a NAEP being the standard?

Mr. Bailey. We would not insist on NAEP being the standard. We certainly believe that quality assessments and quality tests are an important part of what needs to happen.

Mr. Roemer. Who measures that, Mr. Bailey? If you can devise any national test you want at the state level, it becomes just another state test.

Mr. Bailey. Well, but the states, we believe, could be encouraged to partner in testing.

Mr. Roemer. What if Indiana and Louisiana and Ohio and New York all do different tests? You do not have any standard, uniform way to measure the difference.

Mr. Bailey. Well, I think the principle that we support is a principle that the tests need to be high quality; they need to be proven to actually measure what we are attempting to measure. But we are not in the business of designing tests.

Mr. Roemer. That is what a NAEP test is, though.

Mr. Bailey. A NAEP test does that, but we would not argue NAEP is perfect. But we certainly think that it has been proven to be an effective tool and an effective measure over a fairly extended period of years now. But today it still tests a sampling of students in each state. I think the average is around 2,500 students in a state in order to get an assessment. And that sampling, while it has some statistical validity in terms of being a measure, obviously any sample is as good as the sample chosen. And the ultimate issue is to have testing that is comprehensive, and that enables individual students, individual parents and individual schools to be able to measure progress and to remediate where remediation is necessary.

Mr. Roemer. Well, now you are making the argument for the NAEP.

Chairman Boehner. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Souder.

Mr. Souder. I thank the Chairman, and first let me thank all the witnesses today, because whether we are coming from a conservative or a liberal perspective, there is a deep interest in improving the lives of students and improving our education system in the United States. And when we go through these arguments, I think that important premise is important to acknowledge, because it is critical to our nation and to our families and kids.

I want to follow up on the testing question with Mr. Bailey. You have heard both from Mr. Miller and Mr. Roemer how in fact we can evolve to more of a national test. And I want to make a statement here, because I am extremely frustrated with the business community.

I believe we are being led down a path toward national control that has an impact far beyond the question of education. I am asked on a regular basis by the business community; when people come up to me and say, my hand hurts because of repetitive motion, and we said, oh, we don't want a national standard on ergonomics, we're going to leave it at the state level; when somebody comes to me and says, I am really struggling with my health plans and I can't figure out what kind of car insurance to get, the business community comes to me and says, well, we need to have state standards, because we don't want to have a national standard.

When somebody comes to me on telecommunications, about why we decentralized the system rather than having one national standard on telecommunications, or when somebody comes to me on pipeline safety, or when somebody comes to me on energy prices, I say, look, a national standard leads to national control. When you have national control, people manipulate it. Then all of a sudden we won't have energy production in the United States. We will have jobs move overseas if we pass some of these regulations. We won't have adequate health insurance.

Then the business community comes up to us on education; and I understand the motive; the kids in many cases coming into the business community aren't qualified. They are being graduated out, many times with a degree, and they don't have a level of reading. But a national test backup, even NAEP? If NAEP becomes a standard in this bill; and it will be the de facto standard, even if we have an alternative; it will eventually become a politically manipulated test with which to control people.

And I am incredibly disappointed at the business community, and like many other conservatives am continuing to look at this. What is this double standard coming out of the business community, and why should we all the time listen to the business community on other regulation questions, if, when it is in their interest, they are for a national regulation in another category as long as it doesn't affect their direct bottom line?

I just want to express these ideas, and I hope you will take that back to your association, because I know they are committed to education, and I know they are trying to do the right thing. But this pattern, the people who are asking you for a national test do not favor state regulation in other areas either.

And I also wanted to make a brief comment also to thank Dr. Foster for your eloquent testimony. I agree with that very much.

And Mr. Connor, I wanted to ask a follow-up, because I appreciate you raising the science question. This is a very troubling issue to many who have differences in some small parts of the overall science debate. There is no question that science is really important. But I hope you will work with the Committee in looking how, if this passes as a standard, we can have some sort of protection for those who have, not only in science but in other tests, religious convictions that could cause, for example, in a religious

district, if there is a question dealing with the origins, could lead to that district scoring lower on a test because of the religious views. This can happen in English, depending on what book is measured and what the content of that book is. We do not have history in here, but it can happen in history. And I hope that you can work with the Committee, because the Chairman has been very willing overall to work with members on both sides as we look at this, to make sure that the test results actually measure agreed upon standards and don't in effect discriminate against people based on their individual religious beliefs.

Mr. Connor. Congressman, we would certainly work toward that end. Our concern has been, and many of our constituents' concerns have been, that the school system has been more about indoctrination than education. And particularly when you get into these areas, about the origin of the universe, the nature of man, et cetera, this provokes very substantial disagreement, and contributes to undermining many of the parental and religious values that parents seek to inculcate into their children. And they felt that their children have been in a hostile environment. So we appreciate your concern. We certainly would work with the Committee in that regard. And we want to assure that the safeguards that you suggest are present.

Mr. Souder. Thank you.

Ms. Foster. Mr. Chairman? I just wanted to know if I could respond to a question that was raised about the $8,000?

Chairman Boehner. Briefly.

Ms. Foster. Okay. You know, one of the things is that politics has entered into this debate. BAEO is not Democrat or Republican; it is not left or right wing. Actually, it is made up of both Democrat and Republican, left and right wing. And if this $1,500 tax credit is the result of compromise between Democrats and Republicans, then what parents are trying to say to you is we do not need that kind of compromise. You know, we need you to help us escape.

So it is politics that has taken that whole $8,000 and reduced it to the $1,500. And yes, parents would like the whole $8,000. But I can tell you, some of these struggling working class parents and low-income parents, they are working two and three jobs to match that $1,500 so they can escape by any means necessary.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair recognizes the gentle lady from California, Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. Woolsey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bailey, I would love to sit down and talk to you about getting girls involved in technology so you will have a work force in the future. I can't do that; there is too much going on in this room today.

And I am going to start a question with a premise and an assumption that nobody in this room believes that schools who are low-performing schools are doing it on purpose, that there are no administrators, no schools and no teachers that purposefully are not meeting the needs of their students. And if you want to correct me on that, feel free

when I get through.

What is in the way? We know there are schools that have challenges. They are in districts that are tougher than others. Why are we as a nation not stepping up to this so that every parent knows they can send their child to any public school, and that school will meet the need of that student?

We can skim off the top few kids that are going to poor-performing schools and send them to a private institution. Or we can fix our schools for every child in this nation. Tell me, from your perspective, why we are not doing that. Is it we don't have the money in this nation? We don't have the will? The Congress doesn't care enough? What is getting in the way?

Can we start with you, Mr. White?

Mr. White. Thank you. Just to confuse the debate, I am a product of choice, because I would not be here if my parents had not exercised it. And we once funded, probably, experimental vouchers. How is that to confuse it?

I believe that it is because we don't have the will. I mean, absolutely we have got to reach down and we have got to do it at the first, the second, the third grade. So it is will, and we have got to get the community in there so they know what is taking place, and they help the school administrators change.

Ms. Woolsey. Dr. Houston?

Mr. Houston. Well, I would go back to the three points that I think are critical in any debate that you have about these policies and these programs you are talking about. You have got to target the resources where they are most needed, and they are most needed with children with the greatest needs. And you have got to then create enough flexibility that people will use the know-how that they have, and the local knowledge that they have, to make it happen. And then you have got to hold people accountable.

I totally agree with your premise. I have been all over this country; I have been to schools in virtually every state. I have never seen one where people set out purposely to make it bad. There are a lot of conditions around it.

I do think that those of us in the school business have to admit that in some cases we don't always make the right choices, have not always made the right choices. We know, for example, poor schools tend to get the least experienced teachers, the least experienced administrators. We have got to do better at that.

But there is a lot more than just that. If you correct for all that, you have still got a problem of kids coming to school with great need and not always having the resources available, to other children who come to school with less need and have more resources available to them. So you have got to target the resources you have in the places that they need the help the most, and then make sure that those resources are being used effectively.

Ms. Woolsey. Ms. Foster?

Ms. Foster. I think it is no accident that low-performing schools are in low-income districts. Low-income parents have no power. They have no power to pressure school officials, school administrators, anyone, to change those schools. What putting the dollars in the parents' hands, what vouchers, what charters, what these kinds of things do, is it empowers those parents. Now, when we demand accountability, we can get it.

It also puts pressure on the schools in their neighborhoods to improve out of fear that, well, we will lose our students to the charter school down the street; a charter school is a public school, or voucher school. So that is, I really think, fundamentally poor parents don't have power. That is why poor schools are in low-income districts.

Ms. Woolsey. Mr. Connor?

Mr. Connor. Thank you, ma'am. I think the root cause of the problem often is systemic in nature. I think part of it is rooted in the fact that we have had an educational monopoly in the history of our school system. We have had a lack of competition, a lack of meaningful parental choice. We have had interest groups that have placed the interests of bureaucrats and powerful political groups ahead of the interests of children. And often times, we have had a lack of meaningful accountability. I think all of those are factors that have contributed to the problem you have identified.

Ms. Woolsey. Okay. Mr. Bailey?

Mr. Bailey. Well, as I mentioned in my testimony, I think our set of principles that we have provided are comprehensive. But let me share some broader observations.

It seems to me that one of the things that we have lost has been some of the alignment among the various elements that it takes to be successful. Programs have become prescriptive and somewhat fragmented. And you can put a series of well-meaning, well-intentioned programs or initiatives together that, when knit together, don't represent a coherent whole. I think there is an element of that involved.

We have, I think, turned our focus more from the output measures that we really have been talking about this morning, and have been paying more attention to input measures. So I think that that is an element that is important.

Certainly from the standpoint of teachers; and I was taken by Ms. Weingarten's comments with regard to some of the things they did to help failing schools; I think as a general rule in many of the large school districts, the most challenging teaching assignments are regularly given to the least experienced teachers. And I would say that that is wrong-headed. Certainly in a business we wouldn't put our newest graduate engineer on the most demanding construction project.

But on the other hand, that may not be unfair, given the fact that we have no real career ladders any longer for teachers to any significant degree. We are not expecting or rewarding professionalism in teaching to the degree that it needs to be done. And again, I

think that is where the investing in teaching dimension looks at that element.

But to me, it is critical that we look at it on the whole, that we don't look at the individual component parts and lose sight that there needs to be a balance; that these things aren't mutually exclusive, that there clearly is no bolt of lightning that is going to hit everyone in this room where you have a sudden revelation and everything can be fixed overnight because of one simple act. It is much more complex than that.

But I think if we follow the broad standards that have been outlined in our principles, that there is progress that can be made, and that we can achieve the outcomes for students that we all want to achieve.

Ms. Woolsey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Keller.

Mr. Keller. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Connor, as a fellow Floridian and someone who has followed your career for the past decade, I can attest to your lifelong passion for education and your leadership for family values. And I thank you for being here today.

Mr. Connor. Thank you.

Mr. Keller. You are a true hero to the folks back in Florida on those issues.

I would like to make a brief comment on the school choice issue, and then get your thoughts on that. I feel a little bit like deja vu all over again here on this issue. In 1999, the state of Florida, under Governor Jeb Bush's leadership, passed a bill that was nearly identical to H.R. 1 for the state of Florida, called the ``A-plus plan." And what that did was test students, and then provide accountability and school choice, including private school choice, for those schools that failed.

And because I have not yet learned to talk in a sophisticated manner or a diplomat as a freshman Member of Congress, I am just going to address this issue head-on. At the time that that bill was being debated, the opponents said this is going to bankrupt the public schools, by having school vouchers. The supporters said, no, it won't; having these accountability and school choice provisions is going to provide an incentive for the public schools to improve.

Well, now, two years later, we do not have to guess what happened. We went from having 78 F-rated schools to only four F-rated schools. A school in my district, for example, called Orlo Vista Elementary School, where 86 percent of the children are minority, 92 percent are on the free lunch program, went from only 30 percent of the kids passing the standardized test to 79 percent. Another school in the Panhandle called Dixon Elementary, another low-income school, went from 28 percent of the kids passing the standardized test to 94 percent, in only one year. There was a strong incentive to improve, and indeed that is what they did.

I know from your testimony that you are concerned that H.R. 1 does not go far enough, that you want to be even more aggressive with respect to the school choice

provisions. And I am sensitive to that. But based on our experiences in Florida, wouldn't you agree that at least having these accountability and school choice provisions in H.R. 1 will truly provide an incentive for public schools to improve?

Mr. Connor. Yes, indeed, Congressman Keller. And I would suggest that the indisputable, uncontroverted fact is that our educational process has improved in Florida, not only as evidenced by the smaller number of schools that have failing grades, but by the fact that during the 1999-2000 school year over 40 percent of Florida's schools received a school recognition award because of improvement either in the grade level or moving to an A-rated school.

I share Dr. Foster's concern, though, that leaving a child for three years, 25 percent of their educational window, in a failing school is simply not acceptable. In Florida, it is a two-out-of-four year requirement, and I would urge you to consider that. We simply think that these are years that cannot be reclaimed, and we would urge the Committee, and indeed the Congress, to move more aggressively in that regard.

Mr. Keller. Thank you, Mr. Connor. Mr. Chairman, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Andrews.

Mr. Andrews. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the testimony and the intentions of everyone here today. I appreciate hearing what you had to say. And I do agree that we need to move away from the very eloquent debates that we have had to some factual considerations of what affects children.

And with that in mind, Dr. Foster, I wanted to ask you some questions about your very intriguing project you are working on through the Toussaint Institute.

Ms. Foster. That is right, as in Toussaint Overture.

Mr. Andrews. You say that in 1988, the Institute established a fund that, in effect, gave school choice to low-income black male students. How many students have participated since 1988 in that program?

Ms. Foster. About 40 or 50. It is a grassroots-funded program; we didn't get any funding from big foundations.

Mr. Andrews. Do you have any data on the achievements? I assume the oldest student is probably now out of high school, beyond high school age?

Ms. Foster. Yes. Actually, we published the data in the Ravitch and Viteretti edited book, ``City Schools." So that is available there. But we have actually a young man who moved to Texas, who had been in special ed, and he was doing terribly in New York City public schools. We took him out and put him in a black independent school, nurtured him. He learned to read and write, and learned how to behave like one behaves in school. And then, when he moved to Texas and he was placed in a public high school, they didn't

need to put him in special ed. And he graduated from that high school.

We have another young man who is graduating from the Piney Woods Boarding School in Mississippi. We had to get him out of New York City, because there aren't choices at the high school level.

