

**H.R. 1, “NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND”:
MEMBER HEARING DAY**

HEARING
BEFORE THE
**COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND
THE WORKFORCE**
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 28, 2001

Serial No. 107-9

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



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

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio, *Chairman*

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

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

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

Table of Contents

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN MICHAEL CASTLE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE..... 2

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TOM LATHAM, 5TH DISTRICT OF IOWA,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C..... 3

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, 30TH
DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON,
D.C..... 5

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES LANGEVIN, 2ND DISTRICT OF
RHODE ISLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. . 6

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MIKE PENCE, 2ND DISTRICT OF INDIANA,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C..... 7

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB CLEMENT, 5TH DISTRICT OF
TENNESSEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. 9

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHAKA FATTAH, 2ND DISTRICT OF
PENNSYLVANIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
..... 11

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TED STRICKLAND, 6TH DISTRICT OF
OHIO, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C..... 12

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT UNDERWOOD, GUAM
DELEGATE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C..... 14

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RICK LARSEN, 2ND DISTRICT OF
WASHINGTON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C... 16

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MIKE HONDA, 15TH DISTRICT OF
CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. 17

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK KINGSTON, 1ST DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C..... 19

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ELIJAH CUMMINGS, 7TH DISTRICT OF
MARYLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C..... 20

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LARSON, 1ST DISTRICT OF
CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. 22

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN ANNE NORTHUP, 3 RD DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	23
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BALDACCI, 2 ND DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	25
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN ROSA DeLAURO, 3 RD DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	27
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DAVID PRICE, 4 TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	29
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN DARLENE HOOLEY, 5 TH DISTRICT OF OREGON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	31
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JIM MATHESON, 2 ND DISTRICT OF UTAH, U.S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	32
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TODD AKIN, 2 ND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	34
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN THUNE, SOUTH DAKOTA- AT LARGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	35
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ADAM SCHIFF, 27 TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	37
STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TOM ALLEN, 1 ST DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	38
APPENDIX A - WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT, CHAIRMAN MICHAEL CASTLE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.....	41
APPENDIX B - WRITTEN STATEMENT, RANKING MEMBER DALE KILDEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.....	45
APPENDIX C - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TOM LATHAM, 5 TH DISTRICT OF IOWA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	51
APPENDIX D - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, 30 TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	59
APPENDIX E - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JIM LANGEVIN, 2 ND DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	63

APPENDIX F - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN MIKE PENCE, 2 ND DISTRICT OF INDIANA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	71
APPENDIX G - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN BOB CLEMENT, 5 TH DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	77
APPENDIX H - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN CHAKAH FATTAH, 2 ND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	85
APPENDIX I - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TED STRICKLAND, 6 TH DISTRICT OF OHIO, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	93
APPENDIX J - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ROBERT UNDERWOOD, GUAM DELEGATE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	97
APPENDIX K - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN RICK LARSEN, 2 ND DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	103
APPENDIX L - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN MIKE HONDA, 15 TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	107
APPENDIX M - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JACK KINGSTON, 1 ST DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	115
APPENDIX N - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ELIJAH CUMMINGS, 7 TH DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	119
APPENDIX O - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN LARSON, 1 ST DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	125
APPENDIX P - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN ANNE NORTHUP, 3 RD DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	135
APPENDIX Q - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN BALDACCI, 2 ND DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	143

APPENDIX R - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN ROSA DeLAURO, 3RD DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	149
APPENDIX S - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN DAVID PRICE, 4TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	155
APPENDIX T - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN DARLENE HOOLEY, 5 TH DISTRICT OF OREGON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	159
APPENDIX U - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JIM MATHESON, 2 ND DISTRICT OF UTAH, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	165
APPENDIX V - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TODD AKIN, 2 ND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	171
APPENDIX W - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN THUNE, SOUTH DAKOTA-AT LARGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	177
APPENDIX X - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ADAM SCHIFF, 27 TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	181
APPENDIX Y - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TOM ALLEN, 1 ST DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	185
APPENDIX Z – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN ANIBAL ACEVEDO-VILA, PUERTO RICO-AT LARGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	191
APPENDIX AA – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN SAXBY CHAMBLISS, 8 TH DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	197
APPENDIX BB- STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, 21 ST DISTRICT OF FLORIDA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	201
APPENDIX CC – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN VAN HILLEARY, 4 TH DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	207

APPENDIX DD – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN TOM LANTOS, 12 TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	213
APPENDIX EE – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN RON PAUL, 14 TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	221
APPENDIX FF – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN MIKE ROGERS, 8 TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	225
APPENDIX GG – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN MARK GREEN, 8 TH DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	231
APPENDIX HH – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN RONNIE SHOWS, 4 TH DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.....	237
APPENDIX II – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD, CONGRESSMAN LAMAR SMITH, 21 ST DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.	245
Table of Indexes.....	252

HEARING ON H.R. 1
“NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND”
MEMBER HEARING DAY

Wednesday, March 28, 2001

U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Education and the Workforce
Washington, D.C.

The Committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:30 a.m., in Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John A Boehner, Chairman of the Committee, presiding.

Present: Representatives Boehner, Ballenger, McKeon, Castle, Hilleary, Ehlers, Fletcher, Isakson, Osborne, Miller, Kildee, Andrews, Roemer, Woolsey, Rivers, Tierney, Kind, Ford, Holt, Davis, and McCollum.

Staff present: Sally Lovejoy, Director of Education and Human Resources Policy; Kent Talbert, Professional Staff Member; Blake Hegeman, Legislative Assistant; Jo-Marie St. Martin, General Counsel; Becky Campoverde, Deputy Staff Director; Cindy Herrle, Senior Budget Analyst; Patrick Lyden, Professional Staff Member; Maria Miller, Communications Coordinator; Deborah Samantar, Committee Clerk; John Lawrence, Minority Staff Director; Charles Barone, Minority Deputy Staff Director; Maggie McDow, Minority Legislative Associate; Alex Nock, Minority Legislative Associate; Brendan O'Neil, Minority Legislative Associate; Joe Novotny, Minority Staff Assistant; and Ann Owens, Minority Clerk.

Mr. Castle. A quorum being present, the Committee on Education and the Workforce will come to order.

Under Committee rule 12-B, opening statements are limited to the Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Subcommittee. Therefore, if other Members have

statements, they will be included in the hearing record. With that, I ask unanimous consent for the hearing record to remain open 14 days to allow Member statements and other extraneous material referenced during the hearing to be submitted in the official hearing record. Without objection, so ordered. I will read my opening statement.

***OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN MICHAEL CASTLE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE***

Let me extend a warm welcome to all of you and to all my colleagues as well as to all of our guests. The focus of this Full Committee hearing is to give Members of Congress an opportunity to testify on President Bush's "**No Child Left Behind**" education proposal.

As you may know, **H.R. 1**, the **No Child Left Behind Act of 2001**, was introduced just last week. H.R. 1 is comprehensive legislation reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, known as ESEA, encompassing the President's plan.

Despite nearly a decade of uninterrupted economic growth in the 1990s, the achievement gap in our country between disadvantaged students and their peers remains wide. All of us can agree, whether Republican, Democrat, or independent, that this is a problem that requires our attention.

While our hearing is focused on the President's education proposal, the Committee recognizes there are many issues pertaining to education that are important to Members. This hearing was designed to ensure that all Members are afforded an opportunity to share their views and concerns with the Committee.

Although not all Members are available to testify in person, some have chosen to submit testimony for the record. I would like to thank all Members who have taken an active interest in this opportunity and for their efforts to ensure that every American child has the chance to learn.

WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT, CHAIRMAN MICHAEL CASTLE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE – SEE APPENDIX A

Mr. Kildee. At this time, I'd just like to thank the Chairman for giving us the opportunity to hear from our colleagues on this very important issue. And I will yield back temporarily, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Castle. Thank you very much, Mr. Kildee. It is a pleasure, by the way, to be working with you again after a little bit of a rest.

Mr. Kildee. Mike and I have done some good work together.

Mr. Castle. As you may know, we scheduled this hearing today in order to listen to our colleagues regarding their concerns, interests, and priorities for the direction of our nation's educational policy. A couple of them are before us, who do not serve on this Committee.

Our hearing has generated a great deal of Member interest, and we want to hear from our colleagues. Given the great response to our invitation today, we have a large number of Members who will be testifying.

However, in order to provide enough time for testimony, it will prevent Committee Members from asking questions. Hence, Mr. Kildee and Mr. Miller and I would ask that you understand these limitations and allow this time to be spent listening to our colleagues. Of course, if there is a question that must be asked, I am sure we can accommodate you. And I now recognize Mr. Kildee.

Mr. Kildee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I certainly understand the time constraints and agree with you regarding limitation of our questions. I appreciate the opportunity to listen and learn from our colleagues.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, RANKING MEMBER DALE KILDEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE – SEE APPENDIX B

Mr. Castle. Thank you very much. I would ask the staff also to remind other colleagues who come in late of the limitations we are trying to impose. And again, before the testimony begins, I would like to remind the Members who will be testifying, we will be limiting oral testimony to three minutes. The hearing record will remain open for 14 days so that you may submit a longer written statement if you desire, but please try to stay within the time limit. I am sure that the Members testifying after you will be appreciative.

And I think there is not a Member here that does not understand the light system, so I will not bother explaining that to you. And with that, I think we are ready to proceed.

Mr. Latham, you seem to be the number one batter here.

Mr. Latham. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TOM LATHAM, 5TH DISTRICT OF IOWA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This is a critical issue for all of us who want to see this country grow and prosper, and the idea of no child left behind is extremely important to everyone. I will be

submitting written testimony, but I just wanted to make a couple of comments here today.

Iowa is known nationally for its educational excellence. The basis of that excellence is local control, parental involvement, working with teachers, working with local administrators, and trying to do the best job for the children who are in the system.

For the Federal Government to claim any kind of responsibility for the quality of education in Iowa would be like me trying to claim credit for Iowa having deep, black, fertile soil. There is no correlation.

What we have to have is a flexible situation from the Federal Government to empower the local school districts, the parents, and the teachers, to do the best job. We have a lot of different situations in my district. In northwest Iowa it is very rural. We have small school districts. We have larger ones. The lack of funding for IDEA has a big impact on many of my school districts, and I am very pleased that the budget that we are considering today takes that into consideration.

We also have school districts that have changing concerns. One school district has 40 percent non-English speaking students in my district. That district has tried to bring children, three or four years old, into classes to have them learn English so that they will be successful. But under the current guidelines, there is no assistance for them, and what we need to do is have flexibility for that local school district to be successful.

Another case is that many of my school districts are very, very small. In my own hometown, we have K through 12, and about 340 students in that district. They cannot qualify for many of the federal programs, which are currently on the books. And again, there is the need for flexibility, allowing those school districts to use the resources.

There is a huge commitment at the local level for education. As an example, my home school district has a fundraising drive to build infrastructure on the school building itself. It is the first time in the State of Iowa this has happened. We have people contributing about \$600,000 out of their own pocket. My wife and I are committed to \$5,000 for this project. This is what local control and local involvement is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I think you are on the right track. I hope that we can proceed to make sure that our young people have the education that they need. I thank you for the opportunity to testify.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TOM LATHAM, 5TH DISTRICT OF IOWA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX C

Mr. Castle. Thank you, Mr. Latham. We really appreciate your being here as well. We know your schedules are difficult. By the way, as the Members testify, they are welcome to leave if their schedule demands that, or stay as you please.

Yes, Mr. Kildee?

Mr. Kildee I think you made a very good point. Very often our immigration policies in this country do create a need for bilingual education and, therefore, the Federal Government should look at its responsibility there. I think you raised a very good point, and I appreciate it.

Mr. Latham. Thank you.

Mr. Castle. Our next witness will be the Honorable Eddie Bernice Johnson, the gentle-lady from Texas.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, 30TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am here to express the sentiments of the Congressional Black Caucus, and it is regarding President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" educational proposal.

Since the inception of the Congressional Black Caucus, it has championed inequality, and now the country enjoys its longest economic expansion in American history, and it is the Congressional Black Caucus' opportunity to fight to ensure that all Americans share in this prosperity.

It is the belief of the Caucus that if we are to truly realize a dream of an all-inclusive America, we must begin this session, the 107th Congress, securing our children's future, meaning not to let anyone be left behind. I can't see where the President has looked out for many of the key initiatives as stated in his educational proposal.

President Bush's proposal promises to invest in public schools to make sure that no child in America is ever left behind, hold public schools accountable for their performance, improve teacher quality, an early emphasis on reading, but this budget states otherwise.

President Bush provides only a \$2.4 billion dollar increase in education, but proposes to spend nearly \$2 billion of that on reading and Pell grants. This leaves only \$400 million for all of the other educational programs, including all of the elementary, secondary, and higher education programs, special education and vocational education.

So instead of ensuring our youth a brighter future, this seems to me a decision to choose to freeze funding for after school and safety programs by combining and freezing funding for the safe and drug-free schools program and the 21st Century community learning centers after school. Instead of modernizing our schools, the President has chosen to eliminate the school renovation program for fiscal year 2000 and retroactively redirect \$1.2 billion already appropriated for this year to technology and special education.

Instead of training and paying teachers and reducing class sizes, the President has chosen to eliminate the class size reduction initiative by consolidating class size in the Eisenhower Professional Development Program, thus, failing to provide enough funding

to reduce class size and expand professional development and training with our teachers.

I will submit, Mr. Chairman, the rest of my testimony for the record. I see the light has come on, and I thank you very much for the time.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, 30TH
DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEE APPENDIX D

Mr. Castle. Thank you very much, Congresswoman Johnson. Your points are well taken. We are concerned about all the points that you make, and hopefully together we can address some of these things and get everybody aboard. That's the idea of this particular legislation. We appreciate your testimony.

Ms. Johnson. Thank you very much.

Mr. Castle. I'm going to go next to the Honorable James Langevin, because he was actually scheduled to be earlier. We started a little bit late, so we will go to him next. The limit, for those of you who have just walked in, is three minutes on the clock, and we are trying to dispense with questions by Members so we can give you all an opportunity to testify.

***STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JAMES LANGEVIN, 2ND
DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee. I appreciate the opportunity to be here to testify on this important piece of legislation.

Ladies and gentlemen, we have a truly significant opportunity now to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act at a time when the majority of the country sees education as the most important issue facing our nation. We must seize this moment to produce a common sense, bipartisan approach to strengthening our nation's educational system.

As I stated in my written testimony, I am deeply concerned about two issues in this bill. The first is President Bush's voucher proposal, and the second is the lack of provisions for the mental health of our school children. Because time is so limited, I will focus my remarks on the latter issue but ask that you consider my full testimony as it was submitted into the record.

President Bush's proposal, "No Child Left Behind," does just that, however, by proposing to eliminate the elementary school counseling demonstration program. This program provides essential support for the development and expansion of counseling activities that identify children in need and prevent them from taking out their aggressions with violence.

As a victim of an accidental shooting at the age of 16, I understand all too well the life-altering consequences of placing a gun in unsteady or careless hands. No place is immune from accidental or intentional violence or from other harmful effects of emotional instability.

School shootings have occurred in rural Alaska, suburban Colorado and inner city Atlanta. More than 30 of my colleagues represent districts where fatal school or workplace shootings have occurred in the past three years alone.

The elementary school counseling demonstration program provides the only funding for the expressed purpose of improving mental health of our students. Now is not the time to end this critical program but rather to expand it.

Currently, the average student-to-counselor ration is more than twice the recommended ration of 250 to 1. In rural and urban districts, the ration is often much worse. Large caseloads effectively prohibit counselors from providing the emotional stability and guidance that our students need, and vast geographic distances between schools make timely crisis intervention difficult if not impossible.

To truly meet the mental health needs of our students, we must strengthen counseling initiatives in our schools. I urge you to increase funding for the elementary school counseling program from \$30 million to \$100 million in fiscal year 2002 in order to keep pace with the expanding elementary school population.

This increase would enable schools to keep the current student-to-counselor ratio of 560 to 1, which is still twice the recommended ration. And, furthermore, I ask that you allow high schools to obtain these funds to address mental health needs of teenagers among whom we have witnessed so much violence in recent years, including my own district in Rhode Island.

Mr. Chairman, I respectfully request that the Committee enact revolutionary reform of our schools that truly meet the needs of our students both inside and outside the classroom. It is well past time for reform that starts by making professional mental health services available to all our students and ensure that truly no child is left behind.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JIM LANGEVIN, 2ND DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEE APPENDIX E

Mr. Castle. Thank you, Mr. Langevin, for your thoughtful testimony. We appreciate it. And now we shall go to my left and go to the Honorable Mike Pence.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MIKE PENCE, 2ND DISTRICT OF INDIANA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, thank you. And to the Members of the Committee, I am extremely grateful for the opportunity to contribute to your thinking on this bill that is one of the top priorities of this Congress and is certainly the top priority of President George W. Bush.

I am specifically here today, Mr. Chairman, to speak on behalf of state and local control of our schools. I come from a heartland district in East Central Indiana, and everywhere I go, whenever I say that the last thing we need is for the Federal Government to become more involved in our public schools, I am interrupted with applause.

Hoosiers, like most Americans, believe that government that governs least particularly when it comes to education is government that governs best. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, the portion of H.R. 1 that most concerns me is the requirement of a national test. According to many experts, the national assessment of educational progress is considered an obscure test that relatively few of the nation's children have ever taken. This test has seldom been given annually and sometimes takes up to 18 months to grade, and its results are reported in a manner that only trained researchers can benefit from.

In addition, according to many, the NAEP can only judge the reading proficiency of a state and then compare it to other states. It does not show whether a particular student is reading proficiently or how his or her school compares with other schools in the area. Measurable results that are useful for parents should be the cornerstone of our legislation and about any testing that we do.

Accordingly, Mr. Chairman, I am endorsing a measure being offered by our friend and colleague, Congressman Todd Akin of Missouri. The Accountability and Testing Act of 2001 would limit the use of federal funds appropriated for conducting testing in elementary and secondary schools to testing that meets certain needs.

Under Mr. Akin's bill, unlike the NAEP, testing would be designed by a state educational agency. Unlike the NAEP, under Mr. Akin's bill, objective knowledge would be tested based on widely agreed upon measurable standards. And most importantly, a federal official would not have the authority to verify a test under H.R. 1163.

In addition, in the balance of my testimony that I would like to enter into the record in the interest the time I encourage the Committee to address that which our President eloquently calls the soft bigotry of low expectations. What city better fits that description than Congress' own front yard here in Washington, D.C.?

Currently, 72 percent of the 10-year-olds in the District of Columbia cannot read with understanding. It is a school district that oftentimes cannot get rid of poor teachers, and consistently starves its few good schools of resources to prevent them from draining talent from the rest.

Because, Mr. Chairman, the District of Columbia is a creature of the Congress, we have a special responsibility and opportunity to reform its schools and make them a model for America. By implementing an experimental parental choice program, Mr. Chairman, we could allow parents here in Washington to help us answer an important

question. Does allowing the parents of poor children the same opportunities as those who live in suburbs yield similar results?

In other words, if what we want is successful public schools, why not create a powerful constituency for them. In short, if parents in the District of Columbia want to send their children to good schools, they should get to do so whether public, private or otherwise. Therefore, I strongly support the District Choice Initiative, like the one endorsed by Senator Joseph Lieberman and Majority Leader Dick Armey during the 105th Congress.

Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the courtesy of listening to this small-town boy as you help formulate this important legislation. It is my sincerest hope that as you do so we will continue to orient ourselves to that basic principle that education ought to, by definition, remain a state and local function.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN MIKE PENCE, 2ND DISTRICT OF INDIANA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX F

Mr. Castle. Thank you very much, Mr. Pence, for your excellent testimony. We will move along rapidly to the Honorable Bob Clement.

Mr. Clement. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kildee, and Members of the Committee.

I hate to see our good friend and colleague, Mr. Roemer, leave Congress but, as you all know, every Congress he has a child and he cannot afford to stay in Congress any longer.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BOB CLEMENT, 5TH DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

As we move through the reauthorization process of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I hope that our end result will be improving our public schools. A lot of you know I am a former college president. I am Co-chair of the House Education Caucus, and I am a strong believer in our public school system.

I think all of us know that our schools are outdated, ill equipped and falling apart. I visited numerous schools in my district and have seen for myself the poor conditions our teachers and students are forced to suffer through; no air conditioning, asbestos, closets converted to classrooms, outdated technology and shared facilities and resources. We must do better.

Being from Nashville, Tennessee, I am a strong supporter of music and art in public education. I started my kids out in music at five years of age, and I know that it changes people's lives. Research has shown that involvement in music programs

improves a child's early cognitive development, basic math and reading ability, self-esteem, SAT scores, self-discipline, and ability to work in teams, special reasoning skills and school attendance. And let us not forget the importance and significance of music and art in public education and character education.

Congressman Lamar Smith of Texas and myself have introduced H.R. 613, the Character Learning and Student Success Act of 2001 (CLASS Act of 2001). Character education has become a national priority in the education reform debate. I believe that the CLASS Act will begin national attention to the importance and effectiveness of character education and will help schools create positive learning environments. And I hope this Committee will take a close look at this legislation and include it in ESEA reauthorization.

And the last issue I want to mention is H.R. 345; the Three R's legislation introduced by my colleagues Tim Roemer, Adam Smith, and Cal Dooley. I believe that this legislation accomplishes many goals. I hope the Committee carefully considers this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me the opportunity to highlight some of our priorities in education funding this year. I think we can all agree that education is of the utmost importance not only to the Committee and this Congress but also to the American people.

I look forward to working with you to support educational policies and programs that benefit all of our students.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN BOB CLEMENT, 5TH DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX G

Mr. Castle. Bob, thank you. We appreciate your taking the time to come over and talk to the Members of the Committee and we take your suggestions under advisement.

With that, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Fattah, who I am sure, will talk to us about education equity funding of schools. Mr. Fattah is a relentless advocate on behalf of this.

Mr. Fattah. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. And to you and my other friends on this Committee and to the Ranking Member, George Miller, it is a pleasure for me to have an opportunity to appear once again before the Committee on Education and the Workforce, a Committee I served on for three terms. The Chairman has a crystal ball that is flawless about the subject matter that I would like to take a few minutes to discuss.

Mr. Castle. I wish my crystal ball were flawless. It is just that Mr. Fattah has made a point of drilling this message into my head over the last several months, and I appreciate his thoroughness.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CHAKA FATTAH, 2ND
DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The reality is that right now in our country there are, in various stages, in our states about 70 different litigations going on over the issue of how poor children in rural and urban areas in particular are treated by state financing formulas in which they are always on the short end of the per person expenditure, and a number of our state Supreme Courts have ruled on this matter.

From Kentucky, Montana, Vermont, to New Hampshire we can go through the long list including the Chairman's own state, Ohio, where the Supreme Court there has ruled that it is unconstitutional to continue to have a system of public education funding in which on some first graders the state is spending twice as much as on other first grade students. And that disparity continues for each year, every year, until they graduate from public school.

I think that what I would say to this Committee is that 35 years ago the Congress passed the Title I bill, and I have a copy of the debate here, in which the effort of the United States Congress was to aid states in responding to the needs of the most disadvantaged students. Now we are involved in the reauthorization of that Act for this term and for the next five years. And we are going to spend billions of dollars on the question of how we can best aid these students from impoverished areas.

The reality is that the best thing that we could do is to encourage or, in the language of my legislation, H.R. 1234, to require states to fairly fund their public schools and not to have a system in which some children in their state, who happen to be poor, are on the bottom end of the per person expenditures.

The New York Times reports that in Vermont, where the Supreme Court ruled a few years ago and where the state is now equalizing, that in the rural school districts you are starting to see real improvement. You are starting to see computers in classrooms, test scores going up, even a nurse available to students in a school.

And so I think that we have a real responsibility as a Congress not to overlook the fact, as many of my Republican colleagues have pointed out relentlessly, Mr. Chairman, that the majority of the funds that are spent on public education are spent at the state level. And if we allow an unequal disparity in those funds, like in my home state where the disparity can be close to a couple of hundred thousand differential in one classroom from our wealthiest district to our poorest district, and we allow that disparity to continue, it is very difficult for us to argue that we are providing an equal educational opportunity to young people.

And so I think that state governments, if they want to be in partnership with the Federal Government, we need to insist that they do their part, and that they fairly distribute their local funds in ways in which no children are left behind, in the words of our President. Those who start out behind are then compounded in that deficit position by funding formulas that across the country some 31 different state Supreme Courts have found to be unconstitutional and unequal in their application. Thank you, Mr. Chairman

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN CHAKAH FATTAH, 2ND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEE APPENDIX H

Chairman Boehner. Mr. Fattah, we appreciate your testimony and your suggestions.

Mr. Fattah. My suggestion, as you know, is relentless, but I hope you will consider my legislation as an amendment to H.R. 1. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. I'd like to welcome to the Committee today, my colleague and neighbor from the great state of Ohio, Ted Strickland. Ted, welcome.

Mr. Strickland. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to say that I have not yet met our new colleague personally, but I know that Representative Allsburn has a Ph.D. in educational psychology, and I am sure that as a result he will contribute greatly to what happens here in the Congress.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TED STRICKLAND, 6TH DISTRICT OF OHIO, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for inviting us to give testimony on this bill. I understand that one of the cornerstones of this proposal is the annual testing for students in grades three through eight.

I would like to use my time to share with you some of things that I have learned both as a psychologist and as a Representative of a region with a severely under funded educational system.

In my judgment, educational testing should be used diagnostically to determine what learning impediments might exist and prescriptively to determine what methods might be best to help a particular student learn better.

Educational testing is not intended to be a measure of accountability or a factor in decisions about how much money a school district wins as a bonus or loses as a sanction. The use of statewide tests to make high-stakes decisions about individual students, teachers or schools is in my judgment a misuse of standardized testing and has had a predictably negative result in my state of Ohio.

In preparation for the Ohio test, teachers and students spend weeks prior cramming in test-taking strategies in specific subject matter they believe are most likely to be covered on the test. Pressure to perform on the test has been so great on students and teachers that there have been scattered reports in Ohio of organized cheating and test tampering. In several Ohio school districts, breakfast is served to every student during the week of the test and only during the week of the test.

I think that tells us something important. We already know what works in schools, yet, we aren't willing to fund it. We know that school breakfast helps kids be more attentive or else we wouldn't provide them with breakfast during test week. Yet, we don't want to fund that program year-round. What does that say about the priority that we place on learning during the rest of the school year versus the week of the test?

We also know that smaller class sizes and individual attention helps students achieve, otherwise we wouldn't tout that quality as one of the things that makes private schools appealing. Yet, we aren't willing to fund initiatives to reduce class size.

Statewide proficiency tests tell us one more thing we already know, that kids in schools with plenty of resources score better than students in schools with inadequate resources. Yet, rather than target abundant resources to low-performing schools, this legislation has the capacity or the likelihood, I think, of punishing schools with monetary sanctions and vouchers.

Test scores reflect more than the quality of education being provided by the school and the teacher. Test scores reflect a whole host of factors including socioeconomic status, parental involvement, the educational background of the parents, and the level of economic investment in the student. Yet, this bill assumes that test scores are always valid and reliable indicators of educational quality.

