DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Reauthorization of Elementary and Secondary Education Programs

AGENCY: Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education.

ACTION: Notice of request for public comment on the reauthorization of elementary and secondary education programs.

SUMMARY: The Secretary of Education invites written comments regarding the reauthorization of programs under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (ESEA), the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and Subtitle B of Title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (Education for Homeless Children and Youth).

DATES: Comments must be received by the Department on or before July 17, 1998. Comments may also be submitted at regional meetings to be held on July 8–15, 1998 (See dates, times and locations of regional meetings under the **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** section of this notice.)

ADDRESSES: Written comments should be addressed to Judith Johnson, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, U. S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW. (Portals Building, Room 4000), Washington, DC 20202–6132. E-mail responses may be sent to: Frances__Shadburn@ed.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Frances Shadburn, U.S. Department of Education, 600 Independence Avenue, SW. (Portals Building, Room 4000) Washington, DC 20202–6100. Telephone: (202) 401–0113. Individuals who use a telecommunications device for the deaf (TDD) may call the Federal Information Relay Service (FIRS) at 1–800–877–8339 between 8 a.m. and 8 p.m., Eastern time, Monday through Friday.

Individuals with disabilities may obtain this document in an alternate format (e.g. Braille, large print, audiotape, or computer diskette) on request to the contact person listed in the preceding paragraph.

Electronic Access to This Document

Anyone may view this document, as well as other Department of Education documents published in the **Federal Register**, in text or portable document format (pdf) on the World Wide Web at either of the following sites:

http://ocfo.ed.gov/fedreg.htm
http://www.ed.gov/news.html

To use the pdf, you must have the Adobe Acrobat Reader Program with Search, which is available free at the previous sites. If you have questions about using the pdf, call the U.S. Government Printing Office toll free at 1–888–293–6498.

Anyone also may view these documents in text copy only on an electronic bulletin board of the Department. Telephone: (202) 219–1511 or, toll free, 1–800–222–4922. The documents are located under Option G-Files/Announcements, Bulletins and Press Releases.

Additionally, in the future, this document, as well as other documents concerning the reauthorization of the ESEA, will be available on the World Wide Web at the following site: http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea.html.

Note: The official version of this document is the document published in the **Federal Register**.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Secretary is seeking public comment on the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Titles III and IV of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, and Subtitle B of Title VII of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. A complete list of the programs currently authorized under these statutes is provided at the end of this notice. Most of these programs were last reauthorized in 1994. At that time ESEA programs were fundamentally restructured to support, in partnership with Goals 2000, comprehensive State and local efforts to improve teaching and learning and raise academic standards. The authorization for most of these programs expires September 30, 1999.

Need for Reauthorization

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the cornerstone of Federal aid to elementary and secondary schools, embodies the Federal Government's commitment to providing funds for the education of children living in high- poverty communities. Collectively, its programs provide funds to States, districts, and schools to improve teaching and learning to help all children, especially at-risk children, meet challenging State standards. Funding for ESEA and related programs currently represents an annual $12 billion investment in our Nation's future. The support these programs provide for State and local school improvement efforts makes them key vehicles for carrying out the Department's mission: ''To Ensure Equal Access to Education and Promote Educational Excellence Throughout the Nation.''

Title I, the largest of the ESEA programs, is the primary vehicle for providing assistance to schools to raise the academic performance of poor and low-achieving students, especially in schools serving areas with high concentrated poverty.

The 1994 reauthorization responded to data from the Department's ''Prospects'' longitudinal study which concluded that the former Chapter I (now Title I) was not structured to close the achievement gap between students attending high- and low-poverty schools. To address this need, the 1994 reauthorization restructured the program to, among other things, encourage high-poverty schools to move away from ''pullout'' programs to ''schoolwide'' approaches for improving entire schools. To facilitate this change, the 1994 reauthorization linked Title I to other ESEA programs and State and local school reform efforts in partnership with Goals 2000 so that Federal and State programs could work together to provide all children, whatever their backgrounds and whatever schools they attend, with the opportunity to achieve the same high standards expected of all children. The 1994 reauthorization also revised the other ESEA programs so that they too support State and local school reform. For example, the Eisenhower Professional Development program was changed to support improved instructional practices in other core subjects in addition to math and science. A key component of the entire revised ESEA provides States and local schools with greatly increased flexibility in return for being held accountable for improving student achievement.

