AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION BLUEPRINT

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON
EDUCATION AND LABOR

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

HEARING HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, MARCH 17, 2010

Serial No. 111–52

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor

Available on the Internet:
http://www.gpoaccess.gov/congress/house/education/index.html

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

55–303 PDF WASHINGTON : 2010

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2104 Mail: Stop IDCC, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

GEORGE MILLER, California, *Chairman*

Dale E. Kildee, Michigan, *Vice Chairman*
Donald M. Payne, New Jersey
Robert E. Andrews, New Jersey
Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Virginia
Lynn C. Woolsey, California
Rubén Hinojosa, Texas
Carolyn McCarthy, New York
John F. Tierney, Massachusetts
Dennis J. Kucinich, Ohio
David Wu, Oregon
Rush D. Holt, New Jersey
Susan A. Davis, California
Raúl M. Grijalva, Arizona
Timothy H. Bishop, New York
Joe Sestak, Pennsylvania
David Loebsack, Iowa
Mazie Hirono, Hawaii
Jason Altmire, Pennsylvania
Phil Hare, Illinois
Yvette D. Clarke, New York
Joe Courtney, Connecticut
Carol Shea-Porter, New Hampshire
Marcia L. Fudge, Ohio
Jared Polis, Colorado
Paul Tonko, New York
Pedro R. Pierluisi, Puerto Rico
Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Northern Mariana Islands
Dina Titus, Nevada
Judy Chu, California

John Kline, Minnesota, *Senior Republican Member*
Thomas E. Petri, Wisconsin
Howard P. "Buck" McKeon, California
Peter Hoekstra, Michigan
Michael N. Castle, Delaware
Mark E. Souder, Indiana
Vernon J. Ehlers, Michigan
Judy Biggert, Illinois
Todd Russell Platts, Pennsylvania
Joe Wilson, South Carolina
Cathy McMorris Rodgers, Washington
Tom Price, Georgia
Rob Bishop, Utah
Brett Guthrie, Kentucky
Bill Cassidy, Louisiana
Tom McClintock, California
Duncan Hunter, California
David P. Roe, Tennessee
Glenn Thompson, Pennsylvania

Mark Zuckerman, *Staff Director*
Barrett Karr, *Minority Staff Director*

C O N T E N T S

	Page
Hearing held on March 17, 2010	1
Statement of Members:	
Kline, Hon. John, Senior Republican Member, Committee on Education and Labor	5
Prepared statement of	6
Miller, Hon. George, Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor	2
Prepared statement of	4
Questions submitted for the record	45
Scott, Hon. Robert C. "Bobby", a Representative in Congress from the State of Virginia, policy brief: "Schools Without Diversity: Education Management Organizations, Charter Schools, and the Demographic Stratification of the American School System," Internet address to	31
Statement of Witnesses:	
Duncan, Hon. Arne, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education	8
Prepared statement of	13
Responses to questions for the record	52

THE OBAMA ADMINISTRATION'S ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION ACT REAUTHORIZATION BLUEPRINT

Wednesday, March 17, 2010
U.S. House of Representatives
Committee on Education and Labor
Washington, DC

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 2:45 p.m., in room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. George Miller [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Miller, Kildee, Payne, Andrews, Scott, Woolsey, Hinojosa, McCarthy, Tierney, Holt, Davis, Grijalva, Bishop of New York, Loebsack, Hirono, Altmire, Hare, Clarke, Courtney, Shea-Porter, Polis, Tonko, Pierluisi, Sablan, Titus, Chu, Kline, Petri, McKeon, Hoekstra, Castle, Souder, Ehlers, Biggert, Platts, McMorris Rodgers, Bishop of Utah, Guthrie, Cassidy, Roe, and Thompson.

Staff Present: Tylease Alli, Hearing Clerk; Andra Belknap, Press Assistant; Calla Brown, Staff Assistant, Education; Jamie Fasteau, Senior Education Policy Advisor; Denise Forte, Director of Education Policy; Ruth Friedman, Senior Education Policy Advisor, David Hartzler, Systems Administrator; Fred Jones, Junior Legislative Associate, Education; Sharon Lewis, Senior Disability Policy Advisor; Sadie Marshall, Chief Clerk; Bryce McKibbon, Staff Assistant; Charmaine Mercer, Senior Education Policy Advisor; Alex Nock, Deputy Staff Director; Lillian Pace, Policy Advisor, Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education; Helen Pajcic, Education Policy Associate; Kristina Peterson, Legislative Fellow, Education; Rachel Racusen, Communications Director; Julie Radocchia, Senior Education Policy Advisor; Meredith Regine, Junior Legislative Associate; Alexandria Ruiz, Administrative Assistant to Director of Education Policy; Melissa Salmanowitz, Press Secretary; Mark Zuckerman; Staff Director; Stephanie Arras, Minority Legislative Assistant; James Bergeron, Minority Deputy Director of Education and Human Services Policy; Kirk Boyle, Minority General Counsel; Allison Dembeck, Minority Professional Staff; Amy Raaf Jones, Minority Higher Education Counsel and Senior Advisor; Barrett Karr, Minority Staff Director; Alexa Marrero, Minority Communications Director; Susan Ross, Minority Director of Education and Human Services Policy; Mandy Schaumburg, Minority Education Policy Counsel; and Linda Stevens, Minority Chief Clerk/Assistant to the General Counsel.

Chairman MILLER. A quorum being present, the committee will come to order.

The committee meets today to hear from Secretary of Education Arne Duncan on the blueprint that was made public earlier this week and to discuss that with members of the committee. This was done at the urging of the bipartisan group in the House and the Senate that the Secretary has been meeting with and that has been meeting on the reauthorization of the ESEA. So thank you, Mr. Secretary, for doing that.

I will recognize myself at the beginning, and then recognize Congressman Kline.

Today, Secretary Duncan joins us to discuss President Obama's newly released blueprint for rewriting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, as I said, for being with us.

Two weeks ago, you outlined President's Obama vision for providing a world-class education to every child in this country. You told us that the status quo is failing our students, you told us that a strong education system is key to our long-term economic stability, and members of this committee on both sides of the aisle agree.

Right now, even our best students are performing at lower levels in math than students in 22 other countries. Nearly 80 percent of U.S. Students are entering the ninth grade unable to read at grade level. This has to change. It is time to overhaul and improve ESEA so that the law finally lives up to its promise, to provide an equal and excellent education for every child in America.

These improvements will require dramatic reforms to regain our role as a world leader in education. But if we are successful, I believe we can build a solid economic foundation for future generations.

What our students need to succeed isn't a mystery. They need a challenging and rigorous learning environment tied to college and career-ready standards. They need creative and effective teachers who hold them to high standards and who can adjust their teaching strategies when needed.

Innovative reformers across the country at the local level are making significant progress in many of these areas. Now at the Federal level, we have to match their courage to disrupt the system and push the envelope.

I believe that the blueprint that Secretary Duncan presents us offers a strong roadmap for this kind of systemwide change. Eight years ago I helped write our current version of the ESEA, the No Child Left Behind Act, and in many ways the law was transformational. It helped shine a bright light on what was really going on in our schools.

It told all of us, lawmakers, educators, school boards and the community, that it was no longer acceptable for any student to be invisible. It showed us how all students and schools were faring, not just the richest district or the highest achieving students. The results were difficult for many to swallow, but it showed us the value of accountability for our students. It provoked a conversation about education in this country that has gotten us to where we are today.

But we know we didn't get everything right. The blueprint we will hear about today rightfully gives some control back to the States and districts to allow them to determine their own best strategies to turn around their lowest performing schools, and it switches the conversation from one about proficiency to one about ensuring that our students graduate ready for college and a career.

We now have an incredible opportunity to help reshape the future of this country. The Obama administration has already launched game-changing reforms for our schools. Many States are taking unprecedented steps in the right direction.

In my home State of California, the State legislature removed the firewall that prevented student achievement data from being linked to teacher performance, a move that was a long time coming. And in order to qualify for a second round of Race to the Top funding, California recently released the list of its 187 persistently unperforming schools. California's recent actions and the actions of so many other States have signaled they are ready to help fix schools that are chronically failing our students.

As we take a close look at the administration's blueprint today, I would like to lay out some of the fundamental goals of what we must address in this rewrite. We need to reset the bar for our students and for the Nation.

First, we need to ensure that every child can be taught by a great teacher, especially those who need them the most. Teachers are our single most important factor in determining student achievement, but all of the burden cannot fall on their shoulders. Yet we have 14 percent of our new teachers who stopped teaching in their first year, more than a third leave teaching after 3 years, almost 50 percent leave after 5 years. That would suggest there is something wrong with their workplace. We can't expect teachers to stay in a system that doesn't treat them with the same level of professionalism as other careers. We can support great teaching in classrooms across this country by providing them with the right tools, like extended planning time, more opportunities for career development, and the resources necessary to carry out their tasks, and by making sure that they have data at their fingertips on how the children are learning and how we can make success an outcome for every child.

Second, the quality of a child's education should not be determined by their ZIP Code. Every school in every State needs to hold their students to rigorous internationally benchmarked standards that prepare them for college or a career.

Third, there are districts and schools across the country seeing incredible success after years of stagnant results. These schools were given room to innovate. They kept their focus on achieving the highest levels and holding themselves accountable for all students. We must encourage States and districts to innovate and to think differently while maintaining high standards for all.

Lastly, we have to ensure that we are reaching every student with the right resources in every classroom. Secretary Duncan, you have said repeatedly that our students get one chance at an education. One chance. I think the President's blueprint lays important markers for where we begin this rewrite. It will help build the kind

of world-class school system our economy needs and our children deserve.

Secretary Duncan, again, thank you for being with us today. Thank you for your leadership and your vision. I look forward to your testimony.

With that, I would like to recognize the senior Republican on the committee, Congressman John Kline.

[The statement of Mr. Miller follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. George Miller, Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor

Good afternoon.

Today Secretary Duncan joins us to discuss the Obama's administration's newly released blueprint for rewriting the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for meeting with us again.

Two weeks ago, you outlined President Obama's vision for providing a world class education to every child in this country.

You told us that the status quo is failing our students.

You told us that a strong education system is key to our long-term economic stability.

Members of this committee, on both sides of the aisle, agree.

Right now, even our best students are performing at a lower level in math than students in 22 other countries.

Nearly 80 percent of U.S. students are entering the ninth grade unable to read at grade level.

This has to change.

It's time to overhaul and improve ESEA so that the law finally lives up to its promise: to provide an equal and excellent education for every child in America.

These improvements will require dramatic reforms to regain our role as a world leader in education.

But if we are successful, I believe we can build a solid economic foundation for our future generations.

What our students need to succeed isn't a mystery.

They need a challenging and rigorous learning environment tied to college and career ready standards.

They need creative, effective teachers who hold them to high standards—and can adjust their teaching strategies when needed.

Innovative reformers across the country, at the local level, are making significant progress in these areas.

Now, at the federal level, we have to match their courage to disrupt the system and push the envelope.

I believe that the blueprint Secretary Duncan presents to us offers a strong roadmap for this kind of system-wide change.

Eight years ago, I helped write our current version of ESEA, the No Child Left Behind Act.

In many ways, the law was transformational.

It finally helped shine a bright light on what was really going on in our schools.

It told all of us—lawmakers, educators, parents, school boards—that it was no longer acceptable for any student to be invisible.

It showed us how all students and schools were faring, not just the richest districts or the highest-achieving students.

The results were difficult for many to swallow.

But it showed us the value of accountability for our students.

It provoked a conversation about education in this country that has gotten us where we are today.

But we know we didn't get everything right.

The blueprint we'll hear about today rightfully gives some control back to the states and districts to allow them to determine their own best strategies to turn around their lowest performing schools.

And it switches the conversation from one about proficiency to one about ensuring our students graduate ready for college and career.

We now have an incredible opportunity to help reshape the future of this country.

The Obama administration has already launched game-changing reforms for our schools.

Many states are taking unprecedented steps in the right direction.

In my home state of California, the state legislature removed the firewall that prevented student achievement data from being linked to teacher performance—a move that was a long time coming.

And in order to qualify for the second round of Race to the Top funding, California recently released its list of 187 persistently underperforming schools.

But California's recent actions, and the actions of so many other states, have signaled they are ready to help fix the schools that are chronically failing our students.

As we take a close look at the administration's blueprint today, I'd like to lay out some fundamental goals for what we must address in this rewrite.

We need to reset the bar for our students and the nation.

First, we need to ensure that every child can be taught by a great teacher, especially those who need them the most.

Teachers are the single most important factor in determining student achievement.

But 14 percent of new teachers stop teaching after their first year. More than a third leave teaching after three years. Almost 50 percent leave within five years.

We can't expect teachers to stay in a system that doesn't treat them with the same level of professionalism as other careers.

We can support great teaching in classrooms across this country by providing them with the right tools, like extended planning time, and more opportunities for career development.

And by making sure that they have the data at their fingertips on how children are learning so we can understand how to better educate every child.

Second, the quality of a child's education should not be determined by their zipcode. Every school, in every state needs to hold their students to rigorous, internationally benchmarked standards that prepares them for college and careers.

Third, there are districts and schools across the country seeing incredible success after years of stagnant results.