I say this, and I don't say it facetiously, but I would hope that every legislator that would be willing to pass a bill that would impose life-altering decisions on a child as a result of a test would be willing to submit themselves to those tests and to have their scores published in the local newspaper.

In summary, I strongly support accountability, but I oppose using a test instrument that may or may not be valid or reliable enough for use in making an important life decision about a child, a teacher or a school.

Mr. Chairman, those of us in Ohio are proud of your position on this Committee, and I thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TED STRICKLAND, 6TH DISTRICT OF OHIO, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX I

Chairman Boehner. Ted, thank you. We appreciate your testimony.

The Chair is happy to recognize the gentleman from Guam, Mr. Underwood.

Mr. Underwood. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Miller and other members of the Committee. Thank you for the opportunity to address the committee on President Bush's proposal to improve education in our country. And I want to commend the Committee's commitment to taking on education reform and the reauthorization of ESEA.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ROBERT UNDERWOOD,
GUAM DELEGATE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

The introduction of H.R. 1, which is largely patterned after the President's proposal, is a broad-reaching initiative to revamp the public school system in our country. However, I would like to raise my concern that there should be attention in the legislation regarding the treatment of schools in the U.S. territories. If the goal indeed is to leave no child behind in education, then Congress must work to ensure that no child in America should be left behind whether they reside in the states or in the territories.

As Guam's delegate, and a lifelong educator who has taught and served in the administration of public high schools and later served as Academic Vice-president of University of Guam, I have always advocated improvement in the manner in which federal policy is developed by the Federal Government and its treatment of the territories.

I would like to emphasize the special needs of U.S. public schools in the territories, which apart from their remoteness from the U.S. mainland, share in the same struggle to meet the basic needs of operating a public school system. But due to geography and complex historical factors, the territories face unique challenges in the cost of maintenance and financing school construction projects, acquisition of school supplies and equipment and the recruiting and teaching and training of teaching professionals. We also face the added burden of dealing with typhoons and a very unforgiving tropical environment, which accelerates the deterioration of our school facilities.

The Guam Department of Education has crafted a reasonable 10-year plan to address the school system's infrastructure. In Guam, six new schools are needed today to address the overcrowding and building deterioration problems. We look to federal programs and hopefully unique bonding initiatives to jump-start Guam's effort to bring schools into the 21 Century.

The territories are generally included in most national education programs but mostly as afterthoughts. As a result, educators in the territories must often follow a patchwork system of funding arrangements varying from state shares to special formulas for outlying areas in order to obtain needed and fair funding of federal funding program resources. The territories also share in the burden of dealing with struggling economies, high unemployment rates, diverse indigenous and immigrant cultures and varied Federal Government relationships.

It is for this reason that territorial schools systems, which all have a unique relationship with the Federal Government, deserve special consideration in any educational plan which leaves Congress.

As a lifelong educator, I must state some of the concerns I have, which I share with the previous speaker, Mr. Strickland, about the emerging proposals of accountability as stated in this legislation. My concerns about the over-reliance on standardized testing as the only measure of educational success may only lead to failure. In a place like Guam, standardized testing, as a single measure can be particularly misleading, which is

why additional measures should be employed for accountability.

H.R. 1 makes special mention of circumstances to address the needs of migratory children, American Indian and Alaska native children, children of military families, children with limited English proficiency, and children who live in rural areas. However, there is no special section or policy statement that addresses the treatment of school children in the territories. Instead, H.R. 1 attempts to address the needs of the smaller territories by defining them as “outlying areas.” I don't think too many people would enjoy that kind of title.

It also creates a definition for the FAS or freely associated states, which includes the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau, which are all former U.S. territories.

While I believe this is good policy given the fact that the people who reside in the territories are U.S. citizens and nationals and the people who reside in the FAS can freely migrate into the U.S., I also support the extension of educational resources to the FAS, which continues to maintain a special relationship with the United States.

A special category or policy statement would help to bring consistency of the treatment of territories throughout H.R. 1. As it stands now, the definition of outlying areas is inconsistent in the application of the bill. There should be no reason that a definitive national policy for the territories not be included in this plan or any plan that leaves Congress.

The Federal Government has a special and unique relationship to schools in the territories. In some instances, the distinct and unique relationships has led to Guam and other territories to be treated unevenly and differently amongst each other under federal education programs depending on the statute authorizing such programs. More importantly, the Federal Government has recognized that special attention must be given to challenging circumstances.

In closing, I want to state that I am extremely pleased with the work of the Committee and the President in prioritizing the issues that confront our national public education system. I hope that we can work towards resolving these longstanding issues facing territorial governments. And I must reiterate the need for flexibility and consistency in resolving our problems given the distinctly unique circumstances. We need to work in concert to level the playing field for all American children in the States and the territories.

I look forward to working with you to ensure that no American child is left behind in our national education problems, no matter where they live. Thank you very much.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ROBERT UNDERWOOD, GUAM DELEGATE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX J

Chairman Boehner. Mr. Underwood, I appreciate your coming in this morning. And with that, I'll introduce one of our new Members, from the State of Washington, Rick Larsen.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN RICK LARSEN, 2ND DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Members of the Committee. I want to take my few minutes to change the focus a little bit on what it means to leave no child behind.

I was asked to provide a few comments with regard to Job Corps, which is a very important program in my district in Washington State, and I just want to provide a few comments and some perspective on that.

I want to acknowledge Earl Leonard and Kim Shillinger with Job Corps, as well as Don Wick, who is Executive Director of the Skagit County Economic Development Organization, who are working very hard locally to keep Job Corps a success in Sedro-Woolley.

Cascade Job Corps program first opened its doors in Sedro-Woolley, Washington in 1982, and since then has contributed over \$8.5 million to the local economy. The center provides crucial training for students in 11 vocations such as construction trades, health occupation and culinary arts.

Last year alone, over 400 students benefited from the program. For example, graduates like Robert Powers, who is now a cement finisher, and Kevin Huff, a cement mason, both make over \$15 an hour. These men are just two of the many successes of the Cascade Job Corps program.

It also has a senior volunteer program to provide seniors with work options. Both national and regional companies rely on graduates from the Cascade program to sustain economic growth.

Additionally, the program is an invaluable source of community service for the Sedro-Woolley community. Cascades enrollees have constructed the YMCA camp facility, paved and built school district sidewalks with concrete, and planted trees for the Skagit Fishery Enhancement Agency. The work provided by Job Corps students for these projects alone is valued at close to \$30,000.

Like many local and county leaders in Skagit County, I strongly support the Cascades program as part of the national Job Corps program and am proud to have Job Corps in my district. It has taught many students and has generated many success stories and strengthened families and businesses within the local economy.

Finally, I want to take the opportunity to voice my support again for National Job Corps and the Cascades program, and I want to ensure that Cascades Program remains in Sedro-Woolley so it can continue to offer my constituents and others in the northwest a

valuable source of hands-on job training.

I bring this up today in part because it is a part of the story about leaving no child behind. It is a very important part of a district like mine which has seen many job losses in the last 20 years due to changes in the logging industry and the timber industry. And so as we move forward on education, I hope that we do not forget important programs like this as well. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN RICK LARSEN, 2ND DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEE APPENDIX K

Chairman Boehner. Rick, thank you. I'd like to welcome to the Committee another new Member, from the State of California, Mike Honda.

Mr. Honda. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MIKE HONDA, 15TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Mr. Chairman, and distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to present testimony today. As a former high school teacher and principal, I agree with President Bush that we must hold our students and teachers to higher national standards. However, in order to achieve these high national standards, Mr. Chairman, accountability and standards must be a two-way street.

In order for schools to perform at a higher level, we need to give them better tools to encourage and advance their performance. If we are going to judge teachers and students by test scores, then Congress must fund programs that encourage improvement and growth within education.

Nearly 80 percent of Americans support providing federal funding for school repair and modernization. Yet, the President's budget eliminates the \$1.2 billion Congress approved last year for school renovations and cuts another \$433 million in unspecified programs.

In this country, it would take nearly \$112 billion to bring public elementary and secondary schools into adequate condition. This funding would help renovate up to 14,000 needy public schools and serve around 14 million students.

If we want students to learn more at a faster rate, then we need to reduce class sizes to allow teachers to teach. In order to attract and train teachers for both high-need schools and underserved teaching topics, such as math and science, Congress should increase compensation for qualified teachers.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, elementary and secondary school enrollment will grow from 52.2 million students in 1997 to 54.4 million in 2006. This would require new schools and more teachers.

Research has also shown that students in smaller classes in grades K through three learn fundamental skills better, and they continue to perform well even after returning to large classes after third grade. If we truly expect the nation's schools to meet the challenges of greater accountability and higher achievement, then we need to ensure that our school leaders and faculty are the best-trained and highly skilled professional educators in the world.

Due to the positions long hours and high level of stress, many teachers who are qualified to be principals choose not to become principals. Combined with the fact that many principals are reaching retirement age, this has resulted in a growing principal shortage.

Approximately 40 percent of our nation's principals are expected to retire within five to 10 years. Without significant leadership training, we may be neglecting the most critical link to improving schools on a national scale. The bottom line is that successful schools have professional, well-trained principals.

In order for schools to perform at the 21st Century levels, we must provide the 21st Century technology. Over two-thirds of economic growth stems from technological innovation. Our students must be empowered with high tech skills so they can navigate, adapt and succeed in the Internet economy.

I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1149, which expands incorporation for national service by creating a national education technology corps that works with our schoolteachers and administrators to integrate technology into classroom curriculum. We need to encourage high-tech businesses to render employees to the net corps program to ensure that our schools have the most up-to-date technological skills.

We are all deeply troubled by the recent school violence in many cities across the country. Effective school counseling programs are vital to violence prevention. The Elementary School Counselor Demonstration Act will help our nation move toward a goal of reducing student to counselor ratio. And there are many programs that help create an environment that reduce violence reactions such as Tribes and Green Circle.

Now, more than ever, with the greater stress being placed on accountability, Mr. Chair, schools need to encourage self-expression through music, and art classes, as well as physical education programs. The Federal Government needs to start funding our education priorities at the correct levels in order to give schools an opportunity to succeed.

In the classroom, many of my students exceeded their parents' expectation and their own expectations once they learned that they had the confidence and respect of their teacher and their peers. If families need school breakfast/lunch assistance, access to basic healthcare or school counseling, then schools need to provide such programs and services. The classroom should be a place of equity not a matter of one's financial status, and students should have the opportunity to live better lives better through education.

The gist of all this is if we are talking about accountability and student achievement, then the programs that we have been advocating, like modernization, increased funding for new schools, and reduction of class size by increasing number of teachers, would help student achievement.

We also know that research shows that time on task will increase student achievement. The environment and teacher instruction and the programs that we are advocating, will assure student achievement and accountability.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN MIKE HONDA, 15TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX L

Chairman Boehner. Thank you. I want to welcome the gentleman from Savannah, Georgia, Jack Kingston. Jack, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JACK KINGSTON, 1ST DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee. It is great to be here.

I come to you today as a father of four children, as a son of an educator and a brother of two sisters who have been schoolteachers. I guess one thing I've learned sitting around the breakfast table with the family is that education should be child-centered and it should be dynamic. We should not be afraid to challenge status quo to see if we can get a better product.

That's why I am a supporter of the President's "No Child Left Behind" education legislation. I appreciate the work of your Committee, because I was a member of the state legislature when Governor Joe Frank Harris introduced the Quality Basic Education Act, and I know what's happening in your Committee right now. You are being bombarded from all types of groups who want to change this thing or change that thing, and I know you will sort through things to the best of your ability. I just wish you good luck, Mr. Chairman, on all that.

The portion I wanted to address is the scholarship program, the school choice issue. I represent, as you know, Savannah, Georgia, where Gulfstream Aerospace is located. A man named Ted Forceman owned Gulfstream for a period of time. Ted Forceman actually used \$6 million of his own dollars to set up a school choice scholarship program here in Washington, D.C. It was so popular that they actually did not have enough slots for the applicants, and Mr. Forceman actually went back to the well and increased the amount he had offered for kids. But these are the kids who are

trapped in failing schools and wanted to break themselves loose.

I saw that here in Washington, D.C. the scholarship choice idea really worked. Now in this bill, as you know, if a child is in a failing school system, a school that has failed for three years in a row, he would have the choice of going to another school. Right now there is no choice. He has to continue in that school unless his parents move out of town or unless the school turns itself around, but there is no impetus for that to happen. So I like this aspect of it.

Again, getting back to the whole Kingston family table, the child should be the first consideration of education, not the bricks and mortars, not the unions, not the administrators but the child, and I like that emphasis on that.

The second part of this has to do with the school safety issue. I went to a very large public school system, and I guess like any other school it had some good and it had some bad. I was a victim of crime in the tenth grade, Mr. Chairman. I was dropped on my head. Woke up in the hospital with no idea what happened.

(Chairman Boehner. Now we know what the problem is.)

Well, I don't know how badly it changed me permanently, but again in twelfth grade I was a victim of a crime. I was jumped on and beat up. In tenth grade Gerald Winkfield shot Joe Johnson in the school parking lot five times. I was playing basketball once and a kid stole the ball from another one, and the guy pulled a gun on him. So I know from personal experience what it is like to be in a school that is not safe.

Now, obviously, I survived, and there were a lot of good experiences because of that, but that is not a great environment for learning the quadratic formula and learning geography and learning French. This bill addresses that, again, focusing on the child. It says Little Johnny, you are in an unsafe school and nothing seems to be done about that. You will have the option of transferring anywhere.

Mr. Chairman that is what I like about this bill. It is focused on the needs of that student. And having walked in those shoes to some degree, I sympathize with him and his parents. I have a written testimony, and I will leave it with you. But again, thanks for all your good work and keep it up. If we can help you, let me know.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JACK KINGSTON, 1ST DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX M

Chairman Boehner. Jack, thank you. We appreciate your taking the time to come in this morning.

I'd like to welcome Elijah Cummings from the great state of Maryland.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ELIJAH CUMMINGS, 7TH
DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,**

WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank this Committee for all that it has done in the past years to lift our children up.

I come to you as someone who spent his first six years in special education, told that he would never be able to properly speak or graduate from high school only to become a Phi Beta Kappa through public schools. One of my concerns today, Mr. Chairman, is with regard to the E-rate.

In Baltimore, what I do is I take honorarium funding and direct it to a fund we have for purchasing computers for our children. At West Baltimore's middle school, we just presented two computers to our children, and those children had 14 computers for 1300 kids. We added two to that from my speaking engagements, and I can tell you these eighth graders cried. They were so happy to be connected to the Internet. The two, those were connected to the Internet; the 14 were not.

The E-rate, however, has played a very significant role in my district. We say that we don't want any child to be left behind. I don't want any child to be left out. Left behind. I've got children that are being left out, and the whole access-to-computer issue is no longer some luxury, it is a civil right. When I look at all those young people who sit behind you all up there, every single one of them have had an opportunity to learn about computers, and they know how to operate a computer. We've got twelfth graders that are graduating from high school who have never touched a computer, never touched one.

So, sadly, there are many Members of Congress and the administration that would like to curtail or even end the E-rate program all together. I tell you I am very disheartened by that in that they do not recognize how critical this program has become to millions of American students who would not otherwise have access to the Internet. In fact, the Bush administration is proposing block grants for E-rate and technology programs that will slash government programs providing computers and Internet access to poor and underserved areas.

Basically, the administration's plan of block grant funding will effectively eliminate the E-rate and not allow E-rate programs to move through the FCC.

Technology, as I said before, is no longer a luxury. E-rate is one of these programs that have demonstrated its positive impact on student achievement. The E-rate programs are working to bring technology into many schools where children have limited access to technology.

We must guarantee, Mr. Chairman, as I conclude, that a plan is available for every child in America to cross the digital divide by ensuring that all children, all children, whether they are from rural areas or from the inner city of Baltimore, New York, regardless of their race, ethnicity or socioeconomic status, have access to a computer and technology education. And I thank you.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ELIJAH CUMMINGS, 7TH DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEE APPENDIX N

Chairman Boehner. Mr. Cummings, we appreciate your testimony and appreciate the passion with which you bring your ideas to this Committee.

Mr. Cummings. Thank you very much.

Chairman Boehner. I'd like to welcome John Larson, a Member from the great state of Connecticut.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN LARSON, 1ST DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to come and testify before the Committee. As the Chairman of the Digital Divide Caucus I want to personally thank you and Ranking Member Miller for the opportunity to come here and echo the sentiments and the very eloquent remarks of my colleague Elijah Cummings.

Clearly, from our standpoint in the Digital Divide Caucus, the goal of leaving no child behind could not be more imminent than the need for us to address some of the technological issues and barriers that we face today.

I'll revise my extended remarks, Mr. Chairman, and cut right to the chase. The Department of Commerce issued a report back in 1999 that basically said that even though computer technology and access is expanding at a faster rate than ever, there are those that are left behind, and those that are left behind or, as Elijah eloquently said, left out, happen to break down along the lines of race, gender, geography and wealth. If you are wealthy, you are likely to be connected. If you live in a rural area or an urban area, you are less likely to be connected. If you are female, you are less likely to be connected. And if you are black or Hispanic, you are less likely to be connected to the Internet.

The Gardner Report issued recently, which I would like to quote from, says very specifically "The Internet and American society defining digital divide indicates there has always existed an unfair distribution of access to the tools of social mobility. But for the first time in history, a technology exists that to a large extent can level the playing field." Leveling the playing field is exactly what Elijah was talking about. The need for the tool and us to do that throughout our history has been education, and no Committee understands it better than this one here.

This unfair access has implications that reach to the very social and economic core of our nation. And to date, government's digital divide policy has been tactical rather than strategic, focusing on the gap between those with Internet access and those without it.

Leveling the playing field means, by the introduction of technology for us, the ability of teachers, I am a former teacher myself, to individualize instruction, to be more

diagnostic in our approach to teaching and, therefore, more prescriptive in the remedies that we provide for our students.

It goes to all the accountability and testing issues that this Committee and the nation has struggled with and does it in a forthright manner that takes us into the 21st Century while leaving no child behind. It allows the brightest and the best, the most gifted to go as far and as fast as their minds and imaginations will carry them while being able to get after the remedial needs of so many of our children because we now have the technology to do it.

So we cannot skimp on the resources that we need to provide the teacher training, or the infrastructure concerns that some of the other Members have mentioned. Most importantly, we don't want to lose our preeminent edge that we currently enjoy in the global economy, which we are losing both in the terms of national defense and economic vitality.

I will close by saying that the defense of this nation is continued economic prosperity, and its public education system, and its technological advances are inextricably linked and tied to our future. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN LARSON, 1ST DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEE APPENDIX O

Chairman Boehner. Mr. Larson, we appreciate your testimony. And there is no question as we go through this bill that the technology issues will be very important.

Mr. Larson. Our bipartisan Committee looks forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. With that, I'd like to welcome Anne Northup, Member from Louisville, Kentucky, mother of six.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN ANNE NORTHUP, 3RD DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Certainly, we bring our experiences, our personal experience to Washington. And as the mother of six children, I obviously spent years involved in my children's education.

I am specifically here to talk about the President's Reading First initiative, which is part of his "Leave No Child Behind."

As the Chairman of the Reading Caucus, you know that part of our mission has been to focus on how we ensure that every child learns to read, learns to read early.

We know that in the most recent NAEP test, 42 percent of all children in fourth grade did not even read at basic level. And this becomes enormously important because all the science that we look at tells us that if a child is behind in fourth grade, especially in reading, it can be the beginning of the end in terms of their education. They are most likely to begin defining themselves in ways other than their education. They begin to turn off, to act as though it doesn't matter, to separate themselves from a positive educational experience.

When I was first elected, I came to Washington and heard the National Institutes of Health, NICHD Institute, talk about the 20 years of research they had done on how children learned to read. They were very explicit not only on how kids learn to read but why some kids fail.

About two weeks later, the Department of Education came before our Subcommittee to talk about all of their early childhood literacy programs, about new programs that they were instituting, and not one of those programs, not one, with billions of dollars was focused on the scientific insights we had gained after 20 years of research on how kids learned to read.

So we asked the chairman to put into the budget the **Report of the National Reading Panel**. The Report of the National Reading Panel worked for two years to review all research on how children learn to read, what the time is to intervene, and how to intervene effectively for a child at risk. I hope that Members of the Committee have a copy. This was actually released by the scientists last year in April, and they did a wonderful job.

Basically what they told us is that children go through a specific progression learning to read. First of all they learn that words are made up of sounds, that cat has several sounds to it. Then they start to learn that several letters make those sounds, that "M" generally always has the same sound, that "C" always has the same sound. And if they go through that process at very early ages, two, three and four, they begin quite naturally to decode by the time they are five years old, and they will probably be successful.

For children that aren't at that point, systemic, explicit, intensive intervention is important for five-year-olds so that in that special time before they turn eight, they can become good readers also. With that kind of intervention, only about three to four percent of children don't turn out to be excellent readers.

Mr. Chairman, it is important that we focus on reading first. We know what works. We know when to intervene. And it is important that we fund the literacy programs that reflect what the research shows us.

So I want to thank you for the opportunity to come before your Committee and to add my voice to the other voices of why the "Leave No Child Behind" and the particular Reading First initiative is so important for our children.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN ANNE NORTHUP, 3RD DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEE APPENDIX P

Chairman Boehner. Anne, thank you for coming. We appreciate it.

We are pleased to welcome John Baldacci from northern Maine. There are two districts in Maine; one is very small down at the southern end, and then the rest of the state. You've got the largest district east of the Mississippi; is that right?

Mr. Baldacci. Very good, Mr. Chairman, very good. Thank you very much, and thank you very much for being here. Ranking Member Kildee and the Committee Members that are here, I appreciate the opportunity to be able to give testimony regarding President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal.

***STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN BALDACCİ, 2ND
DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.***

The legislation is of tremendous importance to me and to Maine's education community. My staff and I have discussed the proposal with Governor King and Educational Commissioner Duke Albanese and countless teachers, administrators and parents, making sure that we enact the right legislation as a top priority for all of us.

Maine is leading the nation in transforming into a standards-based, highly accountable learning system. The Maine learning results, our state's carefully developed, comprehensive education standards, were adopted by the Maine State Legislature in 1997.

Since that time, our schools, teachers, and Department of Education have worked tirelessly to implement those standards and devise effective assessment practices to ensure that every student is meeting the established goals.

There is every reason to believe that Maine students are doing just that. Maine was rated number one in the nation, the highest performing K through 12 education system by the National Education Goals Panel in 1999. Maine is doing this while living within its means. The state's per pupil spending is near the national average, while its students have the highest composite scores on the National Assessment of Education Progress. This points out the success of the state's approach to education.

I hope that, and expect, in the final education bill that will be enacted into law this year, that Maine's efforts will be respected. One of my greatest concerns about President Bush's proposal is the assessment piece. States must retain the flexibility to design assessment systems that make sense and that are based on the state's standards.

Maine uses a standardized test, the Maine Education Assessment, with every student in the fourth, eighth and eleventh grades. The test includes a multiple-choice component but also includes open-ended questions. It is an excellent test but one that is costly to prepare and score and which takes a significant amount of time to administer.

Maine recognizes that students demonstrate knowledge and learning in different ways. Some do well on pencil and paper tests. Others better show their skills in demonstrative ways like going through portfolios or service learning. Maine believes that there may be multiple measures locally developed but reviewed to be sure that they are reliable and valid.

I would agree, and I would object to accountability provisions that fail to give states the flexibility to design assessments that meet the needs of the state and its students. Simply administering a multiple-choice exam every year will not provide a good measure of the progress of individual students or of the school system.

I was encouraged by President Bush's comments in Portland, Maine last week when he said that 'the Federal Government should in no way tell the folks in Maine how to devise an accountability system, and we don't intend to do so. We trust the local people.'" I hope this will indeed be reflected in the final legislation that we consider.

I also want to share my concerns about the punitive approach taken in that proposal where the message is that if you don't do well on these exams, the resources will be taken away. In Maine, they are trying to develop an intervention team that can work with struggling schools. Experienced educators and administrators will go to under performing schools to provide intensive technical assistance and help turn things around.

My only other comment, Mr. Chairman, is a concern in regards to block grants versus the grant that state projects have already gotten, like Project Mainstay which provides English as a second language and bilingual education training opportunities. These projects are in year two of a five-year program, and the question is how block grants would impact on these programs.

And I submit the rest of my testimony to be reviewed by your Committee. Thank you very much.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN BALDACCI, 2ND DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX Q

Chairman Boehner. John, thank you. Don't worry. When it comes to how the states handle the testing in grades three through eight in reading and math, it will be their decision. In many states such as yours, there isn't a great deal that will have to be done in order to meet that goal.

Mr. Baldacci. I appreciate that.

Chairman Boehner. So we are not going to have the Federal Government be the national school board and create a national test under any circumstances.

Mr. Baldacci. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. With that, thank you. Welcome, Rosa DeLauro from the State of Connecticut, one of my classmates in 1990.

Ms. DeLauro. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Committee. To Ranking Member Kildee and to the other Members who are here, I appreciate this opportunity to talk about the President's education proposals.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN ROSA DeLAURO, 3RD
DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

It really is gratifying that education is now a key part of our national political debate. A thoughtful discussion of education reform has always been vital to our future, the same as national defense or foreign affairs. And in my view, it is kind of past time that education has received as much attention as some of these other areas.

I come to you as an original co-sponsor of Mr. Miller and Mr. Kildee's Excellence and Accountability in Education Act, a bill I believe is a comprehensive, thoughtful approach to education reform, and that I believe can be the centerpiece of a bipartisan agreement on education.

There is a great deal in common between this proposal and that offered by our Republican colleagues. We all want to see greater accountability, higher standards, and teacher empowerment, all with the focus of real results in what we are doing.

However, while we insist on accountability and results, we must also make a true federal investment in education. The President's budget proposal provides a \$2.4 billion increase for education. He proposes to spend nearly \$2 billion of that on reading and Pell Grants. Applaudable; I couldn't be happier with that, but this leaves only a \$400 million increase for all other education programs, elementary, secondary, higher education, vocational education, special education.

In that area, I might add, we put a mandate on local government with regard to special education. And what we don't do is to put our money where our mouth is in terms of helping them meet the goals that we have set out for them to embark on. And the \$400 million increase doesn't leave, enough for the initiatives we care about, teacher recruitment, training, professional development.

We talk about literacy as one of our top priorities, and we cannot forget about those individuals who will be teaching our children how to read. My colleague, Ms. Northup, and myself have worked together on this reading initiative. I am happy to say that through the Labor HHS Subcommittee on Appropriations we've been able to provide funding. The State of Connecticut, in collaboration with our cities and towns, is teaching teachers how to teach reading, and the results of that have been very, very positive so far. While we support literacy, we have to take into consideration laying the foundation for learning.

Last month I introduced the Right Start Act. It is a bill that deals with the concept of school readiness. School readiness is a goal that was promulgated in 1990 by then President George Bush in collaboration with the head of the National Governors Association, William Jefferson Clinton. The goal was that every child should arrive in

school ready to learn by the year 2000.

2001, this year, recent accounts of the President's budget suggest a lack of commitment, in my view, to school readiness. The failure to invest in the education of youngsters was to push children back into the last century rather than moving forward into the new one.

We are aware that we have studies ad nauseam of when children are learning, how they are learning, and those years from zero to three, zero to five, are critical to what their future and their future success will be all about.

