

**DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES, EDUCATION, AND RE-  
LATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS**

**WEDNESDAY, MARCH 1, 2006**

U.S. SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met at 10:45 a.m., in room SD-124, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Arlen Specter (chairman) presiding.  
Present: Senators Specter, Craig, Harkin, Kohl, Murray, and Landrieu.

**DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION**

**OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY**

**STATEMENT OF HON. MARGARET SPELLINGS, SECRETARY  
ACCOMPANIED BY: THOMAS SKELLY, DIRECTOR, BUDGET SERVICE**

**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER**

Senator SPECTER. Good morning Ladies, and Gentlemen, the subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education will now proceed with our hearing on the budget from the Department of Education. I regret our delayed start, but we just finished a vote on the PATRIOT Act, and Senator Harkin was on the floor and should be here I think, shortly. Scheduling has been complicated because of this vote. As you know we had moved the time from 9:30 to 11:00 and then back to 10:30 and we don't like to keep people waiting, especially the Secretary of Education. But we welcome you here, Madam Secretary.

You were confirmed on January 20, 2005. You have extensive experience working for the President when he had been a Governor; you were Assistant to the Secretary for Domestic Policy. You were Senior Advisor to then Governor Bush with responsibilities for developing and implementing the Governor's education policy. You are a graduate of the University of Houston, with a bachelor's degree in political science and journalism.

**PREPARED STATEMENT**

Madam Secretary, I shall be relatively brief because of our time here, our late start. Without objection, my written statement will be included in the record. As you and I have talked briefly earlier this week, I'm concerned about the overall budget. We had a budget for this subcommittee, which has in addition to the Department

of Education, Health and Human Services and Labor, which fell about \$8 billion short when you figure the cuts and take into account, inflation. I know that it is difficult as a loyal member of the administration when you have the policies working up through the Office of Management and Budget. But as I said to you in our telephone conversation, and as I've said repeatedly, I think there's a real need for someone in your position to be a tough advocate for your Department. Education is simply under funded. When I took a look at the President's budget, we're always asked for comment and I wanted to be definitive and brief and chose the word scandalous which I think it is. I know the President, the administration have tremendous problems in many, many areas but when you have so much money for the National Institutes for Health, and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and Worker Safety, and Mine Safety, and important education programs, it's simply insufficient to have continual cuts on discretionary programs. We're regrettably moving to a system where there will be no discretionary funding at all. We'll all be out of jobs. The Appropriations Committee, which used to be—was once a powerful committee.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER

This morning, the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education will discuss the President's \$54.410 billion 2007 budget request for the Department of Education. We are delighted to have before us the distinguished Secretary of Education, the Honorable Margaret Spellings, our Nation's 8th Secretary of Education.

Madam Secretary, your impressive biography clearly illustrates your abilities and potential for leading this important Department. Being a mother of two school-age daughters gives you important insights into your other job as Secretary of Education.

This subcommittee is pleased to see several shared priorities funded in the fiscal year 2007 budget including the \$200 million request for school improvement grants, \$380 million for the American Competitiveness Initiative, and additional funding for foreign language instruction and the Advanced Placement Program.

However, I am concerned that the budget is \$2.1 billion below the fiscal year 2006 level and that there are 42 program eliminations. For example, \$303 million currently available for Gear-Up, which provides for the transition from seventh grade to college; \$1.2 billion for State grants for vocational and technical education programs; and \$23 million for correctional education programs all are proposed for elimination. The Pell Grant maximum award is frozen at \$4,050 for the fifth year in a row.

I know, Madam Secretary, that you can appreciate the difficult tradeoffs that this subcommittee will need to negotiate in the coming months as we balance the competing pressures of biomedical research, worker protection programs and continued investment in our Nation's youth. Madam Secretary, I look forward to working with you to craft an appropriations bill that maintains our commitment to fiscal restraint while preserving funding for high priority programs.

Senator SPECTER. Senator Landrieu, would you care to be acting ranking and make an opening statement?

STATEMENT OF SENATOR MARY L. LANDRIEU

Senator LANDRIEU. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator SPECTER. Or not be acting, just make an opening statement.

## DEPARTMENT LAUDED FOR HURRICANE RESPONSE

Senator LANDRIEU. It's hard shoes to fill, but I will make an opening statement. Just very briefly because I appreciate that we want to hear our witness. But I wanted, Mr. Chairman, to be here this morning to give compliments to this Department—being mindful of what you said and agreeing with the level of funding which I'll get back to in a minute. Which I fully agree is scandalous. But Madam Secretary, your Department has been really a model of partnership for the State of Louisiana through the most difficult time that our State has experienced. I spoke to the Secretary, Mr. Chairman, privately before to let her know that if every Department of the Federal Government had worked this honestly, this reliably, with us we would not be experiencing the problems that we're experiencing now. In all of the calls, and I had thousands of calls about Katrina and Rita and the devastation that occurred, not one call did my office receive from any school or university in the country or from any parent saying they couldn't find a place for their child, or their young person to go to school. Number one, because the word went out across the country, please take the 330,000 children that showed up for school on Friday; the hurricane hit on Sunday, and they had no school to go to on Monday.

Mr. Chairman, it's a credit to the education establishment in this country that almost to my knowledge, every high school student, every elementary school student, and every college student that wanted to, found a place to continue their education of the last 6 months, and Madam Secretary, I think you deserve a lot of credit for that.

Second, the quickness in which we were able in a bipartisan way, we were able to implement with the chairman's help and assistance the special funding for getting our schools back up and started also is a great model. Having said that, we still have many problems as you know. We're hoping the new school system that emerges in New Orleans can be a model for the Nation as it emerges as a network of public charter schools and we're going to need your ongoing help and commitment to that end.

We do have problems with FEMA in terms of reimbursing and not reimbursing for school construction, we've lost over 100 school buildings, Mr. Chairman, which is a great strain on any system, to have to try to build the physical plants as well as the internal operations. But I did want to start with that and then finally say, having said that, the overall budget for the Nation is just not sufficient to meet the new standards and challenges that we have set for our schools as we struggle to provide excellence, opportunity, no guarantee Madam Secretary, but an opportunity.

## TITLE I FUNDING

Title I funding, is the only Title that helps poor and lower middle-income children get the resources they need; to have the kinds of schools they need to be excellent. With that funding decreasing I don't know how our poor counties and middle-income counties that are struggling can meet the targets of No Child Left Behind, which means closing that achievement gap. So that's what I'm

going to focus on in the committee and, Mr. Chairman, I thank you very much.

Senator SPECTER. Well thank you very much, Senator Landrieu. Well welcome again, Madam Secretary, the floor is yours, and we look forward to your testimony.

#### SUMMARY STATEMENT OF HON. MARGARET SPELLINGS

Secretary SPELLINGS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It does seem like all roads lead to you today, and so I'm at your service, and thank you for all your work that you're doing, not only in this arena, but in many others.

#### EDUCATION FUNDS DISBURSED FOR HURRICANE RECOVERY

Senator Landrieu, thank you for your very generous comments. I appreciate the opportunity to be here and your support. Let me begin first, by thanking all of you for your work on behalf of the victims of hurricanes Rita and Katrina. As Senator Landrieu has talked about, we've worked a lot on that. After you passed the Hurricane Education Recovery Act in December, we sent immediately \$250 million to Louisiana, Mississippi, Texas, and Alabama to help re-open schools in the region. That was in addition to \$20 million that we sent to help open, or re-open, charter schools for affected students in Louisiana, and more than \$200 million that we sent to help college students in the region. We'll be sending another \$500 million in aid to these States in the coming days, and we've been consulting with experts at the Federal, State, and local levels, reviewing records from tax data, property loss data, and insurance claims, to make sure that this money is allocated fairly.

We'll also be providing \$645 million to reimburse districts all over the country for the cost of educating displaced students, as they've done so welcomingly, and so well. We've been working with States to help accelerate this process and to identify the number of displaced students so we can begin sending this money to schools.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2007 EDUCATION BUDGET REQUEST

But today I'm here to talk about the President's budget, and it's more important than ever that we spend taxpayer dollars wisely and well. Since taking office in 2001, the President has worked with you to increase funding for education by about 30 percent. The new budget increases education spending in key areas, but, as you've observed, not across the board. I know together we have a very tough job ahead. The programs you make funding decisions for are discretionary and you don't have much room to maneuver. It's only getting harder to fund priorities and reduce the deficit, because of the rising cost of entitlement spending.

#### AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS INITIATIVE

At the same time, as policymakers we must focus on results. We've looked at data to see what policies are working for students, and where we can save taxpayers money or work more efficiently and effectively by eliminating and consolidating less effective programs. Raising student achievement is always our watch word. The

President's new American Competitiveness Initiative would devote \$380 million to strengthen K–12 math and science education. Overall the Department of Education will increase funding for its programs in these critical fields by 51 percent. The President has asked me to form a national math panel of experts to help us bring together the best research on proven strategies for teaching math; just as we've done in reading. His budget includes \$250 million for a new program called Math Now, that will help elementary and middle school students develop the academic foundation to eventually take higher-level classes in high school, such as Advanced Placement courses. The trouble today is that more than a third of our high schools offer no AP classes and that needs to change, especially when we know that students are going to need these skills in a world where 90 percent of the fastest growing jobs require postsecondary education.

The President has also called for \$122 million to prepare an additional 70,000 teachers to lead Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate classes in math, science, and critical foreign languages. The budget includes \$25 million to help recruit 30,000 math and science professionals to become adjunct high school teachers in these critical areas.

I know there are concerns about resources, but in reality we have resources available around these priorities. Currently 13 different government agencies spend about \$2.8 billion on 207 different programs for math and science. The problem is that these programs are in their own silos with little or no coordination with No Child Left Behind and its goals for raising student achievement. It's a 1,000 flowers blooming and maybe even a few weeds throughout the Government.

We should align these efforts with the principles of No Child Left Behind by continuing to hold schools accountable for getting students to grade-level proficiency by 2014, and by giving local policy-makers and educators resources, authority, and the research base to do what's best.

#### SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND HIGH SCHOOL REFORM

Thanks to No Child Left Behind, we've reached a point where we have the data to see what's working in our schools and what needs to work better. We're proposing a new \$200 million School Improvement program to help States use what we've learned to turn around schools in need of improvement. Now we must build on the foundations of the NCLB law, which is working in grades three through eight, to extend the benefits of assessment and accountability for results into our high schools, with the President's \$1.5 billion high school reform proposal. There's a wide and growing consensus that we have a problem in our high schools and we must work together to address these issues. A high school diploma must be a record of achievement and not just a certificate of attendance. If we raise the bar, our students will rise to the challenge just as they always have, but we must give them the skills to compete.

## PREPARED STATEMENT

Thank you. I'd be glad to answer any questions. With me today is Tom Skelly, our Budget Director, who tells me he's been doing this since 1976. So he knows what he's doing by now.

[The statement follows:]

## PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. MARGARET SPELLINGS

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. Thank you for this opportunity to testify on behalf of the President's 2007 budget for education. I know you have received our Congressional justifications and other background materials laying out the details of our request, so I will concentrate on a few key highlights.

President Bush is requesting \$54.4 billion in discretionary appropriations for the Department of Education in fiscal year 2007. We are proposing significant increases in key areas, as well as substantial savings from reductions in lower priorities. The result would be a discretionary total that is up more than \$12 billion, or 29 percent, since fiscal year 2001.

We know the 2007 budget process will involve difficult trade-offs among existing programs, just as was the case with the 2006 appropriations bill. In 2006, we saw that this Subcommittee was willing to balance funding for priority programs with reductions and eliminations in other activities, and we hope you will take the same approach in 2007.

For example, our budget would save \$3.5 billion by eliminating funding for 42 programs. These reductions and terminations reflect the Administration's longstanding goal of providing local control, streamlining government to avoid unnecessary duplication, and targeting taxpayer dollars to those programs with the greatest promise of improving student outcomes. Let me add that we very much appreciate the efforts of this Subcommittee last year in eliminating five Department programs, and making significant reductions in several others, in order to better target existing resources. We look forward to working with you on this goal again this year.

## A BROAD EMPHASIS ON COMPETITIVENESS

President Bush has made ensuring American competitiveness in the global economy a strong priority in his overall 2007 budget, primarily through his American Competitiveness Initiative. Several of the increases in the Department's request are part of that Initiative, and I'll say more about them in a minute, but I think most of you would agree that we need to address the competitiveness issue in America's schools now, this year. This is why most of our major increases for 2007—not just those included in the President's Initiative—are aimed at keeping our students, and our workforce, competitive for the 21st century.

In that context, a key proposal for 2007 is a renewed request for High School Reform, a \$1.5 billion initiative to support a wide range of locally determined reforms aimed at ensuring that every student not only graduates from high school, but graduates with the skills to succeed in either college or the workforce. The High School Reform proposal also would require States to assess students, in reading or language arts and math, at two additional grades in high school. NCLB currently requires assessments in these subjects for just one high school grade. We believe the additional assessments are needed to increase accountability and give parents and teachers the information they need to keep all students on track toward graduation. And more generally, these assessments will help researchers and policymakers understand more about what works and what doesn't work in our high schools, a key goal when about 1 million high school students a year drop out, at great cost to our economy and society. Too many students drop out, and too many of them are minorities.

We also are seeking \$100 million for the Striving Readers program, which is applying the lessons of the successful Reading First model, which translates research into practice to improve reading instruction for young children, at the secondary school level. The \$70 million increase for this program would expand support for the development and implementation of research-based methods for improving the skills of teenage students who are reading below grade level, and who otherwise might end up dropping out of school. It's hard to compete with anyone if you don't finish high school.

## MATH AND SCIENCE

A critical new focus for 2007 is on improving student achievement in math and science from the early grades through high school, and the President is seeking \$380 million in new funding to support this goal through his American Competitiveness Initiative (ACI). That total includes \$250 million for two proposed programs we call Math Now, one focused on developing and implementing proven instructional practices for students in grades K–6, and one to support research-based interventions for middle school students. Both initiatives would be guided by the recommendations of a National Mathematics Panel that I will appoint soon, and that will be charged with identifying essential math content and sound instructional principles, just as the National Reading Panel did for reading instruction.

Another key ACI request is a \$90 million increase for the Advanced Placement program, to expand incentives for training teachers and encouraging students, particularly in high-poverty schools, to take high-level Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate courses in math, science, and critical foreign languages. We also are proposing a new requirement for State or private-sector matching funds to expand the reach of the AP program, so that we can train an estimated 70,000 teachers over the next five years. Over the long term, this proposal would increase the number of students taking AP-IB exams in math, science, and critical foreign languages from 380,000 today to 1.5 million in 2012, and triple the number of students passing these tests to 700,000 by 2012.

I believe that increasing the number of American students studying and gaining fluency in critical foreign languages is essential not only for our national security, as suggested by the President's National Security Language Initiative, but also to maintain our economic competitiveness. That's why I'm very pleased that our request includes \$35 million in new funds for a package of proposals that would encourage more students to master a critical foreign language. The largest proposal is \$24 million for Advancing America Through Foreign Language Partnerships, a new program that would link postsecondary institutions with school districts to support language learning from kindergarten through high school, as well as advanced language study at the postsecondary level.

## BUILDING STATE CAPACITY FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

We continue to make good progress in implementing No Child Left Behind, with scores on State assessments up significantly across the country, and the National Assessment of Educational Progress showing real improvements in closing achievement gaps, especially in the early grades addressed by key NCLB programs like Title I and Reading First. Our 2007 request would help maintain that positive momentum, while providing a new push in the area of school improvement. Our budget would provide \$12.7 billion for Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies, which is the foundation of NCLB, while funding a \$200 million School Improvement Grants program. This initiative would help States to establish and expand the state-wide systems of improvement and support that are essential to the long-term success of NCLB. If we're going to reach the 100-percent proficiency goal by 2013–14, we need to make continuous improvement our watchword, and our request would help States do just that.

Our request also would support additional options for students enrolled in schools that have been identified for restructuring—these are chronically low-performing schools that have not made adequate yearly progress under NCLB for at least 5 years. The \$100 million America's Opportunity Scholarships for Kids program would permit the parents of such students to transfer their children to a private school or to obtain intensive tutoring or other supplemental services, including after-school and summer-school instruction. The President believes that for accountability to be meaningful, there must be real consequences for schools and real options for students and parents.

## OTHER PROGRAMS

The 2007 budget would provide a \$100 million increase for the reauthorized Special Education Grants to States program, for a total increase of \$4.3 billion, or 69 percent, over the past five years. We also would maintain a \$4,050 Pell Grant maximum award with a \$12.7 billion request for that program, while continuing to support the new Academic Competitiveness Grants and National SMART Grants program. I want to thank the Members of this Subcommittee, along with your colleagues in the House, for supporting these critical new grant programs. In particular, SMART Grants complement the President's American Competitiveness Initiative by awarding up to \$4,000 annually to third- and fourth-year postsecondary

students majoring in physical, life, or computer sciences, mathematics, technology, engineering, or a critical foreign language.

#### CONCLUSION

These highlights of our 2007 request show that within the very tight constraints required by the need to reduce the Federal budget deficit in a time of war, we are proposing a strong education budget, one that will maintain and even accelerate progress under No Child Left Behind, while making key new investments in critical areas designed to ensure our future competitiveness in the 21st century global economy.

I will be happy to answer any questions you may have.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2007 EDUCATION BUDGET PRIORITIES

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Madam Secretary. I begin with the questions which I posed in the letter which I sent to you, last month. I focus at the outset on the proposed budget for the Department of Education, being \$2.1 billion below last year. The Department has highlighted rising test scores, a narrowing of the achievement gaps since the passage of No Child Left Behind, and the increase in Federal funding that has accomplished those results. What are the prospects for continued progress with the budget cuts which are in your proposal?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well Senator, I think there are a couple of answers to that. One is that the priorities of No Child Left Behind are indeed funded in the President's budget—the emphasis on reading, the emphasis on teacher development, the emphasis on Title I. Then there are the additional resources that we are requesting for school improvement—the \$200 million that we need as the No Child Left Behind law matures—as well as the investment in competitiveness, and in high schools, and in math and science. So I think that where we have resources we've focused them on the goals of No Child Left Behind. Second, I would say that a lot of the infrastructure that was needed to be put in place to do No Child Left Behind, such as assessments, and reading curriculum reform and those sorts of things, has been done, and now we're turning our attention to the maturing of No Child Left Behind and these other priorities.

Senator SPECTER. The difficulty, Madam Secretary, is that there are cuts in a lot of programs which impact the students whom you're trying to deal with in No Child Left Behind. You're robbing Peter to pay Paul, really. When you have a net decrease of \$2.1 billion and you have the inflation factor as well, it just seems to me that it's impossible to make it up with the shuffling that you're suggesting.

#### PUBLIC SCHOOL CHOICE AND SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES

What is the situation with the repeated public comments about the difficulty of moving students from one school which is not satisfactory to other schools? We see constant complaints that the recipient school districts are unable to accommodate the students, that that has not really been a practical or realistic program?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Let me make a couple of comments about that, Senator. First, I've observed that also. We have about a 10 percent take-up, if you will: 2 million students are eligible for supplemental services, and about 200,000 students are seeking those options. So we must do a better job of making sure those options

for parents are real. But one of the things I think I've learned, and we're piloting strategies in various places around the country, is, does it make more sense—and we ought to get some data about this—to allow students to get extra intervention and supplemental services before the public school choice options are used. So we're testing that theory in Chicago, Los Angeles, New York, and some districts in Virginia will also test that out. Does it make more sense, before we ship them off to other schools, to get them additional remediation. That's why the President's call for an additional \$100 million for either choice, or ramped up supplemental services, makes a lot of sense.

Senator SPECTER. But you still are letting them choose to go to another district, aren't you?

Secretary SPELLINGS. The public school choice options, yes, are still in place. But what I'm saying is, perhaps parents would be equally satisfied or more satisfied to receive supplemental services first.

Senator SPECTER. Well, are you saying that in all situations where children want to move from an inferior school to a better school that there are remedial programs to discourage their moving?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I'm saying that perhaps in the meantime, as we address these choice issues, that getting remediation in a particular skill or subject, quickly and readily available, convenient—

Senator SPECTER. Well, are you talking about something which is realistic, so that we have inferior schools in those situations, all of those situations, or almost all of those situations, or most of those situations, you have remedial programs to discourage going to another school?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I think it's a range of fallibility if you will. I mean, some of these schools are chronically low performing and that's why we need to spend \$200 million to make sure that real school restructuring takes place.

#### EFFECTIVENESS OF SUPPLEMENTAL SERVICES

Senator SPECTER. Madam Secretary, my time is almost up and I'm going to observe the time. But the question really is, is that a palliative and a fig leaf, or does it really work?

Secretary SPELLINGS. I think supplemental services can work very well educationally for kids.

Senator SPECTER. Can. But do they, are they? Are there sufficient supplemental services to pick up on this very critical program problem?

Secretary SPELLINGS. In some places there are, and in some places there are not, Senator. Clearly, I agree.

Senator SPECTER. Well, that's not satisfactory. My red light went on, so I'm going to yield at this point to distinguished ranking member Senator Harkin.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman, I apologize for being late, I'll just forgo my opening statement and ask that it be made a part of the record, if that's okay.