These schools were given the room to innovate. They've kept their focus on achieving at the highest levels and holding themselves accountable for all students.

We must encourage states and districts to innovate, to think outside the box while maintaining high standards for all.

Lastly, we have to ensure we're reaching every student with the right resources in every classroom.

Secretary Duncan, you have said repeatedly that our students get one chance at an education.

One chance.

I think the President's blueprint lays the important markers as we begin this rewrite.

It will help build the kind of world class school system our economy needs and our children deserve,

Secretary Duncan, thank you again for being here.

Thank you for your leadership and your vision.

I look forward to hearing your testimony.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I especially want to thank the Secretary for being with us today and coming back so soon after your last appearance. Actually, very few Cabinet secretaries have your appetite for this much punishment.

We are here this afternoon to discuss the administration's blueprint for ESEA, the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. These 45 pages have been anxiously awaited by many in the education community, the media, and, of course, here in Congress.

For the last several weeks, we have been meeting at the Member and staff levels on a bipartisan basis with our counterparts in the Senate, and this blueprint is viewed by many as the first attempt by any one of those parties to put pen to paper and offer details on any substantive propositions. I appreciate the way Secretary Duncan has framed this document, and I hope we will keep his words in mind today.

As the Secretary says, this is a blueprint, not a bill. Congress writes the laws, and I am pleased to say in the case of the Elemen-

tary and Secondary Education Act, for now we are starting with a blank sheet of paper. Of course, we know the blueprint will serve as a jumping-off point in many ways, giving us policy direction also to consider, and finding proposals we like and some we do not like so much.

The Secretary and I have spoken candidly on several occasions, so I know he was not surprised to learn that I have some questions and concerns about the direction of certain policies we will discuss today.

One such concern is the exclusion of public school choice in supplemental education services—most of us know as tutoring—from the required interventions for struggling schools. These tools would become optional but no longer required for some struggling schools.

In reality, this means few if any students would have access to the immediate lifeline that tutoring and transfers provide. These concerns are precisely why we are here. I know there are Members on both sides of the aisle who hope to better understand the policies outlined in the blueprint and their potential consequences, both intended and unintended.

I try to view the No Child Left Behind Act through the eyes of my constituents, the teachers, principals, superintendents and school board members who implement its requirements, and the parents who experience its consequences directly. From that perspective, I have come to the conclusion that the Federal Government is too involved in the day-to-day operation of our schools, the Federal requirements are too prescriptive, and the measures of success are not nuanced enough.

As Congress prepares to write the next version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I hope we do more than simply cast aside the NCLB name and expand its requirements. I believe we need to have a meaningful conversation about the appropriate Federal role in our schools.

My fellow Republicans and I have developed a set of principles to help guide that reauthorization reform process. Briefly, we believe that to ensure student success in the 21st century, we must focus on what is best for students, parents, teachers, and communities.

Four tenets that guide us are restoring local control, empowering parents, letting teachers teach, and protecting the taxpayers. These principles will guide us as we come to the table to help develop an approach to education policy that puts students before special interests and recognizes that innovation truly does come from the ground up.

I know we are all anxious to hear from the Secretary, so I will close by simply thanking the Secretary once again for his approach. Whether we agree on every policy or not, the open and bipartisan process has truly been a breath of fresh air.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The statement of Mr. Kline follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. John Kline, Senior Republican Member, Committee on Education and Labor

I thank the gentleman for yielding and I especially want to thank the Secretary for coming back before the committee so soon after your last appearance. There are very few cabinet secretaries with your appetite for punishment.

We're here this morning to discuss the Administration's blueprint for ESEA. These 45 pages were anxiously awaited by many in the education community, the media, and of course here in Congress.

For the last several weeks we've been meeting at the member and staff levels on a bipartisan basis with our counterparts in the Senate, and this blueprint is viewed by many as the first attempt by any one of those parties to put pen to paper and offer details on substantive reform options.

I appreciate the way Secretary Duncan has framed this document, and I hope we'll keep his words in mind today. As the Secretary says, this is a blueprint—not a bill.

Congress writes the laws, and I'm pleased to say that in the case of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, for now, we're starting with a blank sheet of paper.

Of course, we know the blueprint will serve as a jumping off point in many ways—giving us policy directions to consider, and finding proposals that we like and some we do not like as much.

The Secretary and I have spoken candidly on several occasions, so I know he was not surprised to learn that I have some questions and concerns about the direction of certain policies we'll discuss today. One such concern is the exclusion of public school choice and Supplemental Educational Services—what most of us know as tutoring—from the required interventions for struggling schools.

These tools would become optional—but no longer required—for some struggling schools. In reality, this means few if any students would have access to the immediate lifeline that tutoring and transfers provide.

These concerns are precisely why we are here. I know there are members on both sides of the aisle who hope to better understand the policies outlined in the blueprint and their potential consequences—both intended and unintended.

I try to view the No Child Left Behind Act through the eyes of my constituents—the teachers, principals, superintendents, and school board members who implement its requirements and the parents who experience its consequences directly. From that perspective, I have come to the conclusion that the federal government is too involved in the day-to-day operation of our schools. The federal requirements are too prescriptive, and the measures of success are not nuanced enough.

As Congress prepares to write the next version of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, I hope we do more than simply cast aside the NCLB name and expand its requirements. I believe we need to have a meaningful conversation about the appropriate federal role in our schools.

My fellow Republicans and I have developed a set of principles to help guide that reauthorization and reform process. Briefly, we believe that to ensure student success in the 21st century, we must focus on what's best for students, parents, teachers, and communities.

The four tenets that guide us are:

- Restoring local control;
- Empowering parents;
- Letting teachers teach; and
- Protecting taxpayers.

These principles will guide us as we come to the table to help develop an approach to education policy that puts students before special interests and recognizes that innovation truly does come from the ground up.

I know we are all anxious to hear from the Secretary, so I will close by simply thanking the Secretary once again for his approach. Whether we agree on every policy or not, the open and bipartisan process has truly been a breath of fresh air.

I yield back.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you very much.

Let me take a moment. Although Secretary Duncan needs no introduction to this committee, this is being broadcast, so I would like to introduce Secretary Duncan.

He was appointed to be Secretary of Education by President Barack Obama. That is rather obvious. Prior to his appointment, Secretary Duncan served as Chief Executive Officer of the Chicago Public Schools and became the longest-serving big-city education superintendent in the country.

As the Chief Executive Officer, Secretary Duncan raised education standards and performance, he improved teacher and principal quality and increased learning options. During his 7½-year tenure, he united education reformers, teachers, principals and business stakeholders behind an aggressive education reform agenda.

As Secretary of Education, he has spearheaded major education reforms, including The Race to the Top and Investing in Innovation Fund. I know I am not alone in saying that he has done a tremendous amount in his first year to improve educational opportunities for children across this country.

We welcome you and thank you for joining us. You proceed in the manner in which you are most comfortable. We are going to allot you a couple of extra minutes here because this is a big subject with a big blueprint, and we want to make sure you are comfortable explaining it to the members of the committee.

STATEMENT OF HON. ARNE DUNCAN, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Secretary DUNCAN. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, Representative Kline, and to all the members of the committee, it is a true honor to be here with you today. I want to thank each of you for your hard work and commitment on education.

I believe that education is the one true path out of poverty. It is the great equalizer in our society, and as the President said in his weekly address on Saturday, there are few issues that speak more directly to the long-term prosperity of our Nation than education. Education is the one issue that must rise above ideology and above politics. We can all agree that we have to educate our way to a better economy.

We currently have an unprecedented opportunity to reform our Nation's schools so they are preparing all of our students for success in college and in careers. Today, Chairman Miller, as you pointed out, the status quo clearly is not good enough.

Consider just a few statistics: 27 percent of America's young people drop out of high school. That means 1.2 million teenagers are leaving our schools for the streets. That is economically unsustainable and morally unacceptable.

In a recent international test of math literacy, our 15-year-olds scored 24th out of 29 developed nations. In science, our 15-year-olds ranked 17th out of 29 nations. And just 40 percent of young people earn a 2-year or 4 year college degree. The U.S. now ranks tenth in the world in the rank of college completion for 25- to 34-year-olds. A generation ago, we were first in the world. But we have fallen behind. The global achievement gap is growing. If we are serious about preparing our Nation's young people to compete in a global economy, we must do better.

Through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act, we have built a foundation for reform. All States are pointing to the progress they are making in four areas of reform: raising standards; developing and recruiting excellent teachers and leaders; using data to inform instruction; and turning around our lowest performing schools.

In The Race to the Top Fund, we have identified 16 finalists for the first phase. We have invited all the finalists to present about their plans, and we will be announcing the winners during the first week in April. The winners will blaze the trail on reforms that will improve student achievement for decades to come.

To promote reforms in every State, I am committed to working with you in 2010 to reauthorize the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It has been more than 8 years since Congress last authorized ESEA through the No Child Left Behind Act. That is the longest gap between reauthorizations in the 45-year history of ESEA.

We all recognize that NCLB had its flaws, and the time to fix those problems is now. My staff and I have reached out to listen and learn from people across the country and to hear what they think about NCLB. My senior staff and I visited every State on our listening and learning tour. We met with parents, teachers, and students themselves. We have engaged in literally hundreds of conversations with stakeholders representing all sections of the education community.

In all of our conversations, we have heard a consistent message that our schools aren't expecting enough of our students. We need to raise our standards so that all students who are graduating are prepared to succeed in college and the workplace.

We have also heard that people aren't looking to Washington for answers. They don't want us to provide a prescription for success. Our role should be to offer a meaningful definition of success, one that raises the bar and shows teachers and students what they should be striving for.

With those lessons in our mind, we have developed our blueprint for ESEA reauthorization. We have shared that with you, Mr. Chairman, and I ask that the blueprint be entered into the record of this hearing.

In this blueprint, you will see that everything is organized around our three major goals for reauthorization: first, raising standards; secondly, rewarding excellence in growth; and third, increasing local control and flexibility while maintaining a laser-like focus on equity and closing achievement gaps.

All of these policy changes will support our effort to meet the President's goal that by 2020 America once again will lead the world in college completion.

In particular, the ESEA will set a goal that by 2020 all students will graduate ready to succeed in college and in the workplace. We will build an accountability system that measures the progress that States, districts and schools are making towards meeting that goal.

We have a comprehensive agenda to help us meet that goal. It starts with asking States to adopt standards that truly prepare students for success in college and careers. Governors and chief State school officers of 48 States are doing the tough job of setting these standards in reading and in math. The leadership at the local level has been remarkable, and the effort is supported by both major unions and by the business community.

In our proposal we call on States to adopt college and career-ready standards, either working with other States or by getting their higher education institutions to certify the the standards are

rigorous enough to ensure students graduate ready to succeed in college-level classes or to enter the workplace.

But standards alone aren't enough. We will need a new generation of assessments that measure whether students are on track for success in college and careers. We will support the effort to develop those assessments so they will measure a higher order of skills, provide accurate measures of student progress, and give teachers the information they need to improve student achievement. These standards and assessments are key parts of our effort to redefine accountability.

Under NCLB, the Federal Government greatly expanded its role in holding schools accountable. It did several things right, and I will always give NCLB credit for its important contributions to education reform.

It required all States to be included in the accountability system, including minority students, students with disabilities, and English language learners. It required States, districts, and schools to report test scores just aggregated by student subgroups, exposing achievement gaps like never before. We know the achievement gap is unacceptably large and teachers and school leaders throughout the country are working in mobilizing to address that problem. NCLB was right to create a system based on results for students, not just on inputs.

But NCLB's accountability system needs to be fixed now. There are way too many perverse incentives. It allows, even encourages, States to lower standards. It doesn't measure growth, and it doesn't reward excellence. It prescribes the same interventions for schools with very different needs. It encourages a narrowing of the curriculum and focuses on test preparation. It labels too many schools with the same failing label regardless of their challenges. It encouraged schools to focus their efforts on only that tiny percent of students close to the proficiency bar and neglect a vast majority above or below that line.

We need adults focused on all children, not only on any small handful in a classroom or in a school. We can't sustain momentum for reform if we don't have a credible accountability system that addresses these issues.

Our proposal will make significant improvements on accountability. The biggest and most important one is that it will use student academic growth as the most important measure of whether schools, districts, and States are making progress. I am much more interested in growth and gain than absolute test scores, as long as students are on a path toward meeting those standards.

Under our plan, we will reward schools, districts, and States that are making the most progress. At the same time, we will be tough-minded on our lowest performing schools and schools with large achievement gaps that aren't closing, although the schools will be given flexibility to meet performance targets working under their State and local accountability system. If we get accountability right, we will provide the right incentives to increase student achievement, and I am confident America's students, teachers, and principals will deliver.

I would like to focus on the critically important work of teachers and leaders. The teaching and learning that happens in schools

every day are what drives American education. We spend a lot of time talking about reform, about the proper Federal role, about the cost of education and the need for more funding and about competitive versus formula, and all of those are important debates to have.

But we can never lose sight of the impact our decisions have on classrooms where teachers are doing the hard work every single day of helping our children learn. Every decision must be viewed through the framework of improving instruction for our Nation's children. Our partnership with teachers and parents' partnerships with teachers empowers them to do their job well.