Mr. Andrews. I appreciate the fact that you have been on a shoestring budget. I admire people that try to work on one. Is anyone on the panel aware of more statistically significant data? Is there a body of data available somewhere that measures the progress of children who have participated in programs like the one that Mr. Connor talks about in Arizona, with 13,000 kids involved at the early stages? Is there any data about what happens when children who have been attending low-performing schools are moved to schools of their parents' choice, what happens to them? Is anybody aware of any data on that?

I will tell you what we will do. We will keep the record open, with the Chairman's permission, so you can supplement the answer.

Mr. Connor, did I pronounce your name correctly? My contacts are a little blurry.

Mr. Connor. Yes, you did.

Mr. Andrews. If I understand your testimony correctly, you are in support of the administration's choice option for the Title I money, is that correct?

Mr. Connor. We think it is a good step, yes, sir.

Mr. Andrews. Yes, that is correct. So if I understand, the premise of that is if we had, say, 500 children in a school, and two-thirds of those 500 children consistently failed to perform up to standard on some standardized test chosen by the state that they were in, and if after three years the school failed to dramatically improve that performance, the parents of those children would have the opportunity to take their Title I money and spend it at a school of their choice. That is a fair description, isn't it?

Mr. Connor. That is a fair description. And our concern, frankly, is that it is too little, too late for those kids.

Mr. Andrews. No, I understand. But let's get to another point.

Now, I think I heard you say earlier that once these children, however many, choose to go to the private school, that you do not favor any sort of standardized testing of them once they get there. Is that right?

Mr. Connor. Well, look, we do not favor federal mandates for standardized testing for public schools, and even less so for private schools.

Mr. Andrews. Okay. So you would not favor the standardized tests in the public school in the first place?

Mr. Connor. We don't favor mandating the particular test. We agree with the notion that the state and local school officials ought to be able to select the assessment that they use, and we would favor that same principle for the private school as well.

Mr. Andrews. So you would support the idea of the state and local officials having the right to require these children to take the test once they get to the private school?

Mr. Connor. Well, in the final analysis I would say that I think parents are the ones who have the biggest stake in the outcome of their children's education.

Mr. Andrews. Well, is the answer yes or no? If the state of Florida were to decide to impose its standardized tests on children that had left the public school under the Bush plan to go to a private school, do you think the Florida test should be administered to those children in a private school?

Mr. Connor. We have not taken a position on that. My initial reaction would be that we would not favor a state-imposed test on a private school.

Mr. Andrews. I have to tell you, I find your position completely disingenuous. You just said that based upon the results of standardized tests, we should permit parents to take public money and spend it in a private school. That is a valid position. I don't agree with it, but it is a valid position.

You then say once they get there, the same standardized test that would be used to determine their lack of achievement in a public school cannot be used to measure their achievement or lack of achievement in a private school. Why don't we apply it to the same school?

Mr. Connor. Well, the position is not disingenuous. The position revolves around in part upon government intrusion into private organizations, where we think in the final analysis that parents are the best judge of the results being achieved.

I think there is a legitimate concern for ensuring that children measure up, that they perform to certain levels of performance. I just think that once government begins to mandate particular tests, whether that mandate comes from the state or Federal Government, on private institutions, that there are real concerns that need to be addressed.

Mr. Andrews. So, and I will close this; so it is your position that taking the public money is okay, but taking the responsibility that comes with it is not?

Mr. Connor. No, that is not my position. I think the demonstrated history is that children do well in these schools. In terms of the longitudinal studies; I think if you do some comparisons between how these children achieve in the future compared to those in public schools, they do very well. I am simply suggesting that parents who opt to put their children in a private school, in the final analysis, ought to be the ultimate arbiters of whether or not that school is meeting the needs and expectations of the child. And I have some serious reservation about a mandated test by any form of government to be imposed

on that school system, on that private school.

Ms. Foster. May I also respond briefly, Mr. Andrews?

Mr. Andrews. It is up to the Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. Very briefly.

Ms. Foster. Okay. I just want to say that in New York, private schools don't like to take the state test because it is less rigorous than the test that they give. Private schools give the Stanford test. The state test is much less rigorous, and if you start giving rigorous tests like the Stanford, and then you have to also give a lesser test like the state, you are testing too much.

Mr. Andrews. Dr. Foster, the record is open for you to submit data that would demonstrate your point. We look forward to it.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York, Mr. Owens.

Mr. Owens. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. As a clean-up hitter here, I will try not to be redundant. I want to thank the distinguished and diversified panel here. I have learned a lot.

And I would like to begin by sort of restating what my colleague, Ms. Woolsey, was trying to get at, and that is, the failing schools are not a mystery. They fail for a reason. They have characteristics that are always similar.

A failing school usually has inferior personnel. That is where you find the uncertified teachers. The pattern in New York is that the failing schools, in one case as many as 50 percent of the teachers at a school serving 1,000 kids, 50 percent of the teachers were not certified. And beyond being not certified, they were what you call substitutes, which are different from week to week and day to day, the worst kind of condition you could have at a school where children have difficulty learning. So failing schools do not have the right personnel.

The politics of it, Ms. Foster, you hit it on the head. The politics determined that when New York had a budget crunch several years ago, they encouraged experienced teachers to resign. They gave them an incentive. They encouraged experienced supervisors to resign; they gave them an incentive. They gave experienced principals incentive to resign. So you have had a drain on the system of the most important resource, and that is the professional resources, the expertise that you need to guide it. New York City schools, as a result, are much worse now than they were 20 years ago or 15 years ago. They are steadily getting worse. There is no mystery. You have to have something to counteract that.

There is no mystery, also, that in these areas where you have the failing schools, they usually have the worst buildings. The correlation between the failing schools and the number of schools that have coal-burning furnaces still; we had about 225 a few years ago, now we have had a crusade to get rid of them, now we are down to about 100.

Schools still burning coal, you send your child to school and you put them in harm's way because the pollutants in the air is going to exacerbate his asthma and so forth.

The schools that have no libraries, because elementary schools are not required to have libraries, or they have libraries with the books being 30 and 40 years old, you know, a geography book or a history book. You can find the pattern in the failing schools, it's the same all over.

We had an effort to try to remedy that, or have some influence on that from the federal level, when we reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Assistance Act in 1994. In addition, the Federal Government was encouraging the development of curriculum standards, which would be voluntary; we would just promote them and help the state develop curriculum standards. We also had testing standards, which also were voluntary.

But we also had, added by the Democratic members, a thing called opportunity to learn standards, where, instead of focusing on the child, the classroom, you focus on the system. Is the state and the local education agency, are they meeting certain standards? Qualified teachers, qualified administrators, buildings which are safe to begin with, and conducive to learning, equipment, supplies. You know, can we not have standards, which we encourage states to live up to, not drop the accountability issue on the back of a child himself only? The student himself must be accountable, and we measure what happens in that school by their ability to pass tests. What about the accountability in terms of, have you provided a decent library? Have you provided teachers who are certified, trained? Have you provided laboratories that have some equipment that can help the kid pass the Regents chemistry exam?

So I would like for you to comment for a minute. We have this standard, it actually passed in legislation. It was in the legislation, the Elementary and Secondary School Act. In the dark of night, during the appropriations sessions, it was unceremoniously removed. That sort of standard, opportunity to learn standard, was taken out of the legislation, because from the very point that we had offered amendments to put it in we had resistance from the governors, heavy lobbying from the governors, who do not want to have that kind of accountability standard for the state or local education. They just say the state is responsible for education, in the final analysis.

So, would you comment on the fact that we had the right approach in terms of recognizing you have got to do more than just drop it on the backs of the child and say, you pass these tests? The system has to be accountable. But we deliberately took that out because we did not want that responsibility. That responsibility requires some financing, and some continual provision of resources. I would like each one of you to comment, if you have got time.

Mr. White. You want me to start? First, I don't think there is any silver bullet. If I put on my businessman's hat, if it was a corporation and you had a bunch of failing operations, you would go in, you would replace the personnel in that particular operation. You might reassign them to other operations that were successful. And you would bring in a new team. And I think that is what has got to be done. And I think that is one of the

finest ways.

Mr. Owens. Somebody has to pay the bill, though.

Mr. White. Yes.

Mr. Owens. You cannot have inexperienced teachers.

Mr. White. I agree.

Mr. Owens. You are encouraging the experienced ones to retire, because they cost less.

Mr. White. That is why I say, if they are failing, you get the team out, you bring another team in, you put those people and train them with some top people, and that is the way I would go about it. And that is the finest choice and voucher system, to me.

Mr. Owens. But to achieve that, you must increase the funding.

Mr. White. I beg your pardon?

Mr. Owens. To achieve that, you must increase the funding.

Mr. White. Well, that is why I testified that I think one of the things that has to be done is to increase the public will for education. And we know darn well the public will does not exist there. And that is why I like the after school programs; they bring the public into the school. You start bringing seniors into the school, and they are the ones who vote. And if you don't get the seniors into the school, you are not going to get them in there supporting the education when you need it. So that is where I come from.

Mr. Houston. I would make two points. One is that accountability needs to be spread throughout the system, and everyone has to be accountable, from the top to the bottom and the bottom to the top. And I think that is part of the point that you are making, is it just doesn't stop at the student level, the school level or the district level. It has got to be everybody that has a role.

The other thing I would go to is my own personal experience. I had the interesting career pattern of going from Princeton, New Jersey, which was spending about $12,000 a kid on children, where the vast majority of kids came from homes where the parents were highly educated with very high expectations, and lots of support, to going to Tucson, Arizona, where they were spending $3,000 a year on kids who were coming from homes where the support system was not as strong and the expectations in many cases were not as high.

And that was about the time that the whole standards movement came into play. I have always strongly supported the issue of standards, but it seems to me to have standards and say that the kids in Tucson should meet the same standards as the kids in Princeton, while ignoring the differential of what they bring to the table and what is brought to the table and placed before them in terms of resources, seems to me a bit of

insanity. So I think the point you are making is very well taken.

Ms. Foster. Congressman Owens, my problem with the point that you are making is that if rules and regulations, and court orders and more dollars in the hands of education bureaucracies could improve schools in low-income neighborhoods, they would have been improved over the last 30 years. The reality is that what we need is not more tinkering with old reform movements. What we need is to transform the educational system.

We need a new paradigm, and this new paradigm gets to the heart of how the American system works, and that is power. And in America, the dollar is power. And if you ever want low-income parents to ever have any power over the quality education of their children, you have to put the dollars in their hands. And then they can say to that school and school system, we want highly qualified teachers in our schools or we are taking our dollars elsewhere.

Mr. Owens. Dr. Foster, I would agree with you that we need experimentation and diversity in the way we approach the problem. In a big city like New York, with 1,100 schools, we could have some of them become charter schools with private contractors. We could do some; not vouchers, vouchers is a waste of time. I won't go into that. But I think we could experiment, I would be in favor of that. We can afford to experiment, yes.

Chairman Boehner. The gentleman's time has expired. Mr. Connor, you have something that you want to add?

Mr. Connor. I was going to respond, if I may.

Mr. Owens. Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the gentleman be allowed to respond.

Mr. Scott. Mr. Chairman?

Chairman Boehner. Go ahead.

Mr. Scott. Mr. Chairman, I would yield my five minutes to Mr. Owens so he could complete the answers.

Chairman Boehner. That would be fine.

Mr. Scott. Okay.

Mr. Connor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Congressman.
Mr. Owens, I would suggest simply that the history of federal involvement in education would suggest that more rules and more regulations and more revenue do not equate with better results. In fact, I think the demonstrated history is that they do not translate into better results. And I am not aware of any studies that suggest necessarily that students excel because their teachers are certified. And I would suggest to you that the results of home schooling demonstrate the value and the contribution of people who may not be

certified as teachers, who may not have the same kinds of revenue streams available to them as our public schools do, and who certainly do not labor under the regulations that our public schools do. And yet the record reflects that those yield often very extraordinary and positive results.

Mr. Owens. There are some studies that do show there is a correlation between certified, qualified teachers and the achievements of students. There are some studies that do show that.

Mr. Connor. Thank you. I am simply not aware of them.

Mr. Bailey. As I sense the heart of your question, it has to do with resources and the role of the Federal Government as opposed to local constituencies.

Mr. Owens. No, not really. Any level of government, just provides the resources. It doesn't matter which level of government does it.

The Federal Government's role is seven percent, only seven percent of the education dollars in this country are federal dollars. So the big role in education is state and local. It doesn't matter where they come from. Let us have some standards which say that you recognize you can't expect this child to be educated if you don't meet certain standards in terms of the quality of teachers and the equipment and the physical infrastructure, et cetera.

Mr. Bailey. Well, and that was one of the points I was going to make, is that the overwhelming amount of the resources do come at the state and local level.

But I also would suggest that the public will is built a community at a time, that it is very difficult to drive that from the top. And again, I think the help that can be brought through the education bill; certainly there are resources at the margin. But it can also establish the principles, the benchmarks, and the things that are demonstrated as being conducive to quality student output.

But whether New York City or Tulsa, Oklahoma, ends up having quality schools that either want ultimately are going to be the public will of those two communities, and not because someone in either state capital or in Washington has mandated that they accomplish something.

Mr. Owens. But you would concede that the bully pulpit of the President, and the influence of business organizations and national organizations, has an impact on all this, and that we all have something at stake nationally? The last super aircraft carrier that was launched was short 300 personnel because they couldn't find the personnel in the Navy who had the capability to operate the high-tech equipment. In the kind of world we are going into, it is in everybody's interest to have a better educated population. And all of us can have an influence; although you might be right, the basic decisions are going to have to be made at the local level, and the impetus has to come from the local level.

Mr. Bailey. No, and I don't quarrel with that at all. I would not be here if I didn't have the view that education was the number one priority in our country.

But my sense is that from the bully pulpit, as you described it, some of the best elements or the most impact can come from being a champion for the appropriate principles, the appropriate benchmarks, the appropriate objectives. And there is a resource layer that comes from the Federal Government that can be linked to some of those elements that can be helpful as well.

Mr. Owens. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for your indulgence.

Chairman Boehner. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Payne, for five minutes.

Mr. Payne. Thank you very much. Sorry that I missed the testimony. I did have the opportunity to hear my good colleague, Congressman Major Owens, here.

I just would first of all, Mr. Kenneth Connor, I don't know if I heard your answer correctly when you indicated that there is no correlation between students excelling or quality education and qualified teachers. I would suggest that maybe you go to Exeter or Montclair Kimberly Academy in New Jersey, or the Peddie School.