Senator SPECTER. Without objection, it will be made part of the record.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOM HARKIN

Good morning, Madam Secretary. I don't get to see you that often in person, so I want to take this opportunity to commend you for the steps you've taken to make the No Child Left Behind Act more flexible. There's still room for improvement, but you're responding to the concerns that many people have with this law, and you deserve credit for that.

Today, however, our focus is on the President's proposed budget for education. And I must speak frankly: I don't see how anyone in this administration can defend it.

This budget would cut federal education spending by \$2.1 billion. That's the largest cut, in dollars, in the 26-year history of the Education Department. And it comes on the heels of a \$600 million cut in fiscal year 2006—the first cut in a decade.

It looks to me as if this administration has basically given up on the three programs that matter most to the Nation's students—Title I, IDEA, and Pell.

Title I is the cornerstone program for the No Child Left Behind Act. It's the program that targets aid to the students who are most at risk of failing. That's why NCLB calls for a \$2.2 billion increase for Title I this year. But how much more does the President ask for? Zero. It's flat funded.

This administration has also given up on funding for students with disabilities. In fact, it's moving in the wrong direction. In fiscal year 2005, the federal government provided 19 percent of the average per-pupil expenditure toward the costs of special education. This year, fiscal year 2006, it went down to 18 percent. Next year, under this budget, it would go down again, to 17 percent. As the federal share goes down, states and local districts have to pick up more of the tab. And we all know what that means—higher property taxes.

This administration has also given up on student aid. Under this budget, the maximum Pell Grant award would be frozen at \$4,050, the same level as four years ago. I wonder if there are any colleges in America that charge the same amount for tuition that they did four years ago. I doubt it. It gets tougher and tougher all the time for low- and middle-income families to afford college, but this administration doesn't seem to care.

It's as if the President said, "Well, I spent a little money on education during the first couple years of my administration. So much for that. I'm done."

So if there's nothing in this budget for Title I, Pell, and IDEA, what is there? Unfortunately, a lot of the "same old, same old."

Once again, the President proposes a high school reform initiative. But as far as I'm concerned, it's dead on arrival. The President asked for it last year, Congress rejected it, and the same thing will happen again this year, as long as it's contingent on eliminating the Perkins vocational ed program.

And speaking of eliminations, the budget zeroes out 42 programs in all. Forty-one of them are programs you tried, unsuccessfully, to eliminate in the past. Congress restored the funding for them last year, and I can tell you right now, we'll restore funding for almost all of them again this year.

Like I said, more of the "same old, same old."

There are really only two new initiatives in this budget of any significance: the Math Now programs, which cost a total of \$250 million, and the Title I School Improvement Grants, which are budgeted for \$200 million.

I happen to like both of these ideas. In fact, I was the first Member of Congress to include funding for School Improvement Grants in an appropriations bill. In fiscal year 2003, when I was chairman of this subcommittee, I included \$100 million for this program in the Senate Labor-HHS bill. It didn't end up getting funded, but I'd like to see it happen.

But where will the money come from to fund these new initiatives? I guarantee you: We're going to restore the TRIO programs that this budget would eliminate. There's enormous bipartisan support for TRIO. So that's \$456 million that we've got to find from somewhere. We're going to restore GEAR-UP, at \$303 million. We're going to restore the Robert C. Byrd Scholarships, at \$41 million. We're going to restore the counseling programs, at \$35 million. I created that program, so I can assure you that Congress will save it.

I could go on and on, program after program. But here's the bottom line: Unless the President helps up find more money overall for education, his new initiatives are simply not going to get funded, at least not anywhere close to the levels he wants.

I've served on this subcommittee as ranking member or chairman since 1989, so I know what I'm talking about. If you want us to fund these presidential initiatives,

you're going to have to work with us to get our congressional priorities funded as well.

Again, Madam Secretary, I want to welcome you to the subcommittee. I look forward to hearing your testimony.

#### NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND FLEXIBILITY PROVISIONS

Senator HARKIN. Madam Secretary, welcome. First a compliment before I get into the other stuff, if you don't mind; I don't see you that often, I just want to take the opportunity to commend you for the steps that you've taken to make the No Child Left Behind Act more flexible. That has always been a sore point, and I appreciate that. There's I think, still some room for improvement. But I think you were responding to the concerns that many people have with this law, and I think you deserve credit for that—to get that flexibility in there. But that's aside from today.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2007 EDUCATION DEPARTMENT BUDGET REQUEST

We're talking about the budget. I guess my first question was, the budget that you've sent up for our subcommittee on education, would you Madam Secretary, like to see it passed exactly as you sent it up?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, Senator, as you know, we propose and you dispose. It's a process between the two of us, we seldom end up—you know, you all seldom enact exactly what the President sends up. I mean obviously——

Senator HARKIN. I'm just asking you. Do you back it? Do you back it as you sent it up?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Certainly. I support the President's budget.

Senator HARKIN. Does your boss the President back it as it was sent up.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Yes, he does.

Senator HARKIN. So he wants it enacted just like that?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I think he believes that this is the smartest, best allocation of resources, given all the various priorities in the Government.

#### PROPOSED EDUCATION BUDGET CUTS

Senator HARKIN. I just want to get that clear for the record. That this isn't just some little game, that this is a budget that your boss the President of the United States, proposed to us, and this is how he'd like to see it enacted and so would you, Madam Secretary. Here is the biggest cut in Federal education spending, \$2.1 billion in the 26 year history of the Education Department. Do you disagree with that?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, Senator——

Senator HARKIN. Is that figure correct, or not?

Secretary SPELLINGS. I can't remember the exact figure, the \$2.1——

Senator HARKIN. That's what I have; I just want to make sure we're on the same page.

Mr. SKELLY. It's the biggest since 1988. So not 26 years.

Senator HARKIN. So what year was the bigger cut?

Mr. SKELLY. 1988.

Senator HARKIN. 1988 was a bigger cut?

Mr. SKELLY. In dollars and in percentage.

Senator HARKIN. In dollars and in percentage, in 1988.

Mr. SKELLY. Yes sir.

Senator HARKIN. Okay, so I was off a few years. Then we had a \$600 million cut in fiscal year 2006. Right?

Mr. SKELLY. That's right, Senator.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—Senator Harkin was correct. The proposed cut of \$2.1 billion would be the largest reduction in the 26-year history of the Education Department. The cut in 1988 was larger as a percentage of the total budget, but not in dollars.]

#### TITLE I GRANTS TO LEAS

Senator HARKIN. Okay. I just want to make sure we're on the same page. Now let's turn to Title I, cornerstone program of the No Child Left Behind Act. Madam Secretary, I read your testimony, you said it was the cornerstone.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I do.

Senator HARKIN. No Child Left Behind calls for a \$2.2 billion increase for Title I this year, how much did the President ask for? Zero. Flat funded.

Secretary SPELLINGS. As well—

Senator HARKIN. That's quite a cornerstone.

Secretary SPELLINGS. As well as some additional resources that attach to No Child Left Behind, like \$200 million for school improvement.

Senator HARKIN. But Title I is the cornerstone, you say that. When it's flat funded and when No Child Left Behind Act calls for a \$2.21 billion increase for Title I this year, something's wrong with the cornerstone.

#### SPECIAL EDUCATION

Special education, Republicans and Democrats for years have been saying we've got to get it to the 40 percent level, you know what I'm talking about.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Right, I do.

Senator HARKIN. We've talked about it; we've had votes on it, Senate Resolutions that are 100 to nothing, or 99 to 1 or something like that, about doing this. Well, we've been inching up the last few years, under the leadership of Senator Specter. We've been getting it up; we've gone up to 19 percent. An all time high. Last year we went back to 18, under this budget we go back to 17 percent.

I don't know how you can see this as any kind of progress at all on how the administration can support this.

#### PELL GRANTS

Student aid Pell Grants are now frozen at \$4,050, the same as 4 years ago. Can you name me one college in the United States where the tuition is the same this year as it was 4 years ago? There isn't such a place. Yet the Pell Grant's frozen at that. These are for the poorest of kids. I mean you know what you have to do to qualify for a Pell Grant?

Secretary SPELLINGS. I do.

Senator HARKIN. You just about have to have nothing to qualify for a Pell Grant. But yet, the President talks about his competitiveness initiative. Sounds great, we all believe in that, but is it just competitiveness just for the kids of wealthy families, or families who can get loans and stuff like that; how about competitiveness for the kids that qualify for Pell Grants. What about them? What about their competitiveness? Where do they fit into this picture? Well—I just don't see how you can support that. I'm not saying it's all bad. There are some things that you got in there that are good. Some of the math and science stuff is okay. That's fine. Little bits and pieces here and there. But in total, I just can't imagine your support for that. I see my time is up now, and I didn't really get a question in, but I wanted to make sure that we were talking about apples and apples, and not oranges and apples and that kind of stuff, and maybe on the second round I can have a question about that. Thank you very much.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Senator Harkin. Senator Landrieu.

#### EDUCATION RESPONSE FOR HURRICANE RECOVERY

Senator LANDRIEU. As the ranking member is here—before you came in Senator, I was complimentary of the Department, of the great work that they have done for the Hurricane Katrina and Rita victims, and said what a reliable partner they've been. I want to thank you also, Senator Harkin, because without you and Senator Specter our education aid bill would not have passed the way it did, and I want to say how much we appreciate that.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2007 BUDGET REQUEST

Having said that, I want to agree with what both the chairman and ranking member said; not only do I think this budget is scandalous in terms of short changing our goals, Madam Secretary, for No Child Left Behind, but it's disheartening and wholly inadequate. Disheartening for the army of people out there trying to close these achievement gaps, making the changes, pushing themselves to achieve excellence, only to find their budget is being cut. While Title I is flat funded dollar for dollar for last year, because it does not have an inflation factor and it's not taking into consideration the extra efforts being made to move these poor and low-income, and moderate-income children up, it really is short changing their ability.

Last night I got to attend a function in Washington, the Youth National Guard Youth Challenge Program, that tries to focus on reaching the 33 million Americans between the ages of 16 and 24 that do not have a high school diploma—33 million Americans between the ages of 16 and 24. Those numbers don't just pop, they are created by budgets like this that do not provide the support of children in those early grades so that they could get a diploma of achievement—they can read, and calculate at grade level.

I know that as the Department's Secretary you're responsible for carrying out the President's budget. But I want to say as a Senator who is given choices between extending dividend tax cuts, reducing capital gains taxes, this is what is paying for those tax cuts. The short changing in education for children in Louisiana, Mississippi, the Gulf Coast, Arizona, in Pennsylvania, in Wisconsin, and in

places in Iowa, and all places are paying for those tax cuts. I think it's too heavy of a price. I just want to go on record. It's too heavy of a price to pay. We end up paying for it, in you know, criminal justice systems. We end up paying it in mental health services. The taxpayer's don't get a break. The taxpayers just pick it up in a more painful, more expensive way. I don't know when we're going to learn that investment in early childhood education is giving children a fighting chance. There's no guarantee of success, but I want to say for the record and my time, and I'd like to ask you this question because only our Federal portion represents about 8 to 10 percent of the total. The States are picking up about 70 percent, is that correct Madam Secretary of Education, expenses at the State level?

Secretary SPELLINGS. It varies around the country.

#### EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF EDUCATION RESOURCES

Senator LANDRIEU. What is the Department doing to try to equalize or make more equitable the funding in the country, from our wealthier counties, to our poor counties? If you could just focus a minute of your answer. I know we haven't directed you as such. Title I attempts to try to equal—it's Congress' best attempt to try to give poor and middle income children the same resources available. But is this Department at all focused on that resource gap? There's an achievement gap, but there's a resource gap. Do you know what it is, can you just tell us, and give us a minute of what you're doing to try to close that gap?

#### DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED PERSONNEL

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, that's a great question and I think it manifests itself in a lot of ways. Highly qualified teachers: one of the dirty little secrets in education is that our most qualified people are in our least challenging environments and vice versa, and so as we implement No Child Left Behind we ought to look at how States and school districts allocate highly qualified personnel. The President's budget proposal on Advanced Placement (AP)—I talked about the 40 percent of the high schools that offer no AP at all. I use the example in my speeches that in Fairfax County, Virginia, you can find schools with 20 plus AP classes, whereas in the District of Columbia, Ballou High School has just 3 or 4. Those are exactly the kinds of things that we need to address as part of either implementing No Child Left Behind or the resources that the President has asked for.

No Child Left Behind—whether it's for special education students or limited English speakers—has focused educators on bottom line results for all kids and resources. Obviously, our Federal commitment has always been to our Nation's neediest students, and that's why we invest so much money in IDEA and Title I, to help level out those educational opportunities around the country. With respect to Title I, obviously the formula reflects the numbers of poor kids as they migrate around our country.

## PER PUPIL EXPENDITURES ACROSS THE NATION

Senator LANDRIEU. Just to conclude though, Mr. Chairman, we focus on the neediest. But I can say from—there are a lot of middle-income families now that would classify themselves as middle-income that are stretched and need help and as we continue to cut these programs back, we're touching the bottom 5 or 7 percent, when we should be trying to help the bottom 40 or 50 percent. Tom, I would like you just to submit for the record, the difference in resources from the poorest counties, to the wealthiest counties to give us an update for the record of this committee. I understand in some places it's like \$3,000 or \$4,000 a child, and then in some counties we're spending \$12,000–\$14,000 a child. I know that we don't direct that funding, but we can you know recognize that while there's an achievement gap, there's a resource gap that this committee has an obligation to fix, or try to fix. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

## EDUCATION FUNDING IN HIGH-POVERTY AND LOW-POVERTY DISTRICTS

Average expenditures per student vary across local educational agencies (LEAs) from about \$3,300 to over \$20,000 per student, according to the 2003 Public Elementary-Secondary Education Finance Data compiled by the Census Bureau. Most of the largest and smallest figures are for very small school districts with limited enrollment. For example, of the 10 LEAs with expenditures per student between \$3,000 and \$4,000, only 1 had an enrollment of over 100 students. They are mostly small, rural school districts, including 5 in Nebraska and 3 in Montana. However, even excluding the very small and rural school outliers, there is a significant difference in the per-student averages among the poorest and wealthiest LEAs (with "poor" and "wealthy" defined on the basis of the percentage of school-aged children living in poverty). The 100 LEAs with the lowest poverty rates and enrollment of at least 1,000 had average expenditures of \$9,585 per student, while the 100 LEAs with the highest poverty rates and enrollment of at least 1,000 had average expenditures of \$7,897 per student.

Among the poorest LEAs, defined as those with poverty above 40 percent, there are many sizable school districts with average expenditures well below the national average of about \$8,100. For example, Roosevelt Elementary School District in Arizona, with a poverty rate over 45 percent and enrollment of 11,000, had an average expenditure per student of \$5,900. Laredo Independent School District in Texas (45 percent poverty; enrollment of 24,000) had an average expenditure per student of \$6,900. Greenville Public School District in Mississippi (42 percent poverty; enrollment of 7,400) had an average expenditure per student of \$5,900. But there are also many poor districts with larger than average expenditures per student. These include Muskegon Heights School District in Michigan (44 percent poverty; \$10,300 per student), Todd County, South Dakota (40 percent poverty; \$11,500 per student) and Rochester City School District in New York (40 percent poverty; \$12,711 per student).

The same can be said for the wealthier school districts. There are examples of high per-student expenditures, such as Fairfax County, Virginia (6 percent poverty; \$9,500 per student), Montgomery County, Maryland (7 percent poverty; \$10,580 per student), and Cherry Hill, New Jersey (3 percent poverty; \$11,300 per student) as well as examples of low per-student expenditures, such as Clay County, Florida (9 percent poverty; \$5,600 per student), Scottsdale School District, Arizona (7 percent poverty; \$5,600 per student), and Alpine School District in Utah (9 percent poverty; \$4,400 per student).

While the spread is significant between the poorest and wealthiest districts, there is a more noticeable pattern among States. The 142 LEAs with an average expenditure per-student below \$5,000 are in only 17 States, with the majority in Arizona, Oklahoma, Utah, Montana, and Nebraska. At the other end of the spectrum, half of the 200 LEAs with the highest average expenditure per student are in three States: California, New York, and New Jersey.

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FUNDS

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Senator Landrieu. Senator Kohl.

Senator KOHL. Thank you very much Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Spellings; you'll recall that we spoke at last year's hearing about Perkins Vocational Education program. Perkins is very important to every State, but particularly my State. Wisconsin received almost \$25 million in Perkins funds last year, and over 23,000 students benefit in my State from Perkins services. The vast majority of Perkins recipients in Wisconsin have gone on to graduate and obtain high skill, high wage jobs. Last year the President proposed to eliminate Perkins funding but the Congress refused to go along, as you know. The Senate voted to reauthorize Perkins by a vote of 99 to nothing. We also worked to restore most of the funding cut by the President. One would think that these actions would have sent a very strong message to the President, and Senators in both parties feel strongly about Perkins. Yet once again, as you know, the President's proposed elimination of this vital program in 2007. Would you explain how he apparently is so out of touch with we here who live and work with the problem everyday in our States? Not just to reduce Perkins, which is unacceptable, but to eliminate Perkins, which seems to me to be incomprehensible.

## INVESTMENT IN SECONDARY EDUCATION

Secretary SPELLINGS. Senator, yes I will. The President believes that we ought to gather up the resources that we spend in vocational education, TRIO, and GEAR UP and a number of our secondary school investments and create a high school reform program; a \$1.5 billion high school initiative for States to use as they see fit, around graduation rates and enhanced achievement for all high school students, including additional accountability and the like. When and where vocational education programs, GEAR UP, TRIO, any of those programs work well, then States can and should—and I'm confident will—continue to invest in those. But I think we also have to look at our results of secondary education, and that is about half of the African American and Hispanic kids who start high school do not complete high school. When these resources and these programs are targeted to them I think we have to ask ourselves, are they working as well as they can be in the aggregate.

Senator KOHL. Well, I don't think you've really answered the question, he still proposes eliminating Perkins and aggregating it all really in the final analysis results in cuts. But it's just done in a way that we don't really see how these cuts occur, but that's I believe pretty clear to most of us who look at this closely that aggregating really involves cutting. Madam Secretary, I supported the No Child Left Behind because it guaranteed flexibility and accountability would come with more Federal funding to make it work. Instead, funding levels have fallen billions of dollars short of what was authorized and these cuts as you know cause real hardships. Schools are being forced to cut staff and important programs like summer school, class size reductions, arts, physical education, and languages. Last year almost 11,000 schools failed to make ade-

quately yearly progress under No Child Left Behind thus facing Federal sanctions. These schools will face even greater challenges as testing and teacher quality requirements go into full effect.

So isn't it time to provide the funding that was promised so that we can give schools and students a real chance to succeed which was the premise behind No Child Left Behind, that there would be funding which is by all accounts not what was promised. Where do we go from here?

#### ALLOCATION OF BUDGET RESOURCES

Secretary SPELLINGS. I think what you'll find in the President's budget, and it is a tough budget no doubt about it, is that the resources are allocated around the core principles of No Child Left Behind, such as our sustained investments in Title I, in reading, in teacher quality, and the accountability features and achievement. That those are our most—that's our most urgent calling, and our highest priority for resources.

#### PELL GRANTS

Senator KOHL. Madam Secretary, the President's budget proposal also targets student aid programs for harmful cuts including a \$4.6 billion reduction in funding for Pell Grants. The maximum Pell Grant award is again frozen at \$4,050 for the fifth year in a row, despite rising tuition costs. These may just seem like numbers but they also have a real impact on students who are struggling to go to college. The University of Wisconsin in Madison alone dispersed \$9.2 million in Pell Grants to 3,751 low-income students last year. In 1975 the Pell Grant recovered 80 percent of the costs of a 4-year public education in college and today that number is down to about 40 percent. So my question is, how can this administration claim to want to make higher education a reality for low-income students while at the same time cut the very programs that would help them achieve that goal.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, let me respond in a couple of ways. One, while as you said the Pell Grant itself is still \$4,050, the actual grant has not been cut. There will be about 59,000 more students who will be taking advantage of Pell Grants. In addition to that, as part of the reconciliation that you all passed, there are additional resources for students who are studying in the critical areas of science, technology, engineering and math. Starting with about an additional \$750 for year one of their studies, going up to \$4,000 by the fourth year if they pursue those particular fields. As you know, the Congress finally has eliminated the Pell shortfall that has vexed us for so long, which is most of that \$4 billion that you spoke of, but I think what we know is that the community colleges, in particular, continue to be able to offer a full and complete education at the Pell Grant level. So it's a matter of students frequently starting there at community college as opposed to a State university. But the Pell Grant does remain stable at \$4,050.

#### PREPARED STATEMENT

Senator KOHL. Thank you, and before I turn it back to the chairman, my time has expired. When you keep a program like Pell

Grants at the same level for 5 years, you are reducing its value, obviously. When I pointed out that the Pell Grant covered in 1975, 80 percent of your public education and today it's 40 percent, that describes the erosion of keeping the number at a constant level. Thank you so much, and thank you Mr. Chairman.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR HERB KOHL

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Spellings, I join my colleagues in welcoming you here today. You face a significant and challenging task in managing the Department of Education and I hope that we can work together to improve access to education for all Americans.