The father of Head Start, Ed Ziegler, who was from Yale University, has written, "while literacy is important, so are other skills." We need to lay a foundation for literacy, teaching, for example, the basic concepts of what a rhyme is, and helping kids to increase their vocabularies by talking to them, and reading to them. "They can't be taught to read before they have basic underlying skills and concepts that children are ready to absorb the preschool years." And that is a quote from Dr. Ziegler.

Let me just sum up, and I will submit the rest of my testimony. I'm concerned about a recent press account that says that the early budget documents show that the Bush proposal plans to eliminate all \$20 million that Congress provided for an early learning fund to improve the quality of childcare and education for children that are younger than five.

I ask myself, if we put aside all of those studies that we have been reading about and understanding how kids learn and how they learn in those years from zero to five, I personally view us as criminally liable for not doing right by our youngsters. We can work together for meaningful education reform. We can do this on early education. We can come to a bipartisan agreement on what needs to get done. Children don't know partisanship. They only know the environment they grow up in. And we are here to make sure that we provide the best that we can.

I look forward to working with the Chairman, with this Committee, on seeing that we can do something about our school readiness and early child development. Thank you, Mr. Chairman

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN ROSA DeLAURO, 3RD DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. SEE APPENDIX R

Chairman Boehner. Rosa, thank you. We appreciate your testimony and would like to welcome David Price whose district includes some of the largest universities in the country.

David, welcome.

Mr. Price. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It is a pleasure to be here. And I commend you on undertaking these hearings on the President's education initiatives.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DAVID PRICE, 4TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I am here today to, I hope, to contribute in a positive way to those efforts by focusing on what I consider is perhaps the dominant education issue of the next decade, and that is our need for more teachers and for high quality teachers.

You know, we have lots of ideas about education reform, but none of them are going to be successful without a high quality teaching force, and we know that a million of our country's three million teachers are going to retire in the next few years. That means my home state of North Carolina has to find 80,000 new teachers in the next 10 years. We don't know where they are coming from. And nationwide it is 2.2 million teachers, and I don't think we know where they are coming from. So we've got to find ways to encourage our best and brightest students to become public schoolteachers. And in that light, I'd like to bring to the Committee's attention legislation that I have introduced to address our nation's critical shortage, the Teaching Fellows Act, H.R. 839.

Secretary Paige said in testimony before your Committee, and I'm quoting, "We need to learn from the states and school districts across the country, and we need to bring to the federal education programs many of the strategies that have worked so well at the state and local levels."

Well, my bill, The Teaching Fellows Act, is a case in point. It builds on two ideas that have been extremely successful in my home state of North Carolina and offers support to states that want to create or expand similar programs. I'll leave most of the specifics for the record, but let me just say that this legislation is based on state-based non-bureaucratic programs. It is open to innovation at the state level. It is the kind of approach I believe that Members of both parties can support.

I'm glad to see Mr. Kildee here. He and the Subcommittee came down to North Carolina. Mr. Castle held hearings and we heard from people who have administered this Teaching Fellows Program. That is in the record and I hope will be useful to the Committee as you consider how to approach our need for quality teachers.

The North Carolina program is called the Teaching Fellows Program. It was enacted in 1996. It gives students, who agree to become teachers, four-year scholarships. It requires them to participate in extracurricular activities that hone their teaching skills and their professional identification.

The Teaching Fellows Act, my bill, would provide \$200 million to states who set up programs of this sort for high school seniors, or they could choose to start it with the sophomore year in college. It would provide annual scholarships, would support extracurricular enrichment activities, and it would give the states great flexibility in designing programs that meet their needs. In return for the investment, the fellows would teach in the state for four years at public schools or for three years at low-performing schools.

This has worked well in North Carolina. We have awarded 6,000 scholarships in the state to outstanding seniors. A large majority of those recipients have fulfilled their

teaching obligations, and 73 percent of the fellow graduates remain beyond the period of obligation. In other words, we are retaining teachers as well as recruiting new teachers.

I see my time is running out. There is another facet of this bill that reaches into the community college system. Our former colleague, Martin Lancaster, who now heads up the North Carolina community college system, has worked with me on this. I am persuaded that there are many two-year graduates, people who are training as teaching fellows, as daycare workers or whatever with two-year degrees, if we could facilitate the transition from community college to four-year programs, I believe many of these people would be fine teachers. And that is another source for supplementing our teaching force.

We are going to need to look for teachers wherever we can find them. This isn't just a quantity issue it is a quality issue. These are programs of proven quality. And we are not just throwing money at the problem, but we are giving students the kind of atmosphere I think that will not only train them as teachers but also help them succeed in their early years of teaching.

So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chance to lay this before you this morning. I'll submit my full statement for the record. I look forward to working with Members of both parties as we address the coming crisis in the quantity and quality of America's teaching force.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN DAVID PRICE, 4TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. SEE APPENDIX S

Chairman Boehner. Well, David, thank you for your testimony. You are certainly right. We have a crisis in terms of the numbers and the quality of new teachers, and it is something that we are going to work closely on as we develop this bill. I appreciate your testimony.

Mr. Price. Thank you.

Chairman Boehner. We are pleased to welcome Darlene Hooley to the Committee, a Member from the great state of Oregon.

Darlene, welcome.

Ms. Hooley. Thank you. I am delighted to be here, Mr. Chairman, and it is nice to testify in front of a Committee that I think is doing such important work. I think education is one of the most important things we do on the federal level.

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN DARLENE HOOLEY, 5TH
DISTRICT OF OREGON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

I'm going to talk about a single issue. It is near and dear to my heart. I know your topic is "Leave No Child Behind." Well, I think you can't talk about that unless you talk about children with disabilities, and I would like to thank the entire Committee for showing support for children with disabilities.

This Committee has shown their commitment early on by including views and estimates on the fiscal year 2002 budget and your recommendation for the full funding of the Individuals with Disability Education Act.

I visited, like I'm sure all of you have, schools across my district, large and small, rural and urban, and despite their geographic and economic differences, every school is struggling to provide the necessary services to children with disabilities.

As you know, we began this discussion 26 years ago. We said we would pay 40 percent of the excess cost to educate a child with disabilities. We have not lived up to that agreement. We have done, actually, fairly poorly except for the last couple of years where we have finally gotten it up to almost 15 percent.

What has happened when we don't pay our full share of the cost is that it really hurts our local communities, and let me give you an example. In one of my small rural schools, they have a child that has autism and other disabilities; it's not just autism. To educate that child costs about \$100,000 a year. For a small rural school district, that just kills them. I mean, that is way more than they can afford. Now, the child absolutely deserves the services, but it is really tough, again, on some of our small schools no matter whether they have a severe case like this or lesser cases. The fact is if they only have a couple of children, they still need a teacher, they still need a bus, whereas although it is difficult for the larger schools as well, sometimes they absorb the costs a little better.

I think it is time that we take some real action on this. You know, we made a commitment, and I know many of you in this room made a commitment to double the funding for National Institutes of Health. I think we need to make a commitment to fund the IDEA program. And whether we do that over five years, six years or ten years, I think we have to constantly be working toward that goal and make a commitment. For example, if you do it over five years, it's a \$3 billion price tag. If you do it over ten years, it's half of that, \$1.5 billion a year. But we need to have a concerted effort. It doesn't do any good to pass a resolution saying we want to do this, which we did last year.

Although I know this Committee isn't appropriations, you certainly have a large influence on appropriations, and I would hope that we can finally keep our promises to our children and make this happen. And with that, I will submit the rest of this for the record.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN DARLENE HOOLEY, 5TH
DISTRICT OF OREGON, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON,

D.C. – SEE APPENDIX T

Chairman Boehner. Well, thank you for your testimony, and I point out that in the President's proposal and various proposals before our Committee, the deal with Early Childhood Reading and Reading First is that we are seeing more and more children in IDEA because they have reading problems. And to the extent that we can implement these programs this year, we think we will take a major step in reducing the number of children who actually end up in these programs, because if we don't do something about the over-identification of children in these programs, we'll never ever get the 40 percent.

Ms. Hooley. Mr. Chair, I understand that. Absolutely reading programs will help. What we do in preschool will help. But whatever changes we make, I still think we need to work toward the goal of providing our share that we said we would provide.

Chairman Boehner. Thank you.

Ms. Hooley. Thank you.

Chairman Boehner. We are pleased to welcome Jim Matheson, a new Member from the great state of Utah. Welcome.

Jim has to go to the floor, Todd, so we're going to allow him to go first.

***STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JIM MATHESON, 2ND
DISTRICT OF UTAH, U.S HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member and Members of the Committee. I thank you for the opportunity to speak about President Bush's education proposal. Education reform is a high priority for the people of Utah, and today I'd like to speak to you as their representative to share with you some of their unique challenges and concerns.

I represent the state with the lowest per pupil expenditure in the nation. This year's census data shows that Utah has the highest number of students per teacher in the nation. These statistics are the results of tremendous family growth and immigration which local schools are struggling to keep up with.

The State Office of Education estimates that in the next ten years, Utah will add over 100,000 new students. This will require the construction of over 124 new schools, which is a 15 percent increase.

The number of teachers available to teach students is diminishing because wages and working conditions in Utah cannot keep up with those in neighboring states. The results are chronically over-crowded classrooms, outdated textbooks and scarce supplies. Clearly, education is primarily a state and local issue, but because these resources are so limited, a state-federal partnership is that much more critical in my state.

Often, federal dollars are the only source of funding for specific educational programs in Utah schools. As I have spoken to Utah educators about the education proposals being considered by this Committee, several themes have emerged, and I hope my outline of these will aid you in ensuring that education reform will be effective in states such as Utah with unique educational challenges.

Utah educators are excited about the priority President Bush is placing on education. They agree with increased funding, flexibility and accountability. However, they have a few concerns about these changes that may affect their schools.

First, Utahans worry about unfunded mandates and increased bureaucracy. They are concerned about providing additional services with the limited education dollars they have and with inadequate federal support. Although it is a short digression from the reauthorization being considered here, I must mention how crucial increased IDEA funding is to every educator with whom I speak.

The cost of educating special needs students is draining resources from all students as the Federal Government fails to keep its promise to fund IDEA. School districts and local education agencies also require flexibility. Rather than imposing another layer of bureaucracy by requiring funds to be passed through the state, money should be directed to the most local level possible.

Second, Utahans aren't afraid of being held accountable. The state has already passed legislation requiring annual testing across all major subject areas. They are also going to be publishing school report cards and making them available to parents. Years of preparation have gone into aligning curriculum with these tests, but local officials do worry about federal mandates requiring that this testing be in place too quickly. They are concerned that federal mandates could force them to change the quality test that they have already developed.

High turnover and influxes of refugee and immigrant students over the course of the year creates a problem for the process of tying federal dollars to school outcomes on tests. They urge the use of tests to measure student progress over time, examining where a student begins a school year and comparing it to when the student is finished at the end of the school year.

In addition, Utah already allows for public school choice except where overcrowding prevents particular schools from accepting additional students. But the education community has told me they cannot afford any plan that would take funding, especially Title I funding, away from those public schools that need it most.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JIM MATHESON, 2ND DISTRICT OF UTAH, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX U

Chairman Boehner. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. Matheson. Okay, I appreciate that.

Chairman Boehner. We'll gladly take the rest of your statement and put it in the record.

Mr. Matheson. I would just like to provide that for the record. I certainly appreciate the time to talk on this important subject.

Chairman Boehner. Glad to do it. Thank you.

Mr. Matheson. Thank you very much.

Chairman Boehner. With that, let me welcome another one of our freshman Members, Todd Akin, from the St. Louis, Missouri suburbs.

Todd.

Mr. Akin. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and other Members of the Committee. First, I want to thank you, Mr. Chairman, and the different members of your staff and other Members of the Committee that have worked with us over the last number of weeks regarding some of our interests and concerns in the area of testing. There is one additional item that I would appreciate bringing to the Committee's attention today.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TODD AKIN, 2ND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

I believe that the heart of the bill is really, first of all, that we are going to measure students, measure schools, and then we are going to be holding them accountable. It seems to me that in order for us to do this in a practical way at the federal level that the tests that are being used as a tool, and I'm very supportive of those tests, should be chosen either locally or at the state level, but still those tests need to be objective in nature and not subjective.

How can we measure accountability and tie federal dollars to it if a test asks a question about how do you feel about this, or did you like this, or what's your favorite color or something along those lines. I would argue that subjective questions might have some place in a test somewhere, but in terms of us trying to measure and hold accountable and tie dollars to it, that the testing should be objective in its nature.

Now, perhaps I am reflecting a little bit of the nature of an engineer here in my understanding that we construct logic from, first of all, known things that we all agree to and we reason from that. But I think that if we move into the area of allowing subjective testing, we have no real basis, particularly on a state-by-state way to say how we are going to tie dollars to what your favorite color is. It is just not going to work.

So if a particular school or state wants to test on some of these attitudinal questions or their political correctness or whatever, I have no problem with states doing that, but I just don't think it fits for us to tie federal dollars to it. We have introduced H. R. 1163, where we take a good stab at defining what is objective as opposed to subjective. I'll make that available.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

WRITTEN STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TODD AKIN, 2ND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX V

Chairman Boehner. Todd, thank you. We appreciate your testimony, and we appreciate the ideas that you brought to us. We'll look forward to continuing to work with you as we develop this bill.

Mr. Akin. Thank you.

Chairman Boehner. I'm pleased to introduce my colleague from the great state of South Dakota who has the whole state of South Dakota, John Thune.

John, welcome.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHN THUNE, SOUTH DAKOTA- AT LARGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today, too, on behalf of President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal. I am here today representing the Members of the Congressional Rural Caucus. As you know, the Rural Caucus is a bipartisan coalition of 138 Members who are committed to helping build brighter futures for the millions of Americans living in rural communities.

Whenever major legislation is debated, the Rural Caucus provides input to other Members on the unique consequences these initiatives may have on rural areas. Certainly, few other proposals affect rural areas quite as profoundly as education reform.

Federal education reform is desperately needed across this country. Too many students and teachers from my state of South Dakota have felt the direct impact of the waste, fraud and abuse of the Washington education bureaucracy.

Last year nearly \$2 million of impact aid money, money that was promised to rural school districts, seems to have magically disappeared from the coffers of the federal Department of Education. It appears it was a case of malfeasance on the part of a few federal bureaucrats.

Now, \$2 million may not mean a lot in Washington, but when these schools do not receive their federal education dollars, there are very real consequences. They can't expand their kindergarten programs; they can't add chemistry and sociology classes in the high school; and they can't hire new teachers.

It is clear that an unresponsive and inflexible and overly bureaucratic federal education system handicaps our students. Rural schools have limited choices. They can decide to pull teachers out of classrooms and instead hire employees to fill out federal paperwork, or they can give up the volumes of paperwork and sacrifice the federal grant dollars that could be put to use in the classroom. Clearly, that's not much of a choice.

Time and again, Members of the Rural Caucus hear from their school administrators and school board members that schools need flexibility in accessing federal education programs. I am pleased that H.R. 1, the "No Child Left Behind" proposal, has specific provisions for flexibility for rural schools. Rural school districts have little opportunity to compete for discretionary federal funding. For those that successfully receive discretionary funds, the allocation can be so small that it has relatively little value to them.

H.R. 1 works to correct this problem by providing the funding needed to make these competitive programs worthwhile for rural schools to apply. The idea is to give rural school districts the flexibility and funding to make these programs workable. It allows rural school districts to bypass the state bureaucracy and apply directly to the Federal Government for these special funds, something that school districts in rural areas really want.

Rural school districts would finally have useful amounts of funding to improve their academic achievement and, after all, academic achievement is what we are all aiming for here.

While specific rural education provisions will benefit thousands of students across the country, some of the broader flexibility proposals will help every school district, whether that district is rural, urban or somewhere in between.

H.R. 1 gives states and local school districts additional flexibility to improve student performance by cutting red tape and consolidating a host of programs to ensure that state and local officials can meet the unique needs of students.

Now, that sounds like a lot of tired rhetoric, but the advantages of flexible programming are very real. Now, I'll give you an example. My hometown of Myrtle, South Dakota has about 700 people. This year's kindergarten class has four students in it. I don't think that Myrtle needs any classroom reduction money. Instead of funding a separate program that can only be used by school districts with class size reduction, H.R. 1 allows schools to address classroom quality differently. Rather than passing up these valuable federal dollars, Myrtle can use the money for teacher recruitment, professional development or technical training.

So I commend the Committee on the work that they are doing with the President's education proposals. I thank you for the opportunity to testify today and look forward, on behalf of the Rural Caucus, to working with this Committee, the President and his administration on improving education for our nation's children. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN THUNE, SOUTH DAKOTA-
AT LARGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

SEE APPENDIX W

Chairman Boehner. John, we appreciate your testimony. Thank you. And we're pleased to welcome Adam Schiff, one of our freshman Members of Congress, from the greater Los Angeles area; is that correct?

Mr. Schiff. Yes, it is, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. Welcome. You may begin.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN ADAM SCHIFF, 27TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Members, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today on the President's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal.

Education is clearly one of the key issues we face as a nation, and our policy must be a comprehensive one that addresses all elements of a child's educational development from the earliest stages through K-12 and into the college years.

We often wonder why our children in the third, fourth or fifth grade still haven't learned to read. As a proud parent of a two-year-old, I see the progress that she makes every day. Children her age are like sponges. They are so willing and eager to learn, we should not deny any child's thirst for knowledge, especially at the earliest possible stages.

Last week, I was proud to join with my colleague and a Member of this Committee, Representative Todd Platts, in introducing a bipartisan bill to ensure that every child has the tools necessary to succeed in school and in life.

Our bill, H.R. 1201, The Reading Readiness Act, requires that the Department of Health and Human Services conduct a study of best practices with regard to reading readiness and provide an incentive to have every Head Start program to adopt these practices. The study will include recommendations of ways to improve on reading readiness and incentives for existing programs to adopt these best practices.

The bill requires every Head Start program to have a strong focus on reading readiness at age-appropriate levels. Most Head Start programs already have a strong reading component. The Head Start programs in my district, for example, are set up like regular classrooms, and those children are learning letters and sounds and numbers and much more.

The bill also addresses increasing enrollment and eligibility and full funds the program over the next few years.

Head Start began in 1965 as a comprehensive program for children offering nutrition, parenting skills, healthcare and more in a preschool environment. It has served more than 18 million low-income preschool children. Nothing in this bill jeopardizes the comprehensive nature of Head Start; rather it will ensure that reading readiness is a

central theme in all Head Start programs while striving for all programs to adopt best practices in reading readiness. And of course, a key component of making this happen is full funding.

Leaving no child behind means eliminating any waiting lists that children are currently on. In 1999, only one percent of eligible children under three years old were enrolled. Only 33 percent of eligible three-year-olds were enrolled, and only 60 percent of four-year-olds were enrolled. And this is not because parents don't want to get their children into the program; in fact, there are waiting lists in many parts of the country and certainly in areas of Los Angeles County such as where I represent.

Funding for Head Start was \$6.2 billion in fiscal year 2001. Unfortunately, this is less than half of what it is estimated would be necessary to fully fund the program in the next several years.

The Reading Readiness Act takes two major steps toward full funding by authorizing \$9.2 billion in fiscal year 2002 and \$11.2 billion in fiscal year 2003. I am pleased to report the bill has the support of both the National Head Start Association and the National Education Association.

I look forward to working with you, Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, to address education at every age level. Thank you for the opportunity to testify.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ADAM SCHIFF, 27TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.
SEE APPENDIX X

Chairman Boehner. Adam, thank you. We appreciate your testimony. And I would think that later on this year after we finish the Elementary and Secondary Education Act we will deal with the issues of Head Start and the President's proposal. Thank you.

Mr. Schiff. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Boehner. Before we go vote, we're going to hear from Tom Allen. Tom represents the other district in Maine, for those of you that have been here.

Your colleague, Mr. Baldacci, was here earlier. Welcome.

STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN TOM ALLEN, 1ST DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Thank you Mr. Chairman, Mr. Kildee and others. I appreciate the chance to testify before the Committee about President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal.

I want to speak about the need for high standards and accountability and to urge this Committee to ensure that states and local districts retain flexibility in their assessment practices. With increased calls for accountability to measure how public schools are performing, we must make sure that we assess not just tests, and I want to describe what we do in Maine.

I agree with the President on many of his goals. Effectiveness, accountability, assessment and state and local flexibility are requisites of any education reform plan, but I do disagree with some of the details. Requiring yearly tests imposes a new mandate on our already fiscally troubled state budgets. The President has said, albeit without much detail, that the Federal Government would provide the necessary financial assistance. But if the Senate's Better Education for Students and Teacher Act were any indication, states would only receive funds to cover 50 percent of the costs of implementing the tests. This would force yet another unfunded mandate upon the states, the most prominent of which is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

We have not met our commitment to funding 40 percent of the costs of special education for the last 26 years, and I see no reason to believe we would meet a new commitment. Just last night, the Rules Committee rejected a proposed amendment of mine to fully fund special education this year. It meant an additional \$11.4 billion in return for reducing the size of the tax cut at the upper levels. It seems to me that if we are ever going to fully fund special education, we have to do it this year. The opportunity will not come again assuming projections hold.

Over the last ten years, a total of 48 states have implemented some system of accountability. It is ironic that the current administration wants to mandate national accountability when local flexibility is its top priority. A federal emphasis on standardized testing is problematic. We must not forget Senator Kennedy's remarks that tests are not reforms but only measurements of the progress of reforms.

The best way to improve our schools is a caring and competent teacher in every classroom. A qualified and dedicated teacher, not just having the best standards and assessment measures, leads to improved student achievement. Studies indicate that the lowest achieving students in both urban and rural areas are in classrooms with the least qualified teachers. Often they teach a subject in which they did not major or minor in college. I believe the best policy is to hire caring teachers who have a background in the subject they teach and to offer them opportunities for continued professional development.

A word about Maine; as part of Learning Results Program, Maine has a partnership with local school districts. Both the state and local schools do assessment. More than multiple-choice exams, these comprehensive assessments measure learning through a variety of methods. The state component includes the Maine Educational Assessment, which is given to students in grades four, eight and eleven. Individual student's scores are reported in five content areas. The state also assists educators in clarifying standards for local assessment systems, developing and evaluating performance tasks and student portfolios, serving as a clearinghouse for exemplary local assessment practices, and developing a framework for multiple and diverse assessments to ensure that all Maine students reach high standards. And this has been done as a result of a real partnership not just between the state and local officials, but also with the business

community. The business community has been very involved in this particular effort.

We think that our experience is that sound assessment coupled with good professional development has lead to increased achievement in writing.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me to testify. I urge the Committee to reject calls for high-stakes testing and fiscal sanctions and instead support initiatives that will place a caring, competent teacher in every classroom. Thank you very much.

WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TOM ALLEN, 1ST DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C. – SEE APPENDIX Y

Chairman Boehner. Tom, we appreciate your testimony. There are several other Members that we thought were coming. I suspect that they are on the floor and voting, and not coming. We will go ahead and adjourn the meeting.

Thank you for coming.

Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the committee was adjourned

***APPENDIX A - WRITTEN OPENING STATEMENT, CHAIRMAN
MICHAEL CASTLE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE***

Opening Statement
Rep. Michael N. Castle

"No Child Left Behind"
Committee on Education and the Workforce
Washington, D.C.
March 29, 2001

Good morning. Let me extend a warm welcome to all of you, to Congressman George Miller -- the Senior Democratic Member, to my other colleagues, and to our witnesses -- Members of Congress.

The focus of this full committee hearing is to give Members of Congress an opportunity to testify on President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal.

As you may know, H.R. 1, the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001, was introduced just last week. H.R. 1 is comprehensive legislation reauthorizing the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) encompassing the President's plan.

Despite nearly a decade of uninterrupted economic growth in the 1990s, the achievement gap in our country between disadvantaged students and their peers remains wide. All of us -- Republican, Democrat, or independent -- can agree this is a problem that requires our attention.

While our hearing is focused on the President's education proposal, the Committee recognizes there are many issues pertaining to education that are important to Members. This hearing was designed to ensure that all Members are afforded an opportunity to share their views and concerns with the Committee.

Although not all Members are available to testify in person, some have chosen to submit testimony for the record. I would like to thank all Members who have taken an active interest in this opportunity and for their efforts to ensure that every American child has the chance to learn.

At this time, I will yield to my friend and Ranking Member, Congressman George Miller for any statement he may have.

***APPENDIX B - WRITTEN STATEMENT, RANKING MEMBER
DALE KILDEE, SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION REFORM,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE***

Statement of Congressman Dale E. Kildee

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my strong support for two existing civic education programs: the **We the People...** program and the International Education Program.

For well over a decade the **We the People...** program has involved elementary, middle and secondary school students throughout America in an innovative approach to learning about the U. S. Constitution, Bill of Rights and the principles of democratic government. More than 26.5 million students in some 24,000 elementary and secondary schools in every congressional district in the United States have participated in this important program. It has directly involved more than 82,000 teachers, and as a result of this program, more than 80,000 sets of civics education textbooks have been distributed free to schools throughout our nation.

The **We the People...** program is widely acclaimed as a highly successful and effective education program. Washington

Post columnist David Broder described its national finals as “the place to have your faith in the younger generation restored.”

The International Education Program began in 1994 to provide civic education assistance to emerging democracies in Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union. Today, educators in 21 U. S. states are linked with more than 31 fragile democracies. This year alone the program reached 225,000 students and more than 2,000 educators in the emerging democracies, as well as more than 56,000 students and more than 550 educators here in the United States. As a result, students in the new democracies and here at home learn the importance, difficulties, and rewards of building and sustaining a democratic government.

It is without question that these programs would disappear if included in a block grant. We would no longer have a national competition on knowledge and understanding of our Constitution and Bill of Rights, the free distribution of textbooks; and the regional teacher training institutes. In the international sphere, the civic education assistance we provide to emerging democracies

would be terminated, as would the program where U.S. students learn firsthand about the difficulties of building and sustaining a democracy in the modern world.

Mr. Chairman, these are not large programs, but they are highly effective ones. They are worth the small amount we spend. They are a critically important investment in the future strength and welfare of democracy here at home and in the emerging democracies abroad. They are undoubtedly worthy of our support, and I would hope the provisions of HR 611, the Education for Democracy Act, could be included in the education legislation we are now considering.

**APPENDIX C - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TOM
LATHAM, 5TH DISTRICT OF IOWA, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Representative Tom Latham (IA-05)
Testimony Before the House Committee on
Education and the Workforce

No Child Left Behind

March 28, 2001

Chairman Boehner, Ranking Member Miller, and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today. As you know, our nation's educational system is at a crossroad. We have the opportunity, working with President Bush, to renovate our nation's educational system to ensure no child is left behind. I believe H.R. 1 contains the ingredients necessary to provide for our children's future – flexibility, accountability, and choice, and look forward to working with the Committee as we address this important matter in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Today, nearly 70 percent of inner city and rural fourth-graders cannot read at a basic level. Perhaps more distressing is the fact that low-income students score an average of 20 percentile points lower than their peers. To maintain our present course would be unfair to the constituents we represent, and devastating to the future of the United States. H.R. 1 takes the first step in reversing these disturbing trends by focusing federal education spending back to its original goal of helping America's disadvantaged students.