Mr. Connor. I think you may have recast my answer. But I understand where you are going.

Mr. Payne. Well, give your answer again.

Mr. Connor. Yes, sir.

Mr. Payne. You said that there was nothing that you knew that correlated quality teachers.

Mr. Connor. No, sir. What I said, Congressman, was that I was not aware of any studies that showed that students excelled simply because their teachers were certified.

Mr. Payne. I didn't hear ``simply." Maybe that is the difference.

Mr. Connor. That is the point I am trying to make. And I think, as an example of how students do excel very often in the absence of certified teachers is the example of home-schooled children.

Mr. Payne. I don't think home-schooled children are a good example. People that teach their children at home are not just a typical person who just walks off the street. You usually find that they have a certain amount of expertise, or they have a certain background. I think if you did a study of the parents of students who are in home training, I think you will find there are some particular things.

And you say ``simply because"; simply means to me to be like a parenthetic expression, it is just casual. ``Simply because they are qualified." In my opinion as a

former educator, when you do make statements like that, one, it is easy to misinterpret; two, it seems like it is cavalier.

Mr. Connor. Well, I certainly don't mean to be cavalier, and I don't want to be misinterpreted or misunderstood. I am certainly an advocate of qualified teachers, and I favor accountability measures to assure that, and also empowering parents to choose schools where teachers are qualified, in preference to having their children languish in schools that may be failing over time.

Mr. Payne. Okay. Well, I am glad you clarified it, because I fly a lot, I like to have experienced pilots.

Mr. Connor. You bet.

Mr. Payne. I may have to be operated on, and when you did ``simply," I didn't know what industry you were in, because I was going to get nervous that this didn't grow and grow and grow, that we simply do not need experience.

Mr. Connor. I am confident you would like an experienced and qualified lawyer representing you before the bar.

Mr. Payne. No question about it. Fortunately I don't have to go before them.

But let me ask this question about what do we need in our failing schools. One of the things that is surprising to me is I have heard a tremendous amount of advertising that is going on here in Washington, D.C. I don't know, maybe Dr. Foster, are you connected with the group that is running these ads?

Ms. Foster. Yes, the Black Alliance for Educational Options.

Mr. Payne. How much have you spent?

Ms. Foster. I don't know. You know, I am a member of the board of trustees, but I really do not recall what our budget was on advertising.

Mr. Payne. You figure $5 million, $10 million? I mean, just the D.C. budget.

Ms. Foster. I am not the person to ask.

Mr. Payne. I would really be interested, because I have never seen so much of an interest in poor inner-city people by some anonymous group. Because I wondered if you would do the same thing with housing, which is as bad, I think, as it relates to different parts of our country. I would be interested to know where you stand on the quality of health care. I have seen a tremendous amount, which makes me curious to see. And when I say ``anonymous," I just don't mean that you are somewhere out there in the air. I simply mean by anonymous that this tremendous amount of money is coming to talk about some poor black kids just about education, when, as you know, the health care, the housing, the police protection, even the quality of food they buy at local stores, are all disparate by

virtue of that.

And so the thing that is curious to me is this great philanthropic group that decides that it is ready to save inner-city kids. As a matter of fact, in my town of Newark, anybody; community leader, non-community leader, whatever, teacher, parent, non-parent; if you want to go to Milwaukee; and maybe it is your same group; you can just say, I want to go tomorrow. Round-trip ticket, put you up at the best hotels in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, to come out to see this whole thing work.

What I am saying is that there is a tremendous amount of money behind this issue. I see the gentleman is chuckling, but if you want to come to Newark and see the people that leave Newark Airport to go to look at these charter schools, you are invited to. They will probably let you go, too.

My question is, where is all of this money coming from? Is it to end the public school systems in the inner cities as we know them? Are there money makers at the end of the day that have companies that come in and just_it is a big business, because education is probably the last public entity in this nation where billions and billions and billions of dollars are spent.

I would just like to even get a chance to meet these philanthropic people who are very, very concerned about some poor black kid downtown in Anacostia, because it is like an anomaly. Because I haven't really run into that much benevolence in the years I have been involved in inner city work where I currently still live in Newark.

Ms. Foster. With all respect, Congressman, you sound a little like me when I ask all the public officials who support not allowing low-income parents to escape poor-performing schools, when I ask them, well, where is the money coming from to support that particular point of view?

You know, the Black Alliance for Educational Options, you have never seen a more diverse group. I wish you had been with the 600 conveners in Milwaukee about a month ago. Republicans, Democrats, the most right-wing black people I have ever met in my life, the most left-wing black people I have ever met in my life. Me; I don't know if you can guess where I am from.

But the fact of the matter is that this is not about politics. So I would imagine that the same groups who are fighting and funding the fight against school choice, and the same groups who are funding the fight for school choice, are the groups we all know, because they are all behind; you know, in this country dollars support. But I can tell you that the African-Americans in the Black Alliance for Educational Options, if your question is who owns us, we own ourselves.

Mr. Payne. Okay, well, there is nobody fighting it. There are no ads on saying don't listen to what they are saying. Believe me, you have got the airways all by yourself. There is no organized effort.

In concluding, because I appreciate the Chairman giving me the opportunity to ask my question, the thing that is interesting, too, is we have a number of public policy

people in Congress, people and Senators that are pushing vouchers very, very strongly. Interesting part is that practically all of these Congressmen and Senators who are pushing for vouchers; not Senators, because they have whole states, but Congressmen; they don't talk about vouchers in their community, because people in their community don't want vouchers. They will run them out of town. What do we need vouchers for? We have good public schools.

And so the question is, why can't we do in our inner cities what you have out there where they don't talk about the vouchers in their districts? And you see, that is where I come down. I think that we have to improve the public school system. I taught public school for 11 years, I know about public schools. I taught secondary, junior high, elementary. I would just like to see those who oppose school modernization from a federal level, those who oppose 100,000 school teachers to make class sizes smaller; you don't have to be a genius to know what people really want.

So with that, I think I heard a little tapping. It sounded like the Raven in Poe. I hear a tapping at my chamber door. Maybe it's the wind, and nothing more. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. The gentleman's time has expired some time ago. Let me thank my friend from New Jersey and all of my colleagues who came today, and let me especially thank all of our witnesses for your excellent testimony.

As Mr. White said at one point, there are no silver bullets. And if there is one thing I have learned as Chairman over the last several months, it is that there have been a lot of silver bullets tried over the years, and everyone thinks they have the silver bullet. It is going to take a concerted effort on the part of all of us in this room. And I look forward to working together as we bring this bill together over the next month or so.

Thank you, and the hearing is adjourned.

Whereupon, at 1:00 p.m., the Committee was adjourned.

APPENDIX A – WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN JOHN BOEHNER, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

OPENING STATEMENT OF REP. JOHN BOEHNER (R-OH), CHAIRMAN

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

HEARING ON TRANSFORMING THE FEDERAL ROLE IN EDUCATION FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

THURSDAY, MARCH 29, 2001

2175 RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING

Good morning. Let me extend a warm welcome to all of you, to Congressman George Miller -- the ranking member, to my other colleagues, and to all our witnesses. Thank you very much for being here.

It is a pleasure to have with us Mr. Keith Bailey, president and CEO of the Business Coalition for Excellence in Education; Mr. Ken Connor, president of the Family Research Council; Dr. Gail Foster, founder of the Toussaint Institute Fund and board member of the Black Alliance for Educational Options; Ms. Randi Weingarten of the New York City Federation of Teachers; Mr. William White, chairman of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation; and Dr. Paul Houston, executive director of the American Association of School Administrators.

Both sides of the political spectrum are represented on this panel; but everyone here shares the same ultimate goal: improving the quality of our nation's schools and ensuring that every child is given the opportunity to reach his or her fullest potential.

The need for change is undeniable: Nearly 70 percent of inner city and rural fourth graders cannot read at a basic level; low income students lag behind their counterparts by an average of 20 percentile points on national assessment tests; and one-third of all incoming college freshmen enroll in a remedial reading, writing, or mathematics class.

We'll be hearing testimony today on three different bills -- H.R. 1, the *No Child Left Behind* bill, based largely on President Bush's blueprint for overhauling the federal role in education; H.R. 340, the *Excellence and Accountability in Education Act*, introduced by Mr. Miller and Mr. Kildee; and H.R. 345, the *Public Education Reinvestment, Reinvention, and Responsibility ("Three R's")*, introduced by Mr. Roemer, Mr. Dooley, and Mr. Smith.

There are similarities among these bills -- each, to some extent, tries to streamline federal education funding, for example. And, to be sure, there are differences. But the goal behind these bills is the same: to transform the federal role in education and to ensure that what we do here in Washington is a blessing, not a burden, to our public school system.

I look forward to a vigorous debate on these proposals in the coming weeks, and remain confident that this Congress will accomplish what the President has challenged us to do this year. At this time, I will yield to my friend and Ranking Member, Congressman George Miller for any statement he may have.

APPENDIX B – WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KEITH E. BAILEY, CHAIRMAN, PRESIDENT, AND CEO, WILLIAMS, ON BEHALF OF THE BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Statement of
Keith E. Bailey
Chairman, President, and CEO
Williams

On Behalf of the
Business Coalition for Excellence in Education

Before the
Committee on Education and the Workforce
U.S. House of Representatives

On "Transforming the Federal Role in Education for the 21st Century"

March 29, 2001

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today about the critical role of federal leadership in education for the 21st century, and to stress how business is convinced that improving student performance is key to both personal and national well-being.

I am Keith E. Bailey, Chairman, President, and CEO of Williams, an energy and communications company employing over 23,000 people. We are a high-tech company. I can speak from personal experience about the importance of well-educated individuals.

I am here today on behalf of the Business Coalition for Excellence in Education.

This Coalition represents more than 70 of the nation's leading business organizations and corporate executives, including many from the high-tech industries, who support effective reform in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

I am also the current chairman of the National Alliance of Business, a national leadership organization focused on increasing student achievement at all levels of the education system. I am a member of The Business Roundtable task force on education, and a member of the board of Achieve, Inc., which is a partnership between governors and business leaders to improve educational standards and assessments in the states.

Business Commitment

Business knows that the quality of life in our communities and our nation is dependent on an educated citizenry. Business is deeply involved in education excellence initiatives and has been for over 10 years, especially at the state and local levels. Business is committed over the long-term to improving student achievement and will remain deeply involved in education reform through federal, state, and local programs and policies.

The world is changing rapidly with advances in technology, communications, and global competition. Education is the key to success in the 21st century, and the advantage given to those who are well educated will only increase.

Educational excellence will continue to be the single clearest predictor of success in higher education, economic opportunity, and responsible citizenship in our democracy. That is why business is so passionate about ensuring that all students have the opportunity to succeed.

New Legislation

The Business Coalition for Excellence in Education believes that your bill in particular, Mr. Chairman, (H.R. 1), and those introduced by Mr. Miller (H.R. 340) and Mr. Roemer (H.R. 345), provide an essential framework for more effective federal investments in K-12 education by insisting that:

- school systems adopt higher standards,
- use high-quality assessments aligned to these standards,
- hold schools accountable for results with clear rewards for increasing achievement and consequences for persistent failure of schools, and
- provide support to help students and teachers reach the standards.

We commend you also for including in your bills priorities for essential investments in:

- teacher quality,
- math and science excellence, and the
- integration of technology in education.

We will continue to work closely with you and your staff to ensure that the best provisions of these bills are used to compile a strong, bipartisan reform bill.

There are key areas in each of these bills that we agree are appropriate priorities for federal leadership and financial investment to increase educational improvement. For example:

- **Standards**. All states should have high quality, rigorous academic standards that reflect the levels of student achievement necessary to succeed in society, higher education, or the modern workplace. There is a federal role in providing states with information and resources to develop, improve, and benchmark rigorous academic standards that can be used to raise individual student performance to world-class levels.

- **Assessments**. In order for parents and teachers to know how students are succeeding in achieving standards, you have to measure and assess progress over time with tools that can give you that information. More importantly, tests should be used for diagnostic purposes. When tests are aligned well to state standards, they can help identify points of intervention for schools, teachers, and individual students who need additional educational assistance to reach the standards. Assessment and accountability systems must provide the timely data and information necessary to make informed decisions about student progress. Annual assessments aligned to state standards that measure individual student progress provide information important to parents about how their children's schools are doing. The responsibility of the system is to use that diagnostic information effectively and act on it to bring all students up to standard.

The Business Coalition for Excellence in Education strongly supports the provisions in H.R. 1 requiring annual tests in reading and math for grades 3 through 8.

Assessments in the early years are particularly important to ensuring that all children have a successful start in core academic subjects.

The business community will strongly support an effective system of testing that includes:

- The development of assessment systems aligned to state standards, with continuous review and improvement.
- Dedicated resources for the professional development of teachers and administrators in standards and assessments.
- Federal aid directed at providing additional educational assistance for students identified through assessments as needing help to reach standards.
- Federal help to provide states with high quality, research based data, including international data, to benchmark standards, curricula, and assessments to those in other states and world-class programs.

We are not calling for a national test. However, the Coalition supports having a uniform benchmark for comparisons and quality checks between states. We encourage states to use tests such as the ***National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)*** that allow parents and communities at large to make informed comparisons about the quality and rigor of their educational systems. (Currently, only 9 states do not participate in NAEP, some for reasons of cost. My home state of Oklahoma participates.) I commend you for the provisions in H.R. 1, as well as Mr.

Miller's provisions in H.R. 340, calling for a uniform benchmark of quality like NAEP to help the states.

- **Accountability**. States, districts, principals, and teachers should be held responsible for student learning and must develop teaching methods and strategies with the goal that all students, including disadvantaged and under-performing students, meet high academic standards. States should have policies of rewards and consequences to hold systems accountable over time for clear performance results.

  To be held accountable, school officials and teachers must be supported by aligned systems of assessments and standards for academic content. The state standards and goals must be clear, so that students and parents know where they are in the process of achieving those standards throughout the school year and from year to year. The Business Coalition calls for supplemental support to be provided to students who do not meet these standards. Performance data should reflect student progress toward high standards and measure progress over time.

Areas of Special Focus

The Business Coalition for Excellence in Education strongly supports the special focus on priorities in education that warrant increased federal investments as we enter the 21st century. In particular, the Coalition supports aggressive leadership and investments to support improvements in:

- **Math and Science Excellence**. Efforts must be undertaken to increase the number of skilled math and science teachers in K-12 by substantially improving the quality of their preparation and professional development and by expanding recruitment incentives. Investments must focus on raising student achievement in math and science by encouraging the use of world-class educational materials and instructional practice.