I appreciate the difficult task you face in funding the many education priorities of our country. That job is more challenging, in our view, because this Administration has chosen budget and tax policies that have led to rising deficits and diminishing resources available for essential education programs.

This budget is abysmal for the education community. It proposes the largest cut to federal education funding in the 26-year history of the Department. Students, educators, parents, and administrators all lose out under this budget. Funding for No Child Left Behind and Special Education, the main federal funding streams for our local school districts, are a far cry from their authorized levels. More specifically, funding for No Child Left Behind is \$12.3 billion dollars below the authorization level, and IDEA is \$6.3 billion short in 2007. In addition, over forty programs are slated for elimination, including funding for Career and Technical Education, Safe and Drug Free Schools, and TRIO programs.

The President's budget should reflect our nation's priorities—but these are just a few examples of this budget being out of step with our values. I will continue to work with my colleagues to improve upon this budget. Madame Secretary, I hope that you will work with us to better meet our nation's education needs.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you Senator Kohl, Senator Craig.

AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS INITIATIVE

Senator CRAIG. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Madam Secretary, I'm pleased you're with us this morning. First and foremost, I want to commend you and the President for including the American Competitiveness Initiative in his State of the Union. I thought that was critically important, and I'm looking forward to working with the Department of Education and in this instance the Department of Energy will have a fair chunk of that, and my colleagues in the implementation of many of those proposals. I think it's important. I think we can convince the American people it's important, that we remain competitive and that we design a system that allows us to do that. When we were holding hearings on that recently in the Energy committee I was likening it to our reaction to Sputnik. The Defense Education Act of the 1960s that followed and the tremendous—and the fallout, the positive fallout of that down through the decades, as we trained a generation of mathematicians, and scientists, all because we found ourselves not competitive in the real world in a cold war environment and out of that space initiative and everything else. Of course because the—what I believe is a national crisis we're in today as it relates to energy, we take that a lot easier because the lights are still on, and even though gas is more expensive at the pump, it's still there and we're adjusting accordingly even though it's costing us, you know, lots of jobs out there in the industrial sector today, and all that. The new world that we compete in is going to be ever demanding.

We all know those stories, they are real and I'm glad to see the President out on the edge of that, pushing it. That's extremely im-

portant for us. In the context of doing that although, I think we have to shape budgets that begin to fit that and move us in those directions, and they are bits and pieces of all that we're talking about in order to meet the challenges laid out by the President in the Competitiveness Initiative. I believe that bringing professionals into the classrooms will be tremendous assets to our students. Yet the system is so rigid to allowing that to happen today that it almost, at the very beginning unless we break down some of those barriers towards the very initiative that's underway. What programs have been or are being implemented to ensure that professionals interested in teaching have the training they require, and do you believe the President's budget provides adequate funding to bring these professionals ultimately into the classroom to work alongside the educator in inspiring these young people into these different areas that are within the Competitiveness Initiative?

#### ADJUNCT TEACHERS PROGRAM

Secretary SPELLINGS. Thank you for that question. The President's budget calls for \$25 million to start to seed some of this kind of activity, which we call Adjunct Teachers. We use this all the time in higher education, especially in community colleges, and it's very effective. Typically, people who are engaged in their own profession teach part time in higher education. Many of these students now, high school students, enjoy dual enrollment programs between community colleges and high schools, and they are already being served by the kind of professionals that you talk about. IBM has committed 1,200 engineers and other highly skilled professionals to make transitions into the teaching profession, so I do think there's an appetite and a willingness out there and a need—a dramatic need—for those sorts of competencies. We have some models to build on through Troops-to-Teachers, Teach for America, and some other programs that have taken mid-career professionals and helped them become effective teachers. But I think the notion is, let's be able to get some of our expertise and resources from the broad community around some of these 185 day, 10-month contract sort of structures, that we're so used to dealing with in education.

#### INNOVATIVE HIGH SCHOOL RESTRUCTURING IN IDAHO

Senator CRAIG. I had the privilege, Mr. Chairman, of walking through a new high school in Idaho during this last recess. The largest building in our State from the standpoint of an educational institution, 2,200 students. I thought, oh my goodness, how can they possibly handle 2,200; surely they must be lost in the system, because I was thinking of the old models. But I walked into a school with academies, and the allowance to actually begin shaping from your freshman year on, some core competencies that move you then into community colleges, or into University settings. In the junior senior year, that nexus with the community college that you had—I spent a couple of hours there, spoke with the senior class, and walked out with a total different opinion. Or a sense of understanding as to these new structures, and in this particular school district which is the fastest growing in our State, they're building a new high school about every 2 years now, they're moving to this concept. They feel they can go to larger schools but they allow the

student to actually identify with a much smaller unit within the school. It's impressive. It's happening at other places in the county. Idaho is not alone in it certainly, and it makes some very real sense, tied to this competitive initiative, and being able to move young people out earlier. Those who chose to, to get into that higher learning, frankly, can break through the rigidity of the current system that says, no, no this is the way we've always done it, we control it, so this is the way you're going to do it. If it isn't providing us with that level of training and talent, then we've got to break through it, and if you can't live within it, you get outside of it, I guess, and that's starting to happen in parts of Idaho where we have community college settings in which they can cooperate. That's a pretty exciting concept. But in doing so—and then transitioning them forward, there was concern about the Pell Grants and other tools to make sure that those students can carry on, and I'm looking at this budget concerned about obviously areas like the Federal Direct Student Loans and the Federal Family Education Loans, and all of those kind of things. Those tools are going to be in part a necessary component of any kind of competitiveness initiative to move these young people forward.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I agree with that.

Senator CRAIG. Thank you.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Absolutely, Senator. I think I'd love to visit that school, I mean these are places as you said—

Senator CRAIG. You want to visit it?

Secretary SPELLINGS. I would like to.

Senator CRAIG. Fine, you'll get an invitation today.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Good.

Senator CRAIG. We'd love to have you out.

#### ADJUNCT TEACHERS

Secretary SPELLINGS. Establishing the nexus between higher education and high school, that can be more efficient and more effective as we get these professionals who are working in the field, and who have this expertise, because we're frankly going to be very challenged to do it other ways.

Senator CRAIG. Well, it's an exciting model, and as I say, there are many large schools across the country that are recognizing that high schools of 2,000, if not restructured, lose children.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Exactly.

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much, Senator Craig. Senator Murray.

#### SCHOOLS-WITHIN-SCHOOLS

Senator MURRAY. Well, thank you very much Mr. Chairman, and Senator Craig, I'm delighted to hear that you went to that school. The Gates Foundation has been focusing on schools-within-schools, with some real successful programs.

Senator CRAIG. If you'll let me interrupt. I'm not absolutely sure, but it's very possible they're participating in this one. Yes.

## ACADEMIC COMPETITIVENESS AND NATIONAL SMART GRANTS

Senator MURRAY. Yeah. I agree with the focus on high schools. I think it's absolutely critical that we as a Nation really find out why we're losing kids at such dramatic rates. Those kinds of programs really make a difference. But let me, Madam Secretary, talk with you a minute about some of the academic competitive grants in the national science and mathematics act says to retain talent, the SMART grants. To receive those American competitive grants, students have to have completed what is called the rigorous secondary school program of study. Now I agree, as I said that we have to do everything we can to prepare students for the global economy they're going to be in. Whether—but I think a student's luck in where they attend high school, whether it's Senator Craig's or another one, shouldn't determine whether or not the Federal Government helps them attend college. CBO estimated that only 9.9 percent of the Pell eligible students are going to be able to take advantage of those academic competitiveness and SMART grants in 2007. Now the maximum Pell Grant has not increased for 4 years despite as we all know tuition rising at our Nation's public colleges by over 7 percent last year. So if the \$850 billion that those grants cost in 2007 were spent on Pell Grants, students would actually receive an additional \$200 in aid that would have made a tremendous difference. I would like to find out from you, how you anticipate judging what constitutes a rigorous secondary school curriculum?

## RIGOROUS HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM

Secretary SPELLINGS. That's a great question and we're struggling with that at the Department now. About a week ago, we had folks in from the Gates Foundation, from the National Governors Association, and from the Council of Chief State School Officers to look at and talk about what's the most appropriate way to do that while being very respectful of our prohibition at the Department of Education for prescribing curriculum. I certainly don't want to sit up here and look at high school course syllabi and so forth. So we're working on that right now. I mean, I think we know things that are widely accepted, like Advanced Placement, International Baccalaureate, and the State Scholar's program—that 14 States have already bought into place, i.e. their determination of a college-ready curriculum. For State Scholars this is 4 years of English, 3 years of math and science, and 2 years of foreign language. We'll be announcing another 8 to 12 States that will be joining the State Scholars program soon. So States have come to terms largely, or are beginning to, with what they believe to be college-ready, so that, I hope, will be informative as we look at the Academic Competitiveness Grants.

Senator MURRAY. Well, I appreciate the goal, but here we are in 2007 where less than 10 percent of the students are going to be eligible for these grants, and in tight budget times it seems to me that using those dollars to help all kids get \$200 in aid, not just those who are lucky enough to attend a high school that works out to have a "rigorous schedule." I just think it's something we have to manage. So I'm very concerned about a large amount of money

funneling to a few kids who happen to be in the right high school, with the right curriculum, versus us being able to help all students with an additional \$200 with the same pot of money. So it's just a budget issue in my mind. Obviously you've got a program you love, and you want to go down that road. But in tight budget times we have to say, are we going to help all kids out there, or just the ones who are lucky enough to have that somehow undefined yet rigorous curriculum.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, it's also obviously our responsibility to make sure that we have a college-ready curriculum, and this is why we need more Advanced Placement in more places, and so forth, making such a curriculum available to all kids everywhere.

Senator MURRAY. Well, I think it's good to provide incentives to high schools to move towards a rigorous curriculum, I'm with you on that. But I don't want to see us use the kids as a tool. Because in the end they are the ones who are not going to be able to go to college based on where they went to school. I think it's so important that we provide that opportunity, but it's a philosophical debate.

#### HEA TITLE IX

I have limited time. I wanted to ask you about Title IX. On March 17, the Department released a new guidance on the interest prong of the three-part test which schools are using to show their compliance with Title IX. As you are aware, I have some really grave concerns about this new guidance, because I believe it sets a new low bar for compliance with the Federal Civil Rights Law. Schools would now be allowed to use an email survey to show their compliance with Title IX. The school would only have to send that survey to women. So, a lack of response at our universities where kids already have a lot to do, and may just say to heck with that, seems to me a very poor way to be determining compliance with Title IX. Now I know that it's used—surveys are used as part of compliance, but it's the sole means to making sure whether a school complies or not, to me seems really wrong headed.

Now as you know there's a lot of concern over this new guidance, and there's a bipartisan group of Senators on the subcommittee who have asked for a report on the guidance and the use of surveys and I wanted to find out from you this morning what the status is of that?

Secretary SPELLINGS. We'll be completing that next month. I believe you all gave us a deadline for March sort of timeframe there. We will be completing it then. I do want to note that we've not had any complaints about the survey aspect yet, and frankly as you know it is a legitimate prong to ascertain interest. This is prong three.

Senator MURRAY. But the sole prong is a problem.

Secretary SPELLINGS. We have about 116 schools around the country that do that now. But your report is due March 17, and we intend to meet that deadline.

Senator MURRAY. Okay, well there's a lot of confusion on behalf of schools about the guidance. I want to know what your department is doing regarding technical assistance to schools on the guidance of that?

Secretary SPELLINGS. You have recently confirmed Stephanie Monroe as AS for OCR. I've had a vacancy in that job for a long time, and we are providing technical guidance around that issue. I'm a mother of two daughters, I'm very committed to their opportunities as well, and so—

PREPARED STATEMENT

Senator MURRAY. Well, we all are. But if we base compliance on an e-mail survey to women in college expecting that their response back as students is going to decide whether or not a school is compliant, I think that is just not a very smart way to go. I'm going to continue to work with other likeminded Senators to make sure we don't somehow use that information to take away the ability of many young women in this country to be able to access sports in colleges.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATTY MURRAY

Secretary Spellings, thank you for coming today to talk with us about the President's fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Department of Education. I want to take this opportunity to say that I have always believed that the federal budget is more than just a compilation of numbers. Rather, it is a collective statement of the values and priorities of our nation. Looking at the figures included in the President's fiscal year 2007 budget request for the Department of Education—which is the largest cut in federal education funding in 26 years—I have to say that I question the value that the President is placing on educating our nation's youth this year.

As a country, we are required to articulate and defend our values and priorities, particularly as we undergo the annual budget process. While I share the President's stated commitment to preparing our nation and workforce for the competition of the 21st century, I am disheartened to see that his rhetoric about the importance of leaving no child behind is not matched by the budget numbers this administration put forward in its fiscal year 2007 request.

I want to remind my colleagues that what we do in the next few weeks will affect us—and the American people—for a long time. The budget decisions we make now will either empower us—or tie our hands—when we turn to determining funding levels in this appropriations committee later this year. That is why I must say I strenuously object to the request put forward by the President.

While it's true that the President's budget includes increased dollars for math and science education, these funds come at the expense of cuts or elimination to other important programs. I view new initiatives in math and science as complements to, but in no way substitutions for, the other federal education investments we have made over the past 40 years. While science and math competence are undoubtedly a critical piece of what our students need to compete globally, it cannot come at the expense of helping disadvantaged students succeed academically, investing in our high schools, and ensuring our college students have the financial means to attend postsecondary education.

I am particularly disheartened that the administration continues to fall behind in meeting its commitments under the No Child Left Behind Act. The President's fiscal year 2007 request does not include any increases in NCLB's cornerstone program, Title I. The administration's decision to recommend level funding—at a time when requirements and accountability provisions for our schools continue to grow—essentially asks our schools to do more with less resources. This inconsistent messaging is disingenuous and unfair. What's worse, our students, parents, teachers and schools suffer as a result.

I also want to express my concern about the High School Reform package the President is promoting. As you know, I have been an advocate for focusing federal education resources to our nation's high schools. That is why last year I introduced my Pathways for All Students to Succeed (PASS) Act, to provide targeted resources to our nation's high schools. The PASS Act would help America's teenagers graduate from high school, go on to college, and enter the working world with the skills they need to succeed.

While I appreciate the President's interest in high school reform, the reality is that he elected to pay for these reforms by cutting important programs. The \$1.475 billion he is proposing for his high school package doesn't come close to replacing the money we currently spend on the 42 programs, including vocational and technical education, GEAR UP and TRIO, proposed for elimination. At a time when 3,000 students drop out of high school each and every school day and when half of our nation's African American and Latino students do not complete high school, we need to be doing more, not less, to make our high schools places where all students can learn.

In addition to stemming the tide of high school dropouts, we must assist students in the transition from high school to college by providing financial resources to facilitate access to higher education. Yet recently the federal government cut \$12.7 billion from student loans that help low- and middle-income families pay for college. This decision, during a year in which tuition and fees increased by 7.1 percent for four-year public universities and 5.9 percent for private universities, does not reflect our national priorities. In the same vein, the value the President purports to place on higher education is not reflected in his budget, which level-funds the Pell Grant program for the fourth year in a row.

As we work together in the next few weeks to prepare the budget resolution, I will do my best to ensure that the values and priorities of our nation and my state of Washington are reflected in the numbers to which we will hold ourselves. As a policymaker and parent, I know that American competitiveness demands a more comprehensive approach to education. We must match our rhetoric with the necessary resources to support all of our students, at all grade levels, in all subject areas. Our children—and our country—deserve nothing less.

Thank you.

#### PROPOSED GEAR UP PROGRAM ELIMINATION

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Senator Murray. Madam Secretary, what participation did you have in the elimination of the program known as "GEAR UP" that's been in existence for about 7 years? On the ratings by OMB, they say "GEAR UP" is based on successful models for increasing the college enrollment rate of at-risk students. Initial program results suggest that grantees have been more successful in increasing the percentage of students taking a more challenging course load, better preparing these students for future college enrollment.

It was an idea advocated by Congressman Chaka Fattah, who has had a lot of experience in government in Philadelphia, where there are tough schools with a lot of dropouts and a lot of students with problems. It has been a program which has been funded principally out of the Senate that I have spoken about repeatedly. Let me ask you a two-part question. What do you think the chances are that "GEAR UP" is going to be dropped by the Congress? Second, what did you have to do with dropping it, if anything?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, Senator, first let me say that you know "GEAR UP" was invented in Houston, Texas, I mean when President Bush was Governor, we were strong supporters of it.

Senator SPECTER. Does President Bush know that?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Yes. President Bush, then Governor Bush.

Senator SPECTER. Does President Bush know it's being dropped?

Secretary SPELLINGS. I presume he does.

Senator SPECTER. I'm going to tell him.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I presume he does.

Senator SPECTER. Have you told him?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Yes, sir. But let me tell you what his—

Senator SPECTER. No, no. Have you—well you can tell me, but first tell me, have you told him?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Have I told him specifically “GEAR UP” is not in the budget?

Senator SPECTER. Yes, ma’am, specifically. Have you told him that “GEAR UP” has been dropped?

Secretary SPELLINGS. I don’t believe that I have told him that specifically.

Senator SPECTER. Do you know if anybody has told him that specifically?

Secretary SPELLINGS. I do not.

Senator SPECTER. Get the President on the phone.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I certainly will tell him.

#### START OF GEAR UP PROGRAM

Senator SPECTER. He calls me with some frequency when he wants Supreme Court Justices confirmed. Next time he calls, I’m going to parry him with this question about “GEAR UP”; I didn’t know it was started in Houston.

Secretary SPELLINGS. By Jim Ketelsen. The former CEO of Tenneco.

Senator SPECTER. The first question I’m going to ask him is, Mr. President, do you know “GEAR UP” was started in Houston? Second question I’m going to ask him is, do you know that “GEAR UP” has been dropped? The third question is, do you know the Secretary of Education didn’t personally tell you that it was being dropped?

Secretary SPELLINGS. You can tell him that.

Senator SPECTER. Okay. It’s your turn.

#### HIGH SCHOOL REFORM INITIATIVE

Secretary SPELLINGS. But let me say this, the President’s philosophy here around this high school reform issue is that you need a block grant kind of program. That we ought to gather secondary school resources into a \$1.5 billion title that we’re saying would get results. That we shouldn’t sit up here and say, here’s how you should get results. Now I fully believe that in Houston, Texas, in Philadelphia, and places where these programs are working well, and effectively, they will continue to do those. I can’t say that that’s necessarily true in the aggregate. Where they’re going to be effective they’ll be maintained. I’m confident of that. The President’s philosophy—

Senator SPECTER. How will they be maintained without funding?

Secretary SPELLINGS. They will be paid for then out of the high school initiative.

Senator SPECTER. So you rob Peter to pay Paul, which is what I said on my last round of questions, I’ll probably say it in my fourth round, too.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I mean, I guess you could look at it that way. We’re gathering resources out of silos, out of specific prescribed programs.

Senator SPECTER. So you think really, you ought to keep “GEAR UP” but under another name?

Secretary SPELLINGS. No. I’m saying that States and local school districts ought to have the opportunity to design and choose pro-

grams as they see fit, including GEAR UP, Vocational Education, or others.

Senator SPECTER. But, when it's been a successful Federal program, and has all the backing from the Members of the House and Senate, why submit a budget which cuts it?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I think the President believes that successful programs will be invested in with Federal dollars and maintained and enhanced at the State and local level.

Senator SPECTER. Federal programs will be invested with Federal dollars and maintained, and enhanced at the State and local level?

Secretary SPELLINGS. That where—in Philadelphia where this is working well, they will use their high school resources to invest in “GEAR UP” and they'll probably use State and local—

Senator SPECTER. What resources? They're strapped to the edge now.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Under the high school reform block grant, if you will, the \$1.5 billion in Federal funds that would be invested in high school reform, this program would absolutely be an allowable purpose.

#### FISCAL YEAR 2006 FUNDING LEVEL OF PROPOSED TERMINATIONS

Senator SPECTER. Well, since that will happen I can rest easy seeing it cut, I guess. Except that I won't. Senator Harkin, why don't you do that on your time. Harkin wisely points out. What was it you wisely pointed out?

Senator HARKIN. That their reform package is \$1.5 billion, but the total amount that gets cut out of all these other programs is \$2.1 billion.

Senator SPECTER. How about that, Madam Secretary?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I think it's more like the \$1.5 billion that we have gathered up. I don't know what all the elements are that are in the \$2 billion estimate that you have, Senator Harkin, but it depends on what's on the list, I guess, is the short answer.

Senator SPECTER. Madam Secretary, you can see the smooth coordination. I frequently use the expression that when we change chairman and ranking member that it's a seamless passage of the gavel, which I now undertake to do, so that he can follow up on his Charlie McCarthy, Edgar Bergen question that I asked on his behalf. Senator Harkin.

Senator HARKIN. Wait a minute. Which one am I?

Senator SPECTER. You're Edgar Bergen, I can tell you that.

Senator HARKIN. Okay, well, to follow up on this.

Senator SPECTER. Secretary Spellings is too young to really know who either is.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I was just going to say you're dating yourselves. But I wasn't going to say anything.

Senator HARKIN. But to follow up on it, Madam Secretary. I understand the High School Initiative program is at \$1.475 billion. But there are 40 some programs that were eliminated. All the TRIO programs, Talent Search, Upward Bound, Smaller Learning Communities, that's \$2.1 billion. So you've taken away \$2.1 billion that goes out to these high schools, and saying now, here's \$1.5 billion.