Under H.R. 1, states and local schools that make significant progress in closing the achievement gap will receive bonuses, while States that fail to progress toward the goal of providing a quality education for all students will face the risk of losing some of their administrative funds. Some may express reservations about the prospect of such penalties. However, I believe this proposal should not be viewed as a penalty for schools that fail to improve, but rather as an incentive for underachieving school systems to redirect their focus to helping students in disadvantaged rural and urban schools receive the best education possible.

Additionally, as we strive to provide America's disadvantaged students greater opportunity, perhaps the best method to assist States and school districts in this goal is to provide them with increased flexibility. As I meet with school superintendents and administrators in Northwest Iowa, the number one concern expressed to me is the need for additional flexibility. Unfortunately, many rural school districts simply do not have enough students to qualify for Federal funding under current funding formulas. H.R. 1 provides additional flexibility by authorizing states and school districts to transfer funds between programs – up to 35 percent at the local level without state permission, and up to 100 percent with the State's consent.

Further, the sad reality of today's educational systems is that many state and local school districts are sometimes forced to sacrifice student achievement in order to comply with the existing bureaucratic regulations. H.R. 1 remedies this situation by cutting red tape and consolidating a host of programs to ensure that State and local programs can meet the unique needs of students. Flexibility, as you know, is the centerpiece to President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" proposal. As a Representative for a rural district, I can say without reservation that the flexibility to work within the system will have an immediate impact on my district in particular.

What's more, while schools in Iowa, and the 5th District in particular, are known for their exceptionally high standards, I am encouraged by the prospect of providing students who attend schools which have consistently failed to provide a quality education an opportunity to seek out a better education.

Unfortunately, while much of the nation has experienced a booming economy over the last 10 years, there are many citizens who have quite simply missed out. These

citizens are often stuck in the second or third generation of poverty and economic instability. I believe the root of these problems lies in the education, or lack thereof, these citizens and their children are receiving. If we continue to resist reforms to fix this broken system, I fear the existing cycle of poverty and economic instability being experienced by many rural and urban families will never be broken.

In order to break this cycle, we first need to identify where the problems exist within the system. Accordingly, H.R. 1 would require states to test students annually from grades 3 through 8 in reading and math. These tests would identify children who are in the beginning stages of falling behind, and provide teachers and school systems the opportunity to make changes in their curriculum or teaching methods in order to meet the needs of these children. Additionally, while these tests do provide for the opportunity to adjust according to the needs of the students, it does not hold the student personally accountable for their scores. Rather, the individual scores can be aggregated at the school, district, and state levels for the purpose of institutional and system accountability.

Unfortunately, opponents of the Administration's reform proposal have incorrectly portrayed this provision in particular as a national testing program and an unfounded mandate. On the contrary, States will select the tests that suit their needs. Further, the federal government will provide funding to states that do not have annual assessments to develop such assessments within three years. This provision simply ensures the federal government does not continue to pour our constituents' hard earned money into an educational system which is failing its students.

While I am confident this provision in particular will help remedy the problems at many of America's failing schools, H.R. 1 does provide a solution for students who

attend schools who fail to make the necessary improvements. H.R. 1 provides for the expansion of school choice and charter schools. Disadvantaged students attending Title I schools that fail to make adequate progress for three years in a row would be able to use federal dollars to pay for tuition at another public school, a private school, or receive supplemental educational services. Additionally, H.R. 1 establishes an Educational Opportunity Fund to set up a limited number of demonstration projects in order to research the effectiveness of school choice programs in improving the academic performance of low-income students.

Perhaps most important, H.R. 1 promotes what works. This legislation sets standards to ensure that federal dollars fund reading programs grounded in scientifically based research. In particular, professional development and technical assistance activities must be based on rigorous scientific research. For too long federal programs have been initiated based on less than perfect research. It is time we educate our children and enhance the professional development of our teachers with proven methods.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, I want to point out the existing commitment this Congress has already made to improve our educational system. As you know, we are debating the Fiscal Year 2002 budget resolution this week. Chairman Nussle and the Budget Committee make a \$44.5 billion commitment to education in Fiscal Year 2002, including a \$4.6 billion (11.5%) increase in funding for the Department of Education. It also assumes sufficient funding in elementary and secondary education for H.R. 1 and the President's education initiatives. Perhaps more important, though, is the Budget Committee's continued commitment to reaching the federal share of IDEA funding by including a \$1.25 billion reserve fund.

Mr. Chairman, our children are our future. It is imperative we renew our commitment to ensuring they receive the best education possible. I am confident H.R. 1 achieves this goal, and look forward to working with you and the Education and the Workforce Committee as we facilitate the improvement of our educational system.

***APPENDIX D - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN
EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON, 30TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Testimony of Eddie Bernice Johnson**"No Child Left Behind"****Committee on Education and the Workforce****March 28, 2001**

Chairman Boehner and Ranking Member Miller, I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak today to express the Congressional Black Caucus's interests regarding President Bush's *No Child Left Behind* education proposal.

Since the inception of the Congressional Black Caucus, it has championed equality. Now, as the country enjoys its longest economic expansion in American history, it is the Congressional Black Caucus, the Conscience of the Congress, that will fight to ensure that all Americans share in this prosperity. It is the belief of the Congressional Black Caucus that if we are to truly realize the dream of an all-inclusive America, we must begin in this 107th Congress by: (1) Making Every Vote Count; (2) Securing Our Children's Future; (3) Creating Wealth and Fairness in Our Communities; and (4) Ensuring a Healthy Community. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to be here today to specifically discuss one of our goals – Securing Our Children's Future.

Mr. Chairman, I need to express my deep concern about the President's decision to neglect many key education initiatives stated in his education proposal. President Bush's proposal promises to invest in public education to make sure that no child in America is ever left behind, hold public schools accountable for their performance, improve teacher quality, and early emphasis on reading, but his budget states otherwise. President Bush provides only a \$2.4 billion increase for education, but proposes to spend nearly \$2 billion of that on reading and Pell grants. This leaves only \$400 million for all other education programs - including all other elementary, secondary and higher education programs, special education, and vocational education.

The education priorities of the Administration truly do not secure our children's future. The Congressional Black Caucus feels that America must focus on both improvements for pre-kindergarten through 12th grade and higher education. Research shows that early education learning makes a difference in children's lives. Continued and expanded support of the Head Start Program will ensure our youth a brighter future. Other initiatives must include school modernization, quality teacher training and pay, smaller class sizes, after-school programs and the best high-tech teaching tools and equipment available for both students and teachers.

Instead of ensuring our youth a brighter future, the President has chosen to freeze funding for after-school and safety programs by combining and freezing funding for the Safe and Drug Free Schools Program and the 21st Century Community Learning Centers after-school program. Instead of modernizing our schools, the President has chosen to eliminate the School Renovation Program for FY 2002 and retroactively

redirect the \$1.2 billion already appropriated for this year to technology and special education. Instead of training and paying teachers and reducing class sizes, the President has chosen to eliminate the class-size reduction initiative by consolidating class-size and the Eisenhower Professional Development Program. Thus, failing to provide enough funding to continue reducing class size and expand professional development and training for teachers.

Last, one area of great concern to the Congressional Black Caucus is the ever-growing digital divide. It is particularly important that all children have access to computers and the internet. There is clearly a digital divide in which those who are poor and live in rural areas are in danger of being left behind relative to wealthier residents of urban areas. This problem continues to be most significant for African-American and Hispanic children. While 46% of white households are connected to the internet, only 23% of African-American and 23% of Hispanic households have internet access.

Studies clearly show that students who have daily access to cutting-edge technology perform better academically. Yet, the Administration is proposing to slash government programs providing computers and internet access to poor and underserved areas. Finally, many are concerned that President Bush will eliminate the E-rate program, an extremely successful program that brings technology into many schools with kids who have no access to technology otherwise.

Mr. Chairman, while the President has talked a great deal about *leaving no child behind*, he clearly appears to be off-message. He continues to slash programs that provide for the neediest children, in reality, *leaving many children behind*. Again, Chairman Boehner and Ranking Member Miller and Members of the Committee, I thank you for this opportunity. I want to place my complete statement in the record and would be happy to answer any questions.

**APPENDIX E - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JIM
LANGEVIN, 2ND DISTRICT OF RHODE ISLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

JAMES R. LANGEVIN
20 DISTRICT, RHODE ISLAND

108 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
TELEPHONE: (202) 225-2726
FAX: (202) 225-5976

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-3902

Testimony by
Representative Jim Langevin
before the Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001

I would like to begin by thanking Chairman Boehner and Ranking Member Miller for the opportunity to speak to you today. I appreciate the chance to share my thoughts on this important bill, as well as the impact of the President's proposal on the second district of Rhode Island.

Our public education system is one of the foundations of our democracy. When our school system works, it levels the playing field and offers our children the opportunity for upward mobility. When it fails, it often resigns them to poverty and illiteracy. I am deeply committed to improving our nation's schools so that every child, regardless of the neighborhood in which they grow up, has every chance to achieve their fullest potential.

There are a myriad of issues that I would like to discuss, but since time is limited, I will focus my testimony on just two: the mental health of our students and vouchers for children in failing schools.

Mental health of our students.

Today students bring more than their books and pencils to schools; they also bring unresolved personal, emotional, mental health and family problems. Sadly some students also bring knives, guns, or other weapons to school. Although an estimated 7.5 million children require mental health services, only 1 out of 5 receive the help they need. America's students need help, and today we have the opportunity to provide that assistance.

No place is immune from school violence and when it happens, it has repercussions all across the country. Student shootings have occurred in rural Alaska, suburban Colorado, and inner city Atlanta. Just three weeks ago, Andy Williams shot and killed two of his

classmates in Santana High School in Santee, California, and wounded 13 others. One of the wounded was Melissa McNulty, whose father lives in my district in Wakefield, Rhode Island. Just weeks before, another of his daughters was named on a sixth-grader's "hit list" of 24 students at South Road Elementary School in my district. This was the second such "hit list" created by middle school students in my district in the past month. These incidents highlight the urgent need for intervention.

I am disappointed that President Bush's plan eliminates Title X, which contains the Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act (ESCDA). This program provides essential support to elementary schools for the development and expansion of counseling activities. Last year, 500 school districts applied for the \$30 million program, but only 58 districts received grants – leaving 442 school districts that have identified a need for this assistance and continue to be denied critical funding.

Now is not the time to end this critical program. Without it our students may not have access to the mental health professionals that they need. Currently, the average student-to-counselor ratio nationally is 561:1, more than twice the Institute of Medicine's recommended ratio of 250:1, and this ratio is often worse in our country's urban districts. For instance, in South Kingstown, there is only one school counselor for the entire district, which includes three separate schools. In many large districts, including the Santee school district in San Diego, the ratio is closer to 1 counselor for every 1000 students. Such large caseloads effectively prohibit counselors from providing the emotional stability and guidance that our students need, and such vast geographic distances between schools makes timely crisis intervention difficult, if not impossible.

School counselors provide critical proactive services to preempt violent incidents such as those in San Diego. With funds supplied by the ESCDA, counselors work with classroom teachers and peer counselors to teach students critical coping mechanisms. Through role-playing, students learn, at a young age, how to deal with the pressures they face daily, including the extraordinary stress associated with divorce or abuse in their families.

President Bush's proposal also combines the Safe and Drug Free Schools program and the 21st Century Learning Centers program into one grant for before- and after-school learning opportunities, and violence and drug prevention activities. The President's proposal does not specifically earmark the money for mental health purposes. Without such targets, schools may use their grants, as the Santee school district did last year, to hire security guards or install metal detectors. While metal detectors may make our schools safer by detecting weapons on students entering the building, they obviously are not foolproof. On the other hand, school counselors can identify children in need, and prevent them from taking out their aggressions with violence. Together both mental detectors and metal detectors can have a significant impact in stopping violence and addressing our youth's emotional needs.

To truly meet the mental health needs of our students we must not only retain, but expand the ESCDA program. High schools have just as great, if not a greater, need for mental health professionals as do our elementary schools. The ESCDA program should provide funding to high schools to help prevent incidents such as what happened at Santana High School. In fact, in order to keep pace with an expanding elementary school population, the ESCDA program should be increased from \$30 million to \$100 million in fiscal year 2002. This would enable schools at least to keep the current student-to-counselor ratio of 560:1, which is twice the recommended rate. I respectfully request that the committee not only fund ESCDA at this level, but ensure that high schools can receive the necessary assistance as well.

Vouchers

The next topic I would like to discuss is vouchers for students in failing schools. While I, and virtually every member of the education community, agree that accountability is important, vouchers are not the best way to achieve that end.

My first objection to vouchers is they violate the spirit of President Bush's plan. Throughout the "No Child Left Behind" proposal, the President stresses the importance of assessing student, teacher, and school district success. Yet, once students obtain vouchers and apply

them to private or parochial schools, their performance is no longer measured. Private and parochial schools are not required to administer the annual tests that are the cornerstone of the President's plan. Therefore, we will never know whether the alternative school is any better or worse than the one he or she left. This system simply assumes that private or parochial schools are better than public schools, and in many cases that assumption may not be valid.

My second concern with vouchers is logistical. There quite simply are not enough slots in private or parochial schools to accommodate all the public school students who might be eligible to receive vouchers. The students who would receive the spaces are likely to be better informed and higher achieving than their peers who do not receive spaces. The President's plan does not require schools to accept students who wish to transfer. Schools are allowed to be selective; to pick and choose students who do not have special needs, such as limited English proficiency or mental or physical disabilities. Due to the lack of available slots in private and parochial schools, even students lucky enough to receive vouchers will not be able to use them. Vouchers would represent an empty promise by not addressing the crippling problems facing our schools and instead creating the false illusion that all students in failing schools have the opportunity to obtain private school education.

Furthermore, students who are able to find a slot in a private or parochial must still make up the difference between the cost of tuition and the amount of the voucher. For the vast majority of low and middle income families, this cost is simply unaffordable.

The President's plan could leave the most troubled students in the public schools, while transferring less troubled students to private and parochial schools. This situation would further discourage good teachers, who already sacrifice higher salaries and more modern classrooms, from teaching in poor public schools.

Rhode Island is already in the middle of a teacher shortage. This shortage is exacerbated in Providence, as it is in cities all over the country. Yet in Providence, only 71% of students

graduate from high school, compared with 83% in Rhode Island overall. Providence needs caring, committed, well-trained teachers. To take money away from public school districts when schools do not meet certain guidelines is to provide a disincentive to teachers to teach in the inner cities of America.

Finally, I would like to caution the Committee against relying too heavily on standardized tests. While these tests may offer a useful snapshot of a school or student's performance, these tests are not perfect measures of scholastic potential. In Rhode Island, we use a holistic approach to measure our student and teacher outcomes. Our method involves sending a team of professionally trained surveyors to all the schools, every few years. This team spends several days at the school and talks with administrators, teachers, and students to develop a complete picture of whether the school is meeting all of its needs. In addition, Rhode Island uses a variation on the standardized test that the President is advocating. By testing analytic and problem-solving skills, instead of just memorization, our test assesses the complex skills that are more closely correlated with students' success later in life. This approach is costly but much more accurate, and surely such a cost is a worthwhile investment in our children's future. It is in fact more costly to society to punish our children on the basis of one's ability to memorize facts, rather than to think analytically. Our children must be stimulated to learn and challenge concepts in order to become intellectually capable in college and throughout their professional careers.

Thank you for allowing me the chance to discuss the President's proposal, how it will affect my home state of Rhode Island, and the lessons we have learned that might contribute to crafting an effective education bill. We have a truly momentous opportunity this year to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act at a time when the majority of the country sees education as the most important issue facing our nation. We must seize this opportunity and produce a common sense, bi-partisan approach to strengthening this nation's educational system.

***APPENDIX F - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN MIKE
PENCE, 2ND DISTRICT OF INDIANA, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

H.R. 1 “No Child Left Behind”**Testimony of Congressman Mike Pence (IN-02)****House Committee on Education and the Workforce****March 28, 2001**

Chairman Boehner, Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. Education is not only the cornerstone of President Bush’s agenda; it is the top legislative priority of most Americans. Therefore, the work you do here in this committee is especially important.

I am here today to speak on behalf of state and local control of our schools. This is not something new to me. Everywhere I appear in my district, the applause line is the same. No new federal mandates on our public schools. Our administrators, principals and teachers all spend too much time filling out forms and grant requests. As it is, most of the school districts in Indiana have a full-time employee who does nothing but fill out federal grant application materials.

Thus, the portion of H.R. 1 that most concerns me is the requirement for one national test. The National Assessment of Educational Progress is an obscure test that relatively few of the nation’s children have ever taken. This test has seldom been given annually and has taken up to 18 months to grade. And results are reported in such a manner that only trained researchers benefit from them.

In addition, the NAEP can only judge the reading proficiency of a state and then compare it to other states. It cannot show whether a particular student is reading proficiently or how his or her school compares to other schools in the area. When you ask parents what accountability means, they usually ask for useful data. They want to know their child's school is working.

Measurable results that are useful for parents should be our goal. Accountability means education customers can use the information to put their child in a school that is working well. Simply put, we should not pour federal money into a test that does not put children first.

That said, I plan to support a bill offered by my colleague Congressman Todd Akin of Missouri. The Accountability in Testing Act of 2001 (H.R. 1163) will limit the use of Federal funds appropriated for conducting testing in elementary or secondary schools to testing that meets certain conditions. I urge the committee to give this proposal serious consideration. It would give accountability and information to parents without tying a principal's hands.

Each line of this bill echoes the statement of our founding fathers that education is a function of local government. Unlike NAEP, testing under H.R. 1163 would be designed by the State educational agency. Unlike NAEP, this bill would test objective knowledge based on widely-agreed-upon, measurable standards. And most importantly, unlike NAEP, a federal official would not have the authority to verify a test under H.R. 1163.

In addition, I'd like to address what President Bush has referred to as the "soft bigotry of low expectations." What city better fits that description than Congress' own backyard, Washington, D.C.? Currently, 72% of D.C.'s ten-year-olds cannot read with understanding. It is a school district that cannot get rid of poor teachers and consistently starves its few good schools of resources just to prevent them from draining talent from the rest.

Because the District of Columbia is a creature of the Congress, we have a special responsibility and opportunity to reform its schools. By implementing an experimental parental choice system, Mr. Chairman, we could allow parents here in Washington to help us answer an important question. Does allowing the parents of poor children the same opportunities as those who live in the suburbs yield similar results? In other words, if what we want is successful public schools, why not create a powerful constituency for them? In short, if parents in the District of Columbia want to send their children to good schools, they should get to do so, whether private, public or otherwise.

Therefore, I strongly support a District Choice Initiative like the one endorsed by Senator Joseph Lieberman and Congressman Dick Armey during the 105th Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you again for holding this hearing today. And as H.R. 1 travels through the halls of Congress, I trust we will remember the Jeffersonian principles of limited government as they pertain to America's schools. Thank you.

APPENDIX G - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN BOB CLEMENT, 5TH DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

BOB CLEMENT
5TH DISTRICT, TENNESSEE

COMMITTEE ON
TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE
KING DEMOCRAT—SUBCOMMITTEE ON RAILROADS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HIGHWAYS AND TRANSIT
COMMITTEE ON BUDGET

COMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
(ON LEAVE)

e-mail: bob.clement@mail.house.gov
website: <http://www.house.gov/clement>



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-4205

DISTRICT OFFICES:
338 U.S. COURTHOUSE
NASHVILLE, TN 37203
615-736-6295

101 5TH AVENUE WEST
SUITE-D
SPRINGFIELD, TN 37172
615-384-6600

2701 JEFFERSON STREET
SUITE 103
NASHVILLE, TN 37208
615-320-1383

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
ROOM 2229
RAYBURN HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-4205
202-225-4311

Statement of Rep. Bob Clement
House Education & the Workforce Committee
March 28, 2001

Thank you, Mr. Chairman for this opportunity to testify before the Committee. As a former college president, current co-chair of the House Education caucus and parent of two daughters who have always gone to public schools, I am extremely concerned about the status of our schools. As we move through the reauthorization process of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I hope that our end result will be an improving of our public schools.

I have always been a strong believer in our public school systems. Improving the public schools in this country needs to be our top priority. Simply put, schools should be free from drugs and violence and an environment rich in learning and educational excellence. We need

adequate facilities, books and teachers both qualified and dedicated. Research shows what parents already know – students learn best when they are in safe, modern schools with smaller classes and 21st century technology. If we are to continue to prosper economically and as a democracy, America must have an education policy that provides opportunities for all of our children to succeed.

Recently, a lot of attention has been given to the quality of our public schools themselves. Simply put, we cannot expect our children to get a 21st century education if their school buildings are outdated, ill-equipped, and falling apart. I have visited numerous schools in my district and seen for myself the poor conditions our teachers and students are forced to suffer through – no air conditioning, asbestos, closets converted to classrooms, outdated technology, and shared facilities and resources. We must do better. I'm deeply concerned to see that the President's budget framework guts school renovation and construction funding. I hope that this committee will see fit to support school modernization efforts.

Being from Nashville, Tennessee, music has always had a special place in my heart. I have been a longtime supporter and proponent of music and arts education. Research has shown that involvement in music programs improves a child's early cognitive development, basic math and reading abilities, self-esteem, SAT scores, self-discipline, ability to work in teams, spatial reasoning skills, and school attendance. Also, children involved with music education are more likely to graduate from high school and attend college, and less likely to be involved with gangs and substance abuse. The study of music and the other arts also provides students with a sense of their cultural heritage.

I recently chaired an Education Caucus briefing on music education. We heard from a researcher as well as musicians, music teachers and music students about the importance of music education. I encourage this Committee to support continued research into music education as well as programs that promote music education in our schools. Just as we would not think to cut math or science from our curricula, we must not cut music or arts education.

I am also very pleased to see President Bush recognize the importance of character education in his recent address to Congress. Americans are concerned about the steady decline of our nation's core ethical values, especially among our children. Parents should be the primary developers of character, but the role of education in character-building has become increasingly important. Schools across the country have begun to incorporate character education in their curriculum in a variety of ways and are achieving real results, including improved school climate, fewer behavior problems and even higher test scores.

Congressman Lamar Smith, of Texas, and I have introduced H.R. 613, the Character Learning and Student Success (CLASS) Act. Character education has become a national priority in the education reform debate. I believe that the CLASS Act will bring national attention to the importance and effectiveness of character education and will help schools create positive learning environments. I hope that this Committee will take a close look at this legislation and include it in ESEA reauthorization.

I agree with President that we must “leave no child behind.” And I hope that there is common ground between his proposal and others that have been introduced in Congress. As a New Democrat, I believe that we must invest our education dollars wisely. We must ensure our poorest schools receive additional dollars. And we must hold our schools and districts accountable for improvements. This is why I am a strong supporter of H.R. 345, the Three R’s legislation introduced by my colleagues Tim Roemer, Adam Smith and Cal Dooley. I believe that this legislation accomplishes these goals. I hope the Committee carefully considers this proposal.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for allowing me the opportunity to highlight some of my priorities in education funding this year. I think we can all agree that education is of the utmost importance not only to this Committee and this Congress but also to the American people. I look forward to working with you to support educational policies and programs that benefit all of our students.

***APPENDIX H - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN
CHAKAH FATTAH, 2ND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, U.S.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

CHAKA FATTAH
2ND DISTRICT, PENNSYLVANIA

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1205 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-4001

DISTRICT OFFICES:
4704 WALNUT STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104
(215) 393-8404
8632 GERMANTOWN AVENUE
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19119
(215) 845-9386



Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

Testimony of Congressman Chaka Fattah
U.S. Representative
2nd Congressional District of Pennsylvania

On the "No Child Left Behind" Education Bill

For the Committee on Education and the Workforce
U.S. House of Representatives
March 28, 2001

COMMITTEES:
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION
AND THE WORKFORCE
POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION, TRAINING AND
LIFE-LONG LEARNING SUBCOMMITTEE
EARLY-CHILDHOOD, YOUTH AND FAMILIES
SUBCOMMITTEE

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT REFORM
POSTAL SERVICE SUBCOMMITTEE
RANKING MEMBER

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF
OFFICIAL CONDUCT

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE
ADMINISTRATION

Thank you, Chairman Boehner, Ranking Member Miller, and Members of the Committee for providing me the opportunity to lend my voice to the debate over the Federal Government's role in improving our nation's education system. It is a pleasure to testify before the Committee that I have served on for the past six years. Today, I ask the Committee to accept my legislation on school finance equity as an amendment to HR 1, The No Child Left Behind Act.

If no child is to be left behind, then all children must be given an equal opportunity to compete. We in America understand this fully when it comes to sports. All of the rules in sports are designed to ensure that competitors face a level playing field. Unfortunately, there is nothing level about the educational playing field in America. To the contrary, our method of school finance creates and maintains a very unequal system. My own State of Pennsylvania has one of the widest disparities in the Union on this score. The disparity in annual per pupil expenditure between the poorest school district and the wealthiest school district in Pennsylvania is nearly \$10,000. If the average classroom size is 30 children, this translates into an average per classroom disparity of \$300,000 per year, or an average annual per school disparity of

\$5,000,000. Not even those who believe that more money for education is not the answer can seriously argue that these additional resources have no impact on the quality of physical facilities, or on the availability of instructional materials that can be provided. Neither can they argue that children subjected to these widely disparate educational experiences approach the challenges of life on a level playing field. Through our current system of school finance, we are perpetuating a self-reinforcing distribution of opportunity in this country which is fundamentally unequal. Unless we address the issue of disparities in educational finance, "leave no child behind" will be nothing more than an empty slogan.

It is particularly regrettable that this problem continues in the field of education, for the heart and soul of the American system of universal education is the desire to give all children the opportunity to succeed and to make the most of their talents. Not only is this fair to the children, but we know that we all will benefit from a more productive and cohesive society when all children have a chance to develop their abilities and participate in our economy. We also understand that giving *every* child the opportunity to succeed will enable America to field her best team to compete in the global economy. Thus many Congresses have voted substantial funds to assist states and their districts in supplementing the resources they make available to students who need more assistance than the states or districts have been providing.

But in all this time we have never directly called upon the states to make sure that their resources are allocated in a fair manner, to make sure that the educational playing fields that we are contributing to are reasonably level, and that the state system of financing schools isn't one of the reasons why our federal dollars are needed to overcome the lack of resources in these poorest

areas. If we want our federal dollars to be effective in helping students, we need to make sure that the state is not depriving them of the resources they need.

We are not alone in the view that financial equity is an important element in improving our schools. Michael Casserly, Executive Director of the Council of Great City Schools, identified inability to drive finance equity as the "... the biggest failure of the education reform movement nationally ...". In his State of the State Address in January, New York Governor George Pataki said, "The time has come to fix a fundamental flaw that ties the hands of local schools - the dinosaur that is the state school aid formula." Days later, the New York State Supreme Court ruled that the school aid system needed to be overhauled to ensure that all students get a "sound basic education." Judge Leland DeGrasse ruled that, "A sound basic education consists of the foundational skills that students need to become productive citizens capable of civic engagement and sustaining competitive employment. Increased educational resources, if properly deployed, can have a significant and lasting effect on student performance. The court found that the city's at risk children are capable of seizing the opportunity for a sound basic education if they are given sufficient resources."