- **Teacher Preparation and Training**. It should be a national priority to increase significantly the quality of professionalism and career opportunities within teaching. States should ensure that teachers have the necessary skills and expertise in the content areas in which they teach. They should ensure that teacher preparation and professional development programs include training to integrate relevant technologies into the classroom. Professional development programs should include principals.

- **Technology in Education**. Technology and the Internet must be integrated into all appropriate aspects of teaching and learning to improve students' 21st century skills as well as educational accountability and administrative effectiveness. Aid should be provided to states and districts to help identify, acquire, and utilize the best available technology and to help teachers integrate it into the curriculum.

Again, we will be working closely with you and your staff to ensure that these priorities receive an aggressive enough investment and a clear enough focus to have a significant impact on student achievement.

Stronger Provisions Needed in Key Areas

I would point out two areas of the legislation where the Business Coalition thinks there should to be stronger provisions for federal leadership and investment:

- **Aligning Systems to Standards**. One of the key issues we face is how all the pieces of a strong educational system fit together in the state. The federal government has a role in helping states develop and maintain rigorous academic standards in all core subjects and stressing the importance of benchmarking these standards to international levels. States should get specific support for the joint planning and design among education authorities to help them align systems of teacher preparation, professional development, curriculum development, assessments, and accountability to high state academic standards.

- **Student Achievement**. Assessments should be used as diagnostic tools to ensure that all students, particularly those identified as under-performing, receive the assistance they need to succeed in reaching high academic standards. The Coalition would support adding language to the bill that would get additional education assistance to those individual students who are assessed as falling short of standard, so that they

will have every chance to come up to standard with timely, appropriate remediation. Current proposals seem to send aid only to persistently failing districts and schools.

A New Compact with the States

We recognize that the approach we are recommending is not provided for in the current Elementary and Secondary Education Act. We applaud the your leadership, Mr. Chairman, in framing a new federal role in K-12 education. Federal funding should support state investments to pursue a common agenda of priorities with clear accountability for achieving results. Real rewards and consequences are essential with the support and flexibility states need to achieve the results.

What we are suggesting is a different relationship between the federal government and the states compared to both the categorical program models of the past and the more flexible, but less well-defined block grant proposals that impose little direction on priorities for national investments. The federal legislation should state clearly what states and localities are expected to achieve with the federal investment, but allow local authorities to work out how those results are reached.

We urge you to be clear about what the federal investment is for, what national needs and priorities must be addressed, but set standards of accountability for achieving those expectations, then let the state and local authorities have enough flexibility to achieve the results you are asking them to produce.

The results, and, therefore, the accountability, are determined by increasing student achievement.

Conclusion

In closing, I want to emphasize that the reforms we are seeking cannot be delayed – the world is changing rapidly and we need to ensure that our educational systems can equip our children with the knowledge and skills to meet the challenges they will face. There is no higher priority than raising student achievement for the well-being of our communities and our nation.

I can't emphasize enough that the course we need to take is uncharted in current ESEA structures. H.R. 1 is a strong foundation for educational assistance that will lead into the 21st century with a clear vision of the nation's needs. We need bold legislative language that does not waste years of our children's educational lives during implementation.

I urge you to remain firm on the key system reforms you propose in the pending legislation related to standards, assessments, and accountability, so that the final result is the strongest bipartisan bill possible. I hope we can help you do that.

I urge you to take on these challenges, and be assured of our support.

I would be happy to answer any questions you have.

Business Coalition for Excellence in Education

Companies:

3Com Corporation
3M Company
Accenture
Agere Systems
Agilent Technologies, Inc.
AOL Time Warner
Apple Computer, Inc.
Applied Materials
AT&T
The Boeing Company
Broadcom Corporation
Caterpillar, Inc.
Cisco Systems, Inc.
Classroom Connect
Compaq Computer Corporation
Currenex, Inc.
Doty, Sundheim & Gilmore
Hewlett-Packard Company
IBM Corporation
Intel Corporation
Lockheed Martin
The McGraw-Hill Companies
Microsoft Corporation
Motorola
MShift, Inc.
MyRoad.com
National Semiconductor Corporation
NCR Corporation
ONEX, INC.
Scientific Learning Corporation
State Farm Insurance Companies
StorageTek
Sun Microsystems, Inc.
Texas Instruments
TRW Inc.
U.S. TriWorks
Verizon
Washington Mutual
Williams

National Organizations

Advanced Medical Technology Association
AeA
American Business Conference
Association for Competitive Technology
The Business Roundtable
Business Software Alliance
Computing Technology Industry Association
The Council of Growing Companies
Council on Competitiveness
Electronic Industries Alliance
Industrial Research Institute
Information Technology Association of America
Information Technology Industry Council
Minority Business RoundTable
National Alliance of Business
National Association of Manufacturers
The National Council on Economic Education
National Association of Partners in Education
National Commission on Entrepreneurship
National Venture Capital Association
Semiconductor Industry Association
Society for Human Resource Management
Software & Information Industry Association
TechNet
Technology Workforce Coalition
U.S. Chamber of Commerce

Regional Business Coalitions

Berks Business Education Coalition (PA)
Delaware Business/Public Education Council
Indiana Chamber of Commerce
Inland Empire Economic Partnership (CA)
Northern Virginia Technology Council
Pittsburgh Technology Council
Southwestern Pennsylvania Industrial Resource Center

Business Coalition for Excellence in Education*

Principles for K-12 Education Legislation

In a world of global competition and rapid technological advances, U.S. schools must prepare all students for the challenges and opportunities of the 21st century. **To achieve this goal, our school systems must adopt higher standards, use high-quality assessments aligned to these standards, and hold schools accountable for results, so that all students have the opportunity to succeed.** Federal investments must help each state implement a standards-based, performance-driven education system that is carefully aligned to the goal of higher student achievement. The Business Coalition for Excellence in Education urges Congress to enact bipartisan legislation that embodies the following principles.

Achieving Systemic Reforms

- **Standards:** All states should have high-quality, rigorous academic standards that reflect the levels of student achievement necessary to succeed in society, higher education, and the workplace. The federal government should provide all states with the information and resources to develop, continuously improve, and benchmark rigorous academic standards that can be used to raise individual student performance to world-class levels.
- **Assessments:** All students should be tested annually with high-quality assessments aligned to state standards. The purpose must be to measure the progress of school, teacher, and student achievement against standards and to identify where additional support is needed for students to reach them.
- **Student Achievement:** Assessments should be used as diagnostic tools to ensure that all students, particularly those identified as under-performing, receive the assistance they need to succeed in reaching high academic standards. Similarly, federal leadership should ensure that pre-school aid focuses on helping prepare children to enter school ready to learn.
- **Accountability:** States, districts, and principals should ensure that all students, including disadvantaged and under-performing students, meet high academic standards. States should have policies of rewards and sanctions to hold systems accountable for improving the performance of students, teachers, and principals. Such policies should be based on performance, including student achievement.
- **Flexibility:** States, localities, and schools should have flexibility for their educational organization, innovation, and instruction while being held accountable for raising student achievement.
- **Alignment:** States must ensure that high quality assessments, accountability systems, teacher preparation and training, and curriculum are aligned with high state standards so that students, teachers, parents, and administrators can measure progress against common expectations for student achievement.
- **Data, Research, and Best Practices:** Student achievement data should be collected regularly and made public in formats that can guide the decision-making of teachers, parents, and students to improve performance. Research must be pertinent to standards-based education systems to enable teachers to apply proven findings in the classroom.

Areas of Special Focus

- **Math and Science Excellence:** Efforts must be undertaken to increase significantly the number of skilled math and science teachers in K-12 by substantially improving the quality of their preparation and professional development and by expanding recruitment incentives. Investments must focus on raising student achievement in math and science by encouraging the use of world-class educational materials and instructional practice.
- **Teacher Preparation and Training:** It should be a national priority to increase significantly the quality, professionalism, and career opportunities within teaching. States should ensure that teachers have the necessary skills and expertise in the content areas in which they teach. They should ensure that teacher preparation and professional development programs include training to integrate relevant technologies into the classroom. Professional development programs should include principals.
- **Technology:** Technology and the Internet must be integrated into all appropriate aspects of teaching and learning, to improve students' 21st century skills as well as educational accountability and administrative effectiveness. Aid should be provided to states and districts to help identify, acquire, and utilize the best available technology and to help teachers integrate it into the curriculum.

* An ad hoc coalition of leading U.S. corporations and business organizations that support these principles in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Contact: Business Coalition for Excellence in Education • 1201 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 700 • Washington, D.C. 20005
Phone (202) 289-2932 • Fax (202) 289-1303

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: KEITH E. BAILEY		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the Committee).	Yes	No x
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 1998: NONE		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	Yes x	No
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: Member, CEO Leadership Board of the Coalition		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 1998, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: NONE		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	No x

Signature: _____ Date: 3/26/01

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX C - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF KENNETH L. CONNOR, PRESIDENT, FAMILY RESEARCH COUNCIL, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Testimony of Kenneth L. Connor, President of Family Research Council
U.S. House Education and Workforce Committee
March 29, 2001

Chairman Boehner, Ranking Member Miller and Members of the Committee, thank you for letting me speak to you today regarding *H.R. 1, No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*. Family Research Council believes that parents are the first and best teachers of our children and we should do nothing to undermine their authority. As President of Family Research Council, I am absolutely committed to ensuring that parents and teachers, not bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., have ultimate authority in the classroom. Family Research Council has been an advocate of education reform for many years, working to return education decision making to those who know our children best: parents, teachers, and local school personnel.

Let me first say, there are several pro-family provisions in this bill that we are excited about and we want to thank the Committee for their hard work in these areas. We are encouraged by the emphasis this bill places on academic excellence, not various social priorities. It is imperative that our schools return to their core mission: helping children read, write and do arithmetic, preparing them for citizenship and assuring that they are contributing members of society. The removal of all references to the failed Goals 2000 program and School to Work language is a signal to families that this bill focuses on core academics and scientifically-based methodologies, not the latest in education fads.

Additionally, we are pleased that afterschool grants are to be offered to religious organizations on the same basis as other afterschool programs. We are also encouraged by language in this bill to protect voluntary school prayer and to expand the scope of the Children's Internet Protection Act. Finally, we are delighted that children in unsafe schools will have the option to attend another school where they can learn in a safe environment. We must ensure that these provisions remain in the bill.

Flexibility

We are excited to see that the bill gives greater flexibility at the state and local level to make education decisions with less interference from the federal government. We thank the drafters of this bill for including Straight A's in the accountability section. This provision will allow states and local schools to have greater flexibility and authority over education spending and decision-making. We think that when states and schools are empowered to make these decisions and to be creative with their resources, teachers will teach, and children will learn.

In order to be truly effective, Straight A's should not be watered down to a pilot program as occurred in the 106th Congress. In addition, this committee should expand the number of programs eligible for consolidation. Increasing flexibility at the state level allows states to implement more effective reforms.

In addition to Straight A's, H.R. 1 permits states and schools to transfer funds from certain programs to others in order to use the money where it is most needed. We believe this will also help raise academic achievement. Protecting certain bureaucratic programs is not in the best interest of all students because the federal government does not have the ability to consider the individual needs of students in all states and schools.

Accountability

H.R. 1 provides for stronger accountability measures in return for increased flexibility to states and schools. Let me say right up front, testing students is necessary for parents and teachers to be able to assess the progress of their students and help them rise to even greater levels of academic achievement. Tests should be designed to be helpful to students, parents, teachers, and schools at the local level. In 1994, the bill Congress passed to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) required states to put in place state standards and assessments for reading and math. So far, we have not seen positive results from this requirement. Should we then continue to raise federal testing mandates to new levels? The federal government cannot raise academic achievement from Washington, DC. Accountability must be demonstrated first and foremost to parents and local taxpayers, and the report cards proposed in H.R. 1 will facilitate this kind of accountability. Report cards that provide test results and comparisons with other schools will empower parents with the information they need to push for improvement in their local schools.

While we appreciate and understand the good intentions behind the accountability provisions in this bill, we want to state categorically that we will oppose any effort that leads to or creates a uniform national curriculum or national test. Thank you for adding language ensuring that states have additional options besides NAEP to confirm the validity of state assessments. We are concerned that sole reliance on the state NAEP may lead to a national curriculum and a *de facto* national test. Please ensure that the incentives for states to select NAEP or the alternative test are on an equal level.

While we are delighted that other assessments may be used, we want to ensure that test questions are academic in nature. We will be watching closely to see that political and social indoctrination is not attempted through the instrument of testing. We thank the authors of this bill for including provisions to protect parental rights and student privacy.

One of our strong concerns in the testing component of H.R. 1 is the inclusion of science as a federally mandated state standard and assessment. As we've seen in the State of Kansas, science standards regarding the origins of life can be controversial, and we encourage the Committee to strike this provision. Science standards and assessments were not required in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization, nor were they in the 106th Congress' H.R. 2. Science assessments were not included in President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" proposal either. Reading, writing and math are the building blocks of academic achievement and we must focus on these.

Consolidation

The efforts of the writers of this bill to consolidate bureaucratic and repetitive programs are to be commended. Currently, there are 760 education-related programs in 39 separate federal agencies. According to the *Education at a Crossroads 2000* report released last year, the Education Department requires more than 38 million hours of paperwork a year to take care of federal mandates, despite recent efforts to streamline the Department. H.R. 1 goes a long way to consolidate funding streams and duplicative programs that are scattered throughout the federal government. Many unfunded programs are repealed and more than two dozen programs are consolidated into a handful of categories.

The largess of the Federal Government in education has created an industry with conflicting priorities that has lost sight of the main goal: helping children learn. By reducing the bureaucratic structure in America's education system, we are better able to serve our students and help them learn.

Choice

Family Research Council shares the Committee's concern that children are not achieving up to their potential, and the achievement gap is growing. That is a fact. We must serve children in failing schools now and we are pleased that H.R. 1 recognizes our current educational crisis and seeks to provide children a way out of an environment that is failing them. Students need to be able to pursue a quality education. We can provide resources and remove barriers to achievement. We must ensure that we leave no child behind.

While we share the Committee's desire to ensure that children in persistently failing schools receive parental choice options under H.R. 1, we believe that by the time failing schools permit choice, too few students will be helped too late. This is unacceptable. Children who have been in failing schools for several years need help now. They simply cannot afford to wait another 3 years. By then we will have lost another generation of children.