We believe that there is a lot in our proposal that teachers will like. We know that there is a lot under current law that teachers don't like. Most teachers believe that we have a broken system of accountability. Many teachers believe their evaluation support systems are flawed.

We need a system of accountability that is fair. I have never met a teacher yet who is afraid of accountability. All they ask is for a system that measures each child's progress, not last year's students against this year's students. We need better evaluation systems that are honest and useful and elevates rather than diminish the teaching profession.

All told, we are requesting a record $3.9 billion to strengthen the teaching profession, an increase of $350 million. We begin with the understanding that teaching is some of the toughest and absolutely the most important work in society, and we are deeply committed to making it a better profession for teachers.

To start with, we are encouraging the development of high-quality teacher preparation programs. Today, many teachers tell us that they are underprepared for what they face in the classroom. They have to learn too much on the job.

We are encouraging the development of meaningful career ladders and stronger efforts to retain the great teachers we have. We lose far too many of those great young teachers due to a lack of support.

From newly hired teachers to tenured teachers to master teachers, mentors, department heads, and principals, we need to rebuild education as a profession with real opportunities for growth that sustain a teacher's craft over a career, not just a couple of years.

We want to encourage schools and districts to rethink how teachers can best do their jobs, how they collaborate, how they use their time outside the classroom, and how they shape professional development programs. When adults have time to collaborate and solve school problems together, they are going to be much more productive and they will get better results for our children. Teachers must be at the center of those efforts.

We are also investing in principals to create better instructional leaders so that teachers will have the leadership they need to do better work. Historically, I think our Department has underinvested in principal leadership, and we are looking to dramatically change that. Good principals, as we know, recruit to retain great talent. Bad principals run off talent.

As for teacher evaluation systems, our goal is a system that is fair, honest, and useful, and built around a definition of teacher ef-

fectiveness, developed with teachers, that includes multiple measures, never just a single test score.

Teachers need great principals for support, and we will also ask for fair evaluation systems for principals. We want to use these systems to support teachers in their instructional practice and to reward great teachers for all they do, including advancing student learning. We also want to reward them for working in the high-needs schools. If we are serious about closing the achievement gap, we must close the opportunity gap our children all too often face.

As I mentioned, we will change the accountability system to make it fairer. For the first time, we will be holding not just schools and teachers accountable for student success, but districts and States as well. This must be a shared responsibility. Teachers can't teach and principals can't lead where they are not well-supported at the local and State level.

We want to stop mislabeling thousands of schools as failures. Instead, we want to challenge them to close achievement gaps with targeted strategies designed by teachers and principals together. Similarly, everyone should get credit for helping students who are behind catch up, even if they do not yet meet standards.

A sixth grade teacher whose students start the year three grade levels behind and their students advance by two grade levels should be applauded, not labeled as a failure. That teacher is not a failure. That teacher is not a good teacher, that teacher is a great teacher. She is accelerating student learning and we must learn from her example, not stigmatize her. The same is true for districts and States as well.

We want to give many more schools and districts the flexibility to improve by focusing much more on the chronically lowest performing schools and those with the largest achievement gaps that aren't closing, while giving teachers and principals of the other schools more flexibility and incentives to succeed.

We are also calling for assessments that measure deep learning, not test-taking skills, assessments that can engage and encourage learning and provide teachers with meaningful, quick feedback. And we want students, parents, teachers, and communities working toward a meaningful bar and support them in getting there.

The goal of the K-12 system has to be to prepare students for the next step on their journey: college and a career. The system needs to be focused on that goal. Dumbed down standards mean we are lying to children, giving them false hope, and undermining the high standards that teachers have for their students. That must end.

We are calling for over $1 billion to fund a complete education, because a whole child is a successful adult. We want schools investing in the arts, history, science, languages, and all of the learning experiences that contribute to a well-rounded education. This is critically important.

Finally, we are seeking $1.8 billion to support students by encouraging community engagement and support and exposure to other positive adults. Teachers cannot do it alone. They need parents, community leaders, social service agencies, and other supportive adults in the school helping to reinforce a culture of learning and respect. A parent is always a child's first teacher and will always be their most important teacher.

I also want to say that ESEA reauthorization provides us with the opportunity to promote early learning programs from birth through third grade. We need to ensure that children attend high-quality early learning programs to sustain achievements.

At the Federal level, we can encourage the alignment of standards and assessments across early learning programs in schools. We can coordinate professional development efforts. We can engage families in their children's learning. It is time to learn from the success of high-quality programs. As the President has pointed out, that pipeline will never work properly unless the road to college begins at birth.

Thank you for the opportunity to discuss our comprehensive reform of ESEA. This will be one of the most dramatic changes in the law's history. It will fundamentally change the Federal role in education. We want to move from being a compliance monitor to being an engine of innovation.

The urgency of these reforms has never been greater. Our children and our future are at risk. So let's together do the difficult but necessary things our schools demand and our children deserve.

We know that schools can transform the lives of children. We have literally thousands of examples of schools serving high-poverty populations that are accelerating student achievement. We need to reward them and hold them up as examples for others to follow.

I thank you for all you have done and all you will do to make education America's highest priority and greatest legacy. We need to work together to continue that legacy and deliver a world-class education for every child.

Thank you so much.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you. Thank you very much for your testimony.

[The statement of Secretary Duncan follows:]

Prepared Statement of Hon. Arne Duncan, Secretary, U.S. Department of Education

Thank you, Chairman Miller, Ranking Member Kline, and Members of the Committee for inviting me to testify today on the Obama Administration's Blueprint for reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Today, more than ever, a world-class education is necessary for success. The President and I believe strongly that this Blueprint provides a way for America to strengthen the schools that our children attend and prepare the children who will be the architects of our continued greatness to assume that role.

This blueprint builds on the significant reforms already made in response to the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 around four areas: (1) Improving teacher and principal effectiveness to ensure that every classroom has a great teacher and every school has a great leader; (2) Providing information to families to help them evaluate and improve their children's schools, and to educators to help them improve their students' learning; (3) Implementing college- and career-ready standards and developing improved assessments aligned with those standards; and (4) Improving student learning and achievement in America's lowest-performing schools by providing intensive support and effective interventions.

Incorporating and extending this framework, this blueprint for a re-envisioned federal role builds on these key priorities:

(1) College- and Career-Ready Students

Raising standards for all students. We will set a clear goal: Every student should graduate from high school ready for college and a career, regardless of their income, race, ethnic or language background, or disability status. Following the lead of the nation's governors, we're calling on all states to develop and adopt standards in

English language arts and mathematics that build toward college- and career-readiness by the time students graduate from high school. States may choose to upgrade their existing standards or work together with other states to develop and adopt common, state-developed standards.

Better assessments. We will support the development and use of a new generation of assessments that are aligned with college- and career-ready standards, to better determine whether students have acquired the skills they need for success. New assessment systems will better capture higher-order skills, provide more accurate measures of student growth, and better inform classroom instruction to respond to academic needs.

A complete education. Students need a well-rounded education to contribute as citizens in our democracy and to thrive in a global economy—from literacy to mathematics, science, and technology to history, civics, foreign languages, the arts, financial literacy, and other subjects. We will support states, districts, school leaders, and teachers in implementing a more complete education through improved professional development and evidence-based instructional models and supports.

(2) Great Teachers and Leaders in Every School

Effective teachers and principals. We will elevate the teaching profession to focus on recognizing, encouraging, and rewarding excellence. We are calling on states and districts to develop and implement systems of teacher and principal evaluation and support, and to identify effective and highly effective teachers and principals on the basis of student growth and other factors. These systems will inform professional development and help teachers and principals improve student learning. In addition, a new program will support ambitious efforts to recruit, place, reward, retain, and promote effective teachers and principals and enhance the profession of teaching.

Our best teachers and leaders where they are needed most. Our proposal will provide funds to states and districts to develop and support effective teachers and leaders, with a focus on improving the effectiveness of teachers and leaders in high-need schools. We will call on states and districts to track equitable access to effective teachers and principals, and where needed, take steps to improve access to effective educators for students in high-poverty, high-minority schools.

Strengthening teacher and leader preparation and recruitment. We need more effective pathways and practices for preparing, placing, and supporting beginning teachers and principals in high-need schools. States will monitor the effectiveness of their traditional and alternative preparation programs, and we will invest in programs whose graduates are succeeding in the classroom, based on student growth and other factors.

(3) Equity and Opportunity for All Students

Rigorous and fair accountability for all levels. All students will be included in an accountability system that builds on college- and career-ready standards, rewards progress and success, and requires rigorous interventions in the lowest-performing schools. We will celebrate the Reward states, districts, and schools that do the most to improve outcomes for their students and to close achievement gaps, as well as those who are on the path to have all students graduating or on track to graduate ready for college and a career by 2020. All schools will be aiming to do their part to help us reach that ambitious goal, and for most schools, leaders at the state, district, and school level will enjoy broad flexibility to determine how to get there.

But in the lowest-performing schools that have not made progress over time, we will ask for dramatic change. To ensure that responsibility for improving student outcomes no longer falls solely at the door of schools, we will also promote accountability for states and districts that are not providing their schools, principals, and teachers with the support they need to succeed.

Meeting the needs of diverse learners. Schools must support all students, including by providing appropriate instruction and access to a challenging curriculum along with additional supports and attention where needed. From English Learners and students with disabilities to Native American students, homeless students, migrant students, rural students, and neglected or delinquent students, our proposal will continue to support and strengthen programs for these students and ensure that schools are helping them meet college- and career-ready standards.

Greater equity. To give every student a fair chance to succeed, and give principals and teachers the resources to support student success, we will call on school districts and states to take steps to ensure equity, by such means as moving toward comparability in resources between high- and low-poverty schools.

(4) Raise the Bar and Reward Excellence

Fostering a Race to the Top. Race to the Top has provided incentives for excellence by encouraging state and local leaders to work together on ambitious reforms, make tough choices, and develop comprehensive plans that change policies and practices to improve outcomes for students. We will continue Race to the Top's incentives for systemic reforms at the state level and expand the program to school districts that are willing to take on bold, comprehensive reforms.

Supporting effective public school choice. We will support the expansion of high-performing public charter schools and other autonomous public schools, and support local communities as they expand public school choice options for students within and across school districts.

Promoting a culture of college readiness and success. Access to a challenging high school curriculum has a greater impact on whether a student will earn a 4-year college degree than his or her high school test scores, class rank, or grades. We will increase access to college-level, dual credit, and other accelerated courses in high-need schools and support college-going strategies and models that will help students succeed.

(5) Promote Innovation and Continuous Improvement

Fostering innovation and accelerating success. The Investing in Innovation Fund will support local and nonprofit leaders as they develop and scale up programs that have demonstrated success, and discover the next generation of innovative solutions.

Supporting, recognizing, and rewarding local innovations. Our proposal will encourage and support local innovation by creating fewer, larger, more flexible funding streams around areas integral to student success, giving states and districts flexibility to focus on local needs. New competitive funding streams will provide greater flexibility, reward results, and ensure that federal funds are used wisely. At the same time, districts will have fewer restrictions on blending funds from different categories with less red tape.

Supporting student success. Tackling persistent achievement gaps requires public agencies, community organizations, and families to share responsibility for improving outcomes for students. We will prioritize programs that include a comprehensive redesign of the school day, week, or year, that promote schools as the center of their communities, or that partner with community organizations. Our proposal will invest in new models that keep students safe, supported, and healthy both in and out of school, and that support strategies to better engage families and community members in their children's education.

I look forward to working with the Members of this Committee on a bipartisan basis to complete this critical work, and I would be happy to answer any questions that you have. Thank you.

Chairman MILLER. Under a previous agreement, the Chair and the Ranking Member will be recognized for 10 minutes apiece.

Mr. Secretary, the blueprint that you have released and you are discussing with us today has received a lot of mixed attention from media and stakeholders. I would like to take a moment to refocus that conversation, as Congressman Kline said, on the needs of the students, and especially in my case of poor children and those suffering in schools with wide achievement gaps.

I have been at this for some 30 years. We can't afford to lose yet another generation of students, and we can't wait to eradicate poverty before we take the action we need on behalf of our Nation's children.

Ten years ago, with No Child Left Behind, we began the process of shining the light on the achievement of all children, no matter what schools they were in, no matter what their social-economic status was, and it was about the idea that they are all entitled to a world-class educational opportunity. I would like to make sure that we don't lose that focus.

I agree with your criticisms. I think you raised important issues about No Child Left Behind. But I just wonder if we might elaborate a little bit on the proposals, how your proposals really create

a system that addresses the needs of students, particularly those who are most disadvantaged and find themselves locked into schools that, as my State just published, more or less year after year are failing to provide the opportunity for those kids to take the advantage of.

Secretary DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I put the schools into three broad categories. There is a set of schools in every State and every district—take the top 10 percent of schools that are absolutely world-class, where students are learning and growing and achievement gaps are shrinking, and we should be holding those schools up as examples. We should be giving them more flexibility, learning from them, and, frankly, getting out of their way.

There is a set of schools that may not be world-class yet, but they are improving every single year, and we need to continue to support their development and their growth.

But what I will argue is, as a country, we need to take the bottom 5 percent of schools, not the 95 percent but the bottom 5 percent, and even take one of those 5 percent each year for the next 5 years and let's do something dramatically different.