The President's fiscal year 1999 budget expands on Goals 2000 and the ESEA by requesting funds to help build the capacity of school districts and schools to: (1) deliver high-quality instruction by reducing class size in the early grades; (2) expand the pace and scope of reform in 35 high-poverty urban and rural school districts with significant barriers to high achievement that have already begun to show progress in implementing standards-based reform; (3) increase the number of school-based before- and after-school extended-day programs; (4) build and renovate public schools through the provision of tax credits to pay interest on nearly $22 billion in bonds; and (5) provide support for schools, communities, and families to work together in improving and expanding opportunities for children to develop strong literacy skills.

When Goals 2000 was established and the ESEA was last reauthorized, the

Congress recognized that States required time to implement thoughtfully high standards aligned with challenging assessments as part of their ongoing school reforms. As a result, Title I requires States to develop or adopt challenging content standards and student performance standards, at least in mathematics, and reading and language arts, by Fall, 1997, and assessments aligned with standards by the school year 2000–2001. States, districts, and schools are steadily making progress toward implementing standards-based reform. However, there are still provisions of the law that have not yet been fully implemented—for example, aligned assessments that are part of accountability systems do not have to be in place until school year 2000–2001. Similarly, many States have requested and received waivers as they continue to develop their student performance standards. Reauthorization provides the opportunity to consider what changes, if any, are necessary to strengthen the effectiveness of Federal elementary and secondary education programs to improve teaching and learning for all students, especially those students most at risk of failing to meet State standards.

The Secretary intends to submit the Department's reauthorization proposal for Goals 2000 and ESEA and related programs to the Congress early in 1999, in conjunction with the President's fiscal year 2000 budget request. Proposed performance indicators also will be developed to provide feedback on program progress in accordance with the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA). GPRA requires all agencies to develop agency-wide strategic plans, and to identify and collect information on performance indicators for all programs. The Department's strategic plan organizes performance measurement around key policy objectives and the programs that advance these objectives: standards development (through Goals 2000); helping at-risk populations to achieve to challenging standards (Title I and other programs that serve at-risk populations); supporting local capacity-building (professional development and technology) to enhance instruction aligned with standards and improve the climate for learning (Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities); and stimulating flexibility, performance accountability, and innovation (charter schools, Ed-Flex). The U.S. Department of Education Strategic Plan, 1998–2002, including current performance indicators, is available on the Department's Web site at http://www.ed.gov/pubs/StratPln/ or can be requested by calling 1–800–USA–LEARN. The Secretary invites public comments on the issues identified in this notice and recommendations for performance indicators.

Issues for Public Comment

The Secretary seeks comments and suggestions regarding reauthorization of Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs. The Secretary is interested both in comments regarding changes that may be needed, as well as comments on aspects of the programs that are working well and should be maintained. As noted above, the last ESEA reauthorization fundamentally restructured all ESEA programs so that they, together with Goals 2000, would support State and local efforts to improve our Nation's schools through comprehensive, standards-based reform of teaching and learning. The programs authorized by these statutes support State efforts to develop standards describing what students should know and be able to do at key points in their schooling, and district and school efforts to put in place educational programs that provide each student with the opportunity to meet those standards.

Since the 1995–96 school year, when the last reauthorization took effect, States have made progress in implementing standards-based reform. Currently, forty-seven States including Washington, D.C. and Puerto Rico, report that they have adopted challenging content standards in at least reading and mathematics as required by ESEA Title I. All the remaining States—except one—also have State content standards that they are either revising or are in the process of formally adopting.