This adds New York to a growing number of states that are taking on the problem of funding disparities in our public school. Four years ago, the Vermont legislature passed The Equal Education Opportunity Act. According to The New York Times, this law has "been a blessing" to some smaller, more rural schools, allowing for new computer laboratories, a wider variety of courses, and a new library, to name a few examples.

The growing acceptance of school finance equity as an essential component of the school reform movement is the most encouraging development that has occurred in decades as this issue is the most serious barrier to meaningful reform in other areas. Despite the many valiant, and in many cases, effective efforts at school reform underway across the country, there still remains much that is antiquated about the way some of our public schools are managed. The most troubled systems -- large urban systems serving predominantly poor students, some of which spend at a rate higher than the national or their state average -- were inherited by their current administrators in dilapidated, under-funded condition with outdated instructional systems, inefficient operating systems, and no systems of accountability of any kind. I mention this to acknowledge that these conditions exist, and to assert nonetheless that while they are intolerable and must be addressed, they do not constitute an excuse for failing to equalize school finance. Our country is in desperate need of comprehensive school reform that addresses instructional format, governance, accountability, *and* finance.

The legal battle for school finance equity is being waged at the state level at the moment. Of the 70 suits that have been filed in state courts, 30 have been decided in favor of equity, 12 have been decided against, and 28 are pending. These cases typically take as long as ten years to be resolved, and the primary roadblock to resolving them more quickly is the debate over whether or not the right to equal educational opportunity is a fundamental right protected under the equal protection clause of the U. S. Constitution.

The principle that equal educational opportunity is a fundamental right was firmly established in 1954 by the landmark *Brown v. Board of Education* decision of the United States Supreme

Court. The Court found, and I quote:

"Today, education is perhaps the most important function of state and local government. Compulsory school attendance laws and the great expenditures for education both demonstrate our recognition of the importance of education to our democratic society. It is required in the performance of our most basic public responsibilities, even service in the armed forces. It is the very foundation of good citizenship. Today it is a principal instrument in awakening the child to cultural values, in preparing him for later professional training, and in helping him adjust normally to his environment. In these days, it is doubtful that any child may reasonably be expected to succeed in life if he is denied the opportunity to acquire an education. *Such an opportunity*, where the state has undertaken to provide it, *is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms.*"

End of quote.

Many state court decisions have followed the principles established in *Brown v. Board of Education*. A more recent decision, *San Antonio Independent School District v. Rodriguez*, introduced ambiguity into how this principle is to be applied. Under the particular circumstances of the *Rodriguez* case -- circumstances which focused on the constitutionality of the property tax as a method of school finance -- the Supreme Court found that the equal protection clause of the Constitution does not apply, and that has provided comfort and cover for findings in some states that the equal protection clauses of their state constitutions do not apply either. However, under both our right to implement the 14th Amendment's guarantee of equal protection under the law, and under our Spending Power to "pay the Debts and provide for the

outdated systems are inadequate to insure that students have sufficient skills to live in a complex and rapidly changing society, to make informed choices, to understand current issues, appreciate their cultural heritages, to function intelligently and to compete favorably in the job market.

How can we function as a nation when increasing percentages of our population can be described in these terms?

The Supreme Court found in *Watson v. the City of Memphis* that constitutional rights "... are not merely hopes to some *future* enjoyment of some formalistic constitutional promise. The basic guarantees of our Constitution are warrants for the here and now and, unless there is an overwhelmingly compelling reason, they are to be promptly fulfilled." Passage of this amendment will provide a foundation for the prompt fulfillment of every American child's basic right to equal education opportunity. Last Congress, 19 of you on this Committee joined with me as we voted for School Finance Equity. There were 183 of us all together -- a very significant percentage of the House. Recognizing that the timeliness and vision with which we respond to this issue will shape the quality of life for all of us in America for years to come, I encourage you to give the Congress an opportunity to revisit this issue by include this amendment in the provisions of HR1.

Thank you

APPENDIX I - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TED STRICKLAND, 6TH DISTRICT OF OHIO, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Testimony of Ted Strickland**"No Child Left Behind"
Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001**

Mr. Chairman, thank you for inviting Members to testify today regarding HR 1. I understand that one of the cornerstones of this proposal is annual testing for students in 3rd through 8th grade. I would like to use this time to share with you some of what I have learned about testing, both as a psychologist and as a representative of a region with a severely underfunded education system.

In my judgment, educational testing should be used (1) diagnostically, to determine what learning impediments might exist, and (2) prescriptively, to determine what methods might be best used to help a particular student learn better. Educational testing is not intended to be a measure of accountability or a factor in decisions about how much money a school district wins as a bonus or loses as a sanction. The use of statewide tests to make "high stakes" decisions about individual students, teachers or schools is, in my judgment, a misuse of standardized testing, and has had predictably negative results in my state of Ohio.

In preparation for the Ohio test, teachers and students spend the weeks prior cramming in test-taking strategies and specific subject matter they believe are most likely to be covered on the test. Pressure to perform on the test has been so great on students and teachers that there have been scattered reports in Ohio of organized cheating and test tampering. In several Ohio school districts, breakfast is served to every student during the week of the test, and ONLY during the week of the test.

I think that this tells us something very important - *that we already know what works in schools, yet we aren't willing to fund it.* We know that school breakfast helps kids be more attentive, or else we wouldn't provide them with breakfast during testing week. Yet we don't want to fund that program year-round. What does that say about the priority we place on learning during the rest of the school year versus the week of the test?

We also know that smaller class sizes and individual attention help students achieve, otherwise we wouldn't tout that quality as one of the things that makes private schools appealing. Yet we aren't willing to fund initiatives to reduce class size. In fact, this bill actually retreats from that goal.

Statewide proficiency tests tell us one more thing we already know - that kids in schools with plenty of resources score better than students in schools with inadequate resources. Yet, rather than target abundant resources to low-performing schools, this legislation punishes these schools with monetary sanctions and vouchers.

Test scores reflect much more than the quality of education being provided by the school and the teacher. Test scores reflect a whole host of factors, including socio-economic status, parental involvement, the educational background of parents and the level of economic investment in the student. Yet this bill assumes that test scores are always valid and reliable indicators of educational quality. I think that every legislator who believes that testing improves students' abilities and who votes to impose high stakes testing on their students should submit to taking the tests themselves and publishing the results in the local newspaper.

In summary, I strongly support accountability, but I oppose using a test instrument which may or may not be valid or reliable enough for use in making important life decisions about a child, a teacher or a school. Thank you again for this opportunity to address the committee.

***APPENDIX J - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ROBERT
UNDERWOOD, GUAM DELEGATE, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Testimony of Robert Underwood**"No Child Left Behind"
Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001**

Chairman Boehner, Mr. Miller, and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to address the Committee today on President Bush's proposal to improve education in our country.

I want to commend the Committee's commitment to taking on education reform and the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The introduction of H.R. 1, which is largely patterned after the President's proposal, is a broad-reaching initiative to revamp the public school system in our country. However, I would like to raise my concern that there should be attention in the legislation regarding the treatment of schools in the U.S. territories. If the goal is indeed to "leave no child behind" in education, then Congress must work to ensure that no child in America should be left behind, whether they reside in the states or the territories.

As the Delegate from the territory of Guam to the U.S. House of Representatives, and a life-long educator who taught and served in the administration of public high schools and later served as the academic vice president of the University of Guam, I have always advocated for improvements in the manner that federal policy is developed by the federal government in its treatment of the territories, which include Guam, American Samoa, the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands.

Unique Treatment of U.S. Territories in Federal Programs

I would like to emphasize the special needs of U.S. public schools in the territories, which apart from their remoteness from the U.S. mainland, share in the same struggle to meet the basic needs of operating a public school system. But due to geography, the territories face unique challenges in the cost of maintenance, financing school construction projects, acquisition of schools supplies and equipment, and recruiting and training of teaching professionals. We also face the added burden of dealing with typhoons and an unforgiving tropical environment which accelerates the deterioration of our school facilities.

The Guam Department of Education has crafted a reasonable 10-year plan to address the school system's infrastructure. In Guam, 6 new schools are needed today to address the overcrowding and building deterioration problems. We look to federal programs and unique bonding initiatives to jump start Guam's effort to bring schools into the 21st Century.

The territories are generally included in most national education programs, but

varied federal government relationships. It is for this reason that territorial school systems, which all have a unique relationship with the federal government, deserve special consideration in any educational plan which leaves Congress.

Assessment in the Territories

As a lifelong educator, as is my wife, my mother, and my daughter, I must state some concerns I have about the emerging proposals of accountability as stated in the President's plan and as stated in H.R.1. My concerns regarding the over-reliance on standardized testing as the only measure of educational success may only lead to failure. In a place like Guam, standardized testing as a single measure can be particularly misleading, which is why additional measures should be employed.

Addressing the Unique Circumstances of Territories

H.R. 1 makes mention of special circumstances to address the needs of Migratory Children, American Indian and Alaska Native Children, Children of Military Families, Children with Limited English Proficiency, and Children who live in Rural Areas. However, there is no special section or policy statement that addresses the treatment of school children in the territories. Instead H.R. 1 attempts to address the needs of the smaller territories by defining them as "Outlying Areas". It also creates a definition for the "FAS" or Freely Associated States, which include the Republic of the Marshall Islands, the Federated States of Micronesia, and the Republic of Palau, which are all former U.S. trust territories. While I believe this is good policy given the fact that people who reside in the territories are U.S. citizens and nationals, I also support the extension of educational resources to the FAS, which continues to maintain a special relationship with the United States.

A special category or policy statement would help to bring consistency of the treatment of territories throughout H.R. 1. As it stands now the definition of outlying areas is inconsistent in the application of the bill. There should be no reason that a definitive national policy for the territories be included in this plan or any plan that leaves Congress. The federal government has had a special obligation to schools in the territories, which each have distinct and unique relationships with the federal government. In some instances, this has led to Guam and the other territories to be treated unevenly and differently under federal education programs depending on the statute authorizing such programs. But more importantly, the federal government has recognized that special attention must be given to their challenging circumstances. H.R. 1 should be expanded by incorporating a separate category to focus specifically on the territories.

In closing, I want to state that I am extremely pleased with the work of the Committee and the President in prioritizing the issues that confront our national public education system. I hope that we can toward resolving these longstanding issues facing territorial governments. I must reiterate the need for flexibility in resolving our

problems given the distinctly unique circumstances, our varying political relationships, and the applicability and non-applicability of certain federal laws.

We need to work in concert to level the playing field for all American children in the states and the territories. I look forward to working with you to ensure that no American child is left behind in our national education programs no matter where they live.

Once again, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Miller and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

***APPENDIX K - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN RICK
LARSEN, 2ND DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

March 28, 2001
Full Committee on Education and the Workforce
Testimony: Congressman Rick Larsen
Importance of Cascade Job Corps Program

Thank you Chairman Boehner, ranking member Miller, members of the Education and Workforce Committee and esteemed members of the panel for allowing me to testify in support of National Job Corps and the Cascades Job Corps program in my District. I would like to request this statement be included in the record.

I would like to acknowledge Lenera Leonard, President of National Job Corps; Kim Shillinger the Director of the Cascades program; and Don Wick, Executive Director of the Economic Development Association of Skagit County for helping ensure the continued success of Job Corps in Sedro-Woolley, WA.

In light of today's theme of "leaving no child behind," I believe National Job Corps is an essential program that transforms at-risk, low-income individuals into skilled and self-sufficient workers. The success of this program can be judged by what it has done for my district.

Like many small communities, Sedro-Woolley has faced a number of large economic set backs over the past 20 years. These include the decline of the local logging industry and the closure of a major Hospital employing and a large industrial manufacturing plant.

The Cascades Job Corps Program first opened its doors in Sedro-Woolley in 1982. Since then, the Cascades program has contributed over \$8.5 million to the local economy of Skagit County.

The center provides crucial training for students in eleven vocations, such as construction trades, health occupations, and culinary arts.

Last year alone, over 400 students benefited from the program. For example, graduates Robert Powers – now a Cement Finisher -- and Kevin Huff – a Cement Masoner – both make over 15 dollars an hour. These men are just two of the many, many successes of Cascades Job Corps.

Cascades Job Corps also has a Senior Volunteer program to provide seniors with work options. Both national and regional companies rely on graduates from the Cascades program to sustain economic growth.

Additionally, the program is an invaluable source of community service for the Sedro-Woolley community. Cascades enrollees have constructed a YMCA camp facility, paved and built sidewalks for the Concrete School District and planted trees for the Skagit Fisheries Enhancement Agency. The work provided by Job Corps students for these projects alone, is valued at close to \$30,000.

Like many local and county leaders in Skagit County, I strongly support the Cascades program as well as the National Job Corps program. I am proud to have this Job Corps program in my District and of the students whose many success stories have strengthened families and businesses within the local economy.

Finally, I want to take this opportunity to voice my support for both National Job Corps and the Cascades program. I want to ensure the Cascades program remains in Sedro-Woolley so that it can continue to offer my constituents and others in the Northwest a valuable source of hands-on job training.

Once again, thank you for allowing me to testify today.

APPENDIX L - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN MIKE HONDA, 15TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Written Testimony of Representative Michael Honda
Before the House Committee on Education & the Workforce
Wednesday, March 28, 2001

Member Day Hearing on
President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" Proposal

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Miller, distinguished Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to present testimony today. As a former high school teacher and principal I agree with President Bush that we must hold our students and teachers to higher national standards. However, in order to achieve these high national standards, accountability and standards must be a two way street. In order for schools to perform at a higher level, we need to give them better tools to encourage and advance their performance.

If we are going to judge teachers and students by test scores, then Congress must fund programs that encourage improvement and growth within education. We must demonstrate our respect and confidence in students by providing safe and permanent classrooms that are not crumbling. Nearly 80% of Americans support providing federal funding for school repair and modernization. Yet the President's budget eliminates the \$1.2 billion Congress approved last year for school renovation and cuts another \$433 million in unspecified programs. It would take nearly \$112 billion to bring public elementary and secondary schools into adequate condition. This funding would help renovate up to 14,000 needy public schools and serve around 14 million students.

If we want students to learn more at a faster rate, then we need to reduce class sizes, to allow teachers to teach. We also need to empower our teachers with the best training in order for them to provide the best instruction. In order to attract and train teachers for both high-need schools and under served teaching topics such as math and science, Congress should increase compensation for qualified teachers.

According to the National Center for Education Statistics, elementary and secondary school enrollment will grow from 52.2 million in 1997 to 54.4 million in 2006, requiring new schools and new teachers.

Research has also shown that students in smaller classes in grades K-3 learn fundamental skills better, and they continue to perform well even after returning to larger classes after third grade. I have seen that there is a direct relationship between smaller classes, more teachers and students who succeed.

If we truly expect the nation's schools to meet the challenges of greater accountability and higher achievement, then we need to ensure that our school leaders and faculty are the best-trained, most highly skilled professional educators in the world. As the instructional leader of a school, and not merely the manager, the principal is in a unique position to implement and foster standards-based reform. However, due to the position's long hours and high level of stress, many teachers who are qualified to be principals choose not to become principals. Combined with the fact that many principals are reaching retirement age, this has resulted in a growing principal shortage. Approximately 40 percent of the nation's principals are expected to retire within the next 5-10 years. Without significant leadership training, we may be neglecting the most critical link to improving schools on a national scale. The bottom line is that successful schools have professional, well-trained principals.

In order for schools to perform at the 21st century levels, we must provide the 21st century technology. Our teachers and administrators must be better trained and assisted if we are to maximize the use of computers and the Internet in schools. Over two-thirds of economic growth stems from technological innovation. Our students must be empowered with high tech skills so they can navigate, adapt and

succeed in the Internet economy. I have introduced legislation, H.R. 1149, which expands the Corporation for National Service by creating a Nation Education Technology (NET) Corps that works with our school teachers and administrators to integrate technology into classroom curriculum. We need to encourage high tech businesses to lend their employees to the NET Corps program to ensure that our schools have the most up-to-date technology skills.

We were all deeply troubled by the recent school violence in many cities across the country. Effective school counseling programs are vital to violence prevention. The Elementary School Counseling Demonstration Act (ESCDA) will help our nation move toward the goal of reducing student-to-school counselor ratio. Students need ways to express their emotions and vent their frustrations in a constructive manner. Now more than ever with greater stress being placed on accountability, schools need to encourage self-expression through music and art classes, as well as physical education programs. The federal government needs to start funding our education priorities at the correct levels in order to give schools an opportunity to succeed.

In the classroom, many of my students exceeded their parent's expectations and their own expectations once they learned that they had the confidence and respect of their teacher and their peers. If families need school breakfast/lunch assistance, access to basic health care, or school counseling then schools need to provide such programs and services. The classroom should be a place of equality no matter one's financial status. Every student should have the opportunity to better their lives through education.

As a Member of the Budget Committee I have advocated for:

- Tax credits to pay for interest on nearly \$25 billion in bonds to be used by local communities for public school modernization revitalization;
- Loans and grants to low income school districts to fund urgent school repair and modernization;
- Tax credits and deductions for the cost of tuition and fees for parents sending their kids to college;
- Increasing Pell Grant and funding for Direct Student Loan Program;
- Higher compensation and new technology training for teachers;
- Recruiting 100,000 new teachers to reduce the average size of classes in grades K-3;
- Reducing the student teacher ratio to 18-1;
- Fully funding Head Start and other school nutrition programs;
- Provide more money for the Healthy Kids Insurance;
- Prevent school violence by developing "anti-bulling" projects;
- Fully fund IDEA;
- Increase the availability of counseling services to students at all levels of elementary, middle and secondary school.

As a country, we are failing to meet the basic needs in education. Healthy, satisfied students and teachers should not only judge by a test score, but also their development. By failing to meet the needs in the education system, we are failing to meet the needs of every single American. Accountability and high standards are of utmost importance, however these standards must be a two way street with other programs that stimulate the education system. Parents and school districts need to focus in and hold Congress to our promise of fully-funding all the aspects of education. It's time to give our education system a chance to work.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. I look forward to working with all of you on these important education issues this year.

###

APPENDIX M - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JACK KINGSTON, 1ST DISTRICT OF GEORGIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

**Testimony for the
Education and Workforce Committee
U.S. House of Representatives**

March, 2001

Mr. Chairman, and Members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to present my testimony on School Choice. Let me first state that I am a supporter of the President's "No Child Left Behind" proposal. I am also a firm believer that, as a parent, I must make the education of my children my first priority.

With respect to school choice -- there are several key areas to highlight . . .

Under the current title I program, it really doesn't matter how many years in a row a school has failed "Little Johnny" -- or that "Little Johnny" is unable to read or do math. His only hope is that his family has the means to place him in a private school or to move from where they are living and working to a new school district.

Under this legislation, "Little Johnny" has hope. If his school fails to make adequate progress, (after being provided with outside technical assistance) he and his classmates would have to be provided the option to transfer to another public school, including a public charter school. If he chooses not to take this option, he would likely still be in a better situation, given that his school would have to begin to take serious action toward improvement (through either replacing staff or instituting a new curriculum).

If Johnny's school fails to make adequate progress for three consecutive years (a school in which virtually no learning is taking place), he would be able to use federal dollars to pay for tuition at another public or a private school, or to receive supplemental educational services from a provider of choice.

This is a far cry from the opportunities currently facing "Little Johnny". But this bill goes even further. School safety is a growing concern between youth and parents. This bill would allow Johnny, if he was attending an unsafe school or if he was the victim of a violent crime, to be able to transfer to a safe alternative, or to private school if space is not available in a safe school.

The bill provides additional opportunities to "Little Johnny" as well -- esp. if his school or district was able to participate in the school choice demonstration project established under the Educational Opportunity Fund. This fund would set up a limited number of demonstration projects in order to research the effectiveness school choice programs and the improved academic performance of low-income students.

Mr. Chairman, that concludes my remarks. I thank you and the committee for the opportunity to present my testimony.

Jack Kingston
Member of Congress

APPENDIX N - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ELIJAH CUMMINGS, 7TH DISTRICT OF MARYLAND, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Testimony

Congressman Elijah Cummings
before the
Education and Workforce Committee

March 28, 2001

Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee.

I am very pleased to come before you today to address President George Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal. There are many issues that bear discussing, such as reducing class size; hiring more qualified teachers; supporting head-start and after-school programs; creating a safe and drug-free environment at our nation's schools; and funding for the construction of new schools and textbooks. However, this morning I will limit my remarks to the 'Enhancing Education Through Technology' section of President Bush's plan.

How can we assure that all children are successful and are adequately prepared for college and the workforce? This question has many answers but I believe the primary way to achieve this goal is through technology access. First, we must close the gap that still exists between middle income and poor school districts. Second, we must provide resources so that every child has access to a computer and the Internet. Finally, teachers must have technology training to implement computer and Internet use into their curriculum.

The cost to connect all of our schools to the Internet is staggering. Above and beyond the

cost of computers and necessary software, for example, it will cost \$78 million to equip schools in my district of Baltimore City with the electronic wiring and telephone lines required for Internet access. Local jurisdictions that serve large numbers of disadvantaged families, like Baltimore, simply do not have the funds to handle these costs on their own.

This is where the E-rate program can help. As you know, in 1997, the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) adopted a Universal Service Order implementing the Telecommunications Act of 1996. The Order ensures that all eligible schools and libraries have affordable access to modern telecommunications and information services. Congress has provided up to \$2.25 billion each year through the E-Rate program to assist eligible schools and libraries with Internet-related subsidies called "discounts." The discounts can be applied to the cost of all commercially available Internet services and related costs. The FCC has played a pivotal role in the success of the E-rate program by overseeing the distribution of billions of dollars. As such, I and more than ninety members of this body have signed a letter to be forwarded to the new FCC Chairman, Michael Powell, calling for the FCC to continue to address the digital divide and strengthen the E-rate program.

Sadly, there are many in Congress and the Administration who would like to curtail or even end the E-Rate program altogether. I am disheartened that they do not recognize how critical this program has become to the millions of American students who would not otherwise have access to the Internet.

In fact, the Bush Administration is proposing block grants for E-Rate and technology programs that will slash government programs providing computers and internet access to poor and undeserved areas. Basically, the Administration's plan of block grant funding will effectively eliminate the E-rate and not allow E-rate programs to move through the FCC.

Technology is not a luxury in today's society. Children in the more affluent school districts in our country are using the Internet. It is essential that we preserve and expand the federal E-Rate program and other measures that will close the digital divide. The E-rate program was implemented to make sure every student benefits from one of the most important resource tools available. It's important that we join forces to promote programs proven to work.

E-rate is one of these programs that have demonstrated its positive impact on student achievement. The E-Rate program is working to bring technology into many schools with children who have limited access to technology. The program deserves our continued support. Yes, we must improve universal service and access to technology by making the E-Rate more accessible and implementing an easier application process. However, I believe that it is critically important that the program be implemented as a separate and distinct program at the federal level in order that we ensure that those dollars are actually used for the purpose for which the E-rate was established.

We must guarantee that a plan is available for every child in America to cross the digital divide by ensuring that all children, regardless of their race, ethnicity, or socio-economic status,

have access to a computer and technology education.

I am committed to the provision of a quality education for the children in my district and the nation as a whole. As we move forward into the Information Age, it is in our best interest to provide children and the public with access to the tools they will need. We must ensure that additional funds are allotted for renovation of our school buildings and technology installation, which includes electronic wiring, more telephone lines and computers. By enhancing education through technology, we can make sure that **no child is truly left behind**.

Thank you.

APPENDIX O - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN LARSON, 1ST DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

**The Honorable John B. Larson
Chairman, Digital Divide Caucus**

**“No Child Left Behind”
Members Day Hearing**

**Testimony before the
Education and the Workforce Committee
United States House of Representatives
March 28, 2001**

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Miller, and Members of the Committee.

First, I would like to thank you for inviting me to testify at this hearing. I come here as Chairman of the Digital Divide Caucus, in which capacity I intend to speak on the portion of the bill that deals directly with overcoming the technological obstacles faced by the nation's public schools.

As you all know, a report released last year by the Department of Commerce entitled "Falling Through the Net: Toward Digital Inclusion," states that, "the rapid uptake of new technologies is occurring among most groups of Americans, regardless of income, education, race or ethnicity, location, age, or gender, suggesting that digital inclusion is a realizable goal."

It further states that:

- The share of households with Internet access soared by 58%, rising from 26.2% in December 1998 to 41.5% in August 2000;
- The gap between households in rural areas and households nationwide that access the Internet has narrowed from 4.0 percentage points in 1998 to 2.6 percentage points in 2000.
- Americans at every income level are connecting at far higher rates from their homes, particularly at the middle income levels

The report, however, goes on to state that “*nonetheless, a digital divide remains or has expanded slightly in some cases, even while Internet access and computer ownership are rising rapidly for almost all groups.*” It further finds that the gap actually *grew* for black and Hispanic households and for people with disabilities and the elderly.

Additionally, a recently released report by the Gartner Group entitled “The Internet in American Society: Defining the Digital Divide”, indicates that, “there has always existed an unfair distribution of access to the tools of social mobility, but for the first time in history a technology exists that, to a large extent, can level the playing field. When someone logs onto the Internet, the wealth of information at that person’s fingertips does not care if he or she is rich or poor, in the majority or a minority. It simply sits there and waits to be used by whoever can get to it. But there is a problem. To date there has been an unfair access to the Internet that mirrors the socioeconomic divisions in society. This unfair access is called the Digital Divide and it has implications that reach to the very social and economic core of our nation.” Furthermore, the report indicates that “to date, government digital divide policy has been tactical rather than strategic, focusing on the gap between those with Internet access and those without it.”

As a direct result of this evidence, I decided to get together with a number of my colleagues to form a Caucus that dedicates itself to the promulgation of initiatives that dare to challenge the status quo that stagnates the educational achievements of our students and our schools. The Digital Divide Caucus was created in response to this

mounting evidence demonstrating the existence of this pernicious divide in American society between the information rich and the information poor.

It is evident to the Members of the Caucus, as I hope it is evident to the Members of this Committee, that the Digital Divide presents the nation with a unique set of challenges that we must overcome in a bi-partisan fashion, in partnership with the private, not-for-profit, and academic sectors. It is not just a civil rights challenge, but also a challenge of maintaining American dynamism in the economy and our national security in the face of the global challenges of the 21st century.

But I am concerned, Mr. Chairman. A recent Washington Post profile on Michael Powell, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, included a few of the Chairman's thoughts on the Digital Divide. In the article, Mr. Powell is quoted as saying that the problem really is not one of a divide separating those with access to information and telecommunications technologies from those without, but is really more of a "Mercedes divide." Moreover, the Wall Street Journal reported on February 15, 2001, that the Administration was considering cutting the Technology Opportunities Program by 65%.

While it is not my intention to take out of context and misinterpret Mr. Powell's comments on the Digital Divide, I do believe that his comments taken together with reports of the Administration's potential reduction of Digital Divide programs within the Department of Commerce signal a change in policy from the previous Administration. Since it is worthwhile to have an open dialogue before proceeding with any change, I am

quite pleased with the opportunity to address this Committee. As Chairman of the Digital Divide Caucus, I am keenly aware of the misconception that when somebody talks about bridging the Digital Divide, to some, these are just thinly-veiled excuses to increase Federal education spending. This perception is characterized by the mistaken view that when those of us who believe there is a real and serious problem propose to cut the gap between the information haves and not have-nots, that we do so tactically, as an end in itself.