We are concerned that parental choice in H.R. 1 simply does not go far enough. We believe the best way to achieve real choice for all students is through education savings accounts and tax credits. While we realize that the Committee does not have jurisdiction over these issues, we wanted to share our enthusiasm for these choice

proposals. In fact, in a 1998 poll commissioned by FRC, 77% of Americans said they agree with us.

Currently, there are several bills that have been introduced regarding tax credits, including legislation modeled after the successful Arizona tax credit. As you may know, the state of Arizona, realizing the need to provide children across the economic spectrum with a high-quality education, passed a measure allowing Arizona parents the right to receive a dollar-for-dollar tax credit when they voluntarily contribute to a private scholarship foundation. Since the tax credit law took effect in Arizona in 1997, more than 30,000 people have contributed money to private scholarships, raising approximately $13.2 million dollars. During the 1999-2000 school year alone, more than 7,000 students benefited from the Arizona plan.

Flexibility and accountability must go hand in hand with real choice options like tax credits in order to best help our students receive the education they deserve. Testing students and providing parents with their child's test scores is helpful only insofar as there is a real option for them to select a better school of their choice. This will truly leave no child behind. Without a strong combination of accountability and choice, this bill represents simply more government interference in education.

In closing, let me quote from the findings section of H.R. 1: "The best education decisions are made by those who know the students best and who are responsible for implementing the decisions, and therefore, educators and parents should retain the right and responsibility to educate their pupils and children free of excessive regulation by the Federal Government." We couldn't agree more. We look forward to working with you to

ensure that flexibility, accountability, and real parental choice are enacted to allow all children to have the quality education they deserve.

Thank you for letting me appear before the Committee and I'll answer any questions you may have.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: Kenneth L. Connor

	Yes	No
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the Committee).		✓
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 1998: NONE		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	✓	
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: Family Research Council		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: President		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 1998, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: none		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list: American Renewal	✓	

Signature: _____ Date: 3/28/01

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX D - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF GAIL E. FOSTER, FOUNDER, TOUSSAINT INSTITUTE FUND; BOARD MEMBER, BLACK ALLIANCE FOR EDUCATIONAL OPTIONS, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Testimony of
Gail E. Foster, Ed.D.

Black Alliance for Educational Options
Toussaint Institute Fund

March 29, 2001

Committee on Education and the Workforce
U.S. House of Representatives
Rayburn House Office Building

Transforming the Federal Role in Education for the 21st Century:
Hearing on H.R. 1, H.R. 340, H.R. 345

My testimony today is in response to H.R. 1, the *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001*, with particular reference to its school choice sections.

I am a former New York City public high school teacher who has worked for over a decade on behalf of parental choice. I founded the Toussaint Institute Fund, Inc. a not-for-profit community based organization in 1988. Founded with grass roots dollars and support, Toussaint was a spontaneous response to the very desperate pleas of low income and struggling working-class families. These parents sought help in finding and accessing good schools for their children. Their children were trapped in schools that stunted their intellectual, social and academic growth, and they were desperate to get them out. In 1988 the Toussaint Institute Fund established the nation's first grassroots inner-city private school scholarship program targeting low income black male students in poor performing public school districts. We sent second and third grade boys who had been targeted for special education to independent schools founded by African American educators and churches attempting to provide these children with quality options.

Last year, I became a founding Board member of the Black Alliance for Educational Options (BAEO), a national organization which seeks to create, promote and support efforts to empower black parents to exercise choice in determining options for their children. My testimony today grows out of my work with thousands of New York parents through the Toussaint Institute Fund and hundreds of African American school choice activists through BAEO.

I understand that the concept of school choice has passionate political and philosophical meaning for many people. I know many good and selfless individuals, public officials, labor leaders and public school administrators take exception to HR1's School Choice components for reasons that are on some levels as respectable as the philosophical and political positions in support of school choice. I support school choice, as does the Black Alliance for Educational Options and the Toussaint Institute Fund. However, I do not choose today to make the philosophical or political case for school choice for one reason: The thousands and millions of African American parents who poll after poll show to be in favor of school choice, do not support it for political and philosophical reasons. They do not prioritize philosophical or political issues over the survival and well being of their children. They are just like you here in Congress and on this Committee and my fellow witnesses.

They are ordinary, good, loving parents who are driven by maternal and paternal instinct and love to insure their children's survival and well-being. They are like President Bush and former President Clinton. They are like the presidents of our various teachers unions

and like the CEO's of this nation's business community. They are like me and like you. When it comes down to parenting – janitors, and waitresses, and subway conductors, and dishwashers and grandmothers raising grandchildren on public assistance, and unemployed people, and people who don't speak English well, and people who themselves did not graduate from high school – all of these people love their children as much as all of you. And like you, they feel compelled to make their children's education a priority that comes before politics and philosophy. So, on their behalf I am going to stop and change voice now. I am going to speak in the voice of the thousands of parents with whom I have worked over the past thirteen years, of the millions of African American parents crying out in the wilderness. Their voice is not Democrat or Republican, right wing or left wing. It's the voice of American parents.

Before I continue, I must remind you of what I am sure you must at least on some level, be already aware of. These parents know that each of you have chosen the best school possible for your child. You chose the best public school or the best private school and you had a wide range of options from which to choose and you used whatever financial, political or social resources at your disposal to do so.

And so they ask:

Why won't you let us choose also. We love our children as much as you. Our children have hopes and dreams just like yours. And like you, we would never put politics before our children's needs. Can't you see that we are not talking about Democrats or

Republicans here. Please have some compassion for us. Our children's lives are at stake.

You have no idea what it is like to be trapped in a poor performing school like the ones in our neighborhoods. Some of you used to live in our neighborhood. Some of you still do. Yet you used your resources to escape the worst schools. And now you are saying to us that for philosophical and political reasons, you are compelled to prevent us from escaping. Why?

You tell us that we should stay in these schools and work from the inside to improve them. If working within these schools is such a good idea. If that's the best way to love and nurture our children's growth - then why didn't you stay and do it?

You tell us that giving us choice will make things worse for our children. But it didn't make things worse for your children. You tell us that the public schools will become dumping grounds for children from the most disempowered families. The worst public schools have been dumping grounds for the most disempowered families for decades! They became dumping grounds after you left. School Choice won't solve all of this nation's sociological contradictions. But it will save my child, the way it saved yours if you'll give me a chance.

You tell us that if we just wait for you to secure another political victory, you will be able to implement your long-term plan for improving the public schools in my neighborhood.

Why is it that your children can't wait four more or eight more years, and ours can? You've been tinkering with the public school system for decades and nothing has changed.

Yes, we support charters, vouchers, tax credits, home school and anything else that gives us the same chance you had to escape these dungeons that are the schools the poorest and least empowered are forced to attend. Escape from a failing school is not something one does as part of a long-term political strategy. Escape implies crisis and urgency. Life and Death. In four years, my bright and capable Kindergartner will be in third grade. And I can predict she'll be two years behind in reading and math based on the documented performance of my neighborhood school. In four years my somewhat hyper-active second grade male child will have been inappropriately labeled Emotionally Disturbed or Learning Disabled and sentenced to a special education system with a documented 90% school drop out rate.

In four years, my fifth grader will be a freshman at one of the lowest performing high schools in the country and he will have begun acclimating himself to the "drop-out" culture that pervades his high school. He'll begin to expect to drop out the way 75% of the school's Senior class did. I will begin fearing for his life. In my neighborhood when young males drop-out they end up in prison. In four years my oldest son, the one whose pediatrician told me when he was five that he may be intellectually gifted, will just be discovering that there is something called the SAT and that he should have taken it six months prior if he had any serious interest in going away to college. There is no college

counselor in his high school. Discouraged and assuming that he's blown his chance at the kind of life we dreamed of for him, he will try instead to take a civil service exam for the fire department - only to discover that he lacks the basic eighth grade reading and writing skills necessary to pass the test. He is intelligent enough to be a doctor, but will lack the basic academic skills required to pass a test for a good civil service job. I worry that he will give up on his dreams of having a family and providing for them. This is the story of my children. And in the words of Martin Luther King, this is "Why We Can't Wait."

We need legislation now, that allows us to have a choice of a quality education for our children. In the words of the No Child Left Behind Act "There must be an escape hatch for students trapped in failing schools that do not teach and will not change." Federal dollars should be used to "give parents the option of removing their children from failing schools and sending them to a different public school or a private school." We need to "compel failing schools to improve and help to close the achievement gap between disadvantaged students and their peers."

We are appealing not to your political persuasion, but to your hearts. Our children's futures are as precious as your children's. Please look into our eyes the next time you see a television piece on a low performing public school. Please look into our eyes and know that we are just like you. We are parents who love our children and who deserve the right, the chance to escape dead-end schools as you have.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, may I offer one last comment as an African American educator. There are also many African American and other educators who are not caught up in the politics of school choice. They simply feel a professional and human compulsion to provide quality public and private school options for the children in their communities. Some have founded small and struggling independent schools, others have attempted to establish alternative public schools and now many seek to open charter schools. These dedicated educators need strong charter school legislation and strong school choice scholarship legislation so that they can continue to meet the growing need and demand for quality school choices in their communities.

Thank you again for this opportunity to speak on behalf of so many desperate parents and educators.

Gail E. Foster, Ed.D.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: Gail Foster, Ed.D.		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the Committee).	Yes	No x
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 1998: none		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	Yes x	No
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: Black Alliance for Educational Options, Inc. (BAEO) Toussaint Institute Fund, Inc. (TIF)		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: I am an on the Board of Directors of both of the organizations listed above. I am President of the Toussaint Institute Fund. Additionally, I am an on the Board of Directors of the Council on American Private Education (CAPE) and St. Christophers, Inc. (A foster care agency.)		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 1998, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: I am aware of no federal grants for any of these organizations.		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	No x

Signature. Gail Foster, Ed.D. _____ Date: 3/27/01 _____

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX E - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF RANDI WEINGARTEN, PRESIDENT, UNITED FEDERATION OF WORKERS; VICE PRESIDENT, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS, NEW YORK, N.Y.

Testimony of Randi Weingarten

President, United Federation of Teachers

Vice-President, American Federation of Teachers

Before the

House Committee on Education and the Workforce

March 29, 2001

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I am Randi Weingarten, President of the United Federation of Teachers in New York City and Vice-President of the American Federation of Teachers, AFL-CIO. Thank you very much for giving me the opportunity to present the views of the AFT on pending legislation to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). This is a tall order for a very short period of time. So, I thought I would make some general comments about the reauthorization and then proceed to focus on two issues that have relevance to the reauthorization: turning around low performing schools; and attracting and retaining qualified teachers, particularly in hard-to-staff areas.

In general, AFT believes that the Federal role in education is critical. Particularly for urban areas lacking adequate property wealth, federal supplementary support makes a critical difference in how well schools can serve their students. Federal education programs should promote quality public education for all our nation's children. They should promote high standards and curricula; they should level the playing field through targeting to low income areas; they should reflect national priorities, through their design and purpose; and they should be held accountable for producing results.

AFT's main interest is educational opportunity for poor children many of whom are served by our members. Title I of the ESEA has been our principal means of pursuing equal educational opportunity, and it has been demonstrably effective. The evidence is clear that without Title I, the substantial inequalities that still exist in state and local resources devoted to educating disadvantaged children, relative to other children would have been even worse. The evidence is also clear that despite those persistent resource inequalities, title I has been a significant factor in the dramatic narrowing of the black-white achievement gap over the past 30 years and in the overall improved performance and educational attainment of poor children.

Congress wisely redirected the Title I program in the 1994 reauthorization to require that poor children be fully included in the nation's effort to raise academic standards. We have already seen positive results in the relatively short six-year span of this law's implementation, with at least eight major urban school *districts* showing sustained improvements for at least three years. Many more urban districts are showing promising signs of progress. Attached to my testimony is a study prepared by AFT that chronicles the experiences and successes of these districts.

Although we may reasonably be frustrated with the fact that not all children have not met high academic standards, the 1994 amendments created a sound structure for Title I that should be retained. Congress should make every effort to avoid radical changes in this law that would disrupt the progress states and school districts are making in implementing it.

Now is the time to build upon the success that we are beginning to see by providing the resources and supports needed to help our schools see that every student actually reaches high standards. In essence, we need to get the "meat" in the sandwich. What constitutes that "meat" is familiar to any of us who have been on the ground working with the reality of schools that are enormously challenged in meeting this goal. Last Congress I testified before this committee on AFT's specific recommendations for the reauthorization of the Title I and I refer you to those remarks for more detail on what is needed to supply those added resources and supports.

Pending Legislation

The AFT is very pleased that President Bush's new administration has put so much effort into this reauthorization and into making education a top priority. The administration's proposal, as reflected in Chairman Boehner's bill, the Miller/Kildee plan, and the Roemer/Dooley bill,

H.R. 345 reflect common themes that the AFT believes are very good ones: accountability; flexibility; choice; teacher quality; and targeting. There are many critically important differences in detail, but I would like to offer some general observations.

The AFT believes that the Miller/Kildee bill, H.R. 340, incorporates most of the key elements that should be part of reauthorization. This legislation strengthens Title I's focus on helping disadvantaged children reach high academic standards by significantly increasing the authorization level, providing greater targeting of the funding, requiring greater accountability for student progress, maintaining the 50 percent threshold to operate schoolwide programs, and providing support to improve the quality of state assessments.

The AFT particularly appreciates H.R. 340's emphasis on improving the quality of teaching by providing teachers with high quality professional development and ensuring that all teachers are qualified and teaching in field. We are especially pleased with the new focus on assisting high-poverty schools to provide adequate compensation for their teachers, which will help high-need schools struggling to attract qualified teachers.

In addition, the Miller/Kildee bill addresses important areas of national concern by continuing a class size reduction program, comprehensive school reform activities the reading program, technology, afterschool, and school safety activities. These programs make a difference in the classrooms of our nation. Other critical areas addressed in the Miller bill are school construction and alternative services for children who have been suspended or expelled from school.

The Boehner bill, incorporating the recommendations of the Administration, maintains the basic structure of Title I and this is very important. We also appreciate the emphasis on closing

the achievement gap, and we have no quibble with testing students for accountability. It is critical, however, to ensure that testing is done correctly, fairly and as part of a comprehensive effort to improve education. We must ensure that new testing requirements do not undermine the strides we've made to get high standards of learning in every state. Any new test must be aligned with a curriculum based on high state standards, with safeguards to ensure fairness and equity. Testing, even when done correctly, is only a small part of the solution to strengthening education. If tests tell us that students are having problems, we must provide the help they need to succeed.