Although the development of content standards is the first step, there is still a long way to go to incorporate State standards fully into daily classroom activities. States and districts generally are now moving to the next phases of standards-based reform—developing student performance standards and assessments that measure student progress toward meeting the standards, and increasing the capacity of teachers, schools, and districts to implement changes to help all students meet challenging State standards. Capacities needed for effective teaching and learning include many factors, such as teacher knowledge and skills, student motivation and readiness to learn, and quality curriculum materials for teachers and students.

One aspect of capacity building is how school reform efforts at the State, district, and school levels can best be informed by high-quality research and dissemination. In addition to technical assistance provided through the ESEA, the Department of Education funds regional educational laboratories to carry out applied research, development, dissemination, and other technical assistance activities by working with States, districts, and schools in their regions. The Department also is required to establish expert panels to review educational programs and to recommend to the Secretary those programs that should be designated as exemplary or promising for dissemination.

Clearly, more time will be needed for States and districts to implement fully a coherent set of reforms reflecting an aligned system of standards, assessment, instruction, professional development, and accountability, and for principals and teachers to fully implement reforms in the classroom. Nevertheless, there is already some evidence of the impact of State and local efforts, supported by Federal education programs, to help all elementary and secondary students attain high standards. States that have had assessments linked to standards for more than two years are showing progress in the achievement of all of their students, including those in high-poverty schools. For example, Texas reports that the percentage of Title I students passing all parts of the Texas Assessment of Student Achievement has increased from 37.6 percent in the 1994–95 school year to 62.1 percent in the 1996–97 school year. National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) scores in math, the first subject area to implement standards-based, comprehensive reforms, are improving generally for the Nation and appreciably in some States. For example, data from the 1996 NAEP long-term trend assessment show math scores for 9 year-olds rising steadily since 1992, particularly in high-poverty schools (schools with at least 75 percent of the students on subsidized lunch). The percentage of 4th-grade students in high-poverty schools who are achieving at or above the basic level in math on NAEP has increased in almost every State since 1992. In some States, achievement in high-poverty schools meets or exceeds the national average of 64 percent of students scoring at or above the basic level.

The Secretary believes that the early evidence from States and districts that have made the most progress in implementing standards-based reform demonstrates that the focus in Goals 2000 and the ESEA on supporting State and local school reform efforts is sound and should be continued in the next reauthorization. The Secretary also

believes that the priorities governing the last reauthorization are also sound and should be continued. These priorities are: (1) high standards for all children with the elements of education aligned so that everything is working together to help all students reach those standards; (2) a focus on teaching and learning; (3) flexibility to stimulate local school-based and district initiatives, coupled with responsibility for student performance; (4) links among schools, parents, and communities; and (5) resources targeted to where needs are greatest and in amounts sufficient to make a difference.

The Secretary seeks comments on the effectiveness of current programs in supporting State and local efforts to improve teaching and learning to help all children, especially at-risk children, meet challenging State standards. The questions in this notice are organized under three cross-cutting categories. These categories are: (1) Federal support for State and local school reform including questions addressing implementing standards in the classroom through professional development, technology to support teaching and learning, and targeting resources; (2) strategies for addressing the needs of children most at risk of failing to meet State standards; and (3) school environments conducive for learning including questions addressing Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, parental involvement, extended learning opportunities before and after school, and school facilities. In addition to consideration of the cross-cutting issues, individual programs will also be reviewed as part of the reauthorization. Comments on issues other than those raised in this notice are welcome.

Within each of the following cross-cutting categories, the Secretary is especially interested in: (1) suggestions on ways to strengthen the ability of Goals 2000 and ESEA programs to help all children, including students with limited English proficiency, migrant children, economically disadvantaged children including economically disadvantaged minority students, children with disabilities, and other educationally disadvantaged children meet challenging State student performance standards; and (2) comments directed at how the activity being discussed can be carried out in the most flexible manner possible while improving accountability for results.