The status quo is not working. We have not seen the kind of progress we need. We have far too many examples of success in high-poverty, high-minority communities, for anybody to say that poverty is destiny. It is not. We have schools routinely beating the odds. And we are simply not working for children. Where there are 50, 60, 70 percent dropout rates, where students are falling further and further behind, despite our best intentions, despite our best work, we are perpetuating poverty and we are perpetuating social failure.

So what we are saying is we need to come in, let's move with a real sense of urgency, and let's get those children a better chance at an education, and let's do it now.

Chairman MILLER. I assume I am correct in understanding that for those students in large mixed districts, like I represent, those students who may be in a relatively good school but they are not doing terribly well themselves, we are not going to lose them in this new arrangement. They do not need to be in one of the worst performing schools before they get attention or they continue to be tracked in terms of whether they are growing toward the goal of being college- or career-ready.

Secretary DUNCAN. That is exactly right. And we are actually trying to do something that I don't think happened enough in the previous law. That if you take a relatively high performing school but where there are huge achievement gaps—and, again, the big thing for me is progress and growth where those achievement gaps aren't shrinking, where they are stubbornly large and not moving—we want to make sure that those students who are being underserved have an opportunity to do better.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

I think one of the more interesting political events in the last year has been the impact of Race to the Top on the educational political system, if you will. Because of the Race to the Top, I think some of us reside in States where we never thought that conversation would take place. We never thought there would be agreement

between the executive and the legislature. We never thought there would be agreement between the teacher organizations and the boards of education and/or within the legislature itself.

Yet I see, as I mentioned in my opening statement, those actions have been taken. They are not exactly as I would do it. I think there is more to be done in my own State. But it is a dramatic change of attitude. I hope it is a change of attitude. It is a dramatic change in the terms of guidance, that the system will operate now under the use of data and other elements of the Race to the Top.

The question is: In the model that you are laying out in your blueprint, can we transfer that kind of atmospherics, if you will, to bring about that kind of cooperation, those kinds of conversations, among the various parts of the education system? Because I think when we look at models of success, we know that it is more than just another 2-year plan that is laid on that school or that system. It is really the preparatory work that has gone in to get buy-in, to get people to participate, to take responsibility across those systems.

I think a lot of that has begun at one level of the educational system with the States. I think now we need to see whether or not we can use the blueprint and the law that we will be offering here to encourage that and extend that.

Secretary DUNCAN. We have been amazed to see the amount of progress and momentum due Race to the Top. What is so interesting, Chairman Miller, is what I hear repeatedly, is although there is a lot of money there, it is really not about the level. What has happened, there has been a level of conversation, there has been a level of corroboration, there have been folks moving outside their comfort zones, and movement and the relationships that should have been happening for a long time, this has forced those things to happen. So that been hugely, hugely encouraging.

I have folks say, yes, they would absolutely love to get the money, but whether or not they do, they are moving forward for reform and they are behaving in very, very different ways.

So whether it is Race to the Top, whether it is in the Invest and Innovation Fund, whether it is in other areas where we have discretionary resources, we are going to continue to reward those States and districts and nonprofits and universities and schools that are doing two things; that are raising the bar for all students and closing the achievement gap. And where we see that movement, we want to put unprecedented resources. Where folks are more recalcitrant, we will invest in other places. But the amount, the willingness and the openness to reform has been unbelievably encouraging.

Chairman MILLER. Well, I look forward to working with you on that, because I think that is key to the success here.

Let me raise another issue, and that is the focusing of attention on what you called the 5 percent of the schools that are persistently and chronically failing. I think they are failing, not just the students are failing, the teachers are failing, the whole community, if you will. But, again, I want to make sure that we don't substitute a model for critically thinking about how you develop success in that particular school or those schools within the system and in those communities.

In the blueprint, you lay out four different models: the transformation model, the turnaround model, the restart model, and the school closure model. My concern would be I think in California we have tried almost all of those, and I would like to have some data presented on where we have seen the successes with those various models, because we have had some, but not all of them have happened.

I would also like to make sure, sort of following on to my previous question, that when we consider these models, they have got to be more than just lines on the paper, if you will.

I visited some of your very successful schools in Chicago, and I think what you saw there was the development of an attitude and expectations and partnerships from parents, the community, the teachers, the school boards, and the individual boards about the success that they wanted, and they took a lot of time bringing people around to that point. Some people left, some principals left, some teachers left, and back and forth. But then they developed a community that they thought could sustain that. And in some of those schools, that has been sustained now for almost 10 years.

My concern is, having witnessed a number of dramatic actions where we get 1 or 2 years and then we are back again trying something else more dramatic, that we provide the means, the tools, the resources for these districts that are making these choices, for schools that have to make these choices, to really plan out and develop that change in expectations and attitudes and competencies that will make that a success, so we don't sort of have a continued rollover of these efforts and we can bring some stability and ongoing sustainable success.

So in this discussion, following what you have put forth in the blueprint, I am very interested in looking at what are the outcomes of these models. Where is it we are going to look for success? Where is it school districts would go to see how this has been done?

Some of these have been legend until their efforts to try to turn around even systems. But here you are sort of focusing on individual schools within systems. That buy-in really has to be extraordinary, and I think we have to encourage that buy-in.

I will sign off with this. One of the remarkable things when I visited Roscoe Academy was the community participation on an hourly and daily and weekend basis about the importance of that school and the success of those kids.

So feel free to respond. But I just worry that we are not just putting outlines and a description of what you would do, and that we don't substitute that for critically thinking about how those models would be successful and what is evidence of their success in the past.

Secretary DUNCAN. It is a great point, and this only works if everybody steps up. No one gets a pass. Students, teachers, parents, principals, the community, everybody has to work together. Where you see that sustained success, you had that community buy-in.

So everybody has to work together. These are hard conversations. They are tough. I think we have to have them. We have to stop sort of sweeping these tough issues under the rug. But where folks come together and plan for the long haul and sustain that effort, we will and we have seen remarkable results.

Also, while Race to the Top has gotten all of the sort of press and publicity. That is $4 billion. We are putting $3.5 billion in school improvement grants out for just that bottom 5 percent. So we are trying to put a huge amount of money out there, more time for teachers to collaborate, longer school days, more time in the summer. We know some of the building blocks, so we are trying to put huge amounts of resources out there for States, districts, parents, teachers, students working together to say we have to do something, and we want to meet them more than halfway.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

Congressman Kline.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Again, thank you, Mr. Secretary, for being here. It has been a pleasure working with you as we move forward towards reauthorizing this essential legislation.

Before I get into the blueprint, I want to mention the Race to the Top again, that the Chairman has been talking about some, and express a couple of concerns I have about the transparency. You and I have had this discussion before, but I want to see if I can't draw it out here a little bit.

We have got a peer review process that is going on, and we don't know still who the peer reviewers are, and they are involved in allocating pretty big piles of money. So it is pretty hard for us, the American people, to have confidence in this system if we don't know who the peer reviewers are. So I am a little troubled about why we can't know who those are.

Then, secondly, I am a little bit concerned about the timing here. We had States put in their requests for this money. Some States put it in with sort of high expectations, like Minnesota, and didn't make the final cut. We don't know why. I understand that at some time coming up, there are going to be some comments and information coming forward.

My question is, why don't we have it now? I know you know, Mr. Secretary, I have a letter here from Governor Schwarzenegger and I think eight Governors saying, you have got to tell us what we didn't do right, because we are busy, these States, trying to compete again for the next tranche of this money.

So there is literally over $4 billion here at stake and you and the administration are asking for another $1.35 billion just for Race to the Top. It seems to me we really have some unanswered questions.

So my question to you is, why can't we know who those people are and why can't the States know what they did well and what they didn't do well so they can address those things?

Secretary DUNCAN. Great questions. What has been paramount in our minds from day one was the integrity of this process, and due to the size of these grants, unprecedented, we were worried about outside influence on potential peer reviewers. There is huge temptation for bad things to happen, and we wanted to do everything at all costs to prevent that from happening.

So as soon as the competition is done, all that will be put out. All the interviews we are doing now with the 16 finalists are being videotaped and all of that is going to be absolutely transparent.

What we said at the start of the competition was, the day it was finished we would put out every State's comment, they will come back, so everyone will get that. We said, again, before the competition started, they would get that at the end of the competition. If we put it out now, States still in the competition could game their answers in the interviews due to those responses.

So when the competition is done, everybody will get all the remarks, all the reviews, and there will be an equal amount of time between that and when the second application is due, as there was at the start of the competition.

So we try to be very, very fair but maintain integrity.

Mr. KLINE. Okay, if I could interrupt, I am sorry. So you are going to start again with a whole new set of peer review teams after this first tranche? Are we not to know who these people are until next September?

Secretary DUNCAN. No, the day this is done you will know who they are.

Mr. KLINE. I am sorry, define "day done."

Secretary DUNCAN. When this competition is completed, we will put out the tapes of the interviews, we will put out who the peer reviewers are, and we will put out all comments for all States publicly.

Mr. KLINE. I am sorry, I guess I am not communicating well here. Competition done——

Secretary DUNCAN. The first time.

Mr. KLINE. Okay. So now I am back to the question. We are going to have this competition done in April, the first part of it, and at that point you are going to tell us who the peer reviewers are?

Secretary DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. KLINE. Okay. Are they going to be the same peer reviewers for the next part, or are you going to start again?

Secretary DUNCAN. Some may come back, some may not. To be clear, they signed up for the first round. That was all they signed up for.

Mr. KLINE. It does help me to understand that. I do think, however, it would be very helpful, because the States are getting ready to compete again, to know what they didn't do well, and the longer that drags out, the harder it is for them.

Secretary DUNCAN. Again, let me be clear. We have been very consistent from the start that we will put all of that out as soon as the first round is done, and the time between that and when the second round application is done will be the same amount of time, not less time, the same amount of time as we had in the first go-around

Mr. KLINE. Thank you. Let me move now to the blueprint. I know, Mr. Secretary, you have talked about this an awful lot over time, and that is being tight on goals but loose on means.

It looks to me though—and I understand this is a blueprint, not a bill, not legislative language—we will go to work on that here shortly. But when you talk about focusing on the bottom 5 percent as a way to limit the involvement of the Federal Government in most schools, I think I understand that, but as I read the blueprint, it looks to me like this Federal—we will just call it "heavy-

handedness"—intervention, could apply to entire districts and even States.

On page 10 it reads, "Both challenge districts and States will face additional restrictions on the use of ESEA funds and may be required to work with an outside organization to improve student academic achievement." Both challenge districts and States.

A State is in the bottom 5 percent? I guess I am trying to understand how that will work.

Secretary DUNCAN. Sure. Schools don't operate as islands. Every school is impacted by their district and by their State, some in extraordinarily positive ways, some in neutral ways, some are hurt by their States and districts. What we want to do, Congressman, in all this stuff is reward excellence and challenge where things aren't working.

So we think that not only are there thousands of high performing schools in this country, we think there are hundreds of high performing districts that are routinely showing remarkable student achievement, often with children who come from very, very tough situations.

We want to shine a spotlight on those districts, we want to give them more flexibility, more resources, learn from them. The same is true for States. This has got to be a shared responsibility.

On the flip side of it, if you have 15,000 school districts, take the bottom 5 percent of school districts where things simply aren't working for the vast majority of students in that school district, I think we need to look at what is going on there and see what we can do better.

Mr. KLINE. I am just trying to understand. But it looks to me like you are directing this at an entire State, and it seems to me that that State might be looking for the most flexibility to make corrections, not the least.

I want to move on to something else, and I just want to mention it for a second. I have talked to you about this many times. I mentioned it again when you came in. I am actually not going to ask the question, because I think 90 percent of my colleagues here are dying to talk to you about this same issue and I want to give them the opportunity to do that.

But when we have got these core standards that are being developed by States, there are an awful lot of questions about how that is going to work and what the Federal enforcement tool is going to be. I know, for example, that my State of Minnesota, said, Wait a minute, I have a problem with these standards now, because they are not as high in math as what we have and what we would like to have. So if we step outside of that and go to our own, it may affect how you, how the Department, awards funds.

So I am asking you not to address that right now, but I just want to express the concern and assure you that as we have talked before, that certainly in my conference at least there are a lot of concerns about that, who is going to adjudicate and what is the role of your Department going to be.

I yield back.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Kildee.

Mr. KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I remain very concerned about the administration's charter school proposal, primarily because of the fiscal effects it could have on traditional public schools. I am concerned that disadvantaged districts, like Flint, Michigan, where I live, will be stretched too thin if more students move to charter school programs and take their entire per-pupil State allocation with them.

What type of supports would you propose to help those districts if we transition to a system that supports significant charter school expansion?

The charter schools really are able to market their schools in a way that the public school systems cannot, and very often my experience has been that the more sophisticated parents are the ones who opt for the charter schools.

How would you help those schools where the students are left behind in the traditional public school system?

Secretary DUNCAN. Yes, sir, I have have said repeatedly I am not a fan of charter schools, I am a fan of good charter schools. We have some charter schools in this country that are extraordinarily high-performing options in very, very poor communities. We have some charter schools that are just mediocre, and we have some charter schools that, frankly, need to close. And when I spoke to the National Association of Charter Schools, I said exactly those things.