The Administration's emphasis on further enhancing the federal reading program, and concentrating resources on this area is excellent. The AFT has done a great deal of work in developing research-based materials on reading instruction, and our affiliate in Texas worked closely with the administration of then-governor Bush to develop that state's program.

The AFT believes that the Administration bill is fatally flawed, however, with its incorporation of vouchers and block grants. It is indeed ironic that the otherwise strong focus of the bill on accountability is totally undermined by its incorporation of these elements—two of the most unaccountable policies. AFT believes that school choice, an absolutely appropriate mechanism, should only be available under the public school system where options must be held to the same standards and accountable for the use of public funds. Similarly, flexibility is a totally supportable concept as long as federal funds are driven to distinct federal priorities and through targeted funding streams. It belies the whole purpose of ESEA for the federal government to totally abdicate its role in driving funds towards national priorities for as long as five years through the Straight A's proposal.

Turning Around Low Performing Schools

Clearly, a major national priority that is reflected in the ESEA proposals before you is turning around low performing schools. The President's reauthorization plan would provide extensive new mandates for testing the progress of students with the expectation that certain levels of progress will be achieved. Our schools must be given a realistic chance of meeting these expectations.

Because of the experience and success we have had in New York City in this regard, I would like to offer my observations on what this will take in terms of programs and resources.

As background, the AFT adopted a resolution in 1997 that explains the union's concerns about low performing schools and outlines an educationally sound approach for their improvement. This "what works" approach urges that solutions be based on solid research evidence on the effectiveness of programs and practices to be adopted. It also advocates that reforms be conducted in cooperation with district administrators, school boards, parents and the community. My own United Federation of Teachers (UFT) AFT Local 2 has been putting "what works" into practice over the last few years with pretty remarkable results.

In the mid 1990s the UFT and administrators worked together to improve 12 of the most troubled schools on the State's list of schools needing improvement. These schools were placed in a Chancellor's district, a special district created to provide targeted support conditions and oversight to the most troubled schools. Low student achievement and poor conditions within these schools were typical of the most struggling schools.

The district upgraded facilities, including library and technology resources, to improve conditions needed for achievement. Schools were required to implement a 90-minute literacy

block, smaller class size, pre-kindergarten, and afterschool programs for students who need extra help. Every elementary school adopted the research-backed program Success for All. The schools also developed plans to increase parental involvement. With the district's support, the union established teacher resource centers at each school, with staff on hand to provide in-classroom coaching and mentoring. None of the original 12 schools is now designated low performing, and not one of these schools has been taken over by the state.

Driven by the success of the Chancellor's district, the UFT and New York City administrators entered into a reform partnership in 1999. Through collective bargaining we created, from the state's list of the city's lowest performing schools, 51 Extended Time Schools. These schools have their school year lengthened by one week and the school day by 40 minutes to allow for professional development and small-group instruction. The schools have reduced class size and have adopted research-based math and reading programs, including Success for All, in elementary schools.

The union negotiated an agreement with the district whereby certified teachers with a satisfactory record could stay in the school if they agreed to the terms of the Extended Time School plan. Current staff who did not want to stay based on the new plan could transfer to another school. The Extended Time Schools were to be given priority when assigning any new certified teachers. No uncertified teachers were to be hired at any of the schools, although because of teacher shortages some uncertified teachers have been hired. Nonetheless, these schools employ fewer uncertified teachers than at any time in their history. School staff received additional pay for additional time worked; they also had a $2500 tuition reimbursement for a master's degree in return for a three-year commitment to teach in the schools.

Our results are telling. The number of New York City students scoring in the top two levels of this year's state English Language Arts (ELA) assessment rose 9 points in 2000 from the previous year. While all the city's "low performing schools" improved, those receiving the most intensive support, the Extended Time Schools, improved at **twice the rate of comparable schools**. In New York City's District 2, where more than half the students qualify for free or reduced price lunch, students outperformed the statewide averages—surpassing many suburban school districts.

In summary, we know what it takes to turn around low performing schools. It takes determination by school districts, unions and communities. It takes renovations of the physical plant to create an atmosphere of respect for students and learning. It takes longer classes and smaller classes, a longer school day and year. It takes pre-kindergarten and afterschool programs to provide extra supports for poor children who cannot get them at home. It takes qualified staff with regular access to professional development. It takes a research-based curriculum tied to high standards. It takes parental and community involvement and, yes, it takes increased teacher pay and other incentives.

But it also takes additional funding. According to the New York Board of Education the annual cost of providing the extra supports for the Extended Time Schools (approximate size of the school is 700 students) per school is $1.6 million. This does not include any capital costs.

The Rand Corporation looked at the costs of certain reforms nationally. Its research shows that to reduce class size by one student it costs, on average, $196 per pupil; to increase Pre-K participation by 1 point costs $12 per pupil; to increase teacher salaries by $1000 it would cost $148 per pupil on average.

Federal programs are in place to help with these costs and have helped support our efforts in New York City. Titles I and II of ESEA are critical as has been the class size reduction program, which we would certainly urge you to reauthorize and expand. We also need federal help, particularly in urban areas, for school renovations and repairs and to continue the massive job of wiring aged buildings for 21st century educational technology. A missing piece is that many schools have not received the technical assistance promised through Title I to help them improve. Another major problem is a lack of curricula that is aligned to state standards.

Teacher Compensation Issues

Closely related to the issue of turning around low performing schools, is the question of how to attract highly qualified staff to serve in them, particularly certified teachers. This concerns the AFT, and our President, Sandra Feldman, appointed a committee of our Executive Council, which I chaired, to examine professional compensation as a key part of this issue.

As you can imagine, it is not easy for a union to get into discussions of differential pay, bonuses, incentives and the like. Nonetheless, in February, our national Executive Council adopted a resolution calling for enhancing the traditional teacher compensation schedule because,

> AFT believes it is time to explore viable, fair and educationally sound teacher compensation options that will raise salaries while contributing to efforts already underway to assure high-quality, well-prepared teachers for all students.

Many AFT locals have negotiated contracts that incorporate some of these options. In fact, last year the Cincinnati Federation of Teachers approved a contract containing a teacher evaluation plan designed to tie skills and knowledge demonstrated by teachers directly to their compensation.

While I do not want to go into great detail on the findings and conclusions of the AFT committee, I thought that it would be instructive for you to have an idea what we recommended especially if you consider teacher recruitment incentives under ESEA.

First and foremost teacher salaries must be competitive with salaries of other professionals. That they are not should be of no surprise to this committee, and this is clearly a big challenge for us to turn around.

We call for enhancing and improving the traditional salary schedule for teachers rather than eliminating it. A professional teacher compensation system provides multiple opportunities for teachers to advance along the salary scale in addition to years of experience and educational level. The committee's recommendation would expand possible options, taking into account local circumstances, of course, including additional compensation for

- knowledge and skills that advance and/or address high-priority educational goals;
- schoolwide improvement;
- achieving National Board Certification;
- mentoring new and veteran teachers, providing peer assistance and review, serving as lead teachers, etc.;
- teaching in shortage areas;
- agreeing to teach in hard-to-staff and/or low-performing schools;
- assuming additional responsibilities.

You may notice that this list does not include so-called merit pay and we would strongly oppose any reference to this as an option in federal law. Merit pay is an arbitrary and divisive mechanism that undermines the development collegial and professional relationships among

teachers. And, it does not work in attracting and retaining the high quality teachers we need, particularly for children deemed to be at risk.

I would conclude by pointing out that teachers need more than financial incentives to teach in highly dysfunctional schools. Like other professionals they want to be successful in their work and have a work environment that encourages that. They are mindful that many of the "hard to staff" schools have poor administrative leadership, non-existent or non-enforced discipline policies, and inadequate resources including books and basic equipment, let alone technology. Many schools are in such poor physical condition as to be unhealthy and unsafe. Salary is a necessary element but unfortunately not sufficient in itself to attract highly qualified teachers to these settings.

This is why the federal role in providing resources, especially to our neediest schools, is not just important—it is critical. Your expectations for results, however, must be matched by your realism and your commitment to providing "what it takes" to turn around low performing schools.

CF:cmt
OpenoffDoD-rto
Testimony 2 Randi Weingarten

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: Randi Weingarten		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the Committee).	Yes	No X
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 1998: None		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	Yes X	No
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: American Federation of Teachers		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: Vice President, American Federation of Teachers; President, United Federation of Teachers, New York City		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 1998, including the source and amount of each grant or contract:		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	No X

(AFT)

Signature: _____ Date: _____

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX F - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF PAUL HOUSTON, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS, WASHINGTON, D.C.

American Association of School Administrators

Statement of

Dr. Paul Houston

Executive Director

American Association of School Administrators

on

Transforming the Federal Role in Education for the 21st Century:
HR 345 - A Call for Consolidation and Targeting

Given Before the

Committee on Education and the Workforce

The Honorable John Boehner, Chairman

United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC

March 29, 2001

1801 North Moore Street ▲ Arlington, Virginia 22209-1813 ▲ 703.528.0700 ▲ Fax 703.841.1543 ▲ http://www.aasa.org

Chairman Boehner and members of the committee I am pleased to have this opportunity to address HR 345 the Public Education Reinvestment, Reinvention and Responsibility Act,called 3 R's, sponsored by Mr. Roemer and many others.

My name is Paul Houston and I am Executive Director of the American Association of School Administrators, AASA, the professional association of local school system leaders. I bring to this testimony 35 years of experience as a teacher, principal and superintendent. My experience includes teaching and administration in North Carolina, and administration in Alabama, New Jersey, Arizona and California. Much of my experience is urban, but I have also worked in a small up-scale high spending district and a changing suburban district.

Regarding the topic of this hearing AASA supports HR 345 for four reasons.

1. 3 R's improves targeting of funds to schools with large concentrations of high need students and low resource schools.
2. 3 R's sets high goals for student achievement and places clear accountability for achievement squarely on schools, school districts and states not on children.
3. 3 R's takes the first step toward creating bigger funding streams that drive a greater percentage of federal funds to the local level.
4. 3 R's promotes public school choice and rejects vouchers.

TARGETING

Targeting is the single most important issue in this reauthorization of ESEA for AASA. Targeting is our first priority because the states' school funding systems provide more funds to schools serving middle income and wealthy students than schools serving largely students from families with incomes below the poverty line or schools that rely almost entirely on property taxes on land used for agriculture. Providing funds in inverse proportion to the likelihood of additional need for instructional and other supports is a nation wide fact that has its roots in the original reliance on property taxes to fund schools. In its extreme form, the quality of education was tied to the value of property—a very illogical connection for the modern world. Beginning in the 1970's state courts began to reduce the gap between high revenue and low revenue districts. Usually because of a prolonged lawsuit brought by low revenue districts.

Although the gap between low revenue school districts and high revenue districts has shrunk, it is still unconscionably high in nearly every state. AASA is on record as encouraging further litigation aimed at producing not equal funding but sufficient funding to meet the needs of all children. We believe districts serving concentrations of students who need assistance in meeting the new content standards, and districts that lack the resources to meet the challenges they face, ought to be the primary focus of federal education programs.

The federal government is more able to target funds than either local government or state government. My own experiences as a superintendent in an upscale high revenue district,

a large low revenue urban district, and large mid revenue suburban district, is that local school boards are not able to target local funds in a way that meets the needs of individual school sites. About one-half of school funds come from the state and are not generally targeted anywhere close to the actual needs. Also, school board members are elected from districts, and are very immediately impacted by the demands of parents for a "fair" share of local funds. Many school boards to their credit do funds schools based on need, but the combination of parental pressure and lack of control over a significant portion of their funds minimizes the impact of local targeting.

States legislatures find it hard to target sufficient funds to high need school districts, because a majority or near majority of most state legislatures are elected from suburban areas. The resulting political pressures produce funding that reduces the revenue gap but does not eliminate it. The January 1998 GAO study, State And Federal Efforts to Target Poor Students found that states averaged spending 62 cents on poor students for every $1 spent on all students. In contrast the federal government targeted $4.73 to poor students per $1 spent on every student. Those results occurred in spite of the fact that 90 per cent of the states reported targeting funds to poor students. Only the federal government is far enough removed to target funds in the manner needed to approach adequate funding to meet the educational needs of every student.

HR 345 improves targeting, particularly in Titles II and IV. Title I is also well targeted to poverty. Of course, the problem with Title I funding is the hold harmless provisions, not

the targeting. The hold harmless provisions are added in appropriations not in this committee so I am preaching to the choir here.

Sixty percent of the funds in Title II of 3 R's are targeted to poverty an improvement over the 50 percent in current law, but still short of the 100 per cent we urge.

We also applaud that HR 345 helps the often overlooked high need, low resource schools—small rural schools. Agricultural land is taxed at the lowest rate in all 50 states, and small rural districts are generally left out of the state formulas. Again, only the federal government has the distance and perspective to aid such schools.

In summary HR 345 would begin moving a greater percentage of federal funds to districts serving high need students and we applaud and support that targeting. Eventually a larger percentage of federal funds must be targeted to high need districts, but the HR 345 is a good start.

ACCOUNTABILITY

While AASA has been in the forefront of advocating additional funds and additional targeting of those funds to high need students. We recognize that Congress, the state legislatures and local school boards ought to hold us accountable for bringing all students to meet the new standards, if new money is provided. And we strongly support the provisions of HR 345 to require that we provide clear evidence that student achievement is progressing toward the new standards.

Accountability for results is a large part of the new covenant between schools and the communities they serve. We argue that accountability is more than test scores, but it certainly includes the test scores required in Title I of HR 345. HR 345 properly requires states to use tests only for purposes for which they are validated, and to disaggregate data. Both of those requirements are necessary but not sufficient. We hope that the committee forces states to use separate tests for school accountability and individual student progress.

It is important to build accountability that assesses what students understand and can do. We distinguish assessment from testing in that assessment provides the information that teachers need to improve instruction and fill in gaps in student understanding and competence. Thus assessment should be specifically based on state standards, provide regular feedback, and should provide both quantitative and qualitative information that informs teaching and curriculum.

We recommend that every time a state uses one test for multiple purposes that it prove to the National Academy of Science that the test is valid for multiple purposes. States cannot validate tests for multiple purposes when all the best minds in testing say that isn't possible. The National Research Council of the National Academy of Science in its report on high stakes testing and the joint statement of the American Educational Research Association, the American Psychological Association and the National Council

on Measurement in Education both weighed in against using tests for purposes for which they were not validated, yet the practice continues.