## HIGH SCHOOL REFORM INITIATIVE

Secretary SPELLINGS. Here's the difference. Part of the Perkins Vocational Education Program goes into community colleges and is in the postsecondary education environment, if you will, and so the high school reform proposal at \$1.5 billion reflects the investments that are currently going to K-12 schools. The difference, the additional funds, can be found in community colleges, which is obviously higher education.

Senator HARKIN. Oh, so you're saying that Talent Search, Upward Bound and all those programs are now shifted somehow to community colleges?

Secretary SPELLINGS. No, sir. I'm saying that the Perkins Voc Ed Program, some of those resources end up in community colleges, some end up in high schools. Trio, GEAR UP, those sorts of programs that are high school programs, would, could be funded from the \$1.5 billion high school side of it.

Senator HARKIN. Okay. I understand what you're saying now. Please understand what I'm saying, that you add up all those cuts in those programs, it's \$2.1 billion. You replace that with \$1.475 billion for your high school initiative. So when you say that schools, well, if they want to continue the successful programs, they could. Well, I guess what I would ask you to submit to this committee is which of these, is it 42 programs, 40 some, I forget what it was, that you're asking to be eliminated—I mean, which of those are you saying are not successful?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well—

Senator HARKIN. Which of them are not successful? Please.

Secretary SPELLINGS. We have a PART process that rates the programs. I certainly could give that PART list for the 42 programs and will. The difference I want to say on the \$2 billion worth is that, in the Perkins Program, part of those resources go to community colleges, so the high school initiative at \$1.5 billion is, it reflects the resources that are spent in K-12 schools.

[The information follows:]

OMB PART RATINGS FOR PROGRAMS PROPOSED FOR TERMINATION IN THE FISCAL  
YEAR 2007 BUDGET REQUEST

OMB developed the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART) in order to assess and improve program performance so that the Federal Government can achieve better results. Ratings are based on questions in four critical areas—purpose and design, strategic planning, management, and results and accountability. The answers to questions in each of the four areas result in numeric scores, which are combined to achieve an overall qualitative rating that ranges from Effective, to Moderately Effective, to Adequate, to Ineffective. Programs for which we have insufficient evidence from either performance data or rigorous program evaluations cannot be assessed and receive a PART rating of Results Not Demonstrated. PART assessments help our Department and OMB improve the performance of Federal programs by identifying flaws in program design, management, or implementation that undermine effectiveness. PART assessments also help inform funding decisions, but a program's PART rating would not dictate budget policy. For example, the Administration might not request funding for a program for which there is not a clear Federal role or which is duplicative of other programs, even if it is rated Effective or Moderately Effective.

The following chart shows whether programs proposed for termination in the fiscal year 2007 budget request have been assessed using the PART, and if assessed, the year of the assessment and the rating the program received.

OMB PART FINDINGS FOR EDUCATION DEPARTMENT DISCRETIONARY PROGRAMS PROPOSED FOR  
TERMINATION IN FISCAL YEAR 2007

Program	Year assessed	Rating <sup>1</sup>
TRIO Talent Search .....	2003/2005 .....	Moderately Effective
Comprehensive School Reform .....	2002 .....	Adequate
GEAR UP .....	2003 .....	Adequate
Projects with Industry .....	2004 .....	Adequate
Even Start .....	2002 .....	Ineffective
Safe and Drug-Free Schools State Grants .....	2002 .....	Ineffective
TRIO Upward Bound .....	2002 .....	Ineffective
Vocational Education State Grants .....	2002 .....	Ineffective
B.J. Stupak Olympic Scholarships .....	2004 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Byrd Honors Scholarships .....	2004 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Educational Technology State Grants .....	2005 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Leveraging Educational Assistance Partnership .....	2004 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
National Writing Project .....	2004 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Parental Information and Resource Centers .....	2004 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Smaller Learning Communities .....	2005 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Teacher Quality Enhancement .....	2003 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Tech-Prep State Grants .....	2002 .....	Results Not Demonstrated
Academies for American History and Civics .....	.....	Not Assessed
Arts in Education .....	.....	Not Assessed
Civic Education .....	.....	Not Assessed
Close Up Fellowships .....	.....	Not Assessed
Demonstration Projects for Students with Disabilities .....	.....	Not Assessed
Elementary School Counseling .....	.....	Not Assessed
Excellence in Economic Education .....	.....	Not Assessed
Exchanges with Historic Whaling and Trading Partners .....	.....	Not Assessed
Federal Perkins Loans Cancellations .....	.....	Not Assessed
Foundations for Learning .....	.....	Not Assessed
Javits Gifted and Talented .....	.....	Not Assessed
Mental Health Integration in Schools .....	.....	Not Assessed
Ready to Teach .....	.....	Not Assessed
Safe Drug-Free Schools Alcohol Abuse Reduction .....	.....	Not Assessed
School Dropout Prevention .....	.....	Not Assessed
School Leadership .....	.....	Not Assessed
Star Schools .....	.....	Not Assessed
State Grants for Incarcerated Youth Offenders .....	.....	Not Assessed
Thurgood Marshall Legal Educational Opportunity Program .....	.....	Not Assessed
Underground Railroad Program .....	.....	Not Assessed
Vocational Education National Programs .....	.....	Not Assessed
VR Migrant and Seasonal Farmworkers .....	.....	Not Assessed
VR Recreational Programs .....	.....	Not Assessed
VR Supported Employment State Grants .....	.....	Not Assessed
Women's Educational Equity .....	.....	Not Assessed

<sup>1</sup> Reflects the most recent rating for programs that were reassessed.

NOTE: A total of 74 ED programs have been assessed since 2002 using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART); additional programs will be rated in the future.

Senator HARKIN. So in your opinion the \$2.1 billion and \$1.5 billion that's just money that normally goes to community colleges, is that right?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Yes, sir.

Senator HARKIN. Well, I'll have to take a look at that. I'm not certain about that one but give me some documents on that and I'll—

Secretary SPELLINGS. I'll definitely do that.

Senator HARKIN. Let me ask you, but one thing I did want to cover is this what's happening with special education. I said earlier it goes from 19 percent to 18 percent, now down to 17 percent and, right, but here's the real problem, as bad as that is, there's another hit coming to these schools outside your jurisdiction but you should be cognizant of it, Medicaid pays for the cost of coverage services

for eligible children with disabilities. School districts can be reimbursed by Medicaid for transportation costs they incur in providing services if this works. The administration wants to prohibit schools from getting reimbursed for transportation and in fiscal year 2007 schools are expected to receive \$615 million from Medicaid for that purpose. If this change goes through then they're going to have to pay the \$615 million in transportation costs themselves. So while you might say that there's been a slight increase in IDEA funding from \$10.583 to \$10.683, a \$100 million increase, still not keeping up with inflation or anything, there's going to be another cut from Medicaid reimbursement for these kids. Where are these schools going to get that \$615 million, \$650 million, \$615 million, can't read it, \$615 million for transportation? Did I make myself clear?

Secretary SPELLINGS. You did. Senator, as you know, those are reimbursements through HHS and I'm sure you'll discuss that with Secretary Leavitt. My understanding is, those are places where they found a lot of fraud and abuse with respect to those reimbursements and, you know, with respect to IDEA funding overall we've had a 68.5 percent increase in funding since 2001 and, you know, we continue investments on the education side for special education. With respect to the transportation funding, my understanding is that it's been a place where there's been some fraud and abuse and that that needs to be curtailed.

Senator HARKIN. I'm all for cutting fraud and abuse but when you disallow the whole thing, I mean, you're saying that every dollar's being abused. I mean, you're not saying it—

Secretary SPELLING. I'm just not very familiar with the particulars, since we don't run that program.

Senator HARKIN. You're not saying that but OMB or the administration's saying that and since there's a close correlation here between the two, between you and HHS on this, I mean, somehow we've got to bring that together because if we cut the \$615 million COLA, that's going to be a big hit.

#### ESEA TITLE I PROPOSED FUNDING DECREASE

Title I, let me just say one thing about Title I. Right now 29 States will get less Title I funds under the budget, than they did last year. My State, Iowa, was one of 15 States that will get less Title I funding than they did 3 years ago in fiscal year 2004. On the district level it's even bleaker. This fiscal year was the third year in a row that most districts got less Title I funding than they did the year before. Fiscal year 2007 will be the fourth straight year. In my State, two-thirds of Iowa districts got less Title I funding this year than they did 3 years ago. So how can you say you're giving schools enough money for No Child Left Behind when our budget once again cuts Title I funds the most to the districts?

Secretary SPELLING. Well, as you know, under Title I the distribution formulas follow the kids and the poorest kids as they move around and as those populations shift. There are also obviously States who are getting additional Title I resources owing to the distributional mechanics of Title I funds following those poorest, neediest kids.

## SCHOOLS CATEGORIZED AS NEEDING IMPROVEMENT

Senator HARKIN. I'm told there are about 11,000 schools in this country that have been designated in need of improvement, is that about right?

Secretary SPELLINGS. That's sounds about right—

Senator HARKIN. 11,000.

Secretary SPELLINGS [continuing]. That sometimes gets characterized as failing schools. I think, you know, we all know that there are schools that need improvement when half the minority kids aren't getting out of high school. We have work to do with special ed students and limited English speakers and so on and so forth, so, it doesn't surprise me that 11,000 schools need improvement.

## ESEA TITLE I FUNDING

Senator HARKIN. Yeah, but again how are we going to help these schools when we're cutting Title I funding? I mean, you say it follows the kids around and I know poverty's gone up in some areas but I can tell you we still have, I suppose, kids in Iowa and rural areas and places like that that are getting cut out, because it's almost like you're assuming there's a static level of poor kids just goes to this level and they shift around but it always stays static, I mean the total number stays static. That's not true. I don't think there's any figures that show that. The number of poor kids in this country has gone up.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Right. That's why we supported increases in Title I for the poor through the course of the present administration.

Senator HARKIN. Well, we're getting less Title I money.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I'm talking about in the entirety of the President's term, Title I funding is up about 45 percent.

Senator HARKIN. Oh, I see. So it went up a couple of years in a row. Now we can sit back and we don't have to increase it any more.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I'm not suggesting that we can sit back by any stretch but—

Senator HARKIN. We hear that when we double the funding for NIH and we got it up there, now we say, well they did that, now we don't have to worry any more and we just sit back. I think what we were doing in the first couple of years is trying to play catch-up ball in funding these kids in Title I. That doesn't mean it's remained static and I just think the program funds Title I.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, we've also called for \$200 million for School Improvement. You talked about the 11,000 schools.

Senator HARKIN. I know about the \$200 million. I just divide that out to 11,000, it's about \$20,000 per district.

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I think we can learn from each other. I think States will be doing more systematic and systemic work at a State level that will leverage some of those resources.

Senator HARKIN. Our time is up. Madam Secretary, you said quite frankly in your opening statement that the Federal Government's role is providing help to States for under-privileged, poor kids and kids with disabilities. Well, this is it, right here, and I

think we're shirking our responsibility in that area to provide that kind of help to the States. Thank you.

#### HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUTS—THE SILENT EPIDEMIC

Senator SPECTER. Thank you, Senator Harkin. One final inquiry and, Madam Secretary, we're having votes about to begin, force back votes on the PATRIOT Act. The publication of *The Silent Epidemic* is out on dropouts—I see you nodding in the affirmative—thanks to the Gates Foundation on funding it, and it shows that about 3.5 million young people between the ages of 16 and 25 have dropped out of high school, were not in school in the year 2003, the most recent year in which such an estimate is available. What in the budget is being directed to that major problem?

#### ADDRESSING THE HIGH SCHOOL DROPOUT PROBLEM

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, Senator, a few things. One, as that study observes, and I'm meeting with one of those authors of the report this afternoon, I think, of the things we know is that kids drop out because they don't have the necessary reading and deciphering skills, particularly reading skills, to do high-school-level work. That's why we support the Striving Readers Initiative for a \$100 million, so we can take some of our reading research and extend it in the middle schools and get these kids caught up so that they can do more rigorous work. The other thing, as the report observes, and I think it speaks to boredom and a lack of rigor sometimes in high school, is that many of the students that drop out, you know, are passing. They are kids that are effective in attending school and they're just completely disengaged and tend not to find it very satisfying. So I think if we expand Advanced Placement, if we expand dual enrollment, and provide some of these things that are more engaging and more interesting and more rigorous, and more relevant to kids—I think those are some things we can do to guard against dropouts.

Senator SPECTER. What do you think the prospects are of ameliorating that problem?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, I think it's, you know, obviously going to be a journey. I don't think this is something that happens overnight. I think we need to know more. This is why the President has called for enhanced accountability in high schools. We don't know very specifically as policy-makers what is it about high school that's working and not working and for whom. Is it reading? Is it rigor? Is it, you know, disengagement? Is it a lack of vocational—

Senator SPECTER. How do you propose to find out?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Well, what the President has called for is additional accountability, more measurement in high school. We only test in one grade in high school. Typically States have elected to do that in the 10th or the 11th grade. So after 8th grade we lack information about what the state of high schools really is and an ability to parse that down for a policy tool.

Senator SPECTER. Where the President has called for it, what has the response been?

Secretary SPELLINGS. Many States have put high school assessments in place. I would say half or so have a full complement of assessment through high school. That's the Governor's—

## DEPARTMENT'S COMMENTS ON THE SILENT EPIDEMIC

Senator SPECTER. Madam Secretary, we're going to have to recess here in a moment but what I would ask you to do is to give us your evaluation, your Department's evaluation of this report on dropouts and what is currently being done and what you think ought to be done. That's a gigantic problem which we really ought to address.

Secretary SPELLINGS. I agree.  
[The information follows:]

## SCHOOL DROPOUTS

"The Silent Epidemic: Perspectives of High School Dropouts," a March 2006 report by Civic Enterprises in association with Peter D. Hart Research Associates for the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, is based on a series of focus group interviews conducted with young people aged 16–25 who identified themselves as high school dropouts from public schools in large cities, suburbs, and small towns. As the report notes, the study's purpose was to approach the dropout problem from the perspectives of the former students themselves, to better understand the lives and circumstances of students who drop out of high school and to help ground the research in the stories and their reflections.

Though the study is primarily anecdotal and was not designed to be nationally representative, its findings are consistent with the Administration's emphasis on the need for high school reform in the 2006 and 2007 President's Budget proposals, as well as the effort to bring more rigor to the high school curriculum through such initiatives as the expansion of support for Advanced Placement courses.

For example, fully one-third of those surveyed said that they dropped out of high school because they were "failing in school," and 45 percent said they lacked academic preparation for the challenges of high school. In response, The Silent Epidemic recommended the development of "early warning systems" to help identify students at risk of failing in school, the provision of intensive assistance to struggling students, and research on what works in high school. The Administration's \$1.5 billion High School Reform initiative, first proposed in the President's 2006 Budget, would address each of these recommendations. Grantees would use test scores of incoming high school students to identify those most at risk of not meeting State standards and potentially dropping out, develop individualized performance plans to meet student needs, and support research on specific interventions and strategies for improving student achievement in high school.

The 2007 request also includes two other proposals specifically targeted to the needs of students like those discussed in The Silent Epidemic. First, a \$70 million increase for the Striving Readers program would significantly expand the development and implementation of research-based interventions to improve the skills of teenage students who are reading significantly below grade level. And a new, \$125 million Math Now for Middle School Students initiative would support research-based math interventions in middle schools.

In addition, the proposed \$90 million increase to expand the availability of Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate programs in schools with large populations of low-income students would help ensure that such students are able to prepare for and successfully complete challenging, college-level curricula.

Finally, the Department already has played a key leadership role in working with the National Governors Association (NGA) to reach a common definition for calculating high school graduation rates. In particular, the National Governors Association also agreed on the use, while States ramp up their own capacity for a long-term solution, of an Average Freshman Graduation Rate, an interim calculation developed by the Department to provide comparable State-level graduation data.

The Department believes that momentum is building for a serious, nationwide effort to improve the performance of our high schools. President Bush has provided strong leadership in this area for the past two years, and The Silent Epidemic should contribute to that momentum and help persuade Congress that the time for action is now.

## STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

Senator SPECTER. We have received the prepared statement of Senator Thad Cochran which will be placed in the record.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

Mr. Chairman, I welcome Secretary Spellings to the subcommittee and look forward to her testimony about the fiscal year 2007 Budget proposal for the Department of Education.

I first want to thank the Secretary for her extraordinary efforts and those of her staff following Hurricane Katrina. The first questions our school superintendents in Mississippi had as they began recovering were about being able to comply with the No Child Left Behind standards and regulations. The Secretary showed understanding and compassion for the difficulties faced by these administrators who still are simply trying to get schools back in operation and students back in their classrooms. Her actions to waive and provide flexibility under these trying circumstances are greatly appreciated. Her visits to Southaven, Pass Christian, and Jackson and those of the Assistant Secretary for Elementary and Secondary Education, Henry Johnson to Biloxi and others to my State have been well received and again, appreciated. An especially helpful gesture to my staff was detailing Beverly Ward, a Department employee here in Washington, to my Mississippi Gulf Coast office. She is still there, and has helped to provide coordination, communication, and a sense of comfort to those in both K-12 and higher education. Thank you very much for that assistance, Madam Secretary.

While the overall budget for the Department of Education is \$2.2 billion less than last year, I am happy to see the budget proposal includes continuation and even some increases in important programs such as, Title I grants to schools for disadvantaged students this is especially important in my State; an increase of \$100 million for Special Education grants; continuation of Ready to Learn Television; and a \$2 million increase in the Foreign Language Assistance Program grants to schools.

The budget is challenging again this year, and the President has proposed a number of reductions and eliminations that include programs that have proven to be popular and successful, so we will work to find a consensus agreement on what and at what amounts programs should be funded. I note for example, the National Writing Project, Arts Education, Gifted Education, and Civic Education are among the proposed program eliminations. I'll be working with you, Mr. Chairman, in an effort to ensure those programs are continued.

We will discuss the details of these programs over the next few months. As always, we begin the process of the appropriations cycle with a number of competing interests: those from the administration, members of this Committee, other Senators, and the members of the House. We will work to accommodate as many of those priorities as possible, and come to decisions as a committee that will reflect what we ascertain as the best course of action.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator SPECTER. There will be some additional questions which will be submitted for your response in the record.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ARLEN SPECTER

AMERICAN COMPETITIVENESS INITIATIVE

*Question.* The budget proposes to strengthen math and science achievement of K-12 students through a new \$380 million American Competitiveness Initiative. I am a co-sponsor of S. 2198, which addresses many of the same issues identified in this Initiative. My concern is that this worthwhile Initiative is funded through reductions in programs that many members of Congress support. Can you explain how this budget will accommodate both this new initiative and the other priority programs of various members of Congress?

*Answer.* We very much appreciate the strong support that you and other Members of the Senate have shown for our efforts to improve math and science education, as shown by the very similar goals of S. 2198 and the ACI. As for your concerns about funding the ACI proposals, I would point out that at seven-tenths of 1 percent of our discretionary budget, the \$380 million request for the ACI represents a modest, targeted approach to improving math and science education. The Congress should be able to finance this initiative by reducing funding for less needed or less

effective programs. I understand very well that trade-offs will be required by the Congress to fund the ACI, because we made those very same trade-offs in preparing our 2007 request. At the same time, we know that in negotiating the 2006 appropriations bill, your Subcommittee demonstrated a willingness to balance funding for priority programs with reductions and eliminations in other activities. We hope to work with you to achieve that same kind of funding discipline for 2007, and our request includes many examples of programs that could be reduced or eliminated to pay for new initiatives like the ACI.

#### FEDERAL PERKINS LOANS

*Question.* Your budget includes \$664 million in spending that is offset by the recall of the Federal contribution to the Perkins Loan program. During last year's session, the House and Senate Authorizing Committees agreed to extend the Perkins Loan program, not phase it out, as your budget assumes. Can you tell me how my subcommittee should make-up for the fact that this \$664 million offset is not a viable mechanism for additional spending proposed in your budget request?

*Answer.* The administration continues to believe needy students would be better served by redirecting Perkins Loan funds to more broadly available student aid programs, such as the Pell Grant, Federal Family Education Loan (FFEL), and Direct Loan programs. With the number of Perkins Loan institutions declining from 3,338 in academic year 1983-84 to 1,796 in 2003-04 and with only 3 percent of students enrolled in postsecondary education receiving Perkins Loans each year, the Administration believes the Federal share of funds held by this small group of institutions would be more effective if used in a way that serves all eligible students regardless of institution.

#### USE OF TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDS FOR COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM

*Question.* In the last two Department of Education Appropriations Acts, the conferees have included language in the statement of the managers which encourages the Secretary to notify States of a priority that they should place on the awarding of funds from the 4 percent school improvement. Can you explain what actions your Department has taken to comply with this language?

*Answer.* On March 9, 2005, the Department sent an e-mail to Title I State directors to notify them of the provision in the fiscal year 2005 appropriations report language and to inform them of the conditions that must be met for a State educational agency to use Title I school improvement funds for comprehensive school reform (CSR) projects. A Department official also discussed the directive at the Title I State directors' meeting last year.