I. Support for State and Local School Reform

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act provides the framework for Federal support of State and local efforts to reform public schools by supporting the development of challenging State standards and new assessments to measure whether children are achieving those standards. The 1994 ESEA reauthorization built on the Goals 2000 framework, fundamentally reshaping ESEA programs so they would better support comprehensive State and local efforts to improve teaching and learning, especially in schools serving economically disadvantaged communities. The changes made in 1994 included: (1) requiring the same challenging State content and student performance standards for all students; (2) linking Federal program accountability requirements to student's achievement of challenging State standards; (3) supporting professional development tied to those standards; (4) providing greater flexibility in exchange for greater accountability for student performance; (5) promoting school-level decision-making to bolster local initiative; (6) authorizing consolidated applications and plans to reduce paperwork burdens so that educators can focus more time, energy, and resources on better educating children; and (7) providing authority for the Secretary to waive Federal rules and regulations, as needed, to improve student achievement. The Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration program was added in 1997, primarily as part of Title I of ESEA, to encourage more extensive implementation of research-based approaches to comprehensive school reform.

Support for State and Local School Reform: General Questions

1. Are there changes in Federal statutes that would make Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs more effective tools for supporting comprehensive State and school district school reform? For example, given the progress that States, districts, and schools have made in implementing standards-based reforms, are changes needed to Goals 2000 to make it better aligned with current implementation efforts? Are there changes that would enable Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs to support more effectively State and school district efforts to improve the capacity of teachers, schools, and districts to integrate standards into the classroom? Are there changes that would make it easier for States, districts, schools, and teachers to get information on new research, on research-based programs, and on promising practices for improving the achievement of all students, especially educationally disadvantaged children?

2. In addition to funding technical assistance through a variety of ESEA and Goals 2000 authorities, the U.S. Department of Education also funds regional educational laboratories to assist in the implementation of education reform. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would enable federally supported technical assistance efforts to support State and district, and school reform more effectively?

3. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would encourage greater public school choice as part of State and local school reform? For example, the Department of Education encourages expansion of choice within the public school system with such alternatives as charter schools, magnet schools, and system-wide strategies that make every public school a school of choice. Are changes needed in the law to strengthen these alternatives? Are changes needed in the Federal law to incorporate the knowledge gained about school reform from the establishment and operation of charter and magnet schools?

4. The ESEA currently contains provisions addressing the participation of private school students and teachers that are applicable across many ESEA programs. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would improve the effectiveness of these provisions?

Support for State and Local School Reform: Implementing Standards in the Classroom

Improved teaching and learning is central to the effort to help each child achieve to high State standards. Because professional development helps all teachers, school leaders, and other personnel teach to and support high standards, professional development is an authorized activity in Goals 2000 and almost every ESEA program. The ESEA also authorizes a major program, the Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development program, specifically to support national and State professional development in the major content areas.

Research indicates that professional development must be sustained, intensive, and of high quality to have a lasting impact, and must address teacher preparation as well as ongoing training for teachers in the classroom. Research also indicates that professional development is most effective when it includes networks, study groups, teacher research, and other strategies that enable teachers to meet regularly to solve problems, consider new ideas, analyze student work, or reflect on specific subject matter issues. The U.S. Department of Education and the

National Science Foundation have launched a joint effort to develop a range of appropriate mechanisms to raise student achievement in mathematics and science. These mechanisms include support for networks among teachers, schools, parents, colleges, students, professional scientists, mathematicians, engineers, and others.

5. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would focus and coordinate professional development resources across Goals 2000 and ESEA programs to ensure that all teachers and educational personnel have sufficient knowledge and skills to teach all children, including children most at risk of failing, to challenging State standards?