Having access to information and telecommunications technologies, however, is not a luxury, as is owning a Mercedes Benz. Believing this requires you to examine carefully what the benefit is of enhancing the nation's investment in our schools. The long-term value provided by this access is worth many times more its cost in added benefits to our education system, the health of our economy, and the national security of the Nation, and it cannot and should not be considered just another commodity, analogous to an expensive car that only a few can afford.

Collin Powell once said that "the digital divide...threatens to deny millions of our youth the skills and technical savvy they need to take their places in the high-tech economy of the future." This youth is disproportionately minority, rural, and poor. We can be content with filling the demand for innovation from abroad in the short-term. We must strive to provide incentives, to encourage and, where necessary, create the opportunities for our youth that are the only way we can hope to remain educationally, economically, and internationally competitive in the future. Access to information and the high-tech skills that will be in demand in the coming decades will fuel the continued growth of this

country. The competitive marketplace that we need in this country to keep innovation at the cutting edge will be maintained only if we strategically optimize our resources and take advantage of our rich diversity.

We all accept the implicit understanding that our education system is linked to our economy is linked to our national security is linked to our education system, and so on. Recently, I am concerned that this integral relationship is breaking down under the mantra of “reducing the size of government”. Though I am not wedded to any one solution, any one approach, any one vision, I do believe that the Federal Government’s role is key to our national education endeavor. It worries me that viewing information and telecommunication technologies as commodities—to be bought, taken out of their box and plugged into the wall—fails to realize their potential for spurring innovation and enhancing individual talent. Our strategy must remain focused on maximizing their ultimate benefit and in the bigger picture, so that pitting policymakers at opposite ends of the ideological spectrum, to the detriment of the Nation.

I bring these thoughts to your attention with the hope that we do not, in haste, virtually do away with good programs and solid initiatives, and with the desire to engage you in meaningful discussion of our Nation’s future.

Having said this, however, I believe this bill does not adequately address schools’ needs in its present form. While I appreciate the fact that it contains programs to train teachers to use education technology and I do support the goal of reducing duplication and paperwork for our schools, I have specific concerns with some provisions of the bill.

Performance-based grants sounds like a fine idea, but in practice I am not sure how effective they are. As presently constituted I do not believe the bill would do enough to ensure that a pipeline will be put in place which guarantees continued supplies of the fuel needed to propel our success. Granted, our current system is not perfect. There's too much bureaucracy, too much tactical thinking, and not enough research that feeds back into the system. But neither, I believe, is this bill an improvement. We need to do everything possible to ensure that the money spent actually increases the opportunities for our children so that we leave no child behind. I do not believe that this bill presently does that. But it is still a good first—I repeat, *first*—step.

I hope we can all work together to improve this bill, before mark-up and later on the floor. I look forward to working with all of you in the coming weeks. Thank you.

**APPENDIX P - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN
ANNE NORTHUP, 3RD DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Testimony of Representative Anne M. Northup (KY-3)
H.R. 1 -- "Leave No Child Behind"
House Education and Workforce Committee
Wednesday, March 28, 2001

Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to testify before your Committee in support of President Bush's education proposal, "Leave No Child Behind." As founder and co-chair of the House Reading Caucus, I am particularly impressed that the President's plan has an emphasis on early reading skills and I would like to primarily address his "Reading First" Initiative in my remarks today.

As the mother of six children, I know how unique the education needs are of each and every child. I understand how important it is to every parent that their children get off to a good start in school and this is especially true regarding reading. Unfortunately, many of our nation's children are truly struggling.

In 1998, the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) found that 42% of fourth graders read below basic levels. Let me say that again: forty-two percent of fourth graders read below basic levels. This number is staggering. It is intolerable.

What's worse is that science tells us that if a child is not reading by fourth grade, he is not likely to catch up, and he is more likely to give up. A child who cannot read will not be able to solve math problems or unravel the mysteries of science. Reading is the fundamental building block of education. That is why it is critical that our students receive the best reading instruction.

However, despite all the federal dollars we have spent on Title I, Headstart and specific literacy programs for early grade children, the reading crisis has grown more severe. We've spent more and more money, but today the crisis is worse. How is this possible?

It's actually quite simple. There is a serious disconnect between reading research and classroom practice. As a member of the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations Subcommittee, which funds the Department of Education and the National Institutes of Health, I've seen this disconnect first hand.

In 1997, Dr. Reid Lyon of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) shared the findings of the Institute's research on how children learn to read, when to intervene to help a struggling child, and what techniques work. That same year, the Department of Education proposed additional funding for literacy programs that were unrelated to what the research showed was effective. I did a double take.

Why would we fund research at NICHD that gave us scientific answers of what works best and then discard or ignore the data when it came time to deliver services? When I asked the Department of Education about Dr. Lyon's research, officials seemed puzzled - even dismissive.

For decades, the Department of Education spent money trying to fix the problem before they had the scientific research of how to intervene effectively. Even when research from NICHD began to emerge that gave us clear insight, the Department of Education and the education establishment were unaware or not interested in adopting these approaches.

That is why Congress funded the National Reading Panel. This panel was a collaborative effort between the professionals at NICHD and the Department of Education. The Panel was charged with conducting a comprehensive review of the evidence-based research on reading and assessing the effectiveness of different approaches.

The National Reading Panel found that there is a clear and distinct pattern for all children as they learn to read. The first step is the recognition of sounds and the ability to identify the 44 different sounds of our alphabet. Scientists call this phoneme awareness.

A child's next step involves linking these sounds to letters and then putting these sounds together to form a word. For instance the "mmmm" sound is linked to the letter 'M'. By sounding out each letter, they can read the word. Educators call this step phonics. The Panel

found that instruction in phoneme awareness and phonics is highly effective for all children across a range of age and grade levels. For children at-risk, instruction in these essential skills needs to be explicit, intensive, and systemic in order to gain fluency.

The Panel also found that there are clear benefits to children reading aloud - especially with a teacher, parent or peer that can help them work through a tough sentence. While reading silently may be good practice, research shows that it cannot replace oral reading. As children learn to decode words quickly and accurately, reading aloud can also better their comprehension.

The National Reading Panel did a wonderful job and was very explicit about which current research is clear and conclusive. The Panel also proposed areas where we need further investigation like how to best intervene with older students, adults who can't read, and English as a Second Language (ESL) students. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, I'm working hard to see that we provide money to continue research so that we can develop better solutions for all those who struggle to read.

I am pleased and proud that President Bush's 'Reading First' Initiative has been shaped by the findings of the National Reading Panel. The President understands that a six-year-old is only six one time and that we should identify high risk students early and use explicit, intensive and systemic phonics instruction to help keep them on track.

He will insist that schools be successful. He will ensure that teachers and schools have access to the best instruction methods. He believes it is important that schools have a compelling interest and commitment in adopting successful methods not only for their success, but also for their survival. He understands that we can no longer throw enormous amounts of money at reading programs that just don't work.

There couldn't be a better time to focus on literacy. We know the dismal statistics of illiteracy do not have to exist. I am optimistic that with the National Reading Panel's findings as our guide, we can achieve much better results.

It's particularly important to improve our nation's reading programs because of the widening achievement gap between rich and poor and white and minority students. Nearly 70 percent of inner city and rural fourth-graders cannot read at a basic level; low income students lag behind their counterparts by an average of 20 percentile points on national assessment tests.

All students can learn to read. We need to make sure that students from our most disadvantaged communities are given the same opportunities, because their parents have the fewest options available to help their children succeed.

Public education is the fundamental equalizer in our society. Public education enables those from humble beginnings to enter the middle class and enjoy prosperity. Public education makes the American dream possible.

Like President Bush, I care deeply about improving public education so that every child learns to read. I heartedly endorse the President's "Leave No Child Behind" proposal, H.R. 1, and commend this Committee for their commitment to our children's education.

***APPENDIX Q - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN
BALDACCI, 2ND DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

JOHN ELIAS BALDACCİ
SECOND DISTRICT, MAINE
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
AND INFRASTRUCTURE

AT LARGE WHIP

1740 LONGWORTH BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 725-6206
(202) 225-6485 TDD
www.house.gov/baldaccı
baldfacci@me02.house.gov

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-1902

Testimony of Congressman John E. Baldacci
Before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001

DISTRICT OFFICES:

P.O. Box 858
202 HARLOW STREET
BANGOR, ME 04402
(207) 942-4605

157 MAIN STREET
LEWISTON, ME 04290
(207) 764-1036

445 MAIN STREET
PRESQUE ISLE, ME 04769
(207) 764-1036

500 MAIN STREET
MADAWASKA, ME 04756
(207) 728-6169

Chairman Boehner, Ranking Member Miller, Committee members: Thank you for the opportunity to testify today regarding President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal. This legislation is of tremendous importance to me and to Maine's education community. My staff and I have discussed the proposal with Gov. Angus King, Education Commissioner Duke Albanese and countless teachers, administrators and parents. Making sure that we enact the right legislation is a top priority for all of us.

Maine is leading the nation in transforming into a standards-based, highly accountable learning system. The Maine Learning Results, our state's carefully developed, comprehensive education standards, were adopted by the Maine State Legislature in 1997. Since that time, our schools, teachers and Department of Education have worked tirelessly to implement those standards, and to devise effective assessment practices to ensure that every student is meeting the established goals.

There is every reason to believe that Maine students are doing just that. Maine was rated Number One in the nation - the highest performing K-12 education system - by the National Education Goals Panel in 1999. Maine is doing this while living within

its means. The state's per pupil spending is near the national average, while its students have the highest composite scores on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP). This points out the success of the state's approach to education.

I hope and expect that, in the final education bill that is enacted into law this year, Maine's efforts will be respected. One of my greatest concerns about President Bush's proposal is the assessment piece. States must retain the flexibility to design assessment systems that make sense and that are based on their state standards.

Maine uses a standardized test, the Maine Educational Assessment, with every student in grades 4, 8 and 11. The test includes a multiple choice component, but also includes open-ended questions. It is an excellent test, but one that is costly to prepare and score, and which takes a significant amount of time to administer.

Maine recognizes that students demonstrate knowledge and learning in different ways. Some do well on pencil and paper tests. Others can better show their skills in demonstrative ways, like through portfolios or service learning. Maine believes that there must be multiple measures, locally developed, but reviewed to be sure that they are reliable and valid.

I agree, and I would object to accountability provisions that fail to give states the flexibility to design assessments that meet the needs of the state and its students.

Simply administering a multiple choice exam every year will not provide a good measure of the progress of individual students or of school systems.

I was encouraged by President Bush's comment in Portland, Maine, last week that, "The federal government should in no way tell the folks in Maine how to devise an accountability system and we don't intend to do so. We trust the local people." I hope this will indeed be reflected in the final legislation that we consider.

I also want to share my concern about the punitive approach taken in the President's proposal. The message is that schools must do well on these annual tests, or else resources will be taken away. I fail to understand how simply withdrawing resources will improve a local school that is struggling. The premise seems to be that there are schools that simply don't care enough to work hard to help kids succeed. I am not aware of any such school in my state.

I favor a more supportive approach. Maine is exploring the development of intervention teams that can work with struggling schools. Experienced educators and administrators would go to under-performing schools to provide intensive technical assistance and help turn things around. This positive approach strikes me as a far more effective way to reach the outcome we all are seeking: excellent schools for every child.

Finally, I want to make brief mention of a specific concern that has been raised with me by several organizations in Maine that are receiving multi-year grants. These organizations are concerned about what will happen to them if funding is channeled into state block grants. For example, Project Mainstay provides English as a Second Language and Bilingual Education training opportunities for administrators, teachers and support personnel throughout northern Maine. The project is in Year 2 of a 5-year Title VII Personnel and Teacher Training grant, and is achieving great success. At this point, it remains unclear how existing grants would be treated if Title VII is transitioned into a block grant. I would urge the Committee to include a grandfather provision to ensure that commitments that have already been made to multi-year grant recipients are kept.

Again, I want to thank the Committee for providing this opportunity for input. Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is crucially important to our nation's collective future, and to the futures of individual children across the country. I look forward to working together with you.

***APPENDIX R - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN
ROSA DeLAURO, 3RD DISTRICT OF CONNECTICUT, U.S.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

**REMARKS OF THE HON. ROSA L. DELAURO
MEMBER HEARING DAY: COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 28, 2001**

Thank you, Chairman Boehner. And let me express my gratitude to you and Ranking Member Miller for providing Members with the opportunity to come before the Committee today to share their thoughts and views on the President's education proposals. I appreciate the opportunity to be with you.

It is gratifying that education is now a key part of our national political debate. A thoughtful discussion of education reform is as vital to America's future as discussions of national defense or foreign affairs. It is past time that education received as much attention.

I come to you as an original cosponsor of Mr. Miller and Mr. Kildee's "Excellence and Accountability in Education Act," a comprehensive and thoughtful approach to education reform that I feel can form the basis for bipartisan agreement. There is a great deal in common between this proposal and that offered by our Republican colleagues.

We all want to see greater accountability, higher standards, teacher empowerment, all with a focus on real results. However, while we insist on accountability and results, we also must make a true federal investment in education. The President's budget proposal provides a \$2.4 billion increase for education, but he proposes to spend nearly \$2 billion of that on reading and Pell grants. This leaves only a \$400 million increase for all other education programs - including elementary, secondary, and higher education programs, vocational education and special education. This does not leave enough for the initiatives we rightfully care so much about, like teacher recruitment, training and professional development. When we talk about literacy as one of our top priorities, we can not forget about those individuals who will be teaching our children how to read.

When we support literacy, we also have to take into consideration laying the foundation for learning. Last month I introduced "The Right Start Act," a bill that deals with the concept of school readiness. School readiness is a goal that was promulgated in 1990 by then-President George Bush in collaboration with the head of the National Governor's Association, William Jefferson Clinton. The goal was that every child should arrive in school "ready to learn" by the year 2000.

It is now the year 2001 and recent accounts of the President's budget suggest a lack of commitment to school readiness. This failure to invest in the education of our young will push children back into the last century instead of the moving them forward into the new one. Everyone on this Committee is aware that children begin learning at birth - not on the first day of school. The quality of care and the quality of caregivers that children have before they reach school age is the signature of school readiness.

While we applaud the President's emphasis on literacy, one of the nation's experts on child development, the father of Head Start, Dr. Edward Zigler from Yale University has written that while literacy is important, so to are the other skills.

"The job with these children is to lay a foundation for literacy - teaching, for example, basic concepts like what a rhyme is, or helping to increase children's vocabularies by talking and reading to them. They can't be taught to read before they have the basic underlying skills and concepts that children are ready to absorb in the preschool years."
(New York Times - Op-Ed)

When a child falls from a tree and his mother takes him to the emergency room - we don't fix the broken arm and ignore his head and neck injuries. We treat the whole child. Similarly, we do not want the child to learn how to read without learning basic concepts, like how to get along with others, especially in the violent world in which they will live.

I am very disturbed by a recent press account citing early budget documents showing that President Bush plans to eliminate all \$20 million that Congress provided for an early learning fund to improve the quality of child care and education for children younger than 5. Why would we do this when we know so much about the importance of these years? As Professor Zigler pointed out, literacy must have a foundation.

We must work together on meaningful education reform, including early education, and we must work from a real budget that demonstrates our values and our priorities. If education is truly our priority, our budget should reflect this.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this vital effort. Thank you for allowing me to be with you today.

APPENDIX S - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN DAVID PRICE, 4TH DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

Testimony of David Price
"No Child Left Behind"
Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001

I want to thank you for the opportunity to testify before the Committee on Education and the Workforce regarding President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" initiative. I am pleased that the President has made education a top priority and that First Lady Laura Bush wants to serve as an ambassador for the teaching profession. I am here today to join in these efforts and to offer a solution for what I consider to be the education issue of the coming decade: the teacher shortage.

While there is widespread agreement about the need to improve and reform our education system, no reform initiative will be successful unless we have well-trained, quality teachers in our classrooms. Teacher recruitment is especially urgent because of the pending teacher shortage. Mr. Chairman, up to 1 million of the country's 3 million teachers will retire in the next 5 years. That means my home state of North Carolina must hire 80,000 new teachers. The U.S. Department of Education estimates that we will need 2.2 million more teachers nationwide by 2010.

In order to meet this challenge, we need to find ways to encourage our best and brightest students to become public school teachers. I want to bring to the Committee's attention legislation I have introduced to address our nation's critical teaching shortage: The Teaching Fellows Act of 2001, H.R. 839.

As Secretary Paige said during his testimony before this Committee, "we need to learn from the States and school districts across the country and... we need to bring to Federal education programs many of the strategies that have worked so well at the State and local levels...". My bill, the Teaching Fellows Act, would do just that. It builds on two ideas that have been extremely successful in my home state of North Carolina and offers support to states that want to create or expand similar programs. Before I go into the specifics of the legislation, I want to stress that this legislation is state-based, non-bureaucratic and open to innovation at the state level. I know this is the type of legislation that members of both parties can support.

First, the bill builds on the North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program, enacted by the General Assembly in 1986, which provides students who agree to become teachers four-year scholarships and requires them to participate in activities to hone their teaching skills. The Teaching Fellows Act would provide \$200 million for states to design scholarship programs for high school seniors or college sophomores interested in becoming teachers. The programs would offer annual scholarships of at least \$6500 per student and would support extra-curricular enrichment activities. States would have the flexibility to design a Teaching Fellows program that fits the needs of their school districts and communities. In return for this investment, Fellows would teach

within the state for four years at public schools or for three years at low-performing schools. By April 2001, the North Carolina Teaching Fellows Program will have awarded 6000 scholarships to outstanding North Carolina high school seniors. A large majority of scholarship recipients fulfill their teaching obligation, and seventy-three percent of Fellows graduates remain beyond the period of the obligation.

Second, the bill would utilize a great untapped resource for finding teachers, the community colleges. I have been working with the president of our Community College system in North Carolina, former Representative Martin Lancaster, to develop an approach that encourages and provides support for greater collaboration between community colleges and four-year schools. The Teaching Fellows Act is based on another North Carolina success story, the N.C. Model Teaching Consortium, which provides financial support to classroom teaching assistants, other school personnel, and state government employees, to encourage them to obtain four-year education degrees. My legislation would provide \$100 million in competitive grants to states which create partnership programs between community colleges and four-year universities to help those training as teacher assistants or who have already received a two-year degree to continue at a four-year school. Scholarships would be at least \$6,500 per year or \$26,000 over six years (for those unable to take a full course load). There are numerous people working as teacher assistants who are great candidates to get a four-year education degree and teach. I am looking everywhere to find solutions to the teacher shortage crunch, and our community colleges are a great place to start.

As we all know, this is not just a quantity issue. We need quality teachers in our classrooms as well--teachers that inspire, teachers that are excited about their subject area, and teachers that challenge our nation's youth. The Teaching Fellows Act would not just throw money at the problem, but would instill in each student a sense of professionalism through activities that extend beyond the classroom and would provide mentoring to help new teachers succeed. With this approach we can not only recruit, but also retain a first-rate teaching force.

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I think my bill gets at the heart of both the quality and quantity concerns in addressing America's teaching shortage and takes an important step toward ensuring that each of our nations' classrooms has a well-qualified teacher at its helm. Thank you again for the opportunity to speak before the Committee today, and I look forward to working with members of both parties to address this important issue.

***APPENDIX T - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSWOMAN
DARLENE HOOLEY, 5TH DISTRICT OF OREGON, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

TESTIMONY
CONGRESSWOMAN DARLENE HOOLEY
HOUSE EDUCATION COMMITTEE
MARCH 28, 2001

Thank you for inviting me to testify before this distinguished committee on an issue that is near and dear to many of us. This issue affects each and every one of us because it affects each and every school in our districts.

The topic here today is "No Child Left Behind." I am here today because we cannot address this issue without talking about children with disabilities. And we cannot talk about children with disabilities without talking about the funding crisis many of our schools are in today.

I would first like to thank you for showing your support for investing in children with disabilities. This committee has shown their commitment early on by including in your "Views and Estimates on the Fiscal Year 2002 budget" your recommendation for fully funding IDEA.

Since coming to Congress, I have visited a number of schools across the state of Oregon: big, small, rural, urban. Despite their geographic and economic differences, every school is struggling to provide the necessary services to children with disabilities.

Congress began this discussion 26 years ago. When Congress passed the predecessor language to IDEA in 1975, it was agreed that states and local education agencies should be required to provide a free appropriate education to every eligible child with a disability. At that point, it was estimated that educating children with disabilities cost twice what it costs to educate other

children. Because of these additional costs, Congress authorized the federal government to pay up to 40 percent of each state's "excess cost" of educating children with disabilities.

As you are well aware, the federal government's investment in IDEA has more than doubled since 1996. Unfortunately, we have not even funded half of the 40 percent we promised to pay 26 years ago. The reasoning behind this major under-funding of IDEA boils down to one thing...MONEY. What our predecessors didn't plan for when they passed this legislation is the incredible costs associated with educating these special children. And when it came time for Congress to hold true to its promises, it just couldn't find the money.

I think we can all agree that educating children with disabilities is expensive. If the federal government would have paid their 40 percent to the states, the cost this year would have been \$17 billion. Instead, we paid a mere \$6.3 billion. Not once, in the 26 years since the IDEA legislation was passed, have we even come close to paying 40 percent. As I stated earlier, this year, the federal government will pay 14.9 percent of the costs, still not even a big dent. By not paying our share of these costs, the federal government is putting states and local communities between a big rock and a hard place.

When the state of Oregon and local school districts have to make up for the money we aren't providing, they are forced to cut funding somewhere else. As a result, every child in this country is helping to pay the federal government's debt.

While every school district across the country is struggling to come up with the funding required

to educate children with disabilities, rural communities are breaking the bank trying to provide children with disabilities a proper education. It can be estimated that the cost of educating one child with autism in a rural area in my district is over \$100,000 per year. Larger school districts with many students with disabilities are able to provide one teacher for a number of children, one bus to transport a number of children, equipment that can be used by many children. Don't get me wrong, these costs are extremely high. But consider the impact only one child with a disability can have on a small school district. They must hire a teacher for one child, they must provide transportation services to one child. These costs can create a dire situation for a small school.

It's time to take some real action on this issue and relieve states and local school districts of this undue responsibility. Last year, Congress passed a resolution "urging full funding of federal special education programs and recognizing that it should be the top funding priority at the K-12 level." This resolution was agreed to in the House by a vote of 413-2. However, once again we didn't keep our promise.

I have introduced legislation, along with Congresswoman Nancy Johnson, that would appropriate money to bring the federal government's share of IDEA funding up to the full 40 percent by 2006. Although we cannot be sure of the costs of special education five years down the road, we have estimated what it will be and authorized that the federal government pay that amount. I look forward to working with the leadership in Congress and President Bush on this issue and urging them to support this bill.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I put this issue before the committee last week. I

introduced an amendment that would have increased IDEA funding to 40 percent by 2007. Unfortunately, the amendment failed.

Full federal funding of IDEA will remain at the top of my priority list until it is dealt with. I appreciate the opportunity to address this issue. I know that this committee is not responsible for education appropriations but the discussions going on here today are not complete without considering the funding piece. I believe that together, we can hold the federal government to the promise it made and show our commitment to every child in this country.

Thank you.

***APPENDIX U - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JIM
MATHESON, 2ND DISTRICT OF UTAH, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Testimony of Jim Matheson**"No Child Left Behind"****Committee on Education and the Workforce****March 28, 2001**

Chairman Boehner, Ranking-member Miller, and members of the committee, thank you for this opportunity to speak about President Bush's education proposal. Education reform is a high priority for the people of Utah. Today, I would like to speak to you as their representative, to share with you some of their unique challenges and concerns.

I represent the state with the lowest per pupil expenditure in the nation. This year's census data shows that Utah has the highest number of students per teacher in the nation. These statistics are the result of tremendous family growth and immigration, which local schools are struggling to keep up with. The State Office of Education estimates that in the next 10 years Utah will add over 100,000 new students. This will require the construction of over 124 new schools, a 15% increase. The number of teachers available to teach students is diminishing because wages and working conditions in Utah cannot keep up with those in neighboring states. The results are chronically over-crowded classrooms, out-dated textbooks, and scarce supplies.

Because resources are so limited a state / federal partnership is that much more critical.

Often, federal dollars are the only source of funding for specific educational programs in Utah's schools. As I have spoken to Utah educators about the education proposals being considered by this committee, several themes have emerged. I hope my outline of these will aid you in ensuring that education reform will be effective in states such as Utah with unique educational challenges. Utah educators are excited about the priority President Bush is placing on education; they agree with increased funding, flexibility, and accountability. However, they have a few concerns about how these changes may affect their schools.

First, Utah's schools worry about unfunded mandates and increased bureaucracy. They are concerned about providing additional services with the limited education dollars that they have and with inadequate federal support. Although it is a short digression from the reauthorization being considered here, I must mention how crucial increased IDEA funding is to every educator with whom I speak. The cost of educating special needs students is draining resources from all students as the federal government fails to keep its promise to fund IDEA. School Districts and Local Education Agencies also require flexibility. Rather than imposing another layer of bureaucracy by requiring funds to be passed through the state, money should be directed to the most local level possible.

Second, Utahns are not afraid of being held accountable. The state has recently passed legislation requiring annual testing across all major subject areas. They are also going to be publishing school report cards and making them available to parents. Years of preparation have gone into aligning curriculum with these tests. However, local officials worry about federal mandates requiring this testing to be in place too quickly. They are concerned about federal mandates that will force them to change the quality tests they have developed. High turnover and influxes of refugee and immigrant students over the course of the year creates a problem for the process of tying federal dollars to school outcomes on tests. They urge the use of tests to measure student progress over time, examining where a student begins the school year and comparing it to where that student finished. In addition, Utah already allows for public school choice, except when over-crowding prevents particular schools from accepting additional students, but they cannot afford any plan that would take funding, especially Title I funding, away from those public schools that need it the most.

Third, there is concern that the consolidation of programs will eliminate needed resources for special programs and services they just began offering. Consolidation may allow flexibility, but there are a few key programs that must be protected. Let me mention just two of these.

- One of the only sources of funding for ongoing teacher training in Utah is the federal Eisenhower Professional Development Program. School Board members report that they have seen greater increases in student achievement through these training activities, than any other program. Nevertheless, over-crowded classrooms are the norm in Utah. Consolidating the Eisenhower Professional Development Program with Class Size Reduction may free money for a moderate decrease in class size, but it could also remove one of the only sources of professional development available. Institutions of higher education have also effectively used this funding to provide training for teachers, particularly in math and science. Adjusting this program and administering it to the state may remove the opportunity for universities to obtain these funds.
- Many schools in Utah have started after-school programs using the 21st Century Learning Centers grants. These funds pay for homework clubs which have dramatically increased student academic achievement. They allow for schools to open early and stay open late so that students have a safe place to be rather than on the streets. Often Utah schools can obtain these competitive grants through hard work, innovation, and teachers' commitment. However, formula allocations frequently short change Utah's students because they are based on population or the per pupil expenditure made at the state level (such as with Title I). In a state with the lowest per pupil expenditure and a rapidly increasing student population not always reflected in census data, changing the allocation and administration of these competitive funds may remove the only designated source of money for effective after school programs in Utah.