What we want to do is we just need more good schools in this country. So we need more good traditional schools, we need more good magnet schools, we need more good Montessori schools, and good charter schools are a piece of that solution.

I think, sir, every school has a chance to market itself and to tell its story. Parents are very smart, very sophisticated. They are not going to be swayed by some fancy marketing material. Every parent is looking for a great option for their child. So where families have good options, that is fantastic. Where parents don't have good options, we want to create some new options for them of every form and fashion.

So a district like Flint, whether it is strengthening existing schools, whether it is creating new schools within the district, or through charters, we are wide open to that. Charter schools are public schools. They are our tax dollars. They are accountable to us. We think they shouldn't receive any advantages. We think there shouldn't be any disparities in the funding they receive either, though. We just want to play it straight.

Mr. KILDEE. We certainly want both good charter schools, if we are to have them, and good traditional public schools. But the fact of the matter is that parents who are more sophisticated, maybe have a better level of education than others, are the ones that in fact do tend to choose the charter schools.

What do we do, even though the charter school is a good school, what do we do when the other school down the street is receiving less dollars because those dollars are going to the charter school? The entire State fund goes to the charter school.

Secretary DUNCAN. So as part of our proposed budget, as you know, the President is asking for historic increases in funding, and the overwhelming majority of these resources are going to to go traditional schools, to those children, to those teachers.

So I can go through line by line. For teachers and leaders, $3.6 billion, a 10 percent increase. For well-rounded education, $1 billion, 10 percent increase. Student support, $1.8 billion, 16 percent increase. Right down the line. So the overwhelming majority of our resources, and hopefully new resources, if our budget is approved, will go to traditional schools.

There has been lots of conversation, Mr. Kildee, around whether charters are getting higher performing kids and more engaged families. Obviously, you want to make sure it is a level playing field.

I will point you to a study that was done in the New York Public School System, the charter schools, that looked at their long waiting lists there for charter schools. It looked at students who got into the charters and it looked at kids who applied but didn't. So there was no selection bias. Everyone was applying.

What they actually found in that study was that the children who actually did get in did better than the children who went into the traditional public schools. So they tried to sort of account for that, making sure it is apples against apples.

So again, I will just go back. We need more good schools. We need to support every school to be successful. And good charter schools, not bad ones, not mediocre ones, but good charter schools, particularly in historically underserved communities, have been a significant piece of the answer.

Mr. KILDEE. You talk about teacher evaluation. How do we assure that any teacher evaluation system is, first of all, developed in collaboration with the teachers and really accurately measure teacher performance?

For example, I taught Latin for the most part, 90 percent Latin, and my Latin students all got A's or B's. Occasionally I would grab an American history class, and no matter how hard I tried, and I knew history as well as I did Latin, those students were getting C's for the most part. So the teacher doesn't have much choice over what type of student they receive. In my Latin class, they were top students.

How do we make sure that all these things are measured?

Secretary DUNCAN. Well, it is a great point. I will tell you when the Chairman talks about we need bold action, we need to get dramatically better, one of the things most fundamentally broken largely in our country are teacher evaluation systems.

I went to the NEA convention in San Diego and spoke before 5,500 delegates and talked about teacher evaluation being broken, and everybody applauded. I went to the AFT convention, 2,500 members, and everybody applauded when I talked about broken teacher evaluation systems.

This is one area of the country where we need to get dramatically better. There is no perfect system out there. These need to develop. I know what doesn't work is what we are doing today. Good teachers don't get recognized today. Teachers in the middle don't get the support they need. And teachers at the bottom who ask for support and mentoring and induction, who shouldn't be teaching, they don't get moved out either. So if the systems today don't work for any adults, I promise you they are not working for the children either.

So what we have to do, and it has to be collaborative to your point, it can only be done with unions and teachers and management working together, but we need to get to a whole different level of sophistication and thoughtfulness to really reward excellence and support those teachers that are trying to get better.

Systems now don't work for any of the adults. Everybody is above average. I wish we lived in Lake Woebegon; we don't; everybody is superior, and we need to be much more thoughtful in it. So I can't promise you we will have a perfect system tomorrow. In fact, I will tell you we won't.

But we need to be working hard in this area. It needs to be done at the local level, not by us here in Washington. And we need to be encouraging folks to do that, and we are going to put a lot of money on the table to incentivize those districts that are willing to take this on and be much more thoughtful.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Hoekstra.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, good to see you and glad that you are here today.

Has the Department done any estimate on what the cost was to States and local school districts to implement No Child Left Behind over the last 8 years?

Secretary DUNCAN. I don't know of that. I don't know of it.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I would think that that would be valuable information too, because I will tell you what I am concerned about. I read your Blueprint For Reform. It is relatively interesting. Then you go through here, and on page 7 it says "a new approach." You get to page 13 and it says "a new approach." A couple more times through the document it talks about a new approach.

It is like wow, here we go again. We had No Child Left Behind in 2001 as "the" new approach to education in America. Now for 8 years we have whipsawed local school districts and States to implement No Child Left Behind. Whether you like No Child Left Behind or not, after 8 years we maybe have filtered down and actually got all the procedures in place and the mechanisms in place for No Child Left Behind.

Now we get a new administration and it is a new approach. I can tell you what my local schools are already telling me. It is kind of like we just got done with one system—and most of them didn't like it—one bad system that has put in a tremendous amount of cost and bureaucracy into the process, and now we have got, quote-unquote, you geniuses in Washington coming up with the next new approach for us. We have got a responsibility to educate kids every day, and now we are going to have to figure out the new approach.

They are saying, I wonder what this new approach is going to cost us.

I actually find it almost incomprehensible that we have been moving forward for 8 years on No Child Left Behind, and you can't tell me what it has cost.

Can you tell me what this new approach is going to cost in terms of mandates to States and local schools, and will this administration fully fund the mandate that it is going to put on States and schools?

Secretary DUNCAN. Sir, let me be very, very clear. This blueprint, the ideas didn't come from geniuses in Washington. These ideas

came from teachers and parents and principals and students around this country. The previous law was too punitive. It was too prescriptive. It lowered the bar for children, and it narrowed the curriculum.

What we want to do is we want to raise the bar, have meaningful standards. We want to reward excellence, we want to increase local flexibility, and we want students to have a well-rounded curriculum. This is the right thing to do for children. It is the right thing to do for adults. There are too many perverse incentives.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. I was going to say, when you went through No Child Left Behind, we went through and I highlighted every time it said the State or local school district "shall," "must," or "will."

Do you expect that this new authorization will be full of the "school district shall," "the State will," "the State must," or will there be a tremendous amount of flexibility? Because these ideas, you are right, I am glad that they came from grassroots. So did No Child Left Behind.

But what No Child Left Behind did is it went through the ideas that came up from the grassroots level, and they said we are going to accept some and we are going to leave some by the wayside, and then we will tell local school districts that they "shall" or that they "must."

I can tell you, and you know this, that the needs of Detroit are very, very different than the needs of Lansing, which are very different than the needs of Baldwin, Michigan.

Will there be a tremendous amount of flexibility, or will this be full of the mandates? And if there are mandates, will this administration fully fund them?

Secretary DUNCAN. One of my four core principles I talked about was more local flexibility. We are absolutely committed to that. What I think is in all communities, Flint, Detroit, you name it, all children should have high expectations. The opposite of that happened under No Child Left Behind. Great teachers, great principals, great schools, great school districts need to be rewarded. There was none of that under No Child Left Behind. Fifty ways to fail, no ways to succeed. We want to fix that.

Every child deserves a well-rounded curriculum. Everywhere I went, I heard about a narrowing of the curriculum, rural, urban suburban.

So, yes, we want to maintain local flexibility. But there are a couple core principles that every child in this country needs and deserves, and we are trying to stay true to that.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. Maintain local flexibility. I would tell you most school districts, and you know this if you have been talking to them, don't believe that there is a lot of local flexibility left. And I think that for us to restore it, you are going to have to make a massive change in the approach.

I hope that is what we see when we actually get the legislative language. We look forward to working with you to restore local flexibility instead of Federal mandates.

Secretary DUNCAN. I appreciate that. I want to assure you, I am not a Washington bureaucrat. I worked on the other side of the law for 7½ years, and I know what works and what doesn't.

Mr. HOEKSTRA. It is amazing what Washington does to people, especially when they get in an agency.

Thank you very much.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Payne.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much. I want to thank you for coming up with a really comprehensive way we can really improve our educational system. As we are all aware, we are losing the battle worldwide. That means we are losing our edge competitively. So I commend you for trying to make this educational ship of state work.

You know, I just wonder, as we talk about the worst performing public schools, those are the ones that I continually—and I think we have had some conversations, I am not opposed to charter schools and all. We know that they tend to get more motivated parents, and those parents should not be penalized because they are motivated. However, kids can't pick their parents, and therefore they are the victims, in a lot of instances, of parents that are not motivated. They languish, they are behind. So we are concerned about the bottom, working from the bottom up. I think that is a great idea.

But do you have any ideas of how we can incentivize teachers to be at those bottom schools? I know we can recreate schools, and that is what happened a lot with the charter schools. They will get kids that were in failing schools. They pick them out, and they therefore tend to perform. As I said, the chronically poor and those who have parents who are not as motivated, they tend to stay at that same school. I am concerned about that school where they stay.

What are some of the things? Is there any way you can have teacher pay incentive, or have some way to have smaller class sizes? Could you have additional teachers' aides to work with these youngsters that have a whole host of problems when they get home? They don't have dinner, they stay up late, they come to school tired; the health components, a visiting nurse in the school.

Are there any of these kind of creative things that will try to make these failing students, who are failing because of the environment, and it is going to be difficult to get these failing communities whole, because that is going to take a whole new infrastructure, et cetera, et cetera.

How much can you envision, being at the worst school, to try to turn it around?

Secretary DUNCAN. Again, I just keep going back. We are spending $4 billion in Race to the Top for the entire country. We want to spend $3.5 billion on just 5 percent of the schools. So we want to make a massive investment. And I want the ideas to come from the local community.

But all of the things you talked about, more time for teachers to collaborate and work together, involving the community, reducing class size, more time for students, longer days, longer weeks, longer years, all of those things are going to be absolutely possible, and we are going to be looking for good ideas from the communities.

Again, we have hundreds of these schools around the country. I will tell you one that sticks out in my mind is the Congressman to your left, Congressman Scott. I went to a school in his commu-

nity, not a charter school, a traditional public school, Achievable Dream.

What is the percent poverty there, Congressman? One hundred percent poverty. The entire community is backing it, and what you have seen is remarkable. They basically closed the achievement gap. Is this work hard? Does it have to be comprehensive? Yes. But is it possible? Absolutely. And there are now hundreds and hundreds of schools like that around the country.

So it is possible, it is doable, but we have to have the courage to do those tough things, and we want to put unprecedented resources behind those efforts.

Mr. PAYNE. Since we have so many people that want to speak, I appreciate that. We have a school in Newark, the Harriet Tubman School, that is the same. But the thing about Harriet Tubman, it is in the heart of the inner city, but it has been a high-performing school for the last 30 or 40 years. I am trying to catch a school that has been at the bottom for 30 or 40 and see if we can make it like Harriet Tubman. It is a real true public school.

Secretary DUNCAN. I testified this morning before the Senate Health Committee, and Senator Alexander said we spend a lot of time trying to catch failure. We need to start catching success.

I think there is lots of success out there that we have not been catching, and we want to learn from those successes. So that is why I am so optimistic. Despite these challenge, despite the sense of urgency, we have never had more high-performing, high-poverty schools in tough communities, urban, rural, suburban. This is happening. What we have to do is take these pockets of excellence and take them to scale.

But, again, the answers are not going to come from Washington bureaucrats. The answers are going to come from great educators at the local level.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you.

Mr. Castle.

Mr. CASTLE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am sort of taking this question from what you stated and what I have talked to you about before, and you stated before, and that is the issue of standards and assessments.

I understand that the Governors are putting together standards, and things will hopefully bubble up from that, and somehow we will allow that to become the standard setting, which I think is good. There is no question in my mind some States have played games with standards and with assessments in terms of making their standings look better than perhaps they are.

My question is on the assessments, and that may also tie in to your teacher evaluation issue, too. Maybe it does, maybe it doesn't.

What are the plans for assessments? Is that also going to come from the States, or is it going to be done as it is today, the States can select from various testing standards out there and that kind of thing? But what are the plans for that as far as this legislation is concerned?

Secretary DUNCAN. If I could, Congressman, just to take one second on Mr. Kline's question, to be very, very clear on the standards, yes, there is a consortium of 48 Governors, 48 State school chiefs working together. Again, both unions are supporting it. The

business community is crying out for this. This was the third rail a couple years ago. You couldn't talk about this issue.

Everybody is coming together, saying this is the right thing for children. I can give you for the record, Chairman, quotes from the head of the union. I can give you quotes from Republican Governors, I can give you quotes from the head of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce. Everybody is saying this is an idea whose time has come.

If States want to opt-out of that for whatever reason, that is fine with us, too. What we want is just to make sure they are high standards. So if they work as part of that consortium, great. If not, we just want the local University of Minnesota, University of Tennessee, whatever it is, to certify if you are hitting the standard that a student won't have to take remedial classes.