6. A recent National Academy of Sciences study states that if all students are to become successful readers, children must be able to discover the nature of the alphabetic system, understand how sounds are represented alphabetically, gain meaning from print, and practice reading skills to achieve fluency. In order to gain these skills, exposure to language and literacy must begin in the pre-school years, primary grades must focus on reading instruction; teachers must participate in ongoing sustained professional development; elementary schools must have enriched reading programs; students who do not have proficiency in English should be exposed to reading in their native language while acquiring proficiency in spoken English; and early intervention is critical. How can the use of research-based knowledge and of research-based approaches to improving student achievement be encouraged through teacher preparation and ongoing training?

7. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would strengthen connections between institutions of higher education and schools for high-quality professional development to increase the capacity of teachers and principals to implement standards-based reform?

Support for State and Local School Reform: Using Technology To Support Teaching and Learning

Educators across the country have begun to use technology in their classrooms on a regular basis, and many are convinced that technology can be very effective in improving teaching and learning. There is strong evidence that, used properly, computers and related telecommunications technologies provide new opportunities to students that can improve their motivation and achievement. The best instructional practices using technology are generally recognized as providing strong support for the kinds of improvements sought by education reformers through new approaches to teaching and learning. While teacher's level of knowledge about technology is rapidly expanding, technology also is changing rapidly. Questions about new technology and how best to use it in teaching and learning will create an ongoing need for updated information in schools across the Nation, and the quality and quantity of assistance made available to schools will be an important factor in how quickly and well the benefits of technology are realized. Furthermore, as opportunities for using technology at school and home increase, it is imperative that all schools and students—not just those that can afford it—have access to these new resources so that technology reduces rather than increases disparities in the education of poor children and their better-off peers. In addition, the expertise of the teacher and the integration of technology into the curriculum are essential to improving student performance.

Under the current authorization, concentrated Federal support for technology is provided under five main programs that include a mix of State formula and discretionary grants. Authorization to use funds for technology also is embedded in other large programs, such as Title I and Goals 2000.

8. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would better support the use of technology to advance State and local school reform efforts designed to help all children acquire the knowledge contained in State content standards? For example, are there changes that would improve access for students in high-poverty schools to high-quality academic content through technology? Are there changes that would increase the ability of teachers to use technology as an instructional resource? Should the focus be on development and demonstration of high-quality instructional applications of technology for all schools, or should it continue to be development of the infrastructure for students and schools in high-poverty areas?

Support for State and Local School Reform: Targeting Resources/ Equalization

Academic performance tends to be lower in schools serving the highest percentages of children who live in poverty, and the obstacles to raising academic performance are considerable. The current law contains multiple provisions to direct financial resources to areas of greatest need. For example, Title I funds must be used first in all schools with poverty rates above 75 percent, and low-poverty schools may not receive higher per-pupil allocations than high-poverty schools.

In addition to the issue of how Federal funds are targeted, since 1971 State courts have found school funding systems to be inequitable and unconstitutional in 17 States, and a 1997 General Accounting Office (GAO) report found that ''On average, wealthy districts had about 24 percent more total funding per weighted pupil than poor districts.'' Sizable disparities also exist across States, with average per-pupil funding ranging from a high of $9,700 to a low of $3,656 in 1994–95. Because Federal funding is more targeted to at-risk students, both in terms of services and total dollars, than State funding, it is an important source of funding for closing the gap between high- and low-poverty schools.

9. Are there changes to the Federal statutes that would improve the distribution of ESEA and related program funds to communities and schools where they are most needed?

10. Current distribution formulas for some ESEA programs may result in allocations so small that school districts may have difficulty mounting effective, comprehensive programs. Are changes in Federal statutes needed to address this situation?

11. Should the Federal Government play a role in promoting greater equity in the distribution of school funding across and within States. If so, what should that role be and are there changes to Federal statutes that would be necessary to carry out the role?