In addition, the Department has hosted three regional meetings of State Title I directors and State CSR directors to talk about capturing the lessons learned from CSR, building bridges between Title I and CSR, and leveraging statewide systems of support to disseminate information learned through CSR.

The Department will hold a meeting this spring focused on building State capacity to improve schools using CSR and Title I to institutionalize what has been learned about working with high-performing, high-poverty schools. At the meeting Department staff will discuss the fiscal year 2006 report language about using Title I school improvement funds to support CSR projects.

#### COMPREHENSIVE SCHOOL REFORM AS SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT STRATEGY

*Question.* Given that one rationale for the elimination of the Comprehensive School Reform program was that States could use funds under their 4 percent set asides for the same activities, do you have any evidence that States have made or will make subgrants that support comprehensive school reform activities in school districts, and if not, why not?

*Answer.* We do not yet have any evidence, either from evaluation data or other reports, that States or school districts are using comprehensive school reform as part of their school improvement strategy. In part, this may reflect the progressive nature of the No Child Left Behind Act's (NCLB) school improvement requirements, which gradually move from school improvement plans in the first 2 years to replacement of curricula or staff under corrective action to alternative governance during restructuring. Comprehensive school reform generally represents the kind of thoroughgoing, fundamental change called for under corrective action and restructuring and, thus, may be adopted more frequently as increasing numbers of schools are subjected to these more stringent improvement measures.

Also, while the school improvement requirements in NCLB are fairly prescriptive, they do not specifically mention comprehensive school reform as an improvement strategy. States and districts naturally look to the statute for guidance as to what

they must do to support schools in the various stages of improvement, and will tend to adopt the specific remedies found there.

Finally, comprehensive school reform is intensive and time-consuming and requires considerable technical assistance from States and school districts that have been focused in recent years on overall implementation of NCLB. As States establish and strengthen their statewide systems of support for LEA and school improvement, they are likely to gain greater capacity to support activities like comprehensive school reform. The President's School Improvement Grants proposal would support this kind of evolution in State-level improvement capabilities.

#### TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT SET-ASIDE

*Question.* In the fiscal year 2007 budget request, you have proposed overriding a provision in the No Child Left Behind Act to allow States to reduce the grants to local educational agencies below the amount they received in the 2006–2007 school year to generate sufficient funds under the 4 percent school improvement provision of the law. Could a State reduce the Title I grant funds of a school district identified for improvement and subgrant those funds to another district?

*Answer.* Yes, that would be possible, but any such reduction would be very small. Under the Administration's proposal, all districts would contribute proportionately to the pool of funds available to support State and local school improvement, not just those districts receiving increased allocations under the Title I formulas. States would then subgrant 95 percent of those funds to school districts with schools identified for improvement, with priority on those districts with the greatest need for such funds and the strongest commitment to using them to raise the performance of the lowest-achieving schools. By the way, the hold-harmless also leads States to reduce allocations to districts identified for improvement and redirect funds to other districts; it simply does so by disproportionately taking funds from districts that otherwise qualify for more Title I funds.

#### LIMITATION ON REDUCTION OF TITLE I GRANTS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PURPOSES

*Question.* Would this proposal establish any limit to the amount by which a State could reduce a school district's Title I grant?

*Answer.* Yes, unlike current law, our proposal actually would limit any reduction for school improvement purposes to 4 percent. Under current law, districts that receive increased Title I funding often see their allocations reduced by more than 4 percent to make up for those districts protected by the hold-harmless.

*Question.* If not, why do you believe that is unnecessary?

*Answer.* As I said, our proposal actually would restore a meaningful limit to the State reservation for school improvement.

#### TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT FUNDING GENERATED BY 4 PERCENT SET ASIDE

*Question.* With more than 9,000 schools identified for improvement in the 2004–2005 school year, effective interventions that reduce this number and lead to improved student outcomes would help States and local school districts meet the goals of No Child Left Behind. How much funding has been generated and allocated under the 4 percent set-aside for each of the past 3 fiscal years?

*Answer.* We do not have actual data on the amounts reserved and allocated by the States during this period. We estimate that States reserved and allocated for school improvement purposes approximately \$484 million in fiscal year 2004 and \$500 million in fiscal year 2005, and will reserve and allocate roughly \$499 million in fiscal year 2006.

*Question.* Is there any information about the reach of this funding and the number of schools identified for improvement, or on watch lists, that have not been assisted?

*Answer.* Earlier this year, the Department published a report, "Title I Accountability and School Improvement from 2001 to 2004," which found that about 90 percent of school districts with schools identified for improvement reported that they provided at least some kinds of the assistance required by NCLB. At the same time, more than half of "continuously identified schools" (those identified for improvement throughout the period studied) reported that they did not receive more intensive assistance, such as assistance from a school support team or a school-based staff developer. The Department study also found, however, that State practices for allocating school improvement funds varied widely, partly because the study began prior to the implementation of No Child Left Behind, which brought significant changes to school improvement funding that were not fully implemented when the study was completed.

The recently released report, "National Assessment of Title I: Interim Report," found that less than three-quarters of districts with identified schools reported having the staff, expertise, time, or money to improve the performance of those schools.

*Question.* Is there any information on how the 4 percent set-aside for school improvement funds have been used to remove schools from school improvement lists?

*Answer.* We currently do not have data directly linking school improvement funding with success in exiting improvement status.

#### TITLE I SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT MONITORING

*Question.* Has the Department done any monitoring of the types of activities funded with the 4 percent school improvement set-aside established under the No Child Left Behind Act?

*Answer.* Yes. The monitoring indicators used by ED's Title I monitoring team include a focus on whether SEAs have (1) reserved and allocated Title I Part A funds for school improvement activities, and (2) created and sustained a statewide system of support that provides technical assistance to schools identified for improvement. The SEA must provide documentation that it has established effective school support teams with members who are knowledgeable about scientifically based research and practices related to school improvement. Likewise, the SEA must provide documentation that the teams provide support to schools on such topics as the design and operation of the instructional program and strategies for improving student performance. Monitors also seek evidence that SEAs are ensuring that LEAs carry out their own school improvement activities.

Another area reviewed is how the SEA distributes the 4 percent school improvement funds. Of the amount it reserves, the SEA must allocate not less than 95 percent directly to LEAs that operate schools identified for improvement to support improvement activities. In most cases, States are using these funds to provide special grants to support improvement in those schools. In a few instances, States, with the approval of the LEAs, directly provide improvement activities or arrange to provide them through regional educational centers.

At the local level, ED's Title I monitors review how LEAs and schools are using the funds for improvement activities. This information is gleaned through interviews with LEA and school staffs.

*Question.* In particular, has the Department monitored the use of funds for implementing required 2-year improvement plans incorporating strategies based on scientifically based research and addressing the specific issues that led to schools being identified for improvement?

*Answer.* Yes. The monitoring indicators used by ED's Title I monitoring team seek information and evidence that the SEA has assisted LEAs in developing or identifying effective curricula aligned with State academic achievement standards and disseminated the curricula to each LEA and school within the State. Additionally, monitors review and discuss school improvement plans with LEA and school staffs to discern how these plans address the 10 required components under NCLB, including how the improvement plans incorporate strategies that are research based and strategies that address the specific issues that led to the school being identified for improvement.

#### SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT GRANTS PROGRAM AND EFFECTIVE SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT ACTIVITIES

*Question.* What are your plans for using any knowledge generated through research on effective school improvement activities; and how will the fiscal year 2007 budget request support this goal?

*Answer.* The new \$200 million request for School Improvement Grants recognizes the critical need for State leadership and support in LEA and school improvement. While States currently reserve 4 percent of Title I, Part A allocations for school improvement activities—an amount totaling more than \$500 million annually, they must subgrant 95 percent of these funds to LEAs, leaving just \$25 million available for State-level school improvement activities. The request would provide substantial new support for State-led LEA and school improvement efforts and would help build State capacity to carry out statutory improvement responsibilities.

One research based approach that the Department is considering for the proposed School Improvement Grants program is requiring each State to use diagnostic assessments in schools that repeatedly fail to make adequate yearly progress. Such tests would help LEAs and schools clearly identify student strengths and weaknesses in a particular subject and develop appropriate instruction.

## SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES

*Question.* Budget documents supporting the budget request note that “While many students attending schools identified for restructuring receive SES, the services tend to be of limited duration.” How does the amount of funding generated from the appropriations for Title I Grants to LEAs under the 20 percent SES/choice requirement relate to this finding?

*Answer.* The statement in the budget request simply reflects the reality that the duration and intensity of current supplemental educational services (SES) are limited by the statutory cap on per-pupil payments, with the current cap averaging about \$1,500 nationally. There are other factors that affect the duration of services, such as the structure of SES programs and the actual costs charged by various providers, but the general point is that the America’s Opportunity Scholarships for Kids proposal would roughly double the funding available for SES, from \$1,500 to \$3,000 and, therefore, greatly increase the intensity and duration of available services.

*Question.* If limited funding is not the reason for such limited intensity, what are the primary causes of it?

*Answer.* The premise of our budget request was to enable parents to purchase more extensive services with greater resources, and that students in schools identified for restructuring are likely to be those students who would most benefit from more extensive services than are available under current law.

*Question.* What is the impact of this finding of limited intensity on the effectiveness of the SES activity?

*Answer.* The SES program is still in its early years and we do not yet have meaningful impact data.

*Question.* How is the Department monitoring the requirement in NCLB that requires low-achieving students to receive priority for services under choice and supplemental services options?

*Answer.* ED’s Title I monitors review documentation to show that the SEA has developed and disseminated guidance to LEAs outlining requirements for implementing public school choice and supplemental education services and that this guidance includes the requirement that low-achieving students receive priority for these services. At the LEA level, ED’s Title I monitors review parent notification letters, guidance documents, LEA contracts with SES providers, and other documentation to determine if the LEA has complied with the required priority for providing the choice and SES options.

## SUPPLEMENTAL EDUCATIONAL SERVICES PILOT PROGRAM

*Question.* You announced a number of pilots last year giving a select number of districts in need of improvement the flexibility to serve as supplemental educational service (SES) providers in exchange for greater student participation and achievement data. All of your other pilots invited interested States to “apply” before being offered this sort of flexibility. Can you explain how you selected the handful of districts that are in the SES pilot and why you circumvented States altogether and negotiated with districts directly?

*Answer.* For each of the pilots that we started last year (allowing Chicago and Boston to be providers although they are districts in need of improvement and allowing four districts in Virginia to reverse the order of choice and SES), the Department discussed and sought approval from each of the States before the pilots began. In the case of the Virginia pilots, we negotiated directly with the State throughout the entire process. For Chicago and Boston, we sought and received approval from their respective States for participation in the pilot. As for selection of these particular districts for the pilots, in the case of Chicago and Boston we worked with the Council of the Great City Schools to help us identify districts that were willing and able to participate in the pilot. Virginia had been in communication with the Department about ways to strengthen SES in the State, and came to the Department with a formal request to reverse the order of choice and SES. It was the first State to do so, and we granted this flexibility on a trial basis.

## SELECTION OF DISTRICTS FOR SES PILOT PROGRAM

*Question.* Why was Chicago selected as opposed to districts such as Pittsburgh or Philadelphia, for instance?

*Answer.* As I mentioned, the Department worked with the Council of the Great City Schools to identify districts that had the ability to provide high-quality SES services and would meet the terms of the pilots. Pittsburgh and Philadelphia were not identified at the time as districts meeting these conditions.

## STUDENT PARTICIPATION AND ACHIEVEMENT UNDER THE SES PILOT PROGRAM

*Question.* How many additional students are benefiting from each of the 3 pilots, which waive your regulation around prohibiting districts in need of improvement from serving as an SES provider?

*Answer.* Chicago and Boston are the two districts participating in this pilot. New York City was invited to participate but declined for this year. In Chicago, approximately 55,000 students are participating in SES through Chicago's program and private providers' programs; this compares to about 40,000 last year. In Boston, about 3,700 are participating, compared to about 2,000 last year.

*Question.* When will we be able to see the data on the benefits of SES on student achievement from these pilots?

*Answer.* We anticipate that this summer, after the spring State assessment results are in, we should be able to collect data on student achievement.

*Question.* How are you assuring high-quality tutoring programs in SES?

*Answer.* As a condition of participation in these pilots, each district had to meet a set of guiding principles that the Department identified as key elements of high quality SES programs. These included communicating to parents about SES through multiple venues and in languages that parents could understand, holding extended windows for enrollment, and allowing providers to serve students at school facilities for a reasonable fee.

## EXPANSION OF THE SES PILOT PROGRAM

*Question.* Do you plan to expand this pilot to additional districts in the next school year?

*Answer.* We have monitored each of the pilot districts and collected data on their implementation this year. We are now in the process of reviewing these data and making determinations as to whether the Chicago, Boston, and Virginia pilots will continue, and whether additional sites will be added.

*Question.* If you do plan to expand the pilot program, what will be the selection process and how many do you anticipate selecting?

*Answer.* In the near future, we will be making determinations as to whether these pilots continue and the criteria we will use to select sites for participation.

*Question.* Do you plan to put any additional requirements on school districts serving as SES providers and, if so, what changes might there be next year?

*Answer.* We are considering whether to add any additional criteria to sites that participate in the pilots next year. We are using the information we have gained from this year's pilot sites to consider ways to strengthen the agreements with districts and help ensure that more students are receiving quality SES services.

## AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS FOR KIDS

*Question.* The Department's budget includes \$100 million for a proposed voucher program that could be used by students in schools identified for restructuring so that they can transfer to a private school or receive intensive tutoring services. Why does the budget request \$100 million for vouchers for an estimated 2 percent of Title I schools and request no increase in the amount of funds available for the Title I grant program, the cornerstone of Federal assistance for helping disadvantaged students?

*Answer.* Congress has invested nearly \$200 billion in Title I Grants to LEAs over the past 40 years, including \$12.7 billion in the current fiscal year. While we agree that Title I is the cornerstone of our efforts to improve the quality of elementary and secondary education, particularly for low-income and minority students in high-poverty schools, the size of the program limits the impact of additional funding available under current budget constraints. For example, the \$100 million proposed by President Bush for the America's Opportunity Scholarships for Kids program represents less than one-tenth of one percent of the funding provided for Title I Grants to LEAs, and would have little or no impact when spread across 14,000 school districts. However, this amount is sufficient to permit a meaningful demonstration of the potential for expanded choice and tutoring options to improve the achievement of students attending chronically low-performing schools. Moreover, these funds would be targeted to the same students who are the focus of the Title I program and, in the case of students who select the tutoring option, would help improve the performance of Title I schools undergoing restructuring.

Also, the President is requesting first-time funding for School Improvement Grants, which would provide an additional \$200 million for State-led efforts to turn around low-performing school districts and schools. These funds would directly benefit participating Title I districts and schools that have been identified for improve-

ment. For this reason, it is not entirely accurate to say that the President's 2007 budget includes no increase in the amount of funds available for Title I.

#### MEASURING PERFORMANCE OF THE IMPACT AID PROGRAM

*Question.* The Administration has been undertaking an examination of how to measure performance under the Impact Aid program and has identified a model for estimating unmet need of eligible school districts. Please provide information on the findings of unmet need for various types of Impact Aid districts.

*Answer.* In 2005, the Department created a simplified model to analyze the effectiveness of the Impact Aid formulas and, more specifically, address the question of whether or not funds are adequately compensating for a Federal presence and the associated tax burden. The Department sent a review and analysis of the model to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in January 2006.

The report applied the simplified model to calculate the gap between available revenues to the LEA and the amount needed to fund schools at the State average per-pupil expenditure for Florida, Alabama, and Wyoming, three States for which adequate data were available. Comparing this gap to the actual payments made to Impact Aid districts revealed that there was very little correlation between the computation of local need from the simplified model and actual payments.

The model incorporates tax data into the analysis and, while it brings us closer to being able to compute valid economic analyses of the program, because of data limitations the model has not yielded the desired results. In order to answer these questions properly, more sophisticated analysis with better data will likely be needed.

#### IMPROVING TEACHER QUALITY PROGRAMS

*Question.* In November 2005, the Government Accountability Office released report GAO-06-25, which relates to State implementation of teacher qualification requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act. This report noted that some teachers who provide instruction in more than one core academic subject—such as special education teachers and those in rural schools—and secondary math and science teachers might not meet the teacher qualification requirement by the current deadline. What activities are funded currently and proposed in the fiscal year 2007 budget to help States and districts ensure that all students are taught by a highly qualified teacher?

*Answer.* In 2007, the administration is requesting funds for several programs that focus on improving teacher quality to help ensure that all teachers are highly qualified. These include: Improving Teacher Quality State Grants (\$2.9 billion), Title I Grants to Local Educational Agencies (\$624 million—the estimated professional development portion), Mathematics and Science Partnerships (\$182.2 million), Transition to Teaching (\$44.5 million), Teaching of American History (\$50 million), Troops-to-Teachers (\$14.6 million), and Advanced Placement (\$122.2 million).

#### HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS

*Question.* What specific steps will be taken to ensure that the disparity between the proportion of highly qualified teachers in lower income school districts and higher income schools is eliminated?

*Answer.* The Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), as amended by the No Child Left Behind Act, establishes the important goal that all students be taught by a "highly qualified teacher" (HQT) who holds at least a bachelor's degree, has obtained full State certification, and has demonstrated knowledge in the core academic subjects he or she teaches. Further, the ESEA requires States and LEAs to include, in their annual report cards, information on the percentage of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers, disaggregated by high- and low-poverty schools. In addition, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Improvement Act of 2004 reinforced the NCLB goal by aligning the requirements for special education teachers with the NCLB requirements.

The Department has been requiring States to submit data as part of their Consolidated State Performance Reports on the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in high- and low-poverty schools, as well as the reasons why, for classes taught by teachers who are not highly qualified, the teacher is not highly qualified. In addition, States must have an equity plan in place to ensure that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children. The Department will be looking at States' progress in both of these areas this spring and summer. Although States and school districts are making significant progress in meeting the HQT requirement, there is still a lot of work to do to ensure that each State can

meet the goal that every child is taught by a highly qualified teacher by the end of the 2005–2006 school year.

*Meeting the NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher Requirement*

In the Department's ongoing visits and communications with State and local officials, we are often asked what will happen if, despite their best efforts, districts cannot hire a highly qualified teacher for every class in a core academic subject by the end of the 2005–2006 school year. Personnel decisions are made at the State and local levels, and the law relies on education leaders in the States to make the best educational decisions for improving student achievement. Last fall, I sent a letter to the chief State school officers to assure them that States that did not quite reach the 100 percent goal by the end of the 2005–2006 school year would not lose Federal funds if they were implementing the law and making a good-faith effort to reach the HQT goal in NCLB as soon as possible.

The letter also stated that the Department will determine whether or not a State is implementing the law and making a good-faith effort to reach the HQT goal by examining four elements of implementation of the HQT requirements: (1) the State's definition of a "highly qualified teacher," (2) how the State reports to parents and the public on classes taught by highly qualified teachers, (3) the completeness and accuracy of HQT data reported to the Department, and (4) the steps the State has taken to ensure that experienced and qualified teachers are equitably distributed among classrooms with poor and minority children and those with their peers. In addition, the Department will look at States' efforts to recruit, retain, and improve the quality of the teaching force. If States meet the law's requirements and the Department's expectations in these areas but fall short of having highly qualified teachers in every classroom, they will have the opportunity to negotiate and implement a revised plan for meeting the HQT goal by the end of the 2006–2007 school year. However, for States that either are not in compliance with the statutory HQT requirements or are not making a good-faith effort to meet the goal of having all teachers highly qualified, the Department reserves the right to take appropriate action, such as the withholding of funds.

*Departmental Review of States' Efforts to Meet the NCLB Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements*

In March 2006, I sent a follow-up letter to the chief State school officers with timelines and additional information about the Department's review of States' efforts to meet the HQT requirement. By the middle of May, the Department will assess States' Consolidated State Performance Report data for the 2004–2005 school year, HQT data for previous years, and supporting information that we have obtained through State monitoring visits and the review of publicly available records. The Department will then make determinations about whether the State is on track to meet the highly qualified teacher requirement.

Using the protocol "Assessing State Progress in Meeting the Highly Qualified Teacher Goal," the Department will determine whether each State's 2004–2005 data indicate that the State has a reasonable expectation of meeting the 100 percent HQT goal by the end of the 2005–06 school year and is faithfully implementing the law. If this is the case, the State may not be required to submit a revised plan, though it certainly may.

It is likely, however, that the Department will request most States to submit a revised plan detailing the new steps they will take to reach the 100 percent HQT goal by the end of the 2006–2007 school year. As part of the plan, each State will explain how and when the SEA will complete the High Objective Uniform State Standard of Evaluation (HOUSSE) process for those teachers not new to the profession who were hired prior to the end of the 2005–2006 school year, and how the SEA will limit the use of HOUSSE procedures for teachers hired after the end of the 2005–2006 school year to those secondary school teachers teaching multiple subjects in eligible rural schools (who, if highly qualified in at least one subject at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate competence in additional subjects within 3 years), and those special education teachers teaching multiple subjects (who, if they are new to the profession and highly qualified in language arts, mathematics, or science at the time of hire, may use HOUSSE to demonstrate competence in additional subjects within 2 years). Peers and teacher-quality experts will review the State's revised plan and evaluate how effectively the plan addresses the State's challenges in reaching the 100 percent HQT goal.