I would like to thank you again for this opportunity. I hope that as you prepare to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act you will keep in mind the needs of schools in unique states like Utah. States with high achievement, scarce resources, and a tremendous need for the limited federal dollars they receive.

***APPENDIX V - WRITTEN STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN
TODD AKIN, 2ND DISTRICT OF MISSOURI, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

**Congressman Todd Akin, remarks before the House Committee on
Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001**

Chairman, Ranking member, members of this committee, I want to thank you for the opportunity to share my views on H.R. 1.

The National Assessment of Educational Progress, a snapshot of American education, depicts 70% of American elementary school students below the proficiency level in reading, and high school students trailing students of other industrialized nations in math scores. It is clear that the Federal education policy has failed to produce results. Continuously throwing more Federal funds and more mandates at education is only a formula for failure.

I spent a great amount of my campaign talking to parents, teachers, and administrators about education. Parents, teachers, and administrators unanimously agree that more local control is badly needed. I could not agree more! We share a belief that sound education reform gives the decision-making and money back to the local schools and school districts so parents, teachers, and administrators can make the decisions—not Washington.

President Bush's proposal for educational reform reflects a deep concern over the future of America's children. He seeks to increase accountability and local control as a much-needed change for our failing schools, but I have some serious concerns about whether H.R. 1's testing requirement successfully advances this goal.

I fully agree with President Bush that accountability of Federal education dollars spent is extremely important. To accomplish this, President Bush has placed great emphasis on tests to show results from the schools. Although I prefer the Local Educational Agencies select the exam used to measure their accountability, I am glad the committee has reached a bipartisan compromise that the states will select the exam. My specific concerns with the testing requirement are that the test will deteriorate into a dumbed-down subjective exam, testing how students "feel" rather than what is learned.

Here is an example of what I am concerned about: after reading a short passage about the Devil's trip to the World entitled *Nuts!*, one of the questions U.S. 11th graders were asked on the National Assessment of Educational Progress:

17. Do you think this is a good story?

- A Yes
- B No
- C I don't know.

What was question the assessing? What is the correct answer? Some state exams ask students to write their opinions on women in combat or to write their Congressman or Congresswoman because Congress is going to cut funding for NASA. These types of subjective questions are being asked to students across this nation. Questions on today's exams are pushing students toward the opinion of the test maker rather than measuring their objective knowledge. What ever happened to testing grammar, spelling and composition? They are frequently being replaced with questions asking personal opinions, attitudes and beliefs.

Testing for accountability must test knowledge and learning, not feelings and beliefs. That is why H.R. 1 needs strong language guaranteeing that for purposes of federal accountability various exams administered by the states are tests of objective and not subjective knowledge. The tests must not question or be influenced by personal opinions, attitudes, or beliefs, and must

be academically appropriate at or above the grade level of the student being tested.

I have offered H.R. 1163, which I feel goes to the heart of the concerns some of my colleagues and I share about the testing requirement. I look forward to working with this committee to strengthen H.R. 1's accountability measures, specifically the testing component, into solid bipartisan education reform.

In closing, ensuring a solid education for each child is a priority for each one of us. Even with our good intentions at the national level to help each child succeed, I fundamentally believe no one knows better than the local school districts what each of their student's need. Neither Congress nor the Federal Department of Education can or should be a national school board. Therefore, we must refocus national education goals toward education as child-centered and locally governed.

I thank you for your attention.

***APPENDIX W - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN JOHN
THUNE, SOUTH DAKOTA-AT LARGE, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Testimony of John Thune**"No Child Left Behind"
Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001**

Chairman Boehner, Members of the Committee, thank you very much for the opportunity to testify before you on President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal. I'm here today representing the members of the Congressional Rural Caucus.

As you may know, the Rural Caucus is a bipartisan coalition of 138 Members who are committed to helping build brighter futures for the millions of Americans living in rural communities. Whenever major legislation is debated, the Rural Caucus provides input to other Members on the unique consequences these initiatives may have on rural areas. Certainly few other proposals affect rural areas quite as profoundly as education reform.

Federal education reform is desperately needed across this country. Too many students and teachers from my state of South Dakota have felt the direct impact of the waste, fraud and abuse of the Washington education bureaucracy. Last year, nearly \$2 million of Impact Aid money, money that was promised to two rural school districts, seemed to have magically disappeared from the coffers of the federal Department of Education. It appears it was a case of malfeasance on the part of a few federal bureaucrats.

Now, \$2 million may not mean a lot to Washington, but when these schools don't receive their federal education dollars, there are very real consequences. They can't expand their kindergarten programs, they can't add chemistry and sociology classes in the high school, and they can't hire new teachers.

It's clear that an unresponsive, inflexible and overly bureaucratic federal education system handicaps our students. Rural schools have limited choices. They can decide to pull teachers out of classrooms and instead hire employees to fill out federal paperwork, or they can give up the volumes of paperwork and sacrifice the federal grant dollars that could be put to use in the classroom. Clearly, that's not much of a choice. Time and again, Members of the Rural Caucus hear from their school administrators and school board members that schools need flexibility in accessing federal education programs.

I am pleased that H.R. 1, the "No Child Left Behind" proposal, has specific provisions for flexibility for rural schools. Rural school districts have little opportunity to compete for discretionary federal funding. For those that successfully receive discretionary funds, the allocation can be so small that it has relatively little value to them.

H.R. 1 works to correct this problem by providing the funding needed to make these competitive programs to be worth the while for rural schools to apply. The idea is to give rural school districts the flexibility and funding to put funding to work. It allows rural school districts to bypass the state bureaucracy and apply directly to the federal government for these special funds, something that school districts in rural areas really want.

Rural school districts would finally have useful amounts of funding to improve their academic achievement. And, after all, academic achievement is what we're all aiming for here.

While the specific rural education provisions will benefit thousands of students across the country, some of the broader flexibility proposals will help every school district, whether that district is rural, urban, or somewhere in between. H.R. 1 gives states and local schools additional flexibility to improve student performance by cutting red tape and consolidating a host of programs to ensure that state and local officials can meet the unique needs of students.

That can sound like a lot of tired rhetoric but the advantages of flexible programming are real. Take my hometown for instance. The town of Murdo, has about 700 people. This year's kindergarten class has 4 students in it. I don't think Murdo needs class size reduction money, do you? Instead of funding a separate program that can only be used by school districts for class size reduction, H.R. 1 allows schools to address classroom quality differently. Rather than passing up these valuable federal dollars, Murdo can use the money for teacher recruitment, professional development, or technical training.

I want to commend the Committee on what they are attempting to do with the President's education proposals. I look forward to working with you further to make sure consideration is given to the impact any student accountability measures may have on rural areas and to improve federal funding for special education.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. The Members of the Rural Caucus and I look forward to working with the Committee, the President and his Administration on improving education for our nation's children.

***APPENDIX X - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN ADAM
SCHIFF, 27TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA, U.S. HOUSE OF
REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Testimony of Adam Schiff**"No Child Left Behind"
Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001**

Chairman Boehner, Ranking Member Miller and members of the Committee, thank you for giving me this opportunity to testify before you today on President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal.

Education is one of the most - if not THE most - important issues we face as a nation. I believe that we must have a comprehensive agenda to address all elements of a child's educational development - from the earliest stages, through K-12, and into the college years.

We often wonder why our children in the third, fourth and fifth grades still haven't learned to read. As a proud parent of a 2-year old daughter, I see the progress she makes every day. Children her age are like sponges - they are so willing and eager to learn. We should not deny any child's thirst for knowledge, especially at the earliest possible stages.

Last week, I was proud to join my colleague, Rep. Todd Platts, a member of this Committee, in introducing a bipartisan bill to ensure that every child has the tools necessary to succeed in school and in life.

Our bill, H.R. 1201, the Reading Readiness Act, requires the Department of Health and Human Services to conduct a study of best practices with regard to reading readiness, and provide an incentive to have every Head Start program adopt these best practices. The study will include recommendations of ways to improve on reading readiness, and incentives for existing programs to adopt these best practices.

Our bill requires every Head Start program to have a strong focus on reading readiness, at age-appropriate levels. Most Head Start programs already have a strong reading component. The Head Start programs in my district are set up like regular classrooms, and those children are learning letters and sounds and numbers and much more.

Our bill also addresses increasing enrollment and eligibility, and fully funds the program over the next few years.

Head Start began in 1965 as a comprehensive program for children, offering nutrition, parenting skills, health care, and more in a pre-school environment. It has served more than 18 million low-income preschool children.

Nothing in H.R. 1201 jeopardizes the comprehensive nature of Head Start. Rather, it

will ensure that reading readiness is a central theme in all Head Start programs, while striving for all programs to adopt best practices in reading readiness.

None of this happens without the support of this Committee for full funding.

Leaving no child behind means eliminating any waiting lists that children are on. In 1999, only 1% of eligible children under 3 years old were enrolled. Only 33% of eligible 3-year-olds were enrolled. And only 60% of 4-year-olds were enrolled. And this is not because parents don't want to get their kids into the program. In fact, there are waiting lists in many parts of the country - including Los Angeles County.

Funding for Head Start was \$6.2 billion in FY01. Unfortunately, this is less than half of what the National Head Start Association estimates would be necessary to fully fund the program in the next few years. The Reading Readiness Act takes two major steps toward full funding by authorizing \$9.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2002 and \$11.2 billion in Fiscal Year 2003.

I am pleased to report that H.R. 1201 has the support of both the National Head Start Association and the National Education Association, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to address education at every age level.

Again, I thank the Committee for this opportunity to testify.

APPENDIX Y - WRITTEN STATEMENT, CONGRESSMAN TOM ALLEN, 1ST DISTRICT OF MAINE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.

**Testimony of
Representative Tom Allen
before the House Committee on Education and the Workforce
about President Bush's Education Proposal
March 28, 2001**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Miller, committee members, thank you for allowing me this opportunity to testify before the Committee about President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal.

Today, I want to speak about the need for high standards and accountability, and to urge this Committee to ensure that states and local districts retain flexibility in their assessment processes. With increased calls for accountability to measure how public schools are performing, we must make sure we assess, not just test.

President Bush believes that the federal government can help close the achievement gap between the haves and have-nots. He has stated that federal investment in Title I programs, which help disadvantaged students, needs to be more effective and accountable. Schools failing to make sufficient progress will receive special assistance. State and local decisions about how to educate our children should still prevail over federal decisions.

I agree with President Bush on these goals. Effectiveness, accountability, assessment and state and local flexibility are requisites of any education reform plan. But I disagree with some of the details of his plan.

Requiring yearly tests imposes a new mandate on already fiscally troubled state budgets. The President has said, albeit without much detail, that the federal government would provide the

necessary financial assistance, but if the Senate's Better Education for Students and Teachers Act is any indication, states would only receive funds to cover fifty percent of the costs of implementing the tests. This would force yet another unfunded mandate upon the states, the most prominent of which is the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). We have not met our commitment for IDEA full funding for over 25 years. I see no reason to believe that we would meet a new commitment, and I fear that schools will not receive financial assistance unless they implement these yearly exams to be required by Congress. In Maine, and I am sure in other states as well, unfunded mandates violate law.

I am also concerned about the effect of annual testing on state assessment measures. Maine, for example, has an effective system of measuring progress, which requires students in grades 4, 8, and 11, students to take the Maine Educational Assessment (MEA). But they also take assessments designed and administered by local school districts. The state/local partnership could be undermined by a mandate that forces the state and local school districts to adopt annual tests.

Over the last ten years, a total of 48 states have implemented some system of accountability. It is ironic that the current Administration wants to mandate national accountability when local flexibility is its top priority. It is even more ironic that the Administration is pushing for one national standard when the University of California education system is questioning the most standardized and high-stakes of all national tests, the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT). A federal emphasis on standardized testing is problematic. We must not forget Senator Edward Kennedy's remarks that tests are not reforms, but only measurements of the progress of reforms.

I do not believe that vouchers and financial sanctions are the answer to failing schools. High-stakes testing, if implemented, is more likely to leave poorer students and school districts behind. The recent problems in Arizona and Massachusetts demonstrate this point.

A caring and competent teacher in every classroom is the best way to improve our schools. A qualified and dedicated teacher, not just having the best standards and assessment measures, leads to improved student achievement. Studies indicate that the lowest achieving students, in both urban and rural areas, are in classrooms with the least qualified teachers. These teachers most often do not even teach a subject in which they majored in college. I believe the best policy is to hire caring teachers who have a background in the subject they teach, and to offer them opportunities for continued professional development.

If we are to have a national system of accountability, however, we should look to successful state systems, including the one in Maine. As part of its Learning Results program, Maine has a partnership with local school districts. Assessment is done by both the state and local schools. More than multiple choice exams, these comprehensive assessments measure learning through a variety of methods. The State component includes the Maine Educational Assessment, which is given to students in grades 4, 8, and 11. Individual student scores are reported in five content areas. The State also assists educators in clarifying standards for local assessment systems, developing and evaluating performance tasks and student portfolios, serving as a clearinghouse for exemplary local assessment practices, and developing a framework for multiple and diverse assessments to ensure that all Maine students reach high standards. Furthermore, Maine has

made a strong commitment to professional development. As a result, our experience in Maine has found that sound assessment, coupled with good professional development, has led to increased achievement in writing. Students are thinking critically, and are engaged citizens in and out of the classroom.

Again, thank you, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Miller, and other members of this Committee for allowing me to testify. I look forward to working to ensure that we support and improve our public schools in a constructive manner. I urge the Committee to reject calls for high stakes testing and fiscal sanctions, and instead support initiatives that will place a caring, competent teacher in every classroom.

***APPENDIX Z – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN ANIBAL ACEVEDO-VILA, PUERTO RICO-AT
LARGE, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON,
D.C.***

ANIBAL ACEVEDO-VILÁ
PUERTO RICO

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-5401

Testimony of the Honorable Anibal Acevedo-Vila

Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico

Before the Committee on Education and the Workforce

March 28, 2000

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to address President Bush's education plan, and how it affects Puerto Rico.

Education is important because it is one of the best solutions to help our Nation grow. Well educated children are the key to our future of economic and social prosperity. Investment in education must start with those students who are most likely to slip between the cracks; these disadvantaged students cannot be overlooked. The ESEA Title I program is paramount because it is the helping hand that disadvantaged students need to compete in mainstream society.

Currently, Puerto Rico has over a half a million children eligible for Title I funds. Out of the total student population, 84% of students fall under the poverty level. In Puerto Rico, over 1500 schools or 96% receive Title I funds. As one can see the Title I program plays an important role in educating Puerto Rican children. Nevertheless, the special Title I formula for Puerto Rico creates an obstacle for our children by demanding that they complete all requirements with less funding support. This formula provides Puerto Rico roughly 75% of Title I funds in comparison

to other local education agencies. A disadvantaged child in Puerto Rico receives \$475 compared to the national average of \$776 (FY1999).

Puerto Rican children are US citizens and deserve equal opportunity funds to provide for quality education. A significant population of Puerto Ricans migrate to the United States. Without equity in Title I funds, a whole segment of society is put at a disadvantage. This unfairness puts Puerto Rican children at considerable risk and negates their future contribution to our society.

Since the 1980s all US territories were funded the same as states, however today the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is the only US jurisdiction that is treated differently. Despite current funding differences Puerto Rico is required by law to fulfill all of the same requirements for Title I funding and is held to the same level of accountability as other states. The Puerto Rico Department of Education is committed to high standards but this goal cannot be reached without equity in the Title I formula.

Moreover, the President's education plan proposes to "leave no child behind" by increasing accountability of schools by linking federal dollars to specific performance goals to ensure improved results. Puerto Rico welcomes the accountability of the Bush plan, but if applied without equally funding Title I, this would result in children being left behind. We need to give kids the tools to so that they may achieve or we are just setting them up for failure. If we are serious about closing the achievement gap between disadvantaged children and their peers we need to place Puerto Rico on equal basis through full funding under Title I.

Education of our children is a priority of Governor Calderon. In her recent budget plan address, the Governor put forward an ambitious reform agenda to upgrade our schools and prepare our students for the global economy. We believe that the investment in our schools by both the Commonwealth's government and Congress will place our young people in a stronger position to compete in today's economy. We cannot allow disadvantaged children to be pushed into the shadows, but we must bring them into the light and allow them to experience their full potential. I commend the President's commitment to leave no child behind, we must make this promise inclusive to the children of Puerto Rico.¹

Again, I thank the Chairman and the Members of the Committee for this opportunity and look forward to working on this important issue.

**APPENDIX AA – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN SAXBY CHAMBLISS, 8TH DISTRICT OF
GEORGIA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON,
D.C.**

COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE
 CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL
 FARM COMMODITIES AND RISK
 MANAGEMENT

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

CONGRESSIONAL AIR POWER CAUCUS
 CO CHAIRMAN



SAXBY CHAMBLISS
 8TH DISTRICT, GEORGIA

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

March 28, 2001

Statement by Congressman Saxby Chambliss

House Education and the Workforce Full Committee

Hearing on President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" Proposal

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support H.R. 1, President Bush's "No Child Left Behind" education proposal. This plan sets high national standards and focuses on children and what they need to succeed. With this education plan in motion I believe that we can work to eliminate failure.

As a husband and father of public school teachers, I am very familiar with the concerns regarding the future of our children. As a father and grandfather, I understand the importance of educating America's youth. Education reform should be a top priority for all of us. It's time to shift the focus of federal education programs from Washington bureaucrats to parents, teachers, and local education officials. More education dollars should reach the classrooms where teachers know the names of each child and their unique education needs.

There are seven points to the President's strategy that I believe are vital to ensure that no child is left behind. The first point of the plan focuses on improving academic performance of disadvantaged students. When a school fails a child for consecutive years, this plan gives parents of children in failing schools several options. They can use resources to hire tutors, purchase technology or even move their children to another school where space is available.

It gives parents the option of removing their child from failing schools and sending them to a different public or private school after three years of chronic failure. It allows states and local schools more flexibility to improve student performance.

We must also close the achievement gap. Nearly seventy percent of inner city and rural fourth-graders cannot read at a basic level. Low-income students lag behind their counterparts by an average of 20 percentile points on national assessment tests. Under H.R. 1, states and local schools that make significant progress in closing the achievement gap will receive bonuses and states that fail to show adequate yearly progress for their disadvantaged students will lose a portion of their administrative funds.

1019 LONGWORTH OFFICE BUILDING
 WASHINGTON, DC 20515
 (202) 225-4531

DISTRICT OFFICES:
 682 CHERRY STREET
 SUITE 200
 MACON, GA 31201
 (478) 752-0800

208 TERRELL STREET
 WAYCROSS, GA 31501
 (912) 227-1180

TOLL FREE: 1-800-254-4209
www.house.gov/chambliss

Cutting red tape and consolidating programs to meet student's needs will give states and local schools additional flexibility to improve student performance. It will allow schools to choose the school-wide approach for programs that serve disadvantaged students and let them combine their federal program dollars and use them to improve the entire school. This plan also promotes accountability by asking states and local schools to develop annual assessments, funded by federal dollars, to implement annual math and reading tests for students in grades three through eight.

President Bush's plan also moves students with limited proficiency in English to English fluency. It holds states and school districts accountable for ensuring that students are proficient in English after three years of attending school in the United States.

Next, the President's Plan promotes informed parental choice and innovative programs. This plan allocates a portion of funds from repealed programs to increase funds for the Innovative Programs block grant where the funds can be used for a wide variety of purposes, including providing scholarships to disadvantaged students in failing schools. It also allows for an Educational Opportunity Fund to set up demonstration projects for researching the effectiveness of school choice programs.

Encouraging safe schools for the 21st Century is another one of our priorities. There will be designated funds to ensure alternatives to students that attend unsafe schools. It also encourages the involvement of faith based organizations to provide after school activities.

Increasing funding for Impact Aid is also important. The federal obligation to schools that educate the children of families who serve in the United States military and Native American children has not been met. These shortfalls should be corrected by increasing funds for construction of the Impact Aid Program and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Lastly, this plan emphasizes the importance of enhancing education through technology. Schools would receive more money for technology funding. There also will be additional funding for Internet filtering.

These priorities will go a long way toward addressing education reform and linking federal dollars to specific performance goals to ensure improved results for our children. America needs to understand that students are taught by teachers, not by government officials. We need to return power to local school systems. This plan puts students first. I believe that all children, regardless of their background, can learn and we must encourage everyone to give them the opportunity by supporting H.R. 1.

As we move forward into the 21st century, America must be prepared to compete in the developing global marketplace. In order to reach this goal, we must prepare our children to excel in life. It is our bi-partisan belief in Congress that the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) can be improved to allow our children more flexibility in the educational process.

**APPENDIX BB- STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART, 21ST DISTRICT OF
FLORIDA, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON,
D.C.**

**STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART
ON H.R. 1, THE "NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND" EDUCATION REFORM BILL
BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE
MARCH 28, 2001**

Mr. Chairman, over 35 years ago the federal government began down a road paved with good intentions, but little results. We have now reached a fork in the road. We, as a country, must decide if we want to continue throwing money into a system that has had little in the way of results, or if we want to choose the path which leads to a new era of education reform.

The time has come for common sense education reform to benefit every child. The need for action is dire. Today, a stunning 40 percent of America's 4th graders continue to read below the basic level on national reading assessments, and one-third of all incoming college freshmen enroll in a remedial reading, writing, or mathematics class. The story is even worse among disadvantaged and minority children. In the inner cities and poor rural areas, 68 percent of low-income 4th graders cannot read at a basic level. This is unacceptable. We can, and we must, do better.

Every child, regardless of their background and upbringing, deserves a chance to excel. We have written off low performing students for too many years. We should have the same expectations of a disadvantaged child that we do of a high performing child. One point that is demonstrated over and over again is that if you expect low standards of a student, you will receive low performances in return.

Since 1965, the federal government has spent more than \$120 billion on Title I, the largest federal education program. Despite this investment, the gap in academic achievement levels remains wide. Our students deserve better. It is time to change our federal education programs to ensure that states, districts, schools and parents have the tools they need to provide a high quality education for all our children.

According to a recent survey, teachers and parents alike are overwhelmingly in favor of increased parental involvement, and both sides agree that involving parents is essential to school improvement. Parental involvement leads to student achievement, better academic standing, and fewer grade repetitions. We must not forget that parents are a child's first teacher. H.R. 1 would promote informed parental decision making. For example, state assessment results would be reported to the public so that parents would have the information they need to make informed decisions about their child's education.

We must also empower schools to make the best educational decisions for each of their students. Washington, D.C. cannot possibly legislate to provide for every child's needs. Students in Miami, Florida often need very different programs and resources than the students in Blackfoot, Idaho. However, we can make sure that students learn by holding local districts and states accountable to certain standards.

Compliance with federal rules and regulations costs states millions of dollars each year. In my home state of Florida, for example, it takes six times as many people to administer a federal education dollar than a state education dollar. H.R. 1 provides states and local districts the

flexibility to cut through much of this red tape in exchange for increased accountability standards. Depending on the choices that a state makes, states and local districts could have many of the same options of charter schools, such as the newly opened Doral Academy Charter School in my district. Teachers and administrators, like those at the Doral Academy, would be able to focus on educating children rather than pushing paper to satisfy the burdensome requirements of government red tape.

Other than our nation's parents, no other factor affects a child's academic achievement more than a knowledgeable, skillful teacher. The more than 15,000 school districts around the nation have differing needs when it comes to ensuring their students have quality teachers in the classroom. The federal government can best help to retain the many qualified teachers and help to ensure that future teachers are highly qualified by, in addition to providing resources, giving power back to local districts and schools. Individual schools and local districts should be able to make the decision as to whether they need higher salaries for teachers, money to recruit teachers, or money to further the professional development of teachers.

While providing added flexibility, H.R. 1 would also hold states accountable to the federal government for showing progress in student achievement over realistic and defined time periods. This legislation would also hold schools accountable to states through increased academic standards and annual assessments. These annual assessments will enable schools to give parents needed information about how their children are doing in school. This data will also allow schools to detect and correct problems on a timely basis.

One way that the federal government can and should help is to provide every child with the basic building blocks for success. We can achieve this goal by nurturing a child's educational growth at the earliest levels of development. I applaud President Bush and the House Education Committee for their efforts to include the "Early Reading First" and "Reading First" initiatives. Combined, these programs will work to ensure that every child is well equipped to enter into a learning situation and thrive.

Mr. Chairman, previous attempts by the federal government to fund and promote educational reforms from Washington, D.C. have often succeeded in adding layer upon layer of bureaucracy. The end result of some of these reforms has been that teachers spend more time trying to comply with endless rules and regulations and less time on the job of educating children. H.R. 1 is a common sense approach to education reform. We focus on what works. I would like to thank President Bush and this committee for all of the hard work that has gone into this legislation.

**APPENDIX CC – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN VAN HILLEARY, 4TH DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.**

Statement of Representative Van Hilleary
before the Education and Workforce Committee
on H.R. 1, No Child Left Behind
3/28/01

Mr. Chairman,

I am very proud to discuss today a provision of H.R. 1 in which I am particularly interested. That provision is Title I Part G, the Low Income and Rural Schools initiative.

This provision is based on my bipartisan bill, H.R. 1148 that I filed last week along with Representative Chris John from Louisiana, Jim DeMint of South Carolina, and Sanford Bishop and Charlie Norwood of Georgia. All of us face the same issues in that our rural areas often do not receive a fair shake in the distribution of government funds.

I have always said that every child every child deserves an equal opportunity in education. It is our job to be sure all our children get a place at life's starting line, no matter what their zip code or parents' bank balance. This feeds into the oft heard concept of "No child left behind." Rural children, like their urban counterparts should not be left behind.

However, presently this is not the case. A study by the National Center for Educational Statistics found that while 46 percent of America's public schools serve rural areas, they receive only 22

percent of the nation's education funds.

That is why I find it so important that we included my legislation within H.R. 1, known as the No Child Left Behind Act.

Rural school districts are almost always at a disadvantage when they compete against larger school districts for competitive grants. Many of the larger districts have the ability to pay for professional grant writers that poor rural districts simply do not have the economic means to afford. This begins a cycle of where the wealthy and large urban districts receive more funds proportionately than the poor rural ones.

This bill helps give all students the same learning opportunities, whether they live in the Connecticut suburbs or in rural Wayne County in Tennessee.

At its core, this legislation addresses an important nationwide need. Passage of this bill would greatly assist rural schools in Tennessee, where they are struggling to find adequate funding. I feel strongly we must make sure that students in rural schools are given the quality education that will give them an equal place at the starting line of life.

The money will be sent to the states in the form of block grants. States can then divide the money among the schools or make it available to the schools in the form of competitive grants. The funds can be used for teacher recruitment and retention, teacher training, educational

technology and for academic enrichment programs.

We designed the bill to be flexible so the states and local schools could use their share of the money to meet their own unique needs. One school can use this money to hire new teachers while another can give raises, buy new computers or meet other educational needs.

I am pleased that we are going forward with this initiative. I filed similar legislation last year, and it passed the House as part of H.R. 2 last Congress. In addition, the Senate has already introduced similar legislation as part of their education package. I am more confident than ever that with the Education and Workforce Committee and President's support that this much needed legislation will finally become law this year.

Thank you once again Mr. Chairman, and I look forward to working with you on this and the broader piece of legislation that means so much to the children of our country.