II. Strategies for Addressing the Needs of Children Most at Risk of Failing To Meet State Standards

Goals 2000 and the revised ESEA and related programs are designed to support State and local efforts to improve America's schools for all children, particularly schools serving disadvantaged children. The resources these statutes provide are supplemental to funds and services provided through State and local resources. While the Federal Government contributes only six percent of American elementary and secondary school dollars nationally, Federal funds are substantial in many States and school districts and represent a significant source of funding for services for at-risk children. According to a January 1998 GAO report, Federal funding is more targeted to at-risk students, both in terms of services and total dollars, than State funding. These additional funds are critical for high-

poverty schools. Generally, academic achievement tends to be low in schools serving many children who live in poverty, and the obstacles to raising performance in these schools are challenging.

Over the past 33 years the Congress has amended and expanded ESEA multiple times, creating programs to help children who speak little English, migrant children, neglected and delinquent children, Native American/Alaskan Native children, and other children most at-risk of failing to meet challenging State standards. The ESEA also supports programs that promote educational equity for women and girls.

Enabling all children, especially at-risk children, to meet challenging State standards requires that State and local school reform efforts take into account the needs of a diverse student population. As States, districts, and schools progress toward full implementation of educational reform, they need specific targeted strategies to provide all students with equal access to rigorous academic standards, instruction, and aligned assessments that measure higher-order thinking skills and understanding.

The Secretary seeks not only to maintain the connection begun in the 1994 ESEA reauthorization between Federal elementary and secondary programs with their focus on at-risk students, and State and local school reform efforts, but to strengthen it.

12. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would make Goals 2000, ESEA, and related programs more effective tools for use by States, districts, and schools in closing the achievement gap between students most at risk of failing to meet challenging State standards and other students? Are there changes to the Federal statute that would improve the role of accountability measures in both raising student achievement and providing more State and local flexibility? For example, should Title I improvement provisions be changed or strengthened?

13. Students most at risk of failing to meet State standards need the highest quality instruction provided by the most knowledgeable teachers, yet half of the instructional staff in Title I are paraprofessionals, most of whom have only high school diplomas. Are there changes to Federal statute that would strengthen qualifications for Title I and Title VII (Bilingual Education) staff who instruct students most at-risk of failing to meet challenging State standards?

14. A growing body of research on the development of the brain and its implications for learning during certain critical periods of child development supports the need for early intervention and the importance of pre-school and parent education. How can Federal programs encourage greater application of this knowledge?

III. School Environments Conducive to Learning

For students to learn and compete in the global economy, schools must be modern and well-equipped, and provide an environment conducive to learning. A school environment conducive to learning is safe and drug-free, encourages active parental and community involvement, and often includes extended learning opportunities during non-traditional school hours (before and after school, weekends and summer sessions).

Students cannot learn and teachers cannot teach if students are disruptive or are threatened with violence. At the same time, research indicates that students who report positive school experiences are significantly less likely to use drugs than their peers who have negative experiences in school.

Research also indicates that when schools make a concerted effort to enlist the help of mothers and fathers in fostering children's learning, student achievement rises. When families are involved in their children's education, children earn higher grades and receive higher scores on tests, attend school more regularly, complete more homework, demonstrate more positive attitudes and behaviors, graduate from high school at higher rates, and are more likely to enroll in higher education than are students with less family involvement in their schooling.

Recent survey data indicate that parents strongly support school-based after-school programs that include expanded learning opportunities and enrichment and recreational activities. After-school programs can also contribute to school safety by providing supervised programs for young people to attend after the regular school day.

Goals 2000 and the ESEA support a variety of approaches to helping families become active partners in their children's education, including Even Start family literacy programs, Goals 2000 parent centers, and school-parent compacts under Title I. The Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act (ESEA, Title IV), first enacted in 1986, has been the Federal Government's major effort in the area of drug education and prevention. It promotes comprehensive drug and violence prevention strategies for making schools and neighborhoods safe and drug free. The 21st Century Community Learning Centers program funds community learning centers that include after-school programs.