So you can work as part of that collaborative. So far there is huge momentum there. Or if a State chooses to go it alone, just have it certified by their local institution of higher education and we will be fine with that too. So, again, this is driven at the local level. If you guys know this is a Federal initiative or this is a national initiative, this dies. The leadership has got to come at the local level, and that is what is happening. Once you get higher standards, which is where we are going, huge progress, you need better assessments, to answer your question.

We were very concerned that due to the tremendous financial stress that States and districts are under now, you know, very, very tough budget times, the toughest in decades, that folks would get to the better standards but would be left with the same less-than-optimal assessments.

So as part of the race to the tomorrow, we carved out $350 million, and we are going to put that out to States. So, again, now it won't be our assessments, it won't be national assessments, we are going to put that out to sets of States that want to work together to come back with much better assessments, much more comprehensive, not just end-of-course, end-of-year, but real-time formative data so teachers and parents and principals and students can know what their strengths and weaknesses are.

So we think there is a huge opportunity here to get to that next generation, and we want to put our resources behind it. But the idea is the leadership is going to come at the local level.

Mr. CASTLE. Okay. Talk to me about the teacher assessment situation and the evaluation of the teachers. We all know that there are potential union problems here; that is, most unions have gotten mandates that you cannot fire a teacher after a couple of years, and they are given permanent jobs, et cetera, which makes I think evaluation more difficult. Also there is a lot of resistance, frankly, to the ability to judge teachers that are doing a superior job and should be on a different pay scale. These have been opposed by a lot of different States and teacher unions.

I sort of heard you talk about it, but how are we going to deal with that? I realize you are trying to rally everybody around to it, but it is going to be difficult to do, I think.

Secretary DUNCAN. I think things are changing. I think the public and maybe everyone here doesn't know how much things have changed. One example, Randi Weingarten, who I have tremendous

respect for, the President of the AFT, gave a speech here a couple months ago, 2 months ago. She talked about how much better teacher evaluations have to get. She talked about rewarding excellence. She talked about not protecting bad teachers. There is an openness and willingness.

Again, I went to both national conferences of unions and talked about teacher evaluation being broken. Everybody cheered. No one is happy with this. No one is saying the status quo is good enough. So the process is so important. As Chairman Miller's point, this has to be done in partnership. It can't be done top down. It has to be done with teachers, not to teachers.

But no one is saying teacher evaluation works. There are a small number of districts, they are doing some wonderfully innovative things, management and union working together, everybody on the same page. But, again, those are just isolated situations.

So some folks are breaking through, but there is a willingness. Again, there is a willingness now that maybe there wasn't 3 or 5 or 8 or 10 years ago. It doesn't mean we are there yet. A lot of hard work is ahead of us. But am I optimistic we can get there? Absolutely. Things are changing in a fundamental way.

Mr. CASTLE. I am still worried about the give-up of teacher tenure after a short period of time, and any kind of evaluation, on the basis they are going to evaluate me unfairly. I think it is going to be very difficult to get there.

My time is up, so I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

You have mentioned the achievement gap several times, and it seems to me if you have a chronic situation where African Americans in a community are getting a 10th grade education and everybody else is getting a 12th grade education, that you have essentially violated the civil rights of the minority community in violation of Brown v. Board of Education, where you have denied the students of the minority race of an equal educational opportunity.

Do you see the achievement gap as a civil rights violation?

Secretary DUNCAN. I see education as the civil rights issue of our generation, and I see where you have chronic achievement gaps that aren't changing. We absolutely have to challenge the status quo. We have to make sure—you know, some schools have 49 AP classes, and some schools have none. Some schools have access to dual enrollment college classes, and some have none. And we just have to make sure that all children have a chance to get a high-quality education.

Mr. SCOTT. One of the gaps is in the dropout rates. And in a previous discussion I think you acknowledged that a school that has a 50 percent dropout rate should not be given, as some are now, credit for AYP, because those that remained in school did okay while half of them dropped out.

Secretary DUNCAN. I talked about perverse incentives under NCLB. You just nailed one of them.

Mr. SCOTT. We thought we had dealt with that when we passed the bill way back when it started, because we worked together and required a provision in there that dealt with dropouts so you would not have the perverse incentive.

Unfortunately, we gave everybody the opportunity to make up their own numbers, which they did. There is no standardized count, there is no standardized goal. You can make up what you want, and it essentially has no basis at all, where you can achieve AYP with a 50 percent dropout rate.

Are you working to standardize the ability to accurately count and set a goal that people are supposed to achieve?

Secretary DUNCAN. We have to, obviously, not just look at growth on evaluations but also look at outcomes and outcomes of graduation rates. I would say if you have the best third-grade test scores in the world but 50 percent of your students are dropping out, you are not changing students' lives. So we have to look at those rates.

I am interested not just in 4-year rates, but 5-year rates. Again, some of the perverse incentives where students fell behind, there wasn't always a push to bring them back into the fold. And at the end of the day it doesn't really matter whether you graduate in 4 years or 5 years. Three is great, four is great, five is great too. We want to make sure students have an opportunity to graduate.

Most importantly, again, it is not just about sticks. We want to find those schools that are really driving up graduation rates and reward them and learn from what they are doing.

Mr. SCOTT. One of the problems we had With No Child Left Behind, too, in the beginning, was that we do the tests, but after you got the results, that was the end of the discussion. We didn't do anything. The old farmer's adage that we often repeat is that you don't fatten the pig by weighing the pig.

We would take the test, but then the school would be no better equipped to do anything about it than they were before they got the rules. What are we actually doing when we find—as we go to empower the schools to do a better job?

Secretary DUNCAN. Sir, what we want to do more than ever before with these discretionary resources, we want to invest in what is working. So where districts can show us they are closing achievement gaps and raising the bar for all students, we want to put a lot more resources behind that and take it to scale. When you have one high-performing school in the community, why can't that go to two to three to five and share those best practices.

Where things aren't working, we want to challenge the status quo very, very hard, but with increased local flexibility. We think there is going to be a real flourishing of innovation, many more good things happening, and we want to reward that success.

Mr. SCOTT. Now, do we have a research capability to capture all this information and to get it in a form for best practices and translate that into replicable strategies?

Secretary DUNCAN. We want to work very hard with IES, which is sort of a separate entity. But there are so many examples of excellence we have not learned from. We want to get much better at that. Race to the Top, we are going to do some great things, we hope. I am sure we are going to make some mistakes as well. We want to learn from that in real time. So having a real research arm working hard on this in real time is very important to us.

Mr. SCOTT. One our challenges is figuring out what a highly qualified teacher is. I think you agree you can't read it off a resume, and that is how we have done it traditionally. You read the

resume, and some are highly qualified and some aren't; some can teach and some can't.

What are we doing to ascertain whether or not a teacher is actually effective, not just one with the paper qualifications?

Secretary DUNCAN. Well, we want to move from highly qualified, based upon paper credentials, to highly effective, based upon the difference you make in students' lives. To your point, you could have four degrees from the fanciest of universities, but if your students are not learning, you are not a great teacher. And you could have none of those fancy degrees and be making extraordinary differences in students' lives. So moving from paper credentials to effectiveness is exactly where we want to go.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to enter into the record another study. I think since the last time we talked about the problems that we are having in charter schools in segregation, another study has come out which leads to the same conclusion. We would like that entered into the record.

Chairman MILLER. Without objection, it will be part of the record.

[The policy brief, "Schools Without Diversity: Education Management Organizations, Charter Schools, and the Demographic Stratification of the American School System," submitted by Mr. Scott, may be accessed at the following Internet address:]

http://epicpolicy.org/files/EMO-Seg.pdf

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Souder.

Mr. SOUDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have two basic questions. One I believe is fairly simple, but I am confused as to why we don't do it. Under IDEA, we have individual education plans for each special-needs student. Why isn't that plan a growth model? In other words, why isn't that IEP either adjusted to meet the annual growth goal, or the growth goal adjusted to meet the IEP? We have not seemed to mesh these two programs.

Secretary DUNCAN. We haven't done great growth models for lots of students, including students with special needs. So I think you are on to something we need to look at very, very closely.

Mr. SOUDER. Because we are paying a lot of money to develop this whole annual plan that doesn't seem to be meshed with the measurement of the school, and I think that would be a measure breakthrough in a lot of schools.

Secretary DUNCAN. It is a great point. Again, when you talk about growth and gain, we want to measure like students against like students. So students with similar disabilities are getting wildly different outcomes. We want to understand why that is and, again, what are the best practices. And when those students aren't progressing, we want to figure out how we challenge that.

Mr. SOUDER. Good, because that is part of my next question, because Indiana is doing that. I am a little worried and I ask for forgiveness from God because this question sounds a little like Chairman Miller's question, and that is always dangerous——

Chairman MILLER. Be very careful.

Mr. SOUDER. In the lower 5 percent schools, I have watched for many years, as a staffer and as a Member working with this, we have tried many of your four different things. We have tried magnet schools, we have tried changing the names of the schools, firing the principals, changing the teachers. And your list of four seems relatively prescriptive in the sense of two of them have replace the principal, one has firing half the school, close the school, and two others.

Now, you are putting additional funds in and you said that you are going to try to measure like students with like students. But one of the challenges here is why would anyone ever choose to teach in one of these schools if they think there is a 50 percent chance they are going to be fired? Why would a principal go there? How are we assured that the same schools that haven't been chronic are going to be measured fairly and get improvement?

Secretary DUNCAN. Those are great, great questions. And to be clear, where you have a principal who has recently arrived there, they are not fired. They can actually stay.

I will say, though, there are no high-performing schools without very great principals, and if that principal has been there 20 years and nothing has moved, I think honestly you do need to make a change there.

What I will tell you, and this is a really important point, that around the country you have heroic teachers and principals who desperately want to go to the toughest communities and make a difference. In fact, that is why many people go into education. What they haven't had is a real opportunity where they thought they could make a difference.

So where you have a critical mass of folks coming together and you are creating the right set of opportunities, great leadership, more time to collaborate, more time for students, a real sense of master teachers helping out, there are phenomenal teachers that want to do this.

Mr. SOUDER. I agree with that wholeheartedly, and we have several schools inside Fort Wayne where teachers actually moved to those schools. And your point about the 50 ways to fail and undersucceed, that was an excellent point; because in measuring student-to-student performance may help or similar type schools may help, but the bottom line is some of those where they have really put their effort in, they get marginal change, even working weekends and so on. And those highly motivated teachers didn't move to those schools thinking 50 percent of them could be fired within a certain number of years if they do everything they can, and spend the extra hours. We obviously have English learners mixed in with this, all sorts of economic changes inside schools.

Sometimes where we see these great performing schools, we see there has been a student mix that has changed. They are all of a sudden getting a neighborhood change. It isn't just that it was suddenly some miraculous—they used some language program and they turned around. It does require the committed principals and teachers, I agree with that.

Secretary DUNCAN. And to Chairman Miller's point, it requires the whole community. I will tell you, as hard as this is, as difficult, I have been to school after school around this country in a rel-

atively short period of time. I was in one school that had the second most violent incidents in its city. Two years later, there was basically no violence, nothing going on.

There are schools where in the first year, maybe test scores don't skyrocket, but there are schools in which student attendance increases 12 percent. Twelve percent may not sound like a lot. Twelve percent on a 180-day school year is about another month of school that students are choosing to come to school.

So there are all kinds of indicators we can look at where adults are in there, working extraordinarily hard. This is the toughest work in America today, and I would argue it is the most important. And we need to, again community by community, find those folks, create an environment where they have a chance to be successful, reward success, give them the time, learn this won't happen perfectly everywhere.

But when you see students one year to the next going to school a month more, something good is going on. When you see violence disappear, something is happening.

Mr. SOUDER. I visited a school in New Orleans, right after Katrina, where only two students failed No Child Left Behind, even though it was 100 percent poverty.

I know it can be done. And part of the question is—and I would like to see the sustainability of those.

Secretary DUNCAN. Yes. We have to stay the course.

Chairman MILLER. It is the intention of the Chair to return after these votes. I am going to try to recognize Ms. Woolsey and Mr. Ehlers, if they are willing to stay here, and then if they have their track shoes on—I am sorry, Ms. Biggert. I will go to Ms. Woolsey, Ms. Biggert, and then run to make the votes and be back after the votes.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. It is wonderful to see you.

No Child Left Behind sounded very similar, different words, absolutely a different group presenting it to us, and No Child Left Behind turned out to be punitive instead of helpful. So I hate to sound like Mr. Hoekstra——

Chairman MILLER. Look, you are bringing us together in a way we never imagined. This is unprecedented in this community over the last decade.

Ms. WOOLSEY. But I really worry that we have got a new team in town, we have got a new White House, a new Secretary; so now we have to do a new something, but it won't be that different. So I will know it is different if we actually invest in the kids that need the help the most.

So what I want to know is: Is there an amount in the budget that will be targeted to ensure that students are ready to learn when they enter the classroom? Because to bring those failing kids, the sick kids, the hungry kids, the worried child, is going to be costly.

Are we going to make that investment, or are we going to expect the teacher to bridge that gap, hold that teacher accountable for something that is impossible? Because you cannot build a workable product if the parts are broken.