*Corrective Steps for Districts not Meeting Highly Qualified Teacher Requirements*

Finally, if the Department determines that a State has not fulfilled its obligations under the statute and is not on track to have all teachers highly qualified by the

end of the 2005–2006 school year, the Department will take corrective actions in addition to requiring the State to submit a revised plan.

By the middle of May, the Department will notify States, in writing, of the results of the assessment of their HQT progress and will request the States, as appropriate, to submit revised plans. States will have until July 7 to submit their revised plans to the Department, and the Department then will determine whether a revised State plan is sufficient to attain the HQT goal in 2006–2007 and beyond. In August, the Department will begin a new cycle of State monitoring visits to ensure that States are implementing their revised plans.

#### INFORMATION DISSEMINATION ON HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER REQUIREMENTS

*Question.* The report also identified some information dissemination challenges. What actions has the Department taken or planned for making helpful information available?

*Answer.* The GAO report recommended that the Department “explore ways to make the Web-based information on teacher qualification requirements more accessible to users of its Web site. Specifically, the Secretary may want to more prominently display the link to state teacher initiatives, as well as consider enhancing the capability of the search function.”

As noted in the GAO report, the Department agrees with the recommendation and has been working to improve the Department’s website so that it is more user friendly for teachers and officials who are trying to find information about the highly qualified teacher requirements. For example, the website now directs students, teachers, parents, and administrators to specific pages for materials of interest to them. The teacher page has a section that describes State and local initiatives to improve teacher quality, and both the teacher and administrator web pages have direct links to information about the highly qualified teacher provisions.

#### STATES’ REPORTING OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHER DATA

*Question.* The Congressional Justification states, “The Department is not entirely confident that all States are reporting accurately on the highly qualified status of their teachers, particularly special education teachers.” This statement is consistent with the Government Accountability Office’s recent report regarding teacher quality issues. What actions are you taking to specifically address this issue and what plans do you have for future actions?

*Answer.* Under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants section of the congressional justification, we did report that the Department is not entirely confident that all States are reporting accurately on the highly qualified status of their teachers, particularly special education teachers. To address this concern, the Department has been working closely with States, especially through monitoring visits, to help them improve the quality of the data that they report. As of late March 2006, the Department has monitored all but three States concerning their highly qualified teacher status and will monitor the remaining States this spring.

We will also be looking very carefully at States’ efforts to report accurately HQT data this spring and summer when we review their progress in meeting the requirement that all teachers of core academic subjects be highly qualified by the end of the 2005–2006 school year. After that review, we will likely require many States to submit revised State plans, and we may take corrective actions against any States that are not making a good-faith effort to improve their data collection and reporting. The Department also plans to begin a new round of State monitoring visits late this summer.

*Question.* How does your budget support your current and planned actions?

*Answer.* The Department is planning to use Salaries and Expenses funds to review States’ HQT data and their efforts towards meeting the goal of having all teachers of core academic subjects highly qualified.

#### ENFORCEMENT OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS REQUIREMENT

*Question.* In your October 21, 2005 policy letter regarding the “highly qualified teacher” issue, you assured States they would not lose Federal funds if they failed to meet the 100 percent requirement and were making a good faith effort to implement the law. One of the ways you will make such a determination is by evaluating whether States take action to ensure that inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers do not teach poor or minority children at higher rates than other children. How are highly qualified teachers distributed currently between low-income and high-income school districts?

*Answer.* States are reporting steady improvement towards meeting the goal of having all teachers of core academic subjects highly qualified by the end of the

2005–2006 school year. Data for the 2005–2006 school year will be reported in 2007. For 2003–2004, the data indicate that 81 percent of core academic classes in high-poverty schools were taught by highly qualified teachers, an increase of 7 percentage points over the baseline of 74 in 2003. 2004 data for the percentage of core academic classes taught by highly qualified teachers in low-poverty, elementary, and secondary schools was 89 percent, 89 percent, and 84 percent, respectively.

ENSURING HIGHLY QUALIFIED TEACHERS FOR STUDENTS OF ALL SOCIOECONOMIC STATUS

*Question.* What steps is the Department taking to ensure socioeconomic status does not determine whether a student has access to a qualified teacher or not?

*Answer.* For the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, the Department requires States to report on teachers' highly qualified status at the classroom level. For example, in the 2003–2004 school year, 81 percent of core academic classes in high-poverty schools were taught by highly qualified teachers. We believe that, by requiring States to report on all classrooms, we are sending the message that we expect all core academic teachers to be highly qualified, whether they are teaching in a high- or low-poverty school, or whether at the elementary- or secondary-school levels.

As mentioned earlier, the Department will closely evaluate States' progress in meeting the HQT requirement this spring and summer as part of our determination of whether they are making a good-faith effort to meet the 100 percent objective. This will include a review of their Title I equity plans, which are meant to ensure that poor or minority children are not taught by inexperienced, unqualified, or out-of-field teachers at higher rates than are other children.

FEDERAL EFFORTS TO ADDRESS INEQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF HIGHLY QUALIFIED AND UNQUALIFIED TEACHERS

*Question.* How have States used Federal funds to address this issue?

*Answer.* The Department sponsored a 2-day meeting for State coordinators in March 2006 that focused on the inequitable distribution of teachers who are unqualified, inexperienced, or out-of-field. Working with experts and researchers from the National Comprehensive Center for Teacher Quality (at Learning Point, Inc.), the Educational Testing Service, and the Council of Chief State School Officers, the Department provided the State coordinators with a series of written tools they can use to examine the inequity issue and begin to prepare State plans to address the issue. The Department also provided all of the States with a protocol that will be used to examine whether revised State plans, which must be provided to the Department this summer, will satisfactorily address this issue.

For most States, this is the first time they will be preparing formal, written equity plans. In previous years, States had difficulty determining if there was an equity distribution problem, so they were unsure how to best address concerns about the unequal distribution of highly qualified teachers. The availability of valid data about the distribution of highly qualified teachers is now helping States to think about the problem and develop equity plans.

Although States are just now developing their equity plans, many States already have incentive programs and strategies to encourage teachers to take on more challenging assignments. The Department is highlighting some of these strategies at the following weblink: <http://www.teacherquality.us/Public/PublicHome.asp>.

TEACHER QUALITY ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM AND TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

*Question.* In recent years, Congress has tried to affect teacher recruitment and retention through a number of legislative efforts, including scholarships for those who commit to teaching in certain geographic or content areas, loan forgiveness programs, and other efforts. In addition, there are new requirements that districts and States are trying ardently to meet as required by No Child Left Behind's "highly qualified teacher" provisions. Why is the Department acknowledging the crucial role teachers play in maintaining the country's competitiveness, while at the same time it is proposing elimination of the Higher Education Act's Teacher Quality Enhancement program? Can you explain these seemingly conflicting efforts?

*Answer.* We do not believe that there is any conflict in the Department's efforts to improve teacher recruitment and retention and the Department's proposal to terminate duplicative programs, such as the Teacher Quality Enhancement program. The Department continues to recognize that the quality of the teacher is one of the most critical components in how well students achieve and that improving efforts to recruit and retain top quality teachers, especially in geographic and academic

areas of high need, is critical to improving the overall quality of the Nation's teachers. The Department's proposal to terminate the Teacher Quality Enhancement program is based, in part, on the fact that State and local entities may already use funds they receive under a number of other Department programs to carry out the activities supported through the Teacher Quality Enhancement program. Both the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program and the Transition to Teaching program include provisions designed to improve teacher recruitment and retention, including all of the activities that are allowable under the Teacher Quality Enhancement program. The Department's proposal to eliminate funding for the Teacher Quality Enhancement program would reduce unnecessary duplication, improve programmatic efficiency, and simplify the grant process for potential recipients.

#### DATA MANAGEMENT INITIATIVE

*Question.* The Government Accountability Office report (GAO), GAO-06-06, released in October 2005, included an assessment of the Department's efforts to identify performance-related data items that could be collected and reported by States that would promote the evaluation of the effectiveness of Federal programs. This report identified several challenges with respect to the participation of and perceived benefit for States and quality and consistency of data collected through the system. What is the Department's plan for addressing the challenges identified in the GAO report and how much funding is being allocated in fiscal year 2006 and requested in fiscal year 2007 for this initiative?

*Answer.* The GAO report recommended that the Department develop a strategy to help States improve their ability to provide quality data. As described in the Corrective Action Plan we submitted to the GAO in response to their report, we have taken several steps to improve the quality of the data the Department collects. By the end of this fiscal year, we will have awarded nearly \$50 million in grants to States under the Statewide Data Systems program to develop and implement statewide longitudinal data systems. The President's 2007 budget requests a \$30 million increase for this program.

The National Center for Education Statistics is working with the staff of the Department's central database, the Education Data Exchange Network (EDEN), to provide technical support and oversight for our grantees. The Department provides additional technical assistance to States through the Data Quality and Standards Contract with the Council of Chief State School Officers. The Department is also a contributing partner in the Data Quality Campaign, a partnership of more than 10 national organizations that helps States implement high-quality statewide information management systems. Finally, the Department has established a Partner Support Center that provides expert technical assistance to States on data submission processes and quality issues related to EDEN.

The Department is conducting a rigorous assessment of the quality of our data collection and reporting. As part of this process, the Department recently announced the launch of EDFacts, a new reporting and analysis tool for data collected and compiled through sources such as EDEN. In 2006, \$5.705 million is being allocated for enhancements to the EDFacts and EDEN systems, and \$6.244 million is requested for 2007.

*Question.* Specifically, how will these funds be utilized?

*Answer.* These funds will be used to support the operation of the Partner Support Center, development of new enhancements for the EDEN and EDFacts systems (including this year's successful online collection of the Consolidated State Performance Report), maintenance of these systems, and development of new reports and tools that enhance program offices' efficient use of collected K-12 performance data.

#### FOREIGN LANGUAGE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

*Question.* The budget proposes a \$2 million increase for the Foreign Language Assistance program. Budget documents supporting this request state that beginning with the 2006 competition, the Department will focus this program on providing incentives for States and districts to provide instruction in critical needs language, especially those programs using technology. Please explain how the 2006 competition will be structured to address the issues raised in the fiscal year 2006 Senate Committee Report and the Statement of the Managers accompanying the fiscal year 2006 Conference Report. Specifically, what type of priority are you proposing for the 2006 competition, and what is the complete list of foreign languages that will be eligible for such a priority?

*Answer.* The Department is committed to ensuring that all school districts that demonstrate the capacity to successfully implement a program receive consideration for competitive grant funds. In response to the concerns raised both in the Senate

Committee Report and the Statement of Managers that the poorest districts may be shut out of Foreign Language Assistance grants due to their inability provide the required 50 percent match, the Department has taken active steps to increase awareness of waiver availability for eligible grant applicants. The application package for grants includes detailed information about what resources may contribute to a grantee's matching requirement, and the Department considers waivers for any district that can demonstrate financial hardship. The program office also has expanded its outreach efforts to include details about the waiver process and eligibility on the Department's web page, at professional workshops, and in fact sheets about the program. The combination of improved grant application materials and increased public awareness about waivers will help ensure that disadvantaged districts are not precluded from participating in the program.

*Foreign Language Assistance Program—Critical Need Languages Priority*

In addition to giving increased attention to grantees that may be eligible for waivers, the Department established a priority relating to critical need languages for the 2006 grant competition. In conjunction with the President's National Security Language Initiative, the Department will give preference to grant applicants that demonstrate the ability to build programs and courses in languages that have significant political or economic importance. The specific languages that have been identified as critical are Arabic, Chinese, Korean, Japanese, Russian, and the languages in the Indic, Iranian, and Turkic language families.

ARTS EDUCATION

*Question.* The No Child Left Behind Act recognizes the arts as a core academic subject and studies show that the arts are proven to help close the achievement gap and improve essential academic skills. You have stated previously that a "well-rounded curriculum that includes the arts and music contributes to higher academic achievement." If arts have been proven to be essential to the learning process, why has the President proposed the elimination of arts education in the fiscal year 2007 budget?

*Answer.* Our request to zero-fund Arts in Education reflects the Administration's policy of increasing resources for high-priority programs by eliminating categorical programs that have narrow or limited effect. These categorical programs siphon off Federal resources that could be used by State and local educational agencies to improve the academic performance of all students.

Districts desiring to implement arts education activities may use funds provided under other Federal programs. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act also provides LEAs with flexibility to consolidate certain Federal funds to carry out activities, including arts education programs, that best meet the needs of their district. For example, under the State and Local Transferability Act, most LEAs may transfer up to 50 percent of their formula allocations under various State formula grant programs to their allocations under: (1) any of the other authorized programs; or (2) Part A of Title I. Activities to support arts education are an allowable use of funds under the State Grants for Innovative Programs authority. Therefore, an LEA that wants to implement an arts education program may transfer funds from its allocations received under the authorized programs to its State Grants for Innovative Programs allocation, without having to go through a separate grant application process.

In addition, under the Improving Teacher Quality State Grants program, local educational agencies can use their funds to implement professional development activities that improve the knowledge of teachers and principals in core academic subjects, including the arts. The flexibility that is available under these Federal programs provides additional justification for the Administration's policy of eliminating discrete categorical grant programs such as Arts in Education.

*Question.* As a "core academic subject," the arts should be included in all research and data collection. The No Child Left Behind Act and current Department of Education policy make it clear that decisions regarding education are made on the basis of research. The FRSS report, "Arts in Education in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools," is the only research report produced by the Department on the status of how arts education is delivered in America's public schools. The last report was for data collected in the 1999–2000 school year and the fiscal year 2006 statement of the managers urges IES to repeat this comprehensive data collection and report. When is the Department planning on another round of data collection for an updated report, which will help study and improve access to the arts as a core academic subject?

*Answer.* We agree that having periodic information about arts education is important. The next National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) arts assess-

ment is scheduled for 2008. It will be an 8th-grade assessment that will include components for music, theater, and the visual arts, as was the case with the last arts assessment in 1997. Work on the 2008 assessment began last year with item development, and we will conduct a field test this year.

The Department has not budgeted for an arts education survey in the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) Fast Response Survey program for fiscal year 2007. The expense of replicating a survey involving multiple samples of teachers in the visual arts, music, and dramatic arts is too great, given competing demands for funds and the costs of the ongoing data collection programs of NCES. The National Endowment for the Arts requested the earlier 1999–2000 arts education survey and paid for it in part.

#### READY TO TEACH PROGRAM AND MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

*Question.* Madam Secretary, the fiscal year 2007 budget allocates \$380 million for new or increased funding for math and science programs aimed at giving students the skills they need to become competitive workers in the global economy of the 21st century. Specifically, part of this funding is targeted to address the critical shortage of qualified teachers for math and science education, particularly in high-concentration areas for low-income students.

The Ready To Teach program funds the development of digital educational content and online professional development in partnerships with the public television community. Congress has invested in this program over several years to ensure that it is easily accessible, flexible and tailored to local, State, and national standards. The most recent grant competition recognized the continued success of PBS TeacherLine service, and technology-based programs that offer a cost-effective complement to off-campus training. In a difficult budget environment, the Department should work to utilize the assets of programs such as Ready to Teach in its effort to strengthen math and science education, especially in the area of teacher training. How will the Department utilize this investment in advancing math and science education?

*Answer.* The Department has no plans to utilize the Ready to Teach program to advance math and science education. There is limited information on the effectiveness of professional development activities supported through this small technology program. It's also not at all clear that nonprofit telecommunications entities, like Ready to Teach program grantees, are very well equipped to address the critical training and professional development and training needs of current and future math and science teachers.

In past years, Ready to Teach has played a very limited role in helping schools and districts address professional development needs, and next to no role in actually providing teacher training. In light of recent research findings on the critical influence of highly qualified teachers on student learning, and the seriousness of the ongoing teacher shortage crisis, the Administration believes that funds should not be provided for small categorical programs like this one that have limited impact and that siphon off Federal resources that could be used by States and districts to pursue more important goals.

#### READY TO LEARN PROGRAM

*Question.* Madam Secretary, last year the Department restructured the Ready to Learn educational television program to focus solely on programming that teaches literacy, and eliminated much of the widespread community outreach portion of the program. We all agree that literacy proficiency is central to fulfilling the goals of No Child Left Behind, and we applaud the Administration's including funds for Ready to Learn in the Administration's budget request. However, the elimination of the outreach activities concerns many of us here in Congress. How does the Department plan to build upon the successes of the local outreach activities by public television stations across the country?

*Answer.* Over the current 5-year budget period, the Department intends to dedicate approximately \$20 million to support on-going Ready to Learn (RTL) community outreach activities. While it's true that the Department restructured the Ready to Learn educational television competition, it's not true that "much of the widespread community outreach portion of the program" was eliminated. In fiscal year 2005, the Department made three new awards under the Ready to Learn program, including one 5-year outreach award to the Corporation for Public Broadcasting (CPB). Under this outreach award, CPB will continue to work strategically with public television stations across the country to support a variety of local outreach activities.

## WORKSHOP APPROACH TO OUTREACH AND IMPACT ON STUDENT LEARNING OUTCOMES

*Question.* A recent evaluation of “the workshop approach” to outreach supported by previous RTL grantees (entitled “Using Television as a Teaching Tool: The Impacts of Ready to Learn Workshops on Parents, Educators, and the Children in Their Care”) suggests that RTL has yet to achieve intended results in key areas of outreach implementation. Although a link between RTL workshops and adults’ self-reported behaviors at 3 and 6 months after the workshops was established, the effect sizes were small and the impacts on adult behaviors did not translate into impacts on children. This study concluded that the workshop approach to outreach had no measurable effects on student learning outcomes and only moderate impacts on parent/caregiver behaviors. As the study pointed out, enhancing children’s school readiness to the point of significant, measurable improvement usually requires large investments in child-focused interventions over extended periods of time. Thus, it’s not surprising that the workshops, which necessarily cannot be implemented at the level of intensity usually associated with most interventions that improve student-learning outcomes, showed no measurable effects on student behaviors and learning outcomes. Based on the findings of this rigorous 5-year evaluation, we believe that RTL outreach activities can be targeted far more effectively, to the end of ensuring that all children read on grade level by the third grade.

Because outreach is such a critical component of the RTL program, under the new outreach award CPB plans to use the latest evidence from social marketing research to target their efforts more effectively. CPB will continue to rely heavily on community partnerships, and will strategically partner with public broadcasting stations as local community hubs. However, unlike in past outreach work, CPB will partner with PBS to promote public awareness of RTL at the national and local levels through press and media outlets such as newspapers, television, and radio, emphasizing those most likely to reach the target audience of low-income parents and caregivers.

More specifically, isn’t there a way to combine the educational television programming on PBS funded by Ready to Learn, with local workshops for parents and teachers and other outreach activities by local public stations, such as free book distribution.

*Answer.* As indicated in our response to the previous question, a recent evaluation of “the workshop approach” to outreach supported by previous RTL grantees (entitled “Using Television as a Teaching Tool: The Impacts of Ready to Learn Workshops on Parents, Educators, and the Children in Their Care”) suggests that RTL has yet to achieve intended results in key areas of outreach implementation. Based on this evaluation, we believe that RTL outreach activities can be targeted far more effectively, to the end of ensuring that all children read on grade level by the third grade.

Under the new outreach award, CPB plans to change its outreach strategy by using the latest evidence from social marketing research to inform its work. CPB will continue to rely heavily on community partnerships, and will strategically partner with public broadcasting stations as local community hubs. However, unlike in past outreach work, CPB will partner with PBS to promote public awareness of RTL at the national and local levels through press and media outlets such as newspapers, television, and radio, emphasizing those most likely to reach the target audience of low-income parents and caregivers.

## READY TO LEARN CONTINUATION PROJECTS

*Question.* Additionally, given the President’s emerging initiative in math and science education, would you support a proposal to expand the focus of Ready to Learn to include, in addition to literacy, math and science education programming?

*Answer.* All of the Ready To Learn funds requested for fiscal year 2007 are needed to cover the continuation costs of current grantees, which were awarded 5-year grants in 2005. Both programming awards must focus on utilizing the principles of scientifically based reading research to improve literacy outcomes for young children, consistent with the priority established for last year’s competition and the cooperative agreements. By 2010, however, when the awards under this program will be re-competed, it is possible that the research base on how children acquire math and science knowledge will be sufficiently well-developed to support the development of new children’s educational programming in these areas.

MATH AND SCIENCE EDUCATION—MATH NOW PROGRAM AND MATH AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS

*Question.* The fiscal year 2007 budget proposes to establish Math Now for Elementary and Secondary School programs, which are intended to improve math instruction for elementary and middle school students. What is the potential overlap between the proposed math programs and the existing Math and Science Partnerships program?

*Answer.* The administration believes that Mathematics and Science Partnerships, a formula-grant program that promotes strong teaching skills for elementary and secondary school teachers, is important for ensuring that all States have high-quality mathematics and science professional development programs that focus on implementing scientifically based research and technology into the curriculum.