Equally important to the activities going on in a school is the physical condition of the school building itself. A 1995 study by the GAO found serious and widespread problems in school facilities across the country. These problems ranged from overcrowding and structural failures to inadequate electrical and plumbing systems. Further, the GAO found that many States and local school districts were unable or unprepared to meet the costs of improving these facilities.

15. Are there changes to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act that would encourage the implementation of more effective, research-based drug and violence prevention programs?

16. Are there changes to Federal statutes that would strengthen the ability of Federal education programs to assist families in their efforts to be active partners in their children's education? For example, could the current Title I requirement for school-parent compacts (which describes the shared responsibility of schools, parents, and students for improved student achievement) be improved?

17. In addition to helping local communities finance the construction and renovation of school facilities, what additional barriers to the modernization of schools need to be addressed?

Regional Meetings

Participants are welcome to address these and other issues relating to the reauthorization of the ESEA, either by attending the regional meetings or submitting written comments. Individuals desiring to present comments at the meetings are encouraged to do so. It is likely that each participant choosing to make a statement will be limited to four minutes. Speakers may also submit written comments. Individuals interested in making oral statements will be able to sign up to make a statement beginning at twelve noon on the day of the meeting at the Department's regional meeting on-site registration table on a first-come, first-served basis. If no time slots remain, then the Department will reserve a limited amount of additional time at the end of each regional meeting to accommodate these individuals. The amount of time available will depend upon the number of individuals who request reservations. In addition, written comments will be accepted and must be received on or before July 17, 1998.

The dates and location of the four regional meetings appear below. The Department of Education has reserved a limited number of rooms at each of the following hotels at a special government per diem room rate (Boston's Park Plaza Hotel does not have a special government per diem room rate). To reserve these rates, be certain to inform the hotel that you are attending the reauthorization hearings with the Department of Education.

The meeting sites are accessible to individuals with disabilities. An individual with a disability who will need an auxiliary aid or service to participate in the meeting (e.g., interpreting service, assistive listening device, or materials in an alternate format) should notify the contact person listed in this notice at least two weeks before the scheduled meeting date. Although the Department will attempt to meet a request received after that date, the requested auxiliary aid or service may not be available because of insufficient time to arrange it.

Dates, Times, and Locations of Regional Meetings

1. July 8, 1998, 1:30–5:30 p.m., Hotel Inter-Continental Los Angeles, 251 South Olive Street, Los Angeles, California; 1–213–617–3300 and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 17.

2. July 10, 1998, 1:30–5:30 p.m., Radisson Hotel & Suites, 160 East Huron Street, Chicago, Illinois, 1–312–787–2900, and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 19.

3. July 13, 1998, 1:30–5:30 p.m., Park Plaza Hotel, 64 Arlington Street, Boston, Massachusetts, 1–617–426–2000, and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 22.

4. July 15, 1998, 1:30–5:30 p.m., Terrace Garden Hotel, 3405 Lenox Road, N.E., Atlanta, Georgia, 1–404–261–9250, and ask for reservations. Room reservations must be made by June 24.

FORMAT FOR COMMENT: This request for comments is designed to elicit the views of interested parties on how the Department's elementary and secondary education programs can be structured to meet the objectives of the reauthorization as stated in this notice.

The Secretary requests that each respondent identify his or her role in education and the perspective from which he or she views the educational system—either as a representative of an association, agency, or school (public or private), or as an individual teacher, student, parent, or private citizen.

The Secretary urges each commenter to identify the specific question being responded to by number, to be specific regarding his or her proposals, and to include, if possible, the data requirements, procedures, and actual legislative language that the commenter proposes for the improvement or redesign of programs.

Richard W. Riley,

Secretary of Education.