AASA recommends that states be required to provide results for every test given to meet a state mandate within 30 days of completion of the test. Students, teachers and administrators need immediate feed back to really improve student performance and professional practices.

Disaggregation of data is good, but it only delivers the information that is already visible when students reach advanced courses in high school. Disaggregation makes a difference if schools receive ratings based on the lowest sub group scores not the aggregate scores. School averages can mask real failure for sub groups. If Congress is serious about serving all students then states need to rate schools based on sub group performance.

In researching the state accountability systems AASA has discovered that some states bought the cheapest possible test package from their test developers, or from the publishers of off the shelf tests. We do not know how wide spread this practice is but we urge this committee to forbid states to receive federal funds if they persist in such practices. In the event a state is does not provide data needed to improve student performance we urge that school districts or consortia of school districts be empowered to forgo the state tests and select or develop accountability measures including tests to obtain needed information to hold schools, school districts and students accountable. Item analysis is the only means possible to use tests to improve professional practices and

curriculum. If the states do not provide the analysis then teachers and administrators can only guess what they need to do improve. For schools with inexperienced teachers facing huge concentrations of high need students, asking improvement based on general test scores is like asking coaches to improve team performance based on scores, without benefit of viewing the game.

We also question the appropriateness of off the shelf tests to meet state standards, but will not pursue that here.

We urge that the accountability provisions in Title I be the basis for evaluation of the work in every other title in 3 R's and the final version of ESEA rather than process targets.

CONSOLIDATION

Perhaps the most widely noted feature of HR 345 has been consolidation of a few similar programs mostly in Title II. There has been an unfortunate branding of consolidation as means to create new block grants. Consolidation should not create block grants.

AASA will support rolling similar programs together to create larger funding streams that are carefully targeted to high need students and low resource schools. We will support consolidated programs that have the clear purpose of moving high need students and students in low resource schools to meet the new high state standards. AASA will support program consolidation that is accountable for results in student achievement not

counting participants or hours of participation. Administrators love flexibility, we always want more, but we know that must be balanced by targeting, clear purposes and accountability. Federal funds ought to bridge the opportunity gap between the rich and the poor English speakers and non-English speakers, and small isolated rural schools and metropolitan schools. The opportunity to learn is central to achievement of the new standards. Consolidating federal funds into larger streams will improve the impact of those funds because we do not foresee the day when federal funds become significantly larger share school revenues. HR 345 is a step in the right direction. HR 345 is not a radical step, just a first step that we applaud.

AASA will oppose new untargeted block grants or consolidation of programs. AASA will oppose block grants and consolidation that does not have the clear purpose of improving the opportunities of high need students whose schools lack resources to meet the new high standards needed for future success. We will oppose new block grants or program consolidations that are not accountable for the achievement of high need students and students in low resource schools.

We believe that consolidation should create very large funding streams, targeted entirely to student need (generally based on poverty), with the purpose of bringing high need students to meet the new state standards. Targeting, clear purposes and high accountability for student achievement must be the hallmarks of program consolidation. HR345 has consolidated some staff development and technology programs, and gathered other programs serving English language learners, and immigrants into a single title. The

reorganization and consolidation bring some order to the purposes of ESEA and some technology programs. We applaud the steps 3 R's takes toward consolidation. We hope that the administration and proponents of HR 1 follow the lead of 3 R's.

Finally we note how difficult consolidation actually is. For example, the ESEA reauthorization reported from the Senate HELP Committee authorizes funding for at least 55 programs, up from our count of 52 in current law.

PROMOTING PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND REJECTING VOUCHERS

I simply refer you to the testimony presented by Dr. Michael Flaniaan to the Subcommittee on Education Reform on March 14. Dr. Flanagan provided an articulate recounting of his leadership in creating 8 charter schools and facilitation of movement between school districts of more than 20,000 students in the Detroit area. We are encouraging school districts to provide all the enrollment options parents desire, and see evidence of that process making a very real difference in communities all over the country.

Every single school we could find that had been defined as failing by state authority serves a concentration of high need students. Available data indicate that inexperienced and uncertified teachers and administrators disproportionately staff schools defined as failing by states. In every case the students were poor and many were English language learners. Permitting some students to use scarce federal funds to attend private or

parochial schools and then imposing huge new administrative costs of public schools to track such students is an idea whose time has passed

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on an important first step to shaping the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. AASA urges that the principals and provisions in 3 R's be reflected in version of ESEA reported from this committee this spring.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: DR. PAUL HOUSTON

	Yes	No
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the Committee).		X
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 1998: none		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	X	
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 1998, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: CORPORATION FOR NATIONAL SERVICE $520,000.00 ENVIORNMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY $600,000.00 DEPT. OF EDUCATION – OERI $2,017,304.00		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:		X

Signature: Paul D. Houston Date: _____

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX G - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF WILLIAM S. WHITE, CHAIRMAN, CHARLES STEWART MOTT FOUNDATION, FLINT, M.I.

William S. White, President and CEO
Charles Stewart Mott Foundation
Testimony Before House Education and Workforce Committee
Transforming the Federal Role in Education for the 21st Century
March 29, 2001
2175 Rayburn House Office Building

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

My name is William S. White, and I am the President and CEO of the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation located in Flint, Michigan. I have come here today to urge you to maintain the 21st Century Community Learning Center (21st CCLC) initiative as a separate program with a separate appropriation as set forth in current law.

The Mott Foundation has more than 75 years of experience in funding and supporting community/school partnerships designed to help meet the needs of children and families in local communities. And it has committed more than $100 million to support the 21st Century afterschool initiative, which began only three years ago. In those 75 years, we have gained more than a little insight on what works.

I believe that the proposals before you seriously undermine and, in some cases, eviscerate a program that, while only in its infancy, is bearing important results. In debating these proposals, I would ask that you consider three fundamental points:

- **Scale & Momentum** – The program has momentum. It has grown very rapidly from a pilot program to its current funding level of $846 million. The 21st Century

Community Learning Centers initiative was designed as school reform legislation. By challenging the elements of the traditional school day and emphasizing community involvement and life-long learning, it was believed that this school-based initiative could teach us a great deal about making schools more effective, improving academic performance, and making children eager to learn. Likewise, it would lead us to new ideas about structuring the school day and school year. With learning at its core, it also was thought that these comprehensive centers could help address social development and keep kids safe, thus helping hardworking American families who are sending upwards of 15 million children home alone and unsupervised after school each day.

With strong voter backing, Congress has increased that initial $40 million to $846 million for 2001. In three breathtaking years, this program — the only federal funding source focused solely on increasing the supply of afterschool programs — has grown from serving 50,000 children and 15,000 adults in 99 communities to serving 1.2 million children and 450,000 adults in 1,500 communities. These programs are the best of the best, selected by a competitive grant process that saw 10 quality applications turned down for every one selected because of limited funding.

Despite its infancy and the challenges of exponential growth, this afterschool initiative is showing promising results: gains in student academic performance and attendance in school, as well as improvements in a range of social issues such as

youth crime, which, incidentally, is why the law enforcement community so strongly endorses this program. Our children who attend these programs like school better and have greater expectations for the future. In our experience, this scale is the best chance we've ever seen to make a permanent difference in how communities and schools work together. It's too soon to make wholesale changes in the program. If we do, we risk losing all the gains we've made.

- **Leverage** — The 21st Century afterschool initiative has leveraged considerable public and private resources. The program has served as a model for the nation. At least 21 states and one territory have current or proposed state funding for afterschool in the works, and at least 18 major cities have city-wide programs serving thousands of students with plans to expand. Just last week in Boston, a $21 million initiative involving local business along with government and nonprofits was announced. It was an exciting harbinger of things to come.

The Mott Foundation's own involvement in this program is said to be an unparalleled example of public-private partnership. Teaming up with the U.S. Department of Education to ensure the highest quality and accountability of this program, we have worked together to conduct annual bidders' conferences in each state to aid in the preparation of high quality proposals; train more than 10,000 local people to train others to run effective quality programs; provide unlimited free technical assistance; conduct important research about afterschool issues; institute a rigorous evaluation of

the 21st Century program; ensure access and equity of programs; identify promising practices; and provide extensive public education about the value of afterschool programs.

Some argue that local organizations are left out. Quite the contrary. Ninety percent of the schools have an average of six community-based organizations as partners. One-third report partnering with faith-based organizations. Almost 70 percent of the schools contract with community-based organizations (on average, about 25 percent of their grants) to provide afterschool services. In some cases, schools contract their entire afterschool program to these community organizations. Are they always matches made in heaven? No. But at the end of the day, it is about involving the community, local decisionmaking, and creating an infrastructure that will stand the test of time.

- **Public Will** — Data shows that afterschool programs make sense to the American people. That base of public will can be the foundation for building long-term support and will for public education. Through 21st Century, schools are open and becoming centers of community. People of all ages are being served and the more they are drawn into the school, the more they begin to see schools as critical public resources that deserve their vote. Without local support, programs will not be sustained and schools ultimately will fail.

With so much accomplished and so much to build upon, why are we trying to fix what clearly isn't broken?

Current proposals, among other things, call for merging 21st Century funding with other programs and/or block granting the funds. Aside from the danger that afterschool funding could get lost in the blend of funding streams, I believe this would have a chilling effect on afterschool initiatives generally, jeopardizing state and local funding, and quelling the momentum of the field. Moving programs to the states raises other critical concerns. Accountability is best assured by having national oversight with a single set of standards and requirements rather than 50 different programs. Fifty state programs require 50 infrastructures and 50 administrative budgets. Programs are harder to measure. It's much more costly to train practitioners and partners. Providing technical assistance becomes cumbersome.

Current 21st CCLC law is not perfect, but it requires only fine-tuning. However, if in your collective wisdom you insist upon remaking 21st CCLC, let me recommend the following to guide you:

Education & Accountability — It's all about making full use of the school as a resource for the entire community, which owns that building, and especially for kids, so we leave no child behind.

21st CCLC first and foremost is about education. Its other benefits and by-products are important, too — keeping kids safe, reducing juvenile crime in the afterschool hours, opening schools to the community, and giving parents the flexibility to work. It's got substance, content, focus, and a commitment to quality through competition. After all, competition breeds quality and requires planning. Evaluations are in place to measure impact. But just as Congress does, as a funder, I want this program to be accountable not only to Congress but also to local communities.

School-based or school-linked — The contributions that community-based organizations bring are priceless and essential for kids and communities. But to keep 21st CCLC focused on education, to build public will for education and to be accountable for performance, the link to school is essential.

Local partnerships — Local partnerships have been the cornerstone of 21st CCLC, sparking new partnerships between schools and all facets of their communities including faith-based organizations and the business community. Requiring these partnerships will lead to local sustainability. Incidentally, a critical key to local program sustainability is good, upfront planning. Local partners bring valuable insights to the planning process.

Public-private partnership — The Mott Foundation has been able to do things the Department of Education couldn't do.

- We've funded training for afterschool providers.
- We've funded the identification of promising practices.

- We've supported advocacy and state policy work.
- We've supplemented the federal evaluation dollars.
- We've served as a convener at the national and state levels, bringing folks together who otherwise wouldn't be talking to each other about what's best for kids.
- We've helped bring other private funders to the table, including major philanthropies and Fortune 500 companies.

All this has been possible because 21st CCLC is a competitive, targeted extended learning program based on accountability. To that end, any new legislation should:

- Keep the 21st Century Community Learning Center initiative a targeted, independent program with independent funding.
- Retain its focus on education.
- Ensure accountability through involvement of the Department of Education, either through national activities or direct administration.
- Promote quality through a competitive grant process.
- Require joint applications between schools and community partners.
- Require a match that escalates over the life of the grant to help stimulate program sustainability.
- Close the funding gap between quality applications and available funds.
- Build upon the unique partnership with private funders such as the Mott Foundation.

- Expand grants to five years. Experienced grantmakers share the belief that it takes a minimum of five years for a program to take root and to capture public buy-in. 21st Century has had only three years. In June, the pioneering 99 projects will end their grants and go it alone.
- If states become involved, hold them accountable for results based on competition.

We need to stay the course and build upon this public investment, not create new rules and new regulations that will slow this important progress. President Bush has challenged all of us to leave no child behind. I submit that the current 21st Century Community Learning Centers initiative is well on its way to fulfilling his vision and, in the process, are helping kids find the hero within. Thank you.

Committee on Education and the Workforce

Witness Disclosure Requirement – "Truth in Testimony"
Required by House Rule XI, Clause 2(g)

Your Name: William S. White		
1. Will you be representing a federal, State, or local government entity? (If the answer is yes please contact the Committee).	Yes	No ✓
2. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) which you have received since October 1, 1998: None.		
3. Will you be representing an entity other than a government entity?	Yes X	No
4. Other than yourself, please list what entity or entities you will be representing: Charles Stewart Mott Foundation Flint, Michigan		
5. Please list any offices or elected positions held and/or briefly describe your representational capacity with each of the entities you listed in response to question 4: None		
6. Please list any federal grants or contracts (including subgrants or subcontracts) received by the entities you listed in response to question 4 since October 1, 1998, including the source and amount of each grant or contract: None		
7. Are there parent organizations, subsidiaries, or partnerships to the entities you disclosed in response to question number 4 that you will not be representing? If so, please list:	Yes	No X

Signature: _____ Date: March 28, 2001

Please attach this sheet to your written testimony.

APPENDIX H – SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, BUSINESS COALITION FOR EXCELLENCE IN EDUCATION, PRESS RELEASE, "BUSINESS LEADERS GIVE HIGH MARKS TO HOUSE EDUCATION BILL".

Business Coalition for
Excellence in Education

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Thursday, March 22, 2001, 12 Noon Eastern

CONTACT: Sheppard Ranbom/
Joseph Garcia
(202) 955-9450

Business Leaders Give High Marks to House Education Bill

Coalition Says Bill Will Bolster Standards, Assessment, Student Achievement and Teacher Quality

WASHINGTON – March 22, 2001 – A coalition of more than 70 of the nation's leading business executives applauded the introduction in Congress today of H.R. 1, the *No Child Left Behind* education bill, and urged Democratic and Republican lawmakers to work together to make the bill a landmark piece of education reform.

The Business Coalition for Excellence in Education (BCEE) praised leaders on Capitol Hill for moving forward on this national priority and expressed confidence that the bill will serve as a strong starting point for achieving bipartisan consensus on what needs to be done to raise student achievement.