The Math Now programs, which will implement proven practices in mathematics instruction, including those recommended by the National Mathematics Panel, will go one step further by helping to ensure that American students are prepared to take and pass algebra courses in middle school, which will encourage them to take and pass higher-level mathematics and science courses in high school. They will focus more precisely than does Mathematics and Science Partnerships on the need to ensure that elementary-school students receive what the best research indicates is the most effective math instruction and for middle-school students who are struggling in math to receive the interventions they need.

MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE PARTNERSHIPS AND MATH NOW PROGRAM ACTIVITIES

*Question.* The States have some flexibility on how they target those funds through their sub-granting process. Is there any information about the extent to which States have targeted funding to the same issues proposed to be addressed by these new programs?

*Answer.* The Department began collecting data from States and partnerships this year that will describe how Mathematics and Science Partnerships (MSP) subgrantees are implementing the program. These data will include information about the kinds of activities MSP subgrantees are conducting with program funds, and the information should be available this summer.

Although we do not have a better sense of the activities MSP grantees are conducting, it is possible that there may be some overlap between the MSP and Math Now programs. However, we expect that it will be minimal. For example, the MSP program focuses on providing professional development for mathematics and science teachers, while the Math Now programs would have several allowable uses of funds, including professional development, but focusing more on improving elementary-school math instruction and helping middle-school students who are significantly below grade level in math. The Math Now grantees would also implement instructional principles and promising practices developed by the National Mathematics Panel, which is not a requirement of MSP subgrantees.

NATIONAL MATHEMATICS PANEL

*Question.* The fiscal year 2007 President's budget proposes to establish a National Mathematics Panel to identify approaches and interventions that meet either the scientifically based research standard, as defined in the No Child Left Behind Act, or "promising practices." How will the selections for the National Mathematics Panel be made, so that individuals with diverse backgrounds are represented on the panel?

*Answer.* In order to ensure a diverse pool of expertise, the Secretary will appoint no more than 20 members from the public and private sectors, as well as no more than 10 members from the Department of Education and other Federal agencies to the National Mathematics Panel. Panel members may include researchers who study mathematics, professors of mathematics and mathematics education, professors of psychology and/or cognitive development, practicing teachers, principals, State or local education officials, parents, business leaders, foundation representatives, members of education associations, and other individuals selected on the basis of their expertise and experiences as appropriate.

*Question.* How will "promising practices" be defined for purposes of identifying approaches and interventions?

*Answer.* Once it has been convened, members of the National Mathematics Panel will meet and determine the appropriate definitions and methodology for their review and synthesis of the evidence base on mathematics education. One of their charges will be to recommend, based on the best available scientific evidence, instructional practices, programs, and materials that are effective for improving math-

ematics learning. Since the scientific evidence base in mathematics education is inadequate in many areas, we anticipate that the Panel will also provide guidance that will help States and districts determine which approaches and interventions have some evidence—even though it does not yet meet the standards for scientifically based research—that indicate that the interventions will improve student outcomes.

#### MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE EDUCATION

*Question.* The President’s Academic Competitiveness Initiative (ACI) clearly emphasizes the need for improved science, technology, engineering and mathematics (STEM) education. The Department of Education’s 2007 budget request makes substantial improved mathematics education via the Math Now program, but does not make a comparable investment in science education. What is the Department’s plan for investing in science education?

*Answer.* Both mathematics and science are important subjects for our students to learn well if we are to remain competitive in the global economy. Because we need to set priorities within our budget, we are focusing on mathematics first through the Math Now programs. Mathematics is a “gateway” course for upper-level mathematics and science learning, so we believe that it is crucial for students to first have a firm foundation in mathematics. In addition, because Title I mathematics assessments are already in place (while the science assessments will not come on line until 2007–2008), we have an immediate source of information for measuring the effectiveness of new strategies in teaching mathematics, but not in science.

#### *Science Education Support*

Finally, the budget request includes either increases or level funding for a number of programs that focus on science, including Mathematics and Science Partnerships and Graduate Assistance in Areas of National Need. The new Advanced Placement and Adjunct Teacher Corps proposals would target science, in addition to mathematics and critical foreign languages. Other Department programs that allow grantees to focus on science include Transition to Teaching, Troop-to-Teachers, and Improving Teacher Quality State Grants.

#### INVESTMENTS IN ADVANCED PLACEMENT

*Question.* The fiscal year 2007 budget proposes to expand the reach of the Advanced Placement program by requiring grantees to offer incentives for teachers to become qualified to teach Advanced Placement and International Baccalaureate Organization classes in mathematics, science, and foreign languages and to teachers whose students pass tests in those subjects. The budget also proposes to require grantees to secure public and private matching funds to leverage the Federal investment. How much money does the Department expect the private sector to contribute toward the matching requirement for the Advanced Placement (AP) program?

*Answer.* The Department expects the private sector to invest roughly \$114 million in the AP program, which matches the Department’s funding request for AP Incentive Grants. Based on conversations with potential donors, who are very excited about this initiative, we believe this assumption is realistic.

*Question.* What is the basis for that projection?

*Answer.* Conversations between Department officials and representatives of private companies indicate that very substantial non-governmental support will be forthcoming. Senior officials are encouraging supporters of the proposal to publicize their commitment, and we hope to provide more information in the coming weeks.

*Question.* Please provide the same information for State contributions.

*Answer.* The Department is aware that many States are already committed to investing in the AP program, and believe that States will contribute their support and resources to increasing low-income students’ access to challenging coursework. Our expectation is that State and local funds will amount to approximately \$114 million, resulting in roughly a one-third/one-third/one-third split in Federal, State and local, and private-sector contributions.

*Question.* Also, does the Department plan to institute a maintenance-of-effort requirement for States; why or why not?

*Answer.* No, because the statute already includes a “supplement, not supplant” provision, which will prevent the Federal funds from merely supplanting existing State and local efforts.

## ADVANCED PLACEMENT INCENTIVE PROGRAM

*Question.* How will the Department ensure that the proposed incentive for teachers whose students pass AP/IB tests will not lead to the unintended consequence of discouraging students from taking these tests?

*Answer.* Providing a bonus to teachers for each student who passes an AP test should be an incentive for teachers to get more students to take and pass AP exams. According to “Do What Works: How Proven Practices Can Improve America’s High Schools,” written by Tom Luce, now our Assistant Secretary for Planning, Evaluation, and Policy Development, and Lee Thompson, the AP incentive program increased the number of students taking AP courses and passing AP exams in Texas. The Department’s proposal would extend the opportunities granted to students in Texas to young people across America.

## FEDERAL STUDENT AID

*Question.* Budget documents supporting the recall of the Federal portion of repayments made under the Federal Perkins Loans program indicate that, “the Administration believes the Federal share of funds held by this small group of institutions might more effectively help students if used in a way that serves all eligible students regardless of institution.” In addition to the \$664 million proposed recall of Perkins proceeds, the proposed budget includes a reduction of \$436 million in funding from the Student Financial Assistance account. How does the proposed budget more effectively serve all eligible students by recalling \$664 million from the Perkins loans program and reducing the Student Financial Assistance account by \$436 million?

*Answer.* It is important to look at the Federal investment in student aid from a broad perspective. Overall, the President’s Budget would build on student benefits included in the Higher Education Reconciliation Act (HERA) to provide a record \$82 billion in new student grant and loan assistance in fiscal year 2007. The HERA created Academic Competitiveness Grants, a new need-based program supported with mandatory funding that will award annual grants of up to \$1,300 to high-achieving first- and second-year students who have completed a rigorous high school curriculum or up to \$4,000 for third- and fourth-year students majoring in mathematics, science, technology, engineering, or critical foreign languages. In 2007, the program would provide \$850 million in grants to 600,000 low-income postsecondary students. Over 2006–2010, grant awards would total more than \$4.5 billion.

In addition, the HERA makes student loans more affordable by phasing out student origination fees and fixing student interest rates at 6.8 percent, reducing the maximum rate from the previous 8.25 percent. (If calculated today, the current variable rate formula—which will continue to apply for loans originated prior to July 1, 2006—would be 7.11 percent; if recent trends continue through June, the actual rate may be even higher.) The HERA also expands loan limits for first- and second-year students and graduate students and permanently expands loan forgiveness from \$5,000 to \$17,500 for math, science and special education teacher serving low-income communities.

Within the Student Financial Assistance account itself, most of the \$436 million reduction you mention reflects the effect of the new scoring rule for the Pell Grant program, which reduces the need for current year budget authority by allowing the use of excess funds from the previous fiscal year. The balance of the reduction reflects revised, lower estimates of fiscal year 2007 Pell Grant program costs and the elimination of two redundant, ineffective, or unnecessary programs: Federal Perkins Loans and Leveraging Education Assistance Partnerships.

## COMMISSION ON THE FUTURE OF HIGHER EDUCATION

*Question.* Specifically, how will low- and middle-income students achieve the same access to postsecondary education as high-income students have, which is an objective of the Department of Education?

*Answer.* In today’s highly competitive global economy it is vital that no American student be denied access to effective postsecondary education due to high costs. Accordingly, in September 2005 the Secretary’s Commission on the Future of Higher Education was created to examine how we as a Nation can keep higher education affordable and accessible. The Commission, made up of experienced leaders from education, business, and government, is holding a series of meetings around the country and gathering data from respected experts on higher education. A final report with the commission’s findings is expected by August.

## FUNDING FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

*Question.* In “Cracks in the Education Pipeline: A Business Leader’s Guide to Higher Education Reform,” it is stated that low-income families, those with incomes in the bottom 40 percent of the earnings distribution, spend one-third of their income to send a child to community college and 43 percent to enroll in a public 4-year school. Further, the document states that, “Student aid has the greatest impact when targeted on low-income students who otherwise would not enroll in college.” What is proposed in this budget to help such families finance their goals for postsecondary education?

*Answer.* The President’s 2007 Budget for student aid builds on a number of significant accomplishments in 2006 to provide a record \$82 billion in assistance to more than 10 million students and parents. Adopting a proposal from the 2006 President’s Budget, Congress appropriated \$4.3 billion in mandatory funding in 2006 to eliminate a long-standing funding shortfall in the Pell Grant program, putting this vital program—the foundation of Federal need-based aid—on a firm financial footing after years of growing fiscal instability. Congress also adopted new budget rules proposed by the President to prevent shortfalls from occurring in the future. In addition, the Higher Education Reconciliation Act, signed by the President in February, would further help the neediest students by phasing out origination fees for Stafford Loans and providing over \$4.5 billion over 5 years in new need-based Academic Competitiveness and SMART Grants.

## ADVANCING AMERICA THROUGH FOREIGN LANGUAGE PARTNERSHIPS

*Question.* The fiscal year 2007 budget proposes a new program, through appropriations language, to establish partnerships between institutions of higher education and school districts that support programs of study in grades K–16 in critical need languages. Specifically, how will this proposed program complement existing Department programs, such as those authorized and funded under title VI of the Higher Education Act and the Fulbright-Hays Act?

*Answer.* The Advancing America Through Foreign Language Partnerships program is intended to complement, not duplicate, existing Department programs that provide support for foreign language and areas studies education. Distinctive elements of the Advancing America Through Foreign Language Partnerships program, compared to the Title VI of the Higher Education Act and those authorized by the Mutual Educational and Cultural Exchange Act (Fulbright-Hays), include partnerships between institutions of higher education and school districts; the degree of focus on “critical need languages” such as Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Hindi, Farsi, and others; and unique language programs of study that enable successful students to advance from early learning in elementary school through advanced proficiency levels in high school to superior levels in college. The Title VI and Fulbright-Hays programs support 14 distinct yet interrelated programs designed to strengthen the capability and performance of American education in foreign languages and in area and international studies in a number of world regions. These programs do not establish articulated programs of study in grades K–16 in critical need foreign languages.

In addition, the objectives of this proposed program that relate to establishing fully articulated K–16 programs that produce college students who achieve a superior level of proficiency cannot be accomplished through grants to local and State educational agencies under the Department’s Foreign Language Assistance program (FLAP). FLAP is focused on improving the quality of foreign language instruction in elementary and secondary schools. Institutions of higher education are not eligible to apply for funding under the FLAP program. Moreover, FLAP is not an appropriate vehicle for establishing the kind of partnerships needed between school districts and institutions of higher education to ensure an articulated curriculum and consistent goals and continual progress toward the required outcomes at all educational levels, including the postsecondary level.

The Advancing America Through Foreign Language Partnerships program fits within the Department’s mission and complements Title VI and other Department activities relating to the teaching and learning of foreign languages.

## ADVANCING AMERICA THROUGH FOREIGN LANGUAGE PARTNERSHIPS AND DOD NATIONAL FLAGSHIP LANGUAGE INITIATIVE

*Question.* How will this new program complement related programs administered by other Federal agencies?

*Answer.* The Advancing America Through Foreign Language Partnerships program would operate following the model created under the National Flagship Lan-

guage Initiative at the Department of Defense. The Administration seeks to expand on DOD's pilot K-16 Mandarin Chinese program by awarding an additional 24 grants to institutions of higher education for partnerships with school districts for programs of language study in a variety of languages critical to national security such as Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Hindi, Farsi, and others. The Administration is proposing that ED (and not DOD) undertake the expansion of this program because the goals of the program fit within the Department's mission and the program complements other ED activities relating to the teaching and learning of foreign languages.

REQUIREMENTS OF ADVANCING AMERICA THROUGH FOREIGN LANGUAGE PARTNERSHIPS  
GRANTEES

*Question.* Supporting budget documents note that applicants would have to demonstrate the long-term success of their project, as well as commit to a significant amount of cost sharing. Would you please provide more information about each of these proposed requirements?

*Answer.* To address the need for skilled professionals with superior competency in foreign languages critical to U.S. national security, such as Arabic, Chinese, Russian, Hindi, Farsi, and others, participants in the Advancing America Through Foreign Language Partnerships program would be expected to make significant commitments. We would expect that institutions of higher education applying for grants would be able to identify each local educational agency partner and describe each partner's responsibilities (including how they would be involved in planning and implementing program curriculum, what resources they would provide, and how they would ensure continuity of student progress from elementary school to the postsecondary level). Participating institutions of higher education would be expected to work with partner school districts to develop and implement an articulated curriculum with consistent pedagogical philosophy and goals throughout all educational levels of the program. To ensure long-term success of the project, we would expect applicants to be able to describe in their applications how they would support and continue the program after the grant has expired, including how they would seek support from other sources, such as State and local government, foundations, and the private sector. We would also expect grantees to provide a non-Federal contribution, in cash or in kind, that would help carry out the activities supported by the grant.

STATEWIDE DATA SYSTEMS PROGRAM

*Question.* The fiscal year 2007 budget requests \$54.6 million for the Statewide Data Systems program, an increase of \$30 million over the fiscal year 2006 amount. Budget documents supporting this request indicate that 14 States are receiving funds from this program, although all States need assistance to develop or refine and fully implement systems that allow them to track the progress of individual students statewide. Budget documents also state that the requested increase for fiscal year 2007 would focus on the issue accelerating the capacity of high schools to report and use accurate high school graduation and dropout data. How are States utilizing funds from fiscal year 2005 and fiscal year 2006?

*Answer.* The Statewide Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) grant program is supporting State educational agencies in designing, developing, implementing, and using longitudinal individual student data and linking the student data to other contextual and management data, such as program, staffing, facilities, financial, early childhood, or post-secondary data. The resulting data systems will allow States to evaluate learning of all students and track the effectiveness of schools, programs, or interventions. Under the grant program, States are required to provide data and meaningful analyses back to local stakeholders, including teachers, principals, and districts. States are also required to develop ongoing evaluation procedures to ensure that the data collected are: (1) of high quality, (2) responsive to local information needs, and (3) useful for improving instruction and student learning.

States receiving SLDS grant money are required to incorporate data from kindergarten to 12th grade in their data systems. Most have also proposed to incorporate preschool and even birth-to-preschool data. Similarly, most grantees propose to incorporate postsecondary data in their systems, spanning prekindergarten-16 and even prekindergarten-20. Some States will also link their data to those from non-education agencies, such health or labor. These longitudinal student data, especially with links to rich contextual data, will for the first time allow States and districts to reliably link student outcomes to different variables, including curricula, educational environment, funding, socioeconomic background, and other factors that affect student learning.

STATEWIDE LONGITUDINAL DATA SYSTEMS

*Question.* How does this proposed priority fit with the basic needs of States for developing longitudinal data systems?

*Answer.* Statewide longitudinal data systems (SLDS) grants enable States to have more informative and reliable data on what is happening and what works in high schools, including the ability to evaluate and track how students' pre-high school experience affects how well they do in high school. These funds also enable States to understand how what happens in high school affects students' success in postsecondary education and/or employment. Grant funds support data system development and enhancements that enable States to conduct a wide range of rigorous longitudinal analyses, including computations of a standard four-year adjusted cohort graduation rate, as adopted by the National Governors Association (NGA). Most of the first cohort of grantee States have not collected and compiled these data before. Some States in the first cohort of grants can currently compute the NGA graduation rate, but these States still depend upon their grant funding to ensure the quality of their data collection.

The requested increase in funding for this program will enable more States that do not currently have this capacity to collect data necessary for the computation of accurate high school graduation and dropout rates necessary data on high school. For States that already collect these data, the requested funding will enable them to connect all relevant data in one longitudinal data system with better and more efficient verification of data over time and across different educational and other data systems. In these States, the SLDS grant will result in better data faster.

NATIONAL ASSESSMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PROGRESS

*Question.* The budget requests an additional \$4 million to allow the Department to begin work on essential activities for implementing in 2009 State-level assessments at the 12th grade level. What activities will be funded by this requested increase?

*Answer.* The funds requested for fiscal year 2007 would be used to conduct validation studies to ensure that the assessment has predictive validity and is an appropriate measure of readiness for work, postsecondary education, or military service. The funds would also be used for the development and pilot testing of new mathematics and reading frameworks.

12TH GRADE NAEP INITIATIVE—READING AND MATH ASSESSMENTS

*Question.* What is the total cost of the 12th grade NAEP initiative, and what is the range of options being considered for implementing this new policy?

*Answer.* Assuming that State participation is mandatory, the estimated total cost of the 12th grade State-level assessments in Reading and Math for 2009 would be \$45 million above the current NAEP appropriation.

The following chart presents estimated costs for an assessment in the 50 States, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico; as well as for a non-mandated assessment, with 45 States volunteering to participate; and for a pilot State assessment, with 10 States selected to participate. Once the development and phase-in of the 12th grade State-level assessments are complete, we estimate that the annual cost, beginning in 2010, of conducting State-level assessments in Reading and Mathematics would be \$22.5 million for the mandatory scenario and \$20.5 million for the voluntary scenario.

[Estimated cost, in millions of dollars]

Year	12th Grade State-Level Reading and Math Assessments		
	Mandatory (52 jurisdictions)	Voluntary (45 jurisdictions)	Pilot (10 jurisdictions)
2007 .....	4.0	4.0	4.0
2008 .....	18.5	18.5	4.0
2009 .....	22.5	18.5	3.6
Total .....	45.0	41.0	11.6

OFFICE OF COMMUNICATIONS AND OUTREACH

*Question.* Budget documents supporting your fiscal year 2007 budget request indicate that staffing for communications and outreach will change from 14 FTE in 2005 to 140 in fiscal year 2006. Will you explain the need for 140 FTE's in this office,

instead of utilizing these staff in grants monitoring and other program administration capacities?

Answer. Staffing for communications and outreach did not increase from 14 to 140. The reason there appears to be an increase is that we took staff from other areas and consolidated them under a new centralized communications office. In an effort to better coordinate the communication functions of the Department to ensure clear, consistent communications, a new Office of Communications and Outreach (OCO) was created. It now includes the former Office of Public Affairs (OPA), most of the functions of the former Office of Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs (OIIA) and the function of internal communications. The new Office of Communications and Outreach encompasses speechwriting, public affairs, web site, publications, event services, external affairs and the Secretary's 10 regional offices. The Office of Communications and Outreach is responsible for creating and distributing appropriate education materials to inform the work and decision-making of educators, policymakers, government officials, parents and students.

#### DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURES FOR PUBLIC RELATIONS AND OUTREACH

*Question.* How much did your Department spend on public relations and outreach in fiscal year 2005?

Answer. In fiscal year 2005, the Department spent \$1,132,246 on public relations and outreach, in procurement of items and services such as speeches and editing for senior staff, logistical outreach event support, webcasting, and the monthly "Education News Parents Can Use" satellite broadcasts.

*Question.* How much do you plan to spend in fiscal year 2006 and fiscal year 2007, and what are the primary outcomes intended to be achieved by these expenditures?

Answer. The Department plans on spending \$1,025,000 in fiscal year 2006 and \$1,100,000 in fiscal year 2007 on public relations and outreach events which are designed to inform members of the public about No Child Left Behind and other Department programs, the monthly "Education News Parents Can Use" satellite broadcast, and technical support for webcasting.

Each "Education News Parents Can Use" broadcast explains U.S. Department of Education programs to parents using practical, plain-language discussions of topics such as ensuring safe and drug free schools, teaching reading, serving students with disabilities, and using new education technology. Each broadcast offers this information in a format that features short segments, including one-on-one interviews, "how-to" demonstrations, and brief conversations with parents, educators, education experts, and community, business and religious leaders.