Existing Programs and Related Provisions Under the Scope of the ESEA/Goals 2000 Reauthorization

Goals 2000: Educate America Act

Title III—State and Local Education Systemic Improvement
Title IV—Parental Assistance
Title V—National Skill Standards Board
Title VI—International Education Program
Title VIII—Minority-Focused Civics Education
Title X—Miscellaneous
Section 1011—School Prayer
Section 1018—Contraceptive Devices
Section 1019—Assessment
Section 1020—Public Schools
Section 1022—Sense of the Congress

Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965

Title I—Helping Disadvantaged Children Meet High Standards
Part A—Improving Basic Programs Operated by LEAs
Part B—Even Start Family Literacy Programs
Part C—Education of Migratory Children
Part D—Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk of Dropping Out
Part E—Federal Evaluations, Demonstrations, and Transition Projects
Part F—General Provisions
Title II—Dwight D. Eisenhower Professional Development Program
Part A—Federal Activities
Part B—State and Local Activities
Part C—Professional Development Demonstration Project
Title III—Technology for Education
Part A—Technology for Education of All Students
Subpart 1—National Programs for Technology in Education
Subpart 2—State and Local Programs for School Technology Resources
Subpart 3—Regional Technical Support and Professional Development
Subpart 4—Product Development
Part B—Star Schools Program
Part C—Ready-to-Learn Television
Part D—Telecommunications Demonstration Project for Mathematics
Part E—Elementary Mathematics and Science Equipment Program
Title IV—Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities
Part A—State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs
Subpart 1—State Grants for Drug and Violence Prevention Programs
Subpart 2—National Programs
Title V—Promoting Equity
Part A—Magnet Schools Assistance
Part B—Women's Educational Equity
Part C—Assistance to Address School Dropout Problems
Title VI—Innovative Education Program Strategies
Title VII—Bilingual Education, Language Enhancement, and Language Acquisition Programs
Part A—Bilingual Education
Subpart 1—Bilingual Education Capacity and Demonstration Grants
Subpart 2—Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination
Subpart 3—Professional Development
Part B—Foreign Language Assistance Program
Part C—Emergency Immigrant Education Program
Part D—Administration
Title VIII—Impact Aid
Title IX—Indian, Native Hawaiian, and Alaska Native Education
Part A—Indian Education
Subpart 1—Formula Grants to LEAs
Subpart 2—Special Programs and Projects to Improve Educational Opportunities for Indian Children
Subpart 3—Special Programs Relating to Adult Education for Indians
Subpart 4—National Research Activities
Subpart 5—Federal Administration
Subpart 6—Definitions
Part B—Native Hawaiians
Part C—Alaska Native Education
Title X—Programs of National Significance
Part A—Fund for the Improvement of Education
Part B—Gifted and Talented Children
Part C—Public Charter Schools
Part D—Arts in Education
Subpart 1—Arts in Education
Subpart 2—Cultural Partnerships for At-Risk Children and Youth
Part E—Inexpensive Book Distribution Program
Part F—Civic Education
Part G—Allen J. Ellender Fellowship Program
Part H—DeLugo Territorial Education Improvement Program
Part I—21st Century Community Learning Centers
Part J—Urban and Rural Education Assistance
Part K—National Writing Project
Part L—The Extended Time for

Learning and Longer School Year
Part M—Territorial Assistance
Title XI—Coordinated Services
Title XII—School Facilities Infrastructure Improvement Act
Title XIII—Support and Assistance Programs to Improve Education
Part A—Comprehensive Regional Assistance Centers
Part B—National Diffusion Network
Part C—Eisenhower Regional Mathematics and Science Education Consortia
Part D—Technology-Based Technical Assistance
Title XIV—General Provisions
Part A—Definitions
Part B—Flexibility in the Use of Administrative and other Funds
Part C—Coordination of Programs; Consolidated State and Local Plans and Applications
Part D—Waivers
Part E—Uniform Provisions
Part F—Gun Possession
Part G—Evaluations
Title VII, Subtitle B, Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act

[FR Doc. 98–14546 Filed 6–1–98; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 4000–01–P