"This bill focuses on students, and that's what this debate is all about," said Roberts Jones, chairman and CEO of the National Alliance of Business and spokesperson for BCEE. "The legislation meets objectives that we in the business community have outlined as critical outcomes for improving federal education policy and student results. The bill will help give our schools both the resources and flexibility they need to bolster student performance."

"H.R. 1 includes many of the tough, bipartisan provisions that passed the House last year, and we urge both parties to work together to produce legislation that merits broad support," Jones added.

Business leaders praised the bill's commitment to helping states meet the needs of all students by focusing on higher standards in key subject areas, annual testing to measure student achievement, improved mathematics and science instruction, better integration of technology into the classroom, and more effective and flexible use of resources. They also noted that they would work with Education and Workforce Committee Chairman John Boehner (R-OH), Representative George Miller (D-CA), individual members of the committee, and other interested members of Congress to produce the strongest bill possible.

"Previously, the federal government placed strict requirements on state use of federal money that did not result in significant gains in student learning," said Jenifer Eisen Verdery, Intel Corp.'s manager of education and workforce policy. "This bill combines flexibility with accountability and creates a real partnership between states and the federal government, giving states a role in determining how federal dollars should be spent to meet their own

educational goals. We give kudos to the members of the committee for their excellent work on H.R. 1."

BCEE offered special commendation to the draft bill for its endorsement of the following legislative measures:

- **Annual Assessments:** BCEE regards annual testing as the keystone of successful education reform if testing is used to chart student progress against measurable standards and to target resources where they are needed most. H.R. 1 provides funding to states for the development and implementation of tests tied to state standards. The bill calls for annual testing of student progress in reading and math in grades 3 through 8.

- **Accountability for School Performance:** Accountability measures provide incentives for schools to demonstrate greater improvement in student performance. The draft bill is in line with BCEE's principles by requiring evidence of adequate yearly progress in student achievement and providing both rewards and sanctions in the case of low-performing school districts.

- **Raising the Bar for Math and Science Education:** To help the nation develop the high-tech, high-skill workforce required in the 21st century, the federal government can play a significant role in strengthening math and science education and teaching. The creation of math and science partnerships between education agencies, higher education, and the private sector is an important provision of the bill.

- **Strengthening Teacher Quality:** BCEE supports the bill's focus on enhancing the quality, professionalism, and morale of our nation's teachers and ensuring that teachers possess both the knowledge and the resources they need to raise student achievement. H.R. 1 offers a variety of improvements in this area, including new investments in professional development, reform of certification standards, mentoring and induction programs for new teachers, and merit-based performance evaluation.

- **Technology for Tomorrow's Classrooms:** Technology and the Internet must be integrated into all appropriate aspects of teaching and learning to improve students' 21st century skills. The bill offers professional development for new teachers, access to high technology for high-needs schools, and promotes innovative local and state initiatives to use technology to improve student achievement.

The Business Coalition for Excellence in Education is an ad hoc coalition of leading U.S. corporations and business organizations that support effective reform in the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. BCEE is co-chaired by Craig Barrett, Chairman and CEO, Intel, Thomas Engibous, Chairman, President and CEO of Texas Instruments, Louis Gerstner, Chairman and CEO of IBM, and Edward Rust, Chairman and CEO of State Farm Insurance Companies. For more information on BCEE, its membership, and its principles, go to www.nab.com.

# # #

Business Coalition for Excellence in Education • 1201 New York Ave., N.W., Suite 700
Washington, DC 20005
Phone (202) 289-2932 • Fax (202) 289-1303

APPENDIX I – SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD BY KEITH E. BAILEY, SUMMARY OF REPORT, "INVESTING IN TEACHING".

THE BUSINESS ROUNDTABLE

NATIONAL ALLIANCE OF BUSINESS

NAM National Association of Manufacturers

Investing in Teaching:

A Common Agenda

Business leaders are committed to improving public schools in this country. Our interest is motivated by the reality that students need increased skills and knowledge to be successful in the workforce, higher education, and in life.

Business leaders have focused on ensuring clearer and higher standards, assessments, and accountability for student learning in every school, and we are heartened by the progress now being made in states and school districts. Making sure all children -- and not just a lucky few—are challenged by rigorous academic expectations is an imperative.

However, we know that raising standards is only the first step in helping schools improve. Without high quality teachers, our efforts to improve student achievement are destined to fail. Research has shown again and again that teachers can make the critical difference in whether or not a student succeeds. We know that if students are to meet ambitious expectations, they must have superbly prepared teachers equal to the task. And while we know other changes must be made in schools and their administration, we recognize that this one—the quality of teaching—is paramount.

Therefore, as corporate leaders who are committed to higher standards and improved performance in public schools, we commit ourselves to work with equal vigor and advocacy on the task of ensuring an effective teacher for every child. To achieve this goal, we propose an agenda that will elevate teaching to a profession.

We must approach all of the elements of the profession—teacher education, professional development, and compensation. We call on states and communities to use this agenda as an overall framework to improve the quality of teaching. Together, we must:

1. Create a new model of teacher preparation and professional development.
If teachers as professionals are essential to helping all students reach high academic standards, we must provide them with the knowledge and tools to do the job.

- **Preparation:** Schools of education should raise admissions requirements and work with arts and sciences faculties to offer high-quality preparation programs. New alternative certification programs should create opportunities for non-traditional candidates to enter the teaching profession. Regardless of their preparation program, teachers should be rigorously tested before they are licensed to ensure mastery of the subjects they teach and knowledge of how to teach those subjects to students.
- **Professional Development:** Beginning teachers need extra support so that they can become full-fledged professionals. Practicing teachers need professional development that is adequately funded, of continuing high quality, and designed to enhance professional learning in the service of improving student achievement. Time must be built into the school day and calendar year for such professional development to occur.
- **National Board Certification:** The National Board for Professional Teaching Standards provides a valuable process for recognizing and rewarding excellent teachers. We believe every school should have a cadre of "master" teachers certified by the National Board.

2. Create a new model of pay tied to performance and a new employment compact.

As we raise expectations of teachers, we also must raise standards for the profession: how teachers are paid, what career options are available, and how teaching effectiveness is evaluated.

- **Compensation:** Teachers need to be paid more so that teaching is competitive with other professions and pay is consistent with the new requirements for teachers. But compensation must be based on performance, providing added benefit to those who improve their knowledge and skills and increase their impact on student learning. We also must create incentives to attract teachers to shortage fields and hard-to-staff and low-performing schools.
- **Career Opportunities:** Teachers must have access to a range of job-related roles for growth *within* the profession, such as serving as mentors for new teachers, peer assessors, or adjunct university faculty. School districts should deal with teachers on a year-round schedule — compensating teachers for differentiated responsibilities on differentiated calendars and providing more time for professional development.
- **Employment Compact:** To make this system work, teachers need time-specific employment compacts that spell out expectations of teachers as well as assistance and incentives that will be available for them. And, we must overhaul teacher evaluation systems so that they are credible, fair, and based on standards of good teaching and evidence of student learning.

3. Create a new school environment that provides teachers with the freedom and flexibility to achieve results.

Teachers deserve a professional environment that respects their expertise. As clearer academic standards focus schools on achieving results, schools — and the teachers in them — must have the flexibility to use resources and personnel in ways that advance student achievement goals.

- **Increased Flexibility:** Decision-making authority in school districts should be decentralized — with teachers able to design instructional programs and school staff given significant budget authority and hiring flexibility. Teachers must also have tools — from resources like office space and technology to job-related information — to make smart decisions that help them do their jobs better.
- **Portable Credentials and Pensions:** In order to create an environment that encourages teachers to move where they are needed most, we need portable teaching licenses and a voluntary national retirement plan.

We understand that this vision of the teaching profession will require substantial new investments as well as tough decisions about existing school resources. In communities all across this country, people have made the investments necessary to implement each of the ideas we propose. We will work with district and school leaders to review and help reprioritize budgets and with state leaders to find new funding sources for these changes. We make these recommendations in recognition of the enormous effect technology will have on education over the next ten years.

Change is never easy and rarely cost-free. Business leaders recognize that the agenda we propose for teaching quality is significant and will take the better part of this decade to accomplish. As we've done for higher standards and improved accountability in schools, we're ready to work tenaciously to implement this agenda for however long it takes.

We commit to this difficult task because we believe so strongly that it will return huge dividends for American students. Our conviction is that every child needs a great teacher, and we believe this agenda will enable us to accomplish that goal.

For more information on the business community's agenda for teaching, read the report **Investing in Teaching.** *To obtain a copy, please call the National Alliance of Business at 800-787-7788 or visit the NAB website (**www.nab.com**).*

APPENDIX J – SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, "THE 'RECEPTIVITY FACTOR', DEFINING THE BOUNDARIES OF ACCOUNTABILITY", EDUCATION WEEK, BY DAVY McCLAY, Ph.D.

EDUCATION WEEK

American Education's Newspaper of Record Volume XIX, Number 26 • March 14, 2001 ©2000 Editorial Projects in Education / $3.00

The 'Receptivity Factor'

Defining the Boundaries of Accountability

By Davy McClay

Barbara Murray

How much of a test score is attributable to home-instilled receptivity, and how much is due to a teacher's skill and delivery?

As an educator, I feel glad when I hear our new president vowing to be the "champion of education." Prospects of a large budget surplus have enabled him, as well as his predecessor and his opponent in the recent presidential election, to engage in some previously unheard-of rhetoric in this area. Sharing in the possibilities they have outlined has been exciting. Up to a point. It appears now that a big part of the programs being promoted will involve holding us teachers more "accountable." While I'm very much in favor of accountability, defining it in terms of my students' test scores is problematic.

Test scores provide generalized indicators of how students are doing and where parents and teachers need to put their focus to ensure maximum benefit for each child. To politicians, though, test scores offer a nice, simple bottom line. They have fallen in love with test scores as a quick and easy measure of classroom effectiveness. Yet no reputable educational researcher would back wholeheartedly any claims that normative tests such as the Stanford Achievement Test-9th Edition, used here in California, are valid and reliable measures of "classroom learning." Spokespersons for the test publishers might claim that their products are "the best," but that dodges the question.

The metaphor undergirding our belief that teachers are accountable for students' test scores is one from the world of business. Test scores are supposedly our "product" in education. But, to stretch that metaphor just a bit, the material we are given for production lacks any quality control. How raw or un-raw the material may be when it comes to us is anybody's guess. Likewise, any changes that may occur with a child's "rawness factor" during the course of a year is open to speculation.

The rawness factor of each child could be defined as the amount of receptivity the child has to the mainstream-oriented curriculum we teachers deliver. There is usually a correlation between (a) a child's receptivity to our curriculum and (b) the socioeconomic status of his or her parents. Here is how it works: Higher-socioeconomic-status parents have been through the system and thus have the knowledge and ability to prewire their children's brains in the home, so that they are able to be more receptive to the curriculum. The parents, after all, received largely the same curriculum when they were in school. Lower-socioeconomic-status parents, on the other hand, typically have not successfully maneuvered the system, and therefore are limited in their ability to prewire their children's brains.

Since it is impossible to determine how "raw" or "un-raw" our students' minds may be when they come to the classroom, there is no way to accurately determine how much teacher competence will be reflected in their test scores. So, if we continue the business metaphor, what we are doing amounts essentially to holding teachers accountable for somebody else's preproduction—and without any system of accountability for these other parties. Such a practice would never pass muster under business management.

Nevertheless, I confess to believing intuitively that what I do has a great impact on my students' scores. In my mind's eye, I see the curriculum I'm delivering as so awesome that my 4th graders cannot fail to stomp any performance measure, including the next Stanford-9. I don't know any other way to work. Like most of my colleagues, my optimism materializes anew each year, without a trace of memory betraying the dashed hopes of previous years (at least in terms of students "stomping" the test).

Many of my students do show significant gains in their test scores over the previous year. But how much of the increase is attributable to me? Often, teachers get all the credit as well as the blame. But that logic assumes that parental and other influences on a student's academic performance remain static from year to year. These assumptions may be right. But they also may be wrong. How do we know?

How much of a test score, or a test-score increase or decrease, is attributable to children's home-instilled "receptivity factor," and how much is due to a teacher's skill and delivery? There is no sound statistical method that can provide us valid and reliable answers to these questions.

We do need to hold our teachers accountable. But that can be done by measuring how well they do what they do. Teachers should be rewarded for engaging in delivery-enhancing specialized training, for earning classroom-related advanced degrees, for achieving National Board for Professional Teaching Standards certification. Even more important, teachers need to work together to implement peer reviews. Those who fare well on these should be rewarded. Those who do not should be remediated, if possible, and given opportunities for other employment if remediation is not successful. There also should be rewards for teachers who engage in special parent activities aimed at helping at-risk students enhance their receptivity to classroom learning. These are meaningful measures of accountability.

We teachers expect President Bush and everyone else to hold us accountable. But we want them to remember that there is no firm statistical foundation for basing that accountability on our students' receptivity to the curriculum, as reflected in their test scores. The standard of accountability should be based on factors that teachers can directly control, such as our educational delivery skills.

And when we pass such accountability tests, we should be paid what highly skilled professionals deserve—and given the space and freedom to do our jobs, working hand in hand with parents. ■

Davy McClay is an elementary school teacher in Los Angeles and earned certification from the National Board for Professional Teaching Standards.

Table of Indexes

Chairman Boehner, 2, 4, 6, 8, 9, 11, 13, 16, 18, 19, 20, 23, 24, 29, 31, 33, 36, 37, 40, 43, 45, 48
Mr. Andrews, 37, 38, 39, 40
Mr. Bailey, 6, 18, 22, 23, 31, 35, 44, 45
Mr. Connor, 8, 28, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 43, 44, 45, 46
Mr. Hoekstra, 23, 24, 26, 27
Mr. Houston, 14, 27, 28, 30, 34, 42
Mr. Keller, 36, 37
Mr. Kildee, 5, 24, 25, 27
Mr. Miller, 3, 20, 21, 22
Mr. Owens, 40, 42, 43, 44, 45
Mr. Payne, 45, 46, 47, 48
Mr. Roemer, 29, 30, 31
Mr. Schaffer, 27, 28, 29
Mr. Scott, 43
Mr. Souder, 31, 33
Mr. White, 16, 24, 25, 26, 34, 41, 42
Ms. Foster, 10, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 28, 33, 35, 37, 40, 43, 46, 47
Ms. Weingarten, 11, 20, 26
Ms. Woolsey, 33, 34, 35, 36