***APPENDIX DD – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN TOM LANTOS, 12TH DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Statement by Congressman Tom Lantos**The Committee on Education and the Workforce****H.R. 1, "No Child Left Behind"****March 28, 2001**

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member and distinguished members of the Education and Workforce Committee, I appreciate the opportunity to share my views with you today. As you begin to consider the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), I urge you to keep in mind the negative effects that working long hours is having on our children's education.

Working during the school year has become much more commonplace among America's youth over the past decades. Currently, nearly 25 percent of 14-year-olds and 38 percent of 15-year-olds have regular scheduled employment during the school year (as opposed to casual baby-sitting or yard work). A recent National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) indicates that almost two-thirds of high school juniors are employed during the school year and that these students work an average of 18 hours per week. Another study, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in December 1999, reports that the number of working teens has grown by 15 percent in the past five years and that nearly seven million teens age 16-19 were employed in all sectors of the United States economy.

Mr. Chairman, as you and your colleagues know, American students continue to score at or below average on international tests. The Third International Mathematics and Science Study showed that American high schools seniors on average spend slightly more than three hours a day working at a paid job – more than their counterparts in any of the other 20 nations studied. Some

experts believe that such intense work schedules might explain the poor showing of U.S. students on international tests. In both math and science, even America's best 12th graders scored well below the international average.

Laurence Steinberg, a professor of psychology at Temple University recently conducted a three-year study (1987 to 1990) of 20,000 students at nine high schools in northern California and in Wisconsin. He determined that a work-load of more than 20 hours seems to mark the point at which work is increasingly linked to a drop-off in the amount of time students spend on homework an increase in their feelings of detachment from school. His research is backed up by Wendy Piscitelli, head of the foreign language department at Hatboro-Horsham high School in Horsham, PA. She states, "once they get up into 20 or 25 hours...they can't keep up the extracurricular activities, and they don't get enough sleep." These conclusions are shared by a teacher at the Governor Livingston Regional High School in Berkeley Heights, N.J., who discussed a problem she is having with one of her students who regularly works past midnight at a local diner. The student, a senior, has trouble making it to school on time, and when confronted about falling asleep in class responds, "but I am making money, Mrs. Tonto."

These students, who are placing after-school employment above their education aren't getting enough sleep at night and are catching up during the day, in the classrooms. A 1999 National Sleep Foundation survey found that 60 percent of children under the age of 18 complained of being tired during the day, and 15 percent reported sleeping at school during the past year. Mr. Chairman, I ask you, how can we expect our children to learn when they are sleeping through the school day? Another problem that arises when students are working more than 20 hours a week is that they begin to cut corners with their school work to accommodate their job. This accommodation manifests itself in many ways, often in the form of cheating, or

taking a less challenging schedule.

Moreover, a number of studies document that long work hours are associated with all sorts of undesirable teenage behavior. According a recent study by the Centers for Disease Control (CDC), working more than 11 hours a week has a strong correlation with the likelihood that teenager will smoke and drink. Working more than 26 hours per week has the same correlation to use of marijuana or cocaine. An earlier CDC study found that students who worked more than 11 hours a week had significantly higher rates of sexually transmitted diseases and unwanted pregnancies. There is also ample evidence that when the number of work hours exceeds 15 hours per week during the school year, academic pursuits suffer. On average, grades go down and truancy increases. When work and school obligations conflict, the great majority will give top priority to their jobs.

Mr. Chairman, studies have shown that the majority of children and teenagers who hold jobs in the United States are not working to support their families, but rather are employed to earn extra spending money. I see nothing wrong with minors working to earn extra spending money and I think we all can agree that it is important for children to learn the value of work, I do think, however, that it is a serious problem when teenagers spend almost the same amount of time working at an after school job as they spend in school. We need to set sensible limits on the hours that minors are permitted to work when school is in session so that our children can focus on their primary job – earning a good education.

Mr. Chairman, under current Federal law, minors aged 14-and 15-years-old may not work for more than three hours a day and a maximum of 18 hours a week, when school is in session. It is also unlawful for 14-and 15-year-olds to work before 7 a.m. and after 7 p.m. so that work will not interfere with learning. Minors who are 16 and 17, however, face no federal restrictions when

it comes to the number of hours they can work, and they often are required to work late into the night.

I recently introduced legislation, H.R. 961, the Young American Workers Bill of Rights, which would set sensible limits to the hours teenagers work in addition to their academic schooling. Mr. Chairman, I urge the Committee to consider including the provisions of this bill in your reauthorization of the ESEA. My legislation would reduce the hours 14- and 15- year-olds would be allowed to work while school is in session, while also setting standards for the number of hours that 16- and 17-year-olds can work while school is in session. My legislation caps the hours of 14- and 15- year-olds at fifteen hours per week. The hours for 16 - and 17 - year-olds would be limited to 20 hours per week. When one adds these hours onto the average amount of time a teenager spends in school, the student is still putting in close to 40 hours a week. This does not include time spent on homework, extracurricular activities, or time spent just being a teenager. I think we can agree that too many teenagers are working long hours at the very time they should be focusing on their education.

Mr. Chairman, let me state unequivocally that I, and supporters of my legislation, do not oppose children taking on after school employment. We firmly believe that children must be taught the value of work. They need to learn the important lessons of responsibility, and they need to enjoy the rewards of working. Furthermore, it is not our aim to discourage employers from hiring young people. Rather, our goal is to ensure that the employment opportunities available to young people are meaningful, safe, healthy, and do not interfere with their important academic responsibilities. A solid education – not after-school employment – is the key to a successful future.

Mr. Chairman, as you and the rest of your committee began to debate the reauthorization

of the ESEA, I strongly urge you to consider the sensible labor standards that my legislation sets forth. These common-sense limits provide American teenagers the ability to have both a valuable academic instruction, while learning the value of work.

***APPENDIX EE – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN RON PAUL, 14TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

RON PAUL
 14TH DISTRICT, TEXAS

FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

VICE CHAIRMAN

OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATIONS

CAPITAL MARKETS, INSURANCE, AND
 GOVERNMENT SPONSORED ENTERPRISES

MONETARY POLICY,
 TECHNOLOGY, AND ECONOMIC GROWTH

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS
 COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEES:

INTERNATIONAL OPERATIONS AND
 HUMAN RIGHTS

WESTERN HEMISPHERE

203 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
 WASHINGTON, DC 20515
 (202) 225-1831

312 SOUTH MAIN
 SUITE 226
 VICTORIA, TX 77901
 (361) 576-1231

100 WEST 2ND STREET
 SUITE 210
 FREESPORT, TX 77541
 (579) 330-0060

Congress of the United States
 House of Representatives
 Washington, DC 20515-4314

Ron Paul

Mr. Chairman, thank you for holding this hearing to solicit member participation on "No Child Left Behind" (HR 1), legislation reauthorizing and overhauling the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). I would also like to thank the Chairman for including language, similar to that contained in my HR 966, banning the use of federal funds for national teacher tests or national teacher certification in HR 1. National teacher testing would destroy local control of education as teachers would base their lesson plans on what they needed to know to receive their government-approved certificate. National teacher testing would also destroy the independence of the teaching profession. The Chairman and the rest of the members of the Committee should be commended for taking a stand against this outrage.

As the Committee begins work on reauthorization of ESEA I hope it keeps in mind the need to prioritize support for those programs which have proven effective at meeting the educational needs of the American people. These programs should be given priority over new programs which have not proved their effectiveness. An example of a program with an established track record of helping those most in need of assistance, and thus deserving of priority status, is the Job Corps program.

Job Corps is the nation's largest residential and educational training program for economically challenged youth ages 16 to 24. Job Corps operates 1,119 community centers, including one in my district, providing academic, vocational, and life skills training, as well as a General Equivalency Diploma (GED) program. Job Corps' mission is to teach the skills young adults need to become employable and independent. Job Corps also helps place them in meaningful jobs.

Last year, eighty-two percent of Job Corps participants found employment, enlisted in the military or enrolled in an institution of higher education. In the past fifteen years, Job Corps has increased the number of participants who either find employment, enlist in the military or enroll in an institution of higher learning by almost 20 percent. Job Corps' success is particularly impressive considering that the average Job Corps student is an 18-year-old high school drop out from an economically disadvantaged family who has never held a full-time job who reads at or below a seventh grade level.

Job Corps improves students academic skills with a hands-on, self-paced approach. The average Job Corps student stays in the program for seven months, and improves reading and math skills by more than two and a half grade levels! Job Corps also helps close the digital divide. In their

first 60 days at the center, every student is taught keyboard skills as well as how to effectively use the Internet and E-mail. Additional technology skills are taught as part of ongoing academic and vocational training.

Job Corps also provides students with an opportunity for hands-on, work-based learning, including internships with private employers so students can learn real-world application of skills taught in the classroom. Job Corps also emphasizes the teaching of employability skills such as punctuality, teamwork, honesty and appropriate workplace behavior.

In order to enhance its programs, Job Corps has signed nine National Employer Partnerships with major employers such as AAMCO, HCR ManorCare, and Walgreen's. Job Corps has also developed customer training programs for many employers including CVS Pharmacy, Roadway Express, and American Commercial Barge Lines.

As you can see, Job Corps is doing an excellent job providing services for those otherwise left behind by our educational system. Job Corps is also one of the few public programs which can demonstrate a positive return for the taxpayer. According to a studies conducted by Mathematica and the Congressional Budget office for every one dollar of federal funding provided to Job Corps almost two dollars is returned to the treasury in income taxes paid as well as in avoided court and penal costs!

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I once again thank you for holding this hearing and I reiterate my concern that programs such as Job Corps, with a proven track record of assisting those most needing of help, be given a priority in federal support over new and untested programs.

***APPENDIX FF – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN MIKE ROGERS, 8TH DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

Testimony for the House Education & the Workforce Committee on H.R. 1 as presented by
Congressman Mike Rogers

Thank you for granting me the opportunity to provide written testimony to the Committee on Education and the Workforce on H.R. 1. As we begin to engage in a dynamic dialogue on improving our education system and looking for innovative ways to empower our children with the tools necessary for learning, I would like to share with you the success that one such program has had in Michigan.

In Michigan and throughout the country, an alarming number of children enter school without the language and literacy foundation necessary to succeed in school. Many children are incapable of deciphering that letters make up words and that words carry meaning. This problem spans all socioeconomic backgrounds and leads to children entering school behind their classmates before they even get started.

Recent brain development research shows that from birth to age four, a child's ability to learn is greater than any other time in his or her life. These same studies also show that most children possess the ability to learn these critical building blocks if they are routinely exposed to basic language and literacy activities at an early age. However, many parents are unaware of the critical link between early childhood learning and their child's later ability to succeed in school. Therefore, there is a tremendous need to increase parent and public awareness in understanding of the importance of early exposure to reading so that each child may reach their full potential.

With this goal in mind, under the leadership of Governor John Engler, Michigan created the R.E.A.D.Y. (Read, Educate and Develop Youth) program in 1998. Designed to reach over 1 million parents of young children in the state, the R.E.A.D.Y. program was developed to strengthen parent involvement in the early childhood years so that children develop the language and literacy skills needed to enter school ready to read and succeed. The kits contain age appropriate materials for infants, toddlers and preschoolers including:

- * a quality children's book,
- * four parent/child activity cards,
- * an activity magnet,
- * a list of enjoyable age appropriate books,
- * a brochure on the importance of engaging and reading to young children,
- * a music cassette of nursery rhymes and children's favorite songs,
- * a child development video tape and booklet,
- * a child development wheel, and
- * a parent membership card recognizing parents for their commitment to helping their young child learn and succeed.

Funding for the distribution of R.E.A.D.Y. kits has been provided through a combination of federal, state, corporate and foundation support. Each kit costs about \$9.25 for the products, administration and distribution. To date, more than \$8 million in federal and state funds have been allocated for R.E.A.D.Y. during FY 1998 - FY 2001. In addition to state funds, \$1.4 million in multi-year corporate financial contributions and \$15 million in corporate in-kind support have been committed to the R.E.A.D.Y. program through FY 2002.

The public and parent response to the kits has been very encouraging. Most recipients surveyed indicated they learned a lot and an overwhelming majority of parents responded that the kit motivated them to read to their child. Educators have also been extremely receptive to the kits as it reiterates the same messages that they relay to parents - time spent reading to your child will have future benefits.

An early pilot project included distributing 35,000 R.E.A.D.Y. kits to parents at birthing hospitals, health care facilities, Head Start programs, day care centers and community health and social service programs throughout Michigan. Since August of 1998, over 200,000 R.E.A.D.Y. kits have been delivered to parents and annual kit production from October 2000 through September 2001 will exceed 300,000 kits. The goal is still to reach over one million parents of young children within five years.

I am proud to say that the R.E.A.D.Y. program has been recognized as one of the nation's most innovative government programs and in late 1999 received the prestigious Council on State Government's (CSG) Innovations Award. R.E.A.D.Y. has also become a national model with over a dozen states actively exploring the development of a similar program. For these reasons, I strongly hope the Committee considers the tremendous success of Michigan's reading program and borrows from it when crafting the details of H.R. 1. I am submitting a R.E.A.D.Y. kit to the Committee for your review.

***APPENDIX GG – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN MARK GREEN, 8TH DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

MARK GREEN
8TH DISTRICT, WISCONSIN
ASSISTANT MAJORITY WHIP
REPUBLICAN POLICY
COMMITTEE



CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

COMMITTEE ON
FINANCIAL SERVICES
VICE CHAIR
SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING AND
COMMUNITY OPPORTUNITY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL
MONETARY POLICY AND TRADE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
DOMESTIC MONETARY POLICY,
TECHNOLOGY AND ECONOMIC GROWTH
COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY
SUBCOMMITTEE ON CRIME
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
COMMERCIAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE LAW

**Testimony of Congressman Mark Green (WI-08)
On H.R. 1, “No Child Left Behind” to
The Committee on Education and the Workforce
March 28, 2001**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

Thank you for this opportunity to testify in favor of H.R. 1, “*No Child Left Behind*.”

You have done an outstanding job in reflecting the President’s priorities for education reform and in crafting a bipartisan bill that will transform the federal role in education. For too long, the federal government has been on the back of the education community. This legislation puts the federal government at its side...a helping hand that helps us all keep our students where they should be—our top priority.

I am honored to represent a state that has a proud tradition of progressive reforms in education. Wisconsin is the home of first-rate students and teachers, and we’ve developed innovative programs such as TEACH Wisconsin that invests in technology for all our schools. These programs help districts in areas ranging from the City of Milwaukee—to the small towns of the Northwoods, to begin to utilize education technology.

We’ve also adopted new standards for educator preparation and licensing—we define what our teachers and administrators need to know and must be able to do, while supporting

1218 LONGWORTH BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-5665

700 EAST WALNUT STREET
GREEN BAY, WI 54301
(920) 437-1954

609A WEST COLLEGE AVENUE
APPLETON, WI 54911
(920) 380-0061

837 CLERMONT STREET
ROOM 132
ANTIGO, WI 54409
(715) 627-1511

TOLL FREE IN WISCONSIN (800) 773-8579
www.house.gov/markgreen

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

beginning educators with mentors.

Because of efforts like these, Wisconsin has consistently out-performed other states in testing scores and graduation rates. In fact, for the last eight years, Wisconsin has ranked first on the ACT college entrance exam scores.

However, as we in Wisconsin are quick to admit, there are still many goals to be met. As our population continues to diversify, we must prepare ourselves for the challenge of closing the achievement gap within minority and low-income communities—in order to leave no child behind. H.R. 1 will be a great help!

Perhaps the most important part of H.R. 1 is its drive to give progressive states like Wisconsin greater flexibility in meeting our challenges, while making sure that our education leaders are accountable for student and school performance. This plan encourages innovation and rewards excellence. It rejects one-size-fits-all notions in recognition of the fact that conditions and challenges vary so much from state to state. When states like Wisconsin are given the chance and the resources to tailor-make an approach to education challenges, I believe that we will see great things happen.

As we all know, if we merely continue with the status quo, the education bureaucracy will continue to promote compliance over excellence. Flexibility when combined with accountability and resources is the key to opening new doors. We have the chance today to empower parents, teachers and administrators. We have the chance to inspire and motivate our kids toward ever higher achievement.

H.R. 1 has the potential to revitalize our country. It takes reform to the grassroots

level—the level at which any and all things are possible. All children in the nation are entitled to public education—it's their birthright. It's our responsibility to assure each and every child receives the attention and commitment they deserve. Our future as a nation depends on it.

Thank you.

**APPENDIX HH – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN RONNIE SHOWS, 4TH DISTRICT OF
MISSISSIPPI, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
WASHINGTON, D.C.**

RONNIE SHOWS
4TH DISTRICT, MISSISSIPPI
Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure
Committee on Veterans' Affairs



SERVING RESIDENTS OF COUNTIES:
Adams Amite Copiah Covington
Franklin Hinds Jefferson Davis
Jones Lawrence Lincoln Marion
Pike Simpson Walthall Wilkinson

**Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2404**

**Testimony of Congressman Ronnie Shows
House Education and the Workforce Committee
March 28, 2001 at 12:00 p.m.**

Chairman Boehner, Ranking Member Miller, distinguished members of the House Education and the Workforce Committee, I want to thank you for inviting members of Congress to speak before this esteemed committee regarding President Bush's *No Child Left Behind* education proposal.

Let me begin by stating how much I look forward to both sides of the aisle debating education policy in Congress. No one issue is more critical to the future of our great nation than ensuring that our children receive an excellent and equitable education. While the ensuing weeks undoubtedly will highlight our differing beliefs, our debates should also provide a valuable exchange regarding our shared passion and commitment to the cause of education, the well-being of our children, and the direction of our nation's future.

The issue of education has always been my first and foremost priority. Long before I had the privilege of serving the people of the 4th district of Mississippi as their representative in Congress, I had the privilege of serving their children as their schoolteacher and coach. The years I taught at Prentiss Junior High School, Lawrence Academy, Columbia Academy and Bassfield Elementary gave me a front row view of the challenges and rewards our nation faces in educating our children.

509 Capitol Building
Washington, DC 20515
(202) 225-5865
(202) 225-5886 FAX
<http://www.house.gov/shows>

245 E. Capitol, Suite 222
Jackson, MS 39201
(601) 352-1355
(601) 352-9044 FAX

243 John R. Junkin Drive, Suite D
Natchez, MS 39120
(601) 446-8825
(601) 446-7250 FAX

728 S. Sawmill Road
Laurel, MS 39440
(601) 425-4999
(601) 425-5428 FAX

Many of the schools in my district, then and now are poor. With strapped resources and overworked and underpaid teachers, the goal of ensuring that the children of Mississippi receive an adequate education has always been a difficult challenge. Nevertheless, it is a challenge that must be met; it is a challenge that I am confident can be met.

I am certain that President Bush and I share the same commitment towards improving our nation's schools. We both believe that it is disgraceful to allow our children's potential to be squandered in failing schools. We both know that it is critical that schools be held accountable for their students progress. We both demand that our schools aggressively implement reform plans to meet reasonable expectations of improvement.

However, as I commend President Bush for working with our colleagues in Congress in making education our number one priority, I must also strongly express my reservations with one key provision in his plan regarding Title I funding. I know that every member in this room is acutely aware of how important Title I funding is. These funds, allocated from the federal government, ensure that disadvantaged children's schools receive critically needed additional resources. It is the largest federal elementary and secondary education assistance program in the United States. Ninety percent of all school districts in the United States benefit from these funds, including over 58% of all public schools. In Mississippi, 100% of school districts benefit from these funds.

Depending upon the percentage of children in need, as determined by the school districts, schools are eligible for a variety of funding under the Title I program. When 50% of students at a school are determined to be living in poverty, the school has the

option of implementing school wide programming. In this category of Title I funding, used in approximately 45% of all Title I schools, all students at the school benefit from the additional programming and resources. Title I funds may be used to provide instruction, to provide educational materials, to provide computers, and for supporting other instructional resources. They may also be used to provide extended tutorial programs in reading and math, on weekends, and before and after school.

As significant as this funding is in giving disadvantaged children the opportunity to excel, the truth is that we do not reach enough children who are eligible for assistance. The number of children who are enrolled in the federal reduced/free lunch program is the standard way school districts determine need by. If families do not enroll their children in this program, then the data school districts primarily use to determine need is incomplete.

We also do not fully fund the Title I program. While President Bush and Secretary Paige have recommended a modest increase in spending to \$9 billion, full funding would require an authorization and subsequent appropriation in excess of \$15 billion.

In part of President Bush's *No Child Left Behind* proposal, The President has recommended that if schools fail to make adequate yearly progress three years in a row, then we should use Title I funds as vouchers to send children to higher performing private and public schools. I absolutely agree that we should set high standards for our children and take every appropriate measure to ensure that no child is left behind when it comes to their education. However, draining Title I funds from disadvantaged schools will leave many children behind.

When you take Title I funding from a disadvantaged, low-performing school, which most likely benefits from school wide programming, the only thing you do is further weaken the school. Since Title I funding averages around \$750 per child, the amount is not significant enough to pay the totality of a private school education. While some parents, who have additional financial resources from family members or other sources, may be able to supplement their child's tuition, the majority of poor families will not. Meanwhile, teachers are forced to educate the children left behind in their community schools with even fewer resources than before. If a school was considered failing prior to the siphoning of these essential Title I funds, how can it effectively operate after losing Title I funds?

One of the President's ideas is that failing schools will be motivated to avoid this harsh, punitive, measure of losing Title I funds by improving their schools. This gamble is an insult to the legions of overworked and underpaid teachers and administrators who are already doing their best to turn around their low-performing schools; schools, whose Title I funding already makes them subject to student progress tests.

We should reject punitive measures in favor of positive ones that benefit all our children. If our schools are failing we should examine the leadership of that school. Are there good principals and administrators? Are they actively involved in promoting a comprehensive school reform plan? In a candid conversation in my office, Secretary Paige told me that when he became Superintendent of Schools in Houston, the first thing he did was examine and change the leadership of his failing schools. This is a progressive step that we can all agree on.

Do we need to ensure that our schools are held accountable for the education of our children, and their use of taxpayer dollars? Absolutely--but we need to be careful about how we address the failures we encounter in our school reform efforts. The last thing anyone wants to do is cause further harm to poor, disadvantaged children, by stripping their schools of funding, right when they need it most. Through measured, yet comprehensive, bi-partisan efforts, I am confident that we can pass meaningful legislation this Congress that will bring us one step closer to delivering our children the excellent and equitable education they all deserve.

Again, thank you for your time. I would be pleased to answer any questions at this time.

***APPENDIX II – STATEMENT SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD,
CONGRESSMAN LAMAR SMITH, 21ST DISTRICT OF TEXAS, U.S.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, WASHINGTON, D.C.***

The Honorable Lamar Smith
Testimony before the House Committee on Education and the
Workforce
Hearing on H.R. 1, “No Child Left Behind”
March 28, 2001

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on H.R. 1, the “No Child Left Behind” bill.

The President has made this legislation a priority because Americans are concerned about the quality of their children’s education. They are also troubled about the decline in our nation’s values and its effect on our children. Polls consistently reveal that virtue and ethics are issues of top concern. Parents should be the primary developers of character but educators play an increasingly important role.

Unfortunately, too many of our children are bombarded daily by negative influences. Society pays the price when we

mock values. To reap the rewards of a virtuous society, we must sow the seeds of character when we educate children.

Communities across the nation recognize that character education is an integral part of a well-rounded curriculum. Our Nation's teachers are aware that character education helps to establish a set of standards for behavior, provide role models, and create caring environments. For instance, many students in Texas participate in character education programs and the lessons they learn now will serve them well in the future.

President Bush has made character education an important component of his education reform bill. By allocating \$25 million to character education, States, local education agencies, parents and students will have an opportunity to promote character and values.

However, there are additional steps to be taken if we are to be

successful. For that reason, I urge the Committee to look at H.R. 613, the Character Learning & Student Success Act (CLASS Act of 2001), which I introduced in February.

This legislation provides a grant to develop initiatives and disseminate up-to-date information about character education and also funds a study that will examine whether or not character education programs are successful and sustainable.

H.R. 1 calls for states to base their character education efforts on the findings of scientific research, yet educational experts have not been given the opportunity to develop those sound scientific conclusions. It is not even known where and how character education has found its greatest success. To support character education in its entirety, we must include research and the dissemination of useful information.

In our changing and challenging world, children need affirmation that society respects

men and women of character. It is imperative that we teach our children the values that

strengthen their character and make our country strong.

Endnotes

- ¹ Two thirds of Americans believe that improving the public schools would be an effective way to help youth (*Kids These Days*, 1997, Public Agenda).
- ² In a 1997 survey (*Kids These Days*, 1997, Public Agenda), 56% of Americans indicated their belief that the problems facing society today stem from a decline in moral values. Over 80% of respondents expressed a desire to have schools teach the values that will help students in the future, like responsibility and self-discipline (83%), hard work (78%) and honesty (74%).
- ³ A 1998 poll revealed that more Americans want Congress to focus on “restoring moral values” and “improving education” than on any other issue (*Battleground '98*, the Tarrance Group and Lake Snell Perry & Associates, August 23-25, 1998).
- ⁴ The average child spends only 33.4 hours a year in meaningful conversation with his or her parents, but invests 900 hours a year in school and 1,500 hours watching television. In those hours of television watching, the average child will see over 32 violent acts and more than 1,000 murders portrayed each year (Barber, et. al., Harper’s, November, 1993, p. 41). Meanwhile, in 1996-97, there were approximately 190,000 physical attacks that took place involving students in schools, and another 11,000 that involved the use of a weapon (National Center for Education Statistics, 1997).
- ⁵ Evaluations of individual character education programs are beginning to reveal that students who participate in character education programs show more pro-social behavior (Battistich, V., et. al., *Journal of Primary Prevention*, 21, 75-99), use less physical aggression (Grossman, et. al., *Journal of the American Medical Association*, May 27, 1997), and perform better academically (Northeast Foundation for Children, 1996-99).
- ⁶ Research in character education to date has primarily involved the evaluation of individual curriculum programs (for example, Second Step, the Child Development Project of the Developmental Studies Center, the Resolving Conflict Creatively Program, Positive Action, Heartwood and the Responsive Classroom have all reported the results of evaluation efforts involving a subset of schools using their programs). While states funded by the Partnerships in Character Education Pilot Projects are required to evaluate the effectiveness of their initiatives and have subsequently begun to report their results, findings are at best based upon one to two years of program implementation (Matera, D., *A Cry for Character*, 2001).

Table of Indexes

Chairman Boehner, 12, 13, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 28, 30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 38,
40
Mr. Akin, 34, 35
Mr. Allen, 38
Mr. Baldacci, 25, 26
Mr. Castle, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10
Mr. Clement, 9
Mr. Cummings, 22
Mr. Fattah, 10, 12
Mr. Honda, 17
Mr. Kildee, 2, 3, 5
Mr. Kingston, 19
Mr. Larson, 23
Mr. Latham, 3, 5
Mr. Matheson, 33, 34
Mr. Price, 28, 30
Mr. Schiff, 37, 38
Mr. Strickland, 12
Mr. Underwood, 13
Ms. DeLauro, 27
Ms. Hooley, 30, 32
Ms. Johnson, 6

□