So, Mr. Secretary, my question is: How much—or are we willing to spend more money on those kids than on my grandchildren, who are well-adjusted, well-fed, happy kids going to school. Ready to learn?

Secretary DUNCAN. A great question. Let me be very, very clear. If a child is hungry, he or she cannot learn. If a child is scared, either in school or going to and from school, that child can't learn. If a child can't see the blackboard, that child can't learn. There is a series of physical and emotional, psychological supports that we have to put in place.

We have six large buckets of funding. One is student supports, $1.8 billion, a $245 million increase, a 16 percent increase. This is to extend after-school programs, extended day, extended year. This is to create neighborhoods that are safe and students that are safe. This is a huge investment, $200 million to replicate Jeffrey Canada's work in the Harlem Children's Zone, not just schools but entire communities around schools, to make sure students have a chance to be successful.

So we want to put unprecedented resources behind the effort to give students a chance to think about algebra and to think about biology and to think about going to college. If you are not hitting those emotional and physical needs first, we are kidding ourselves.

So, yes, to answer your question, we are going to put a huge amount of resources, not behind every child, but behind those children and communities with the greatest needs to give them a chance to be successful academically.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Okay. Thank you.

Chairman MILLER. The gentlewoman yields back her time.

Mrs. Biggert.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is nice to see you again here so soon, Mr. Secretary.

On page 16, you somewhere have got a teacher and leader innovation fund, and I am not quite sure how that all fits in. Does this mean that the blueprint requires a statewide definition of effective teachers and principals that is based in quite a large part on student academic growth? I know we both agree that the student achievement measure must be improved.

But is this an assessment competition designed to have a few States develop a new model assessment, and does that mean that other States, until this happens, that they will be still under the old test?

Secretary DUNCAN. We think States can provide some parameters, but we think this is best done and can only be done at the local level. So local school leaders, unions, teachers, management boards, working together at the local level. And again, I think nothing is more important than great teachers and great principals. We have $3.86 billion in our proposed budget. That is a $350 million increase. So we want to work with those States and districts who want to do something better.

One of the things I want to say, Mr. Chairman, is that we have spent a lot of money on evaluation systems, on professional development, billions of dollars a year, with very, very little to show for it. So we want to work with those places willing to challenge the

status quo and get dramatically better. This is a place where we have a long, long way to go as a country.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Okay. But in the meantime, will the teacher effectiveness determinations be made using the existing standardized tests?

Secretary DUNCAN. There are different ways to do it. We are moving towards this next generation of assessments. You can use existing assessments. Some of those aren't very strong. So you don't have to just look at the test results. You can look in every State; you have different categories of students, students below basic, basic, above or advanced. So you can look at the movement of students between those different categories.

These systems are not perfect. We are in a period of transition. There are different ways to do it. But at the end of the day, we want to get to a better system as quickly as we can. In the interim, there are ways to measure progress and growth.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Just another quick question. When does your Department plan to announce new data on the number of homeless students in the United States? I have really always been concerned about the homeless students. I have heard that it may now be over 1 million.

Secretary DUNCAN. Yes. I don't know the date. I will get you that. I will tell you one change that we are making. Historically, Title I dollars cannot be used for transportation for homeless students, and we are creating flexibility in our plan, our proposed plan, so that homeless children would have access to transportation.

Mrs. BIGGERT. One thing that I am concerned with, and it has to do with HUD, because they are working to change the homeless definition, and it really does depend on what the Education Department says is the number of homeless. That would really be helpful, if you have that number.

Secretary DUNCAN. I will check that data and give it back to you.

Mrs. BIGGERT. I yield back.

Chairman MILLER. I yield to Mr. Hinojosa. We have 3 minutes left. If you want to take your 3 minutes now, you are welcome to.

Mr. HINOJOSA. I will gladly take it, and I will come back for a second round.

Chairman MILLER. You will take your 3 minutes now and I think that will be it. But go ahead.

Mr. HINOJOSA. I want to ask two questions, Mr. Secretary. How do you propose to support high-need schools, we often at times call dropout factories, in both urban and rural areas through the reauthorization of ESEA? And in that response, please include how the Blueprint for Reform improves middle schools so that we can stop the high dropouts which occur in grades 7, 8 and 9?

Secretary DUNCAN. On the middle school piece, all of the reforms we are talking about—better teachers and leaders, well-rounded education, again, not just reading and math, but science and social studies and the arts, all those things, better student support—will impact and help middle schools to become stronger. Again, looking at growth and gain in how much students are improving, we think is going to be very, very important.

For those schools that have chronically underperformed, we have the school improvement grants, which is a $3.5 billion investment in those schools.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Can you see that middle schools get a greater amount than they have been receiving the last decade? Because when I have feedback in middle schools, they always compare how little they get versus the elementary and versus the high school. So that needs some specificity.

Secretary DUNCAN. One thing—this is not quite answering your question directly—but one of the things which always concerns me is high schools like to point their fingers to middle schools, and middle schools to elementary schools and right down the line. What we are really asking is for communities to come together behind their children, everyone rally behind.

That is one of the things that has been so appealing to me about the Harlem Childrens' Zone, is those aren't somebody else's children. Every child there is our child, and everybody is working together behind. So what we want to get out of is this finger pointing and blame game and get entire communities rallying behind children. And obviously middle schools are a hugely important piece of that pipeline, that equation.

Mr. HINOJOSA. My second question to you is the ESEA blueprint calls for identifying and developing effective teachers and leaders. How will you encourage and support States and districts in recruiting bilingual teachers and principals to better meet the needs of English language learners and diverse student populations?

Secretary DUNCAN. We want to put unprecedented resources behind better teacher recruitment, including bilingual teachers and principals. I have said repeatedly, I think our Department has significantly underinvested in principal leadership, and that is huge, and we are asking for a fivefold increase there.

As we have an increasingly diverse student population, I want the adults in front of those students to reflect the diversity of our country, and I would worry about the growing imbalance between our students and the adults there. So making sure we have great representation, whether it is bilingual or teachers and principals who have an ELL background. Thelma Melndez, who is in charge of our K-12 education was an ELL student who faced low expectations and this was a real personal battle.

I worry about the lack of men. I think most teachers around this country, 2 percent of teachers are African American males, 1.5 percent are Hispanic males, so 3.5 percent males from the Hispanic and African American community. Something is wrong with that picture and we have to do better.

Mr. HINOJOSA. We will return.

Chairman MILLER. We will recess.

[Recess.]

Chairman MILLER. The committee will reconvene.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. Our apologies for the vote in the middle of your appearance here.

My understanding is you are going to leave at about 5:20. So Mr. Tierney is recognized next, and then I think Mr. Petri.

Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for this endurance contest; I appreciate it, being in the Senate this morning and here today. It is a little bit like basketball practice, right?

Can you cite any evidence for a State like Massachusetts, which is the highest rate of proficiency, that the top-down imposition of improvement models that are supposed to be used on so-called underperforming schools actually have led to any success anywhere?

Secretary DUNCAN. In Massachusetts?

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, in Massachusetts first, but then generally otherwise.

Secretary DUNCAN. There are a number of high-performing turnaround schools around the country.

Mr. TIERNEY. That has used one of our four models that you cite?

Secretary DUNCAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. TIERNEY. And all of them have been shown to give some success?

Secretary DUNCAN. I think there are examples of success and examples where there hasn't been perfect success. But, yes, there has been success. Nothing is 100 percent.

Mr. TIERNEY. All right. But if each of those four models have shown to be successful so that you have included them on here as something that will help failing schools, then let me ask you what your reasoning is for restricting the number of certain models that be used?

Secretary DUNCAN. Actually what was said for high-performing districts, they could come in with a different model. So they were given flexibility there.

Mr. TIERNEY. A fifth model you are saying?

Secretary DUNCAN. Yes. With high-performing districts.

Mr. TIERNEY. But of the four, you have restricted the use of at least the transformative model. If it has proven to be effective, why restrict it? Why not let States and districts actually have the flexibility of choosing that and not saying that they can only use it for half of the schools?

Secretary DUNCAN. That is only for districts with many, many schools.

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, nine.

Secretary DUNCAN. Nine or above.

Mr. TIERNEY. Nine is not so many in New York or Chicago. Nine is a lot in Boston and Salem.

Secretary DUNCAN. What we are trying to guard against is under No Child Left Behind, everybody picked "other" and nothing changed.

Mr. TIERNEY. Okay, but this isn't "other." This is one of the four you set out and you put it in there because you think it is successful. So I assume if the people that proved that, they are okay with you. They have proven one of your successful models that you are using. So why should somebody else be precluded from choosing that one over the other three?

Secretary DUNCAN. Again, we think that is a good model. We think we need to be doing some other things where there are lots of schools.

Mr. TIERNEY. Presumably there will be people doing the other things. If you are given the four choices, I assume not everybody is going to pick that one. But by having some arbitrary number, I am a little bit mystified as to what purpose that serves.

Secretary DUNCAN. We think a lot of people will choose that model, and it is a very good model. But we want to see other moves as well.

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, I don't buy it. I am sorry. I disagree, and I think I will probably be working against it. I think the transformation model is a very good model. It seems to me it is where most people should be going.

I think that the restart idea is a charter school flak, and I look at the evidence from charter schools. There are some good ones, like there are good public schools; there are some bad ones, like there are some bad public schools. In fact, they are bad or worse than our public schools; they are good as or no better than. So I don't know why we are driving people in that direction. But that is a choice, if people want to take it. I suppose it is not a problem. Why you didn't restrict that, I don't know. If it did more than half, that would have been interesting.

The turnaround model where you dump off half the teachers and the principal, I don't think that is going to be an attractive offer for most people, because as Mr. Kildee said earlier, you can't blame it on the teachers and the principal every time. And to just arbitrarily say you are going to just dump half of them doesn't seem to make it.

The closure model may or may not work. That may be an option in some instances.

So I don't get the rationale and I don't see any evidence as a foundation for your decision to limit that transformation model where you haven't limited the others.

Secretary DUNCAN. Again, what we want to see is in these very low-performing schools, again, these are just the bottom 5 percent in any State, we want to see very aggressive action taken, and talent needs to be a piece of that.

Mr. TIERNEY. Good. But why not restrict the other three, then? You can only use up to half of the transformational model; why can't you only do half on the restart, half on the restart model, half on the turnaround model, half on the closure model?

Secretary DUNCAN. Again, we could look to do that. I don't think that is necessary. I think most people will be picking the transformation model.

Mr. TIERNEY. Then you have limited it to half just because you think people are going to go for the really good one. You want to make them go for one of the less good ones or one of the less attractive ones to them.

Secretary DUNCAN. What we want to see is a multitude of strategies to take on chronic underperformance.

Mr. TIERNEY. What I need to ask you to do is provide for this committee—and Mr. Chairman, I ask that we do this—all the detail you have that the turnaround model has worked anywhere and where it hasn't worked; all the detail where the restart model has worked and where it hasn't worked; all the detail from the closure model, where it has worked and where it hasn't worked; and all the

detail on the transformative model, where it has worked and hasn't worked. And then some data behind why you chose these four and how they stack up against one another, because I don't think it is going to bear out.

I don't mind the flexibility of choosing between four, but precluding people from choosing the one that looks really, really attractive, just on the fact that you want to force some people to choose a less attractive one, doesn't seem like a model for success.

Secretary DUNCAN. Again, we are not saying schools have to all do this next year. This is over the next couple years we are asking folks to take this every year and take some schools and do something dramatically different.

Mr. TIERNEY. We are all for doing something, but you are precluding one of the somethings.

Chairman MILLER. We will work with the Secretary's Office on that.

Mr. Ehlers.

Mr. EHLERS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate your waiting around for the laggards here.

Chairman MILLER. If the gentleman will suspend, the Secretary will be leaving at 5:20, so to the extent we can get the people in the room in the questioning, that will help out. Thank you.

Mr. EHLERS. Okay, I can be fairly brief.

I first want to tell you I appreciate the blueprint you have prepared. I printed it out last Saturday night and read it eagerly. And I think it is a very good analysis of what we have done and what we should do. I recognize the devil is always in the details, but I think it is a good place to start. So thank you for doing that.

I wanted to comment about a couple of things. You raised the issue of standards here, and that is generally a contentious issue on our side of the aisle, but I think it is an issue we have to address. It is not that I want to control standards from Washington, but I think what the States have done in a cooperative way is very good.

I think back in my elementary school days, most of the members of my class quit school after eighth grade. I grew up in a farming community. They thought they had learned everything they would ever need to know in farming, but in fact it would have been very good for them to continue on to high school and study chemistry and mathematics, because, as you know, today farms are far different than they were back in 1948 and farmers today have to be well-educated in the various aspects of science.

I want the standards not just because of science or just for science, but I think we owe it to our students today, because we have such a mobile society today. As you well know, most people move every 4 years or so. And it is easily possible for a family to move over the Christmas holiday, let's say, and the student may have studied a certain subject, particularly in math, which is sequential, or the sciences, which is sequential, and they may have studied it in the fall semester and they are transferred to another school that offers the same subject in the spring semester, and the student misses out on the course that would have been taught in his old school in the spring semester.

This is a major problem when you are talking about moving every 4 years. A lot of kids just get left in the cold. And if we wonder why so many Americans don't understand fractions or percentages or a lot of other things, that is one of the causes of it.