Technical and production support is needed for the creation of high quality, live, or previously videotaped multi-media programs that can be broadcast over the Internet. These productions are for the purpose of raising the general public's awareness of and encouraging participation in programs associated with ED's education reform initiatives.

---

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

##### NATIVE HAWAIIAN EDUCATION

*Question.* First and foremost, I'd like to express my sincere appreciation for the continued funding of Native Hawaiian Education. This funding facilitated uninterrupted curricula development, teacher training and recruitment programs as well as scholarship offerings. Programs such as these allowed many young Hawaiians' the opportunity to fully realize their dreams. Through continued support of Native Hawaiian Vocational Education, countless individuals can now successfully enter, compete and advance in the ever-changing and competitive technological workplace.

I would also like to extend my personal thanks to your Department administrators who have traveled to Hawaii to meet our local program coordinators and provide technical assistance to our remote communities. No doubt, your staff has seen first hand the tremendous impact and success these funded programs have had on the people of Hawaii.

Madam Secretary, what are the indicators or measures your Department uses to manage existing competitive grantees under the Native Hawaiian Education Act?

Answer. The Department has established three performance measures for the Native Hawaiian Education program authorized under Title VII of the ESEA. The measures are:

—The percentage of teachers involved with professional development activities that address the unique educational needs of program participants.

- The percentage of Native Hawaiian children participating in early education programs who improve on measures of school readiness and literacy.
- The percentage of students participating in the program who meet or exceed proficiency standards in mathematics, science, or reading.

The Department collects data on these measures through the annual performance reports submitted by grantees.

*Question.* Please also describe the process by which these indicators were selected.

*Answer.* The development of the performance indicators for the Native Hawaiian Education program was based on an analysis of the program's purpose, priorities and authorized activities, and how those align with the overall priorities and purpose of the No Child Left Behind Act. As the program authorizes a wide number of project activities, we also had to narrow somewhat the areas for performance measurement for the program, in order to minimize the burden of data collection and reporting. Since we were unable to arrive at one performance indicator that would be appropriate for all projects possible or allowed under the program, we conducted an analysis of grantee activities and goals. The analysis showed that most grantees are implementing projects around a small number of areas (early childhood, teacher professional development, and math and science education) and, thus, we developed indicators to track program performance in those areas.

#### WOMEN IN TECHNOLOGY

*Question.* The Women in Technology (WIT) program originated in Maui 5 years ago as a workforce development project initially funded through a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor. A core mission component of the program was to partner with educators and industry to create a pipeline from education to employment in science, technology, engineering and math. This concept was first introduced in our local middle and high schools, to increase the confidence and interest of under represented populations in math and science studies and expose them to educational and professional opportunities in high-tech professions. This was accomplished at no cost to the students.

Elementary school is a critical time to begin outreach efforts to attract students into the science, technology, engineering and math pipeline. National research indicates that gender identities and stereotyping about career roles are set by age seven. One of the goals of Women in Technology includes training elementary school teachers in "inquiry-based learning" methods. In this method, teachers learn how to harness the natural inquisitive nature of their students and nurture it into scientific questions/hypothesis and self-directed activities to prove/disprove the students' questions. The inquiry-based activities are integrated into the teaching curriculum and align with grade level and standards. This method of teaching is well suited to children of both genders and stimulates all styles of learning. A pilot program, recently launched in Maui, included a professional development workshop for one dozen elementary teachers.

Madam Secretary, Women In Technology is a critically important program to securing a more prosperous future for many young Hawaiians. So strong is my belief in the value of this program, that in years past, I sought funding for it via my earmarks. As such are no longer available, will the Department of Education provide funds for the expansion of science, technology, engineering and math "inquiry-based learning" curriculum and training to all elementary school teachers throughout the State of Hawaii?

*Answer.* The agency operating the Women in Technology (WIT) program may pursue discretionary funding opportunities under a number of Department of Education programs that support activities such as the ones you describe. WIT may apply, for example, for funding under the Native Hawaiian Education program, which supports innovative projects to provide supplemental services that address the educational needs of Native Hawaiian children and adults. Authorized activities under that program include development and implementation of professional development programs to prepare teachers to address the unique needs of Native Hawaiian students.

WIT may also be eligible for funding under the Mathematics and Science Partnerships program. Funds for the program are distributed to States based on a formula, and each State then administers a grant competition for the funds. The program supports State and local efforts to improve students' academic achievement in mathematics and science by promoting strong teaching skills for elementary and secondary school teachers, including integrating teaching methods based on scientifically based research and technology into the curriculum. Grantees may also use program funds to develop more rigorous mathematics and science curricula that are aligned with challenging State and local content standards; establish distance learn-

ing programs for mathematics and science teachers; and recruit individuals with mathematics, science, and engineering majors into the teaching profession through the use of signing and performance incentives, stipends, and scholarships. Professional development can include summer workshops, or institutes and programs, that bring mathematics and science teachers into contact with working scientists, mathematicians, and engineers in order to expand teachers' subject-matter knowledge. WIT administrators should contact the Hawaii Department of Education for information on applying for this program.

---

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR HERB KOHL

SPECIAL EDUCATION FULL FUNDING

*Question.* Many of us here have worked hard every year to increase funding for Special Education. Year after year, school districts in Wisconsin tell me that this is one of their top concerns. But this year's budget is especially worrisome. It proposes to cut the Federal share of IDEA costs from 18 percent to 17 percent—that is less than half of the 40 percent “full funding” level that Congress committed to paying when IDEA was first adopted 31 years ago. This deliberate step backward begs the question: does this Administration plan to ever fully fund IDEA?

*Answer.* Under the President's leadership, funding for the Grants to States program has increased by 67 percent since 2001. The President's 2007 request for the Special Education—Grants to States program of \$10.7 billion, which includes an increase of \$100 million, would provide about 17 percent of the national average per pupil expenditure (APPE) for 6.9 million children with disabilities receiving special education, compared to about 14 percent of the APPE in 2001. No Administration has come close to requesting 40 percent of APPE, but this Administration has proposed record-high increases in funding for the program and has achieved record-high levels of the Federal contribution.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION FUNDING

*Question.* While I support the President's proposals to increase resources to support math and science education at the high school level, I am concerned about the decrease in funding for programs that support early childhood education. Research shows that 80 percent of brain development takes place during the first 3 years of a child's life. In light of this research, please explain the Administration's rationale for funneling resources away from programs that support our youngest learners—like the Foundations for Learning and Even Start programs—and putting those funds into our high school age programs.

*Answer.* The Department remains dedicated to the goal of promoting cognitive development for all children, and the President's budget request reflects a strong commitment to programs that have a proven record of success in serving our Nation's youngest citizens. Neither Even Start nor Foundations for Learning has a track record of demonstrated effectiveness. While some local Even Start programs are successful at supporting the development of children's early academic skills, the program's overall reliance on the family literacy model has not been shown to be effective. In addition, the Foundations for Learning program is duplicative of other programs that serve very young children and its size precludes any large impact on the populations to which it is targeted. Other programs, such as Early Reading First and the Early Childhood Educator Professional Development program, focus on proven methods of addressing the cognitive development and school readiness needs of young children

PERKINS LOANS AND OTHER STUDENT AID PROGRAMS

*Question.* Not only does this budget cut Pell Grants, but it also calls for the elimination of the Federal Perkins loan program. This academic year, the University of Madison-Wisconsin served 5,202 students with \$13.2 million in Federal Perkins Loans. These loans helped students cover the gap between other financial aid and the actual cost of attendance. They are also a good option for low-income students because they are not dependent on credit history. Secretary Spellings, if Congress were to agree to the President's recommendation and eliminate Perkins loans, what do you suggest these students do to pay for higher education?

*Answer.* First, to clarify, the President's Budget does not cut Pell Grants; current estimates indicate every eligible student would receive his or her full award under our proposal. The reduction in budget authority compared with fiscal year 2006 reflects the new scoring rule under which an estimated \$273 million in unused funds

from fiscal year 2006 can be used to reduce the need for new appropriations, as well as a slight reduction in the estimated cost of the Pell Grant program.

More broadly, even with the Perkins Loan proposal, student aid would increase under the President's Budget by more than \$4.6 billion in fiscal year 2007 over the previous year, including \$790 million in new need-based Academic Competitiveness and SMART Grants. In addition, student loans under the Federal Family Education Loan and Direct Loan programs will be a better bargain for borrowers due to lower interest rates and reduced origination fees.

#### ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL COUNSELING PROGRAM

*Question.* School counselors play a vital role in the lives of American youths by providing guidance on issues both academic and personal. During times of war and the ongoing fear of terrorism, the need for effective school counseling is clearer than ever. In addition, counselors continue to guide students in career, academic and social development. That's why I am very concerned that the President's budget again eliminates funding for the School Counseling Program. In Wisconsin, each public school counselor oversees 461 students—a caseload that already leaves many students underserved.

School counselors play an important role in helping students meet the goals of No Child Left Behind. Why would the Administration cut a program that is helping to make its signature education policy work?

*Answer.* The budget request to eliminate funding for the Elementary and Secondary School Counseling program is part of an overall budget strategy to discontinue programs that duplicate other programs that may be carried out with flexible State formula grant funds, or that involve activities that are better or more appropriately supported through State, local, or private resources. Specifically, the 2007 budget proposes termination of 42 programs in order to free up almost \$3.5 billion (based on 2006 levels) for reallocation to higher-priority activities within the Department. These higher-priority activities include the Administration's \$1.5 billion High School Reform Initiative. Under this Initiative, local educational agencies will be able to include student counseling services as part of the comprehensive strategies they adopt to raise high school achievement and eliminate gaps in achievement among subgroups of students.

In addition, if school districts choose to do so, they may support counseling programs with the funds they receive under the State Grants for Innovative Programs authority, which allows them to implement programs that best meet their needs. Furthermore, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) provides school districts with additional flexibility to meet their own priorities by consolidating a sizable portion of their Federal funds from their allocations under certain State formula grant programs and using those funds under any other of these authorized programs. A school district that seeks to implement a school counseling program in some or all of its schools may use funds from those programs to do so.

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PATTY MURRAY

##### ACADEMIC COMPETITIVENESS/SMART GRANTS

*Question.* The fiscal year 2006 Budget Reconciliation bill created Academic Competitiveness grants and the National Science and Mathematics Access to Retain Talent (SMART) grants. To receive the Academic Competitiveness grants, students must have completed a rigorous secondary-school program of study. While I agree that we need to be doing all we can prepare students for a job in a global economy, a student's luck in where they attend high school shouldn't determine whether or not the Federal Government helps them attend college. The Congressional Budget Office has estimated that only 9.9 percent of Pell eligible students will be able to take advantage of the Academic Competitiveness and SMART grants in 2007.

The maximum Pell grant has not increased for years despite tuition rising at our Nation's public colleges rising by over 7 percent last year. If the \$850 million that these grants cost in fiscal year 2007 were spent on Pell grants, students would receive an additional \$200 in aid.

How do you anticipate judging what constitutes a rigorous secondary-school curriculum?

*Answer.* The Department of Education is working with all States to help them identify high school programs of study they can submit to the Secretary of Education for recognition as rigorous secondary programs of study. In addition, there will be alternative eligibility provisions for students from States that have not yet submitted designated programs to the Secretary. These State-identified, eligible rig-

orous secondary school programs or acceptable alternatives will soon be posted on a Department web site.

*Question.* Particularly in such tight budget times, shouldn't we be spending our resources on helping all students attend college regardless of their circumstance, not benefiting the few who are lucky enough to attend the "right" high school?

*Answer.* Taken together, the Federal student aid programs under the President's fiscal year 2007 budget request would provide over \$82 billion to students and families, much of it focused on the neediest Americans. Within this larger investment, we believe it is appropriate to target a portion of need-based aid—Academic Competitiveness/SMART Grant recipients must be eligible for a Pell Grant—to encourage the type of rigorous high school study and challenging college coursework that is linked to success both for individuals and, ultimately, for our Nation.

#### TITLE IX REPORT

*Question.* On March 17, 2005, the Department of Education released new guidance on the interest prong of the three-part test which schools use to show compliance with Title IX in athletics. As you are aware, I have grave concerns about the new guidance because I believe it sets a new low bar for compliance with a Federal civil rights law. Schools would now be allowed to use an email survey to show compliance with Title IX. Further, the school would only have to send that survey to women and a lack of response could be determined as lack of interest in sports. Surveys have been used in the past to show compliance with Title IX, but not as a sole means and other factors such as emerging sports had to be taken into consideration.

Because of concern over this new guidance, a bipartisan group of Senators on this subcommittee asked for a report on the guidance and use of surveys due March 17. What is the status of the requested report?

*Answer.* The report in response to guidance and the use of surveys for Title IX was submitted to the Committee on March 17, 2006.

#### TITLE IX TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

*Question.* Clearly, there is a lot of confusion on behalf of schools about this new guidance. What is the Department doing regarding technical assistance on the guidance?

*Answer.* The Office for Civil Rights (OCR) regularly provides technical assistance on a variety of issues to interested parties, including elementary and secondary schools and colleges and universities. Assistance is an important method to help educational institutions achieve voluntary compliance with the civil rights laws and assist in preventing civil rights violations by educating schools about their responsibilities. OCR provides guidance through a variety of methods, including responses to thousands of requests for individualized technical assistance, via phone, email, or mail, each year from individuals, recipients, and groups representing recipients and beneficiaries. Our technical assistance also includes on-site consultations, conferences, training, community outreach, publishing and disseminating materials, through the Department's website and direct mailings, and issuing guidance.

With respect to Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972 (Title IX), the Department issued the Additional Clarification of Intercollegiate Athletics Policy (Additional Clarification) to clarify one method schools may choose to use to assess athletic interests and to provide a practical tool they may choose to use to conduct that assessment.

To further assist schools, OCR has been and continues to actively seek out opportunities to provide technical assistance on a continuous basis. In the year since the Additional Clarification was issued, OCR has provided technical assistance on the Additional Clarification to more than a thousand coaches, athletic directors, Title IX coordinators and legal advisors, in addition to regularly providing individualized technical assistance. These presentations have included secondary schools, 2- and 4-year colleges and universities, and conferences sponsored by umbrella organizations responsible for developing and implementing the governing rules and procedures for national and regional athletics at the secondary, junior college, and 4-year college levels. We will continue to proactively seek out opportunities to educate recipients, educational and athletic organizations, administrators, parents and students regarding nondiscriminatory implementation of Title IX and the Additional Clarification.

#### AMERICA'S OPPORTUNITY SCHOLARSHIPS FOR KIDS

*Question.* The President's budget again proposes school vouchers through the America's Opportunity Scholarships for Kids program. The President's education budget also eliminates 42 programs. We often hear that the programs are proposed for elimination because they are ineffective. However, there is no evidence that pri-

vate school vouchers do anything to improve achievement for any students. Further, we still have yet to see any real evaluation of achievement under the D.C. voucher program.

In such a tight budget, how does the Administration justify spending \$100 million on a program that has yet to be found effective?

Answer. To offer the opportunity of a high-quality education to more students who attend schools in restructuring around the country, the Department proposes the creation of a national school choice program that gives parents the choice to send their children to any public or private schools that they believe would better serve their student's needs. Though it is too early to know the potential effects on academic achievement of the D.C. School Choice Incentive Program, we do know that the program has generated significant support among parents of students in low-performing schools in Washington, DC. The America's Opportunity Scholarships program would extend that option to parents whose children attend low-performing schools across the Nation. In addition, several research studies, such as "Private School Vouchers and Student Achievement: An Evaluation of the Milwaukee Parental Choice Program" by Cecilia Rouse, and Jay Greene's "The Effect of School Choice: an Evaluation of the Charlotte Children's Scholarship Fund," suggest that participation in the private school choice programs leads to improvements in student achievement.

#### IMPACT OF MEDICAID CHANGE ON CHILDREN WITH DISABILITIES

*Question.* The Department of Health and Human Services reflects a change in how Medicaid is dealt with at schools. While I understand this change is proposed in the HHS budget and not the Department of Education, the impact will be felt by students and schools. The HHS budget says that certain costs associated with services provided to special education students who are also on Medicaid will no longer be reimbursed to the schools through Medicaid. The estimated savings to HHS is over \$600 million for fiscal year 2007 and the 10-year savings is over \$9 billion. The President's budget proposes only a \$100 million increase to IDEA. While we will certainly fight for increasing funding for IDEA and other education programs, given these tight budget times, I have a feeling IDEA won't receive \$9 billion in the next 10 years.

I am concerned that students will feel the impact of this change. The Federal Government has yet to live up to the promise of funding 40 percent of the cost of educating a special education student and schools will not be able to absorb the costs associated with this change. Students will be told to get such services outside of school hours.

How do you propose ensuring that students get all the necessary service they receive now if this change happens at HHS?

Answer. The President's 2007 Budget includes a proposal that would prohibit Federal Medicaid reimbursement for Medicaid administrative activities performed in schools. It additionally provides that Federal Medicaid funds will no longer be available to pay for transportation required to be provided to children with disabilities by the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. HHS has had long-standing concerns about improper billing by school districts for administrative costs and transportation services. Both the HHS Inspector General and the Government Accountability Office have identified these categories of expenses as susceptible to fraud and abuse. Schools would continue to be reimbursed for direct Medicaid services identified in an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or Individualized Family Service Plan (IFSP) and provided to Medicaid-eligible children, such as physical therapy, that are important to meeting the needs of Medicaid-eligible students with disabilities.

A shift in funding responsibility for administrative and transportation costs associated with Medicaid eligible children with disabilities should not affect services for these children. State and local governments are responsible for ensuring that needed services are provided for all children with disabilities, regardless of whether they are Medicaid eligible. The change in policy would treat Medicaid eligible children with disabilities the same as other children with disabilities with regard to administrative and transportation costs. The Department of Education and HHS intend to work together to ensure that implementation of this change in policy is done in an orderly and sensible fashion.

#### 21ST CENTURY COMMUNITY LEARNING CENTERS

*Question.* The President's budget would freeze funding for the 21st Century Community Learning Centers Program for the fifth year in a row. Furthermore, NCLB's fiscal year 2007 authorization level for the program is \$2.5 billion. This is a program

that enjoys extraordinary public and bipartisan congressional support. All of us hear from constituents who want and need more funding to develop more afterschool programs in their communities. These programs help working families, provide vital additional academic support to students and provide safe, supervised environments for kids afterschool—priorities that appear to match many of the President's major goals.

With such diverse, bipartisan support, why has the Department continued to propose only \$981 million for the program? That gap leaves the States, communities, families and students—as many as 1.4 million children—behind and more than 25 States unable to offer new grant opportunities in fiscal year 2005.

Answer. The program does, indeed, enjoy bipartisan support in Congress, and we do receive many letters from Members asking us to increase funding. However, in a tight budget environment, we need to target the limited available funding on programs that show evidence of success or that have a strong potential to fill major unmet needs. The results of the only national evaluation of 21st Century Community Learning Centers were not very positive and did not present a case for increasing the funding. However, the Department's Institute of Education Sciences has launched a study of specific math and reading interventions that will determine after-school programs' potential impact on academic achievement. We will review the results of that study, and also the program performance results that States submit, in determining whether to request increases in future years.

#### CIVIC EDUCATION

*Question.* As you know, we face a crisis today with young people who are disenchanted with politics; they are apathetic and cynical about Government and its institutions. I was disappointed to discover the elimination of the Education for Democracy Act in the President's budget request. This program funds domestic civic and international civic and economic education programs. The Civic Education program is successful in helping American students understand and appreciate fundamental values and principles of our Government.

Can you comment on why a program that is consistent with the Administration's desire for American students to have a basic understanding and appreciation of the workings of our Nation's Government and politics along with its values and principles was eliminated in the President's budget?

Answer. The Administration agrees that there is a critical need for education programs that effectively promote basic understanding and appreciation of the workings of our Nation's Government and politics, along with its values and principles. However, we question the efficacy and wisdom of statutorily mandating that 100 percent of funds available for domestic civic education activities must go to a single organization, particularly when so little is known about the efficacy of civic education interventions developed and supported by this organization. The Administration believes that a more effective approach to addressing the issue is to invest in programs that make competitive awards to local schools districts and other eligible entities to help create safe learning environments where students understand, care about, and act on core ethical and citizenship values, such as Character Education (which would receive \$24.2 million under the President's request) and Safe Schools/Healthy Students (which would receive \$79.2 million under the President's request).

While the Civic Education program, as currently authorized, supports some worthwhile activities, there are no reliable measures of overall effectiveness of interventions supported using program funds. Studies and evaluations conducted by the Center for Civic Education provide limited information on program performance, but none are sufficiently rigorous to yield reliable information on the overall effectiveness or impact(s) of the various interventions supported through this program.

The administration does not believe additional funding is necessary for the implementation of activities currently supported by the Center for Civic Education—an established non-profit organization with a broad network of program participants, alumni, volunteers, and financial supporters at the local, State, and national levels. The Center also has a long history of success raising additional support through such vehicles as selling program-related curricular materials, training and workshops, partnering with non-profit groups on core activities, lobbying, and seeking support from foundations.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator SPECTER. Thank you very much. The subcommittee will stand in recess to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 3, in room SD-226. At that time we will hear testimony from the Honor-

able Michael Leavitt, Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services.

[Whereupon, at 12 noon, Wednesday, March 1, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, May 3.]