So I am not concerned quite as much about the standards in terms of what is taught or the quality that is taught, but the sequential nature of courses. It is crucial for science and mathematics, and I hope that everyone on this committee will appreciate that that is a really serious problem.

If we are serious about catching up and, in fact, exceeding what the Chinese and Indians are doing lately, as well as some 30 other nations, we have to look at that very seriously. Most of those nations that are doing better than us do have a standardized curriculum. That doesn't mean they set standards nationally, but they have the curriculum nationalized, so you avoid the sequential problem and also can help make sure the students get the courses they are going to need.

So I wanted to get that in the record, but also hear any comments you might have about that and ways that we can address it, while at the same time taking into account the concerns of my colleagues who are very worried about establishing a national standard.

Secretary DUNCAN. I just think this is happening at the right time for the right reasons, and the leadership in the right place, which is the local level. And, again, this has been bipartisan; Republican Governors, Democratic Governors, union, business community, Chamber of Commerce, everyone working together.

So I think making sure that those courses are linked sequentially, and, again, at the end of the day, they are high bar. Everyone is working hard together now. We are not done yet, but I am very, very encouraged. I think this is a fundamental breakthrough for our country.

Mr. EHLERS. I agree. I am glad States have done this, working together in that way—that is the ideal way, and leave us out of it. Even though I introduced a bill to provide tentative national standards, I am delighted if the bill is not necessary. I suspect that just introducing the bill probably instigated action on the part of the States to avoid the Congress setting standards. So I think we are going in the right direction.

With that, I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MILLER. I would just say that I think on the common standards, I think Professor William Schmidt, who is actually from Michigan, I believe, who raised this whole issue, and I think the standards reflect this idea of sequencing. It is something we haven't done. We jump around a lot, and certainly in the beginning study of mathematics.

Mr. EHLERS. He has done a marvelous job, and I have discussed it with him many times.

Chairman MILLER. Ms. Davis.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman MILLER. We have about 8 minutes left, folks.

Mrs. DAVIS. Good to see you, Mr. Secretary.

Just a comment on the common standards. I think that there are a lot of things in place, certainly the States' efforts, your efforts,

the President's efforts. I think I am still looking for a Sputnik-like moment.

Is that something that you feel as well; that while there is all this attention, you don't sense that urgency really in the country as a whole? And I am not sure whether that is good or bad. I mean, maybe it is okay that this really does have to be thoroughly grassroots in the sense of coming through locals. But I just wonder whether you have that sense, and where is that effort missing? Is it missing in the business community?

Secretary DUNCAN. I think, frankly, as a country we have lacked a sense of urgency, so we feel huge urgency. I feel it every single day, and I think you are seeing more and more people around the country. But, yes, we have to get dramatically better and we have to do it as fast as we can. And we are losing competitive advantage by every way you measure. And if you are serious about educating your way to a better economy, we have got to get better now.

Mrs. DAVIS. I wanted to focus for a second on the evaluations. I am very pleased you are doing that. I worked at the State level as well in teacher evaluations.

How do we really work with what we might call the lowest performing schools now, to have some assurances that they are actually taking the time to develop those evaluations or using ones that are out there? There must be several different plans that schools have been using that are best practices. How do we disseminate that in such a way that it doesn't become top-down?

Secretary DUNCAN. There are plenty of good models out there. When I was in Chicago, we used the TAP model, the Teacher Advancement Project. It was jointly worked on at the national level with the AFT and with folks actually from the Milken Foundation. We thought it was very, very strong.

To me, the evaluation piece shouldn't be done at the school. It really has got to be at the district level, because we don't want 95,000 schools doing their own evaluations. But districts should be working together. There are good models out there and, again, we want to put money behind places willing to do more of that.

Mrs. DAVIS. Is there an accountability piece in there so that schools that don't develop them or they are not going, really, beyond what exists today—what do you?

Secretary DUNCAN. We are going to try to push hard. Again, to me, it is not just up to individual schools. Districts have to provide leadership; management, unions, working together; teachers, stakeholders working together have to create that framework at the district level, and the schools need to implement.

Chairman MILLER. The Secretary is going to leave here, he has to be somewhere else at 5:30.

Mr. Guthrie. If you can limit yourself, we can just quickly jump through the members here. I apologize.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I had a couple of questions, but we will talk again. Thank you so much. I have enjoyed your attitude and the way you are progressing on this. Hopefully we will have a good solution by the end of the year. I had a couple of others questions, but I will just keep it to this.

We had some discussion earlier about charter schools and the good students are seen as students picking to leave charter schools

and leaving, I guess, the parents who aren't as motivated on their children or aren't as sophisticated, as was talked about, and their children staying in the traditional public school.

How do you think through that issue? There is an issue of people leaving charter schools, which I am for, because I think the option is leaving a kid in a school that their parent doesn't want them to attend or giving them an option to move them into a charter school. But what happens to the public school? Does it dwindle away, and there are other options? Then you talk about autonomous schools, and how is that different from a charter school? I will just leave it at that.

Secretary DUNCAN. We just need more good schools, and no one—if there happens to be a good charter school in the community, we need to be working on that neighborhood school as well. We just need more choices.

What I just fundamentally think is that wealthy families in our country have had two, three, four great educational options for decades, for centuries. Poor families have often had one choice, and often that choice wasn't a great one.

So think about if every family in this country—and this obviously works more where there is a denser population—had two, three, or four great choices, empowered parents. Let me tell you, every parent, it doesn't matter how rich, how poor, whatever education background they have, every parent wants the best thing for their child, and we need to give parents those opportunities.

Mr. GUTHRIE. I agree with you. But the autonomous public school, you mentioned that in the bill.

Secretary DUNCAN. Charters don't have the monopoly on innovation, and there are wonderfully innovative traditional public schools, and we want to see more schools with flexibility and the chance to create a vision. Charters are a piece of that answer. Autonomous schools that are part of a district that has some freedom and flexibility are also part of that answer.

Mr. GUTHRIE. Thank you.

Chairman MILLER. Ms. Hirono, 2 minutes.

Ms. HIRONO. Thank you.

The critical role of teachers, and can good teaching be taught? We have talked about this briefly before, The New York Times magazine article. What I want to know is are we getting to the science of good teaching? Is there something specific in the blueprint that gets us to the science of good teaching?

Secretary DUNCAN. I don't think we have the science of good teaching in the blueprint. What we want to do is invest in those places, those districts, those States, those schools of education that are doing a great job of accelerating student achievement and, by definition, are getting towards that science of good teaching.

So I don't think it is up to us to come up with that definition. I think it is our opportunity to invest in places that are taking this very, very seriously.

Ms. HIRONO. Is there money in the blueprint for that?

Secretary DUNCAN. There is very significant money in the blueprint for that, yes.

Ms. HIRONO. Thank you.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Courtney.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, earlier this year you were touting the New Haven school contract as a model for collaboration and flexibility. And I agree with you in terms of significance and the change that was included in that document. What I would say is I would challenge you or your staff to come to my office and explain to me how the turnaround grants in the models that you are proposing square with this contract, because it explicitly focused on the issue of turnaround schools, which New Haven, you know, the leadership recognized that the change needs to happen there. But, frankly, I don't see how what this blueprint calls for complies or dovetails with the hard work that people did on a collaborative basis.

Number two, you don't have to answer that right this second——

Secretary DUNCAN. I will be happy to have that conversation. We actually think there is lots common ground, but that is a good conversation to have, so we will follow up on that.

Mr. COURTNEY. The second question: Your work on the Recovery Act funding, I think, avoided a blood bath in this country in terms of school districts, with the worst economy in our lifetime. But, unfortunately, I still don't think we are out of the woods yet. Every school superintendent I talked to talks about the cliff in 2011.

I understand the thinking behind the competitive grant model in terms of trying to reform the system, but we have an economy that is like a patient with a heart attack, and we are asking school districts to run a marathon right now with resources that are going to really get real scary at the end of this calendar year.

I would just sort of share that with you, that aside from the merits of the substance of it, there is a practical challenge facing every superintendent in this country, and I am not sure this budget really acknowledges that.

Secretary DUNCAN. We absolutely share that concern. And everywhere I go, we are very concerned about potential cuts. We were able to save hundreds of thousands of teaching jobs this past year. We worry going to this next year. Obviously, we need to do both. We need to maintain that and perform. These shouldn't be in conflict. We need to do both at the same time. It is a real challenge. I share that concern.

Chairman MILLER. The Chair is going to go to Mr. Petri, and Ms. Chu, and then that is it. Two minutes.

Mr. PETRI. I will only take 30 seconds with respect to our witness, but just to say that one of the key tensions the No Child Left Behind was the way the assessment worked and how it was driving decisions in schools and in classrooms. And there is a lot that can be done. There is no magic bullet. But something like adaptive testing, which is a little more flexible and assesses student progress, changing it to "no child shall be ignored" and not make reasonable progress, rather than all get the same schedule, is something we need to have a good conversation about. That is it.

Chairman MILLER. Thank you. Ms. Chu, 2 minutes.

Ms. CHU. Yes. I was a teacher for 20 years, though I taught in the community college and not at the K-12 level. Nonetheless, I know that after so many years in the classroom that there are a range of teachers from great to those that need improvement. Clearly those that need improvement require greater intervention

than which exists now, especially in the K-12 classroom, which is a 20-minute evaluation in the back of the classroom once a year.

Now, in your blueprint, the key element seems to be having an effective teacher in the classroom. Yet when 74 teachers were fired at Central Falls High School in Rhode Island, you said that the members of the school board were showing courage and doing the right thing for the kids. Are you saying there was not even one teacher without any redeeming value?

Secretary DUNCAN. That was absolutely not what I was saying. And there are some phenomenal teachers there and in every school that struggles. You never want to see teachers fired. What I was suggesting was that schools like that, that have struggled, where there is a 52 percent dropout rate, where 7 percent of kids are at grade level in their math proficiency. Reading was better than that, but math, 93 percent of students weren't. We have to work hard together. What actually happened subsequent, which I am very pleased about, is the district and the union is working together on mediation and we have been actively encouraging that. So I think that situation is moving in the right direction.

Ms. CHU. How would you expect teachers to collaborate in the process? Because I don't see any area in there for teacher input in the blueprint.

Secretary DUNCAN. There are huge areas. And getting that partnership between teachers and the administrators has to happen. And all these things we are talking about, better evaluations, better assessments, all of that has to happen with cooperation and participation of all parties.

Ms. CHU. Thank you.

Chairman MILLER. Mr. Secretary, thank you very much for your time. I am sorry that we were interrupted in the middle of your testimony by the votes. We requested a view on a bipartisan, bicameral basis to make this blueprint available for us. And it is now our obligation to see if we can reduce this to legislative language.

We look forward to your continued involvement and the involvement of your staff, as has already been done from the Department with a bipartisan, bicameral working team. And we may even bring you back here for an update on all of this. But thank you so very, very much for presenting the blueprint, as was requested. Mr. Kline.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I echo the Chairman's comments, so somebody write this down today. And thank you very much for your hard work and your attendance.

Chairman MILLER. From Hoekstra to Kline, oh, my God. Oh, Souder, too. Jesus.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary. The committee will stand adjourned. And, without objection, all members have 14 days to submit materials for this hearing or questions to the Department of Education. We will forward them.

[Questions submitted for the record:]

U.S. CONGRESS,
[VIA FACSIMILE],
Washington, DC, March 26, 2010.

Hon. ARNE DUNCAN, *Secretary,*
U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY DUNCAN: Thank you for testifying at the Committee on Education and Labor's hearing on, "The Obama Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization Blueprint," on March 17, 2010.

Committee Members have additional questions for which they would like written responses from you for the hearing record.

Representative Raul M. Grijalva (D-AZ) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

1. You mentioned in your testimony that you see the middle grades as an integral part of a cradle-to-career education plan, yet I have not yet heard anything that acknowledges the unique educational situation of middle grades. The middle grades are a fundamental transitional point for students, and the dropout crisis will not be addressed successfully without addressing the crux of when students fall irreparably behind—these are the middle grades and not high school. Can you please expand on your testimony by explaining the place of middle grades in dropout prevention and college and career readiness?

2. I am pleased to see that both the Blueprint and the Department's Fiscal 2011 budget request propose new investments to improve teaching and learning in all content areas, including environmental education.

Former Education Secretary Riley said in a recent statement: If we want to have a green-jobs economy, we need to give our young people the skills to get the good-paying jobs that will become more and more available and attractive in the coming decade. Indeed, environmental literacy and education are at the very foundation of a sustainable green-jobs economy. We cannot have one without the other. We have an urgent need to raise student achievement and expand the academic pipeline for STEM-related subjects. Environmental literacy is one sure way to engage young people by giving them hands-on experience outside the classroom. Environmental literacy is good for the environment, good for education and a smart way to grow our economy.

Do you agree with Secretary Riley's statement? How can we ensure that the Department's proposed new investments in environmental literacy will get to those students who are most in need of better environmental education, specifically the economically and educationally disadvantaged students in our urban centers?

3. The Chairman and CEO of Norfolk Southern Corporation—a Fortune 300 Company—recently sent you a letter with copies to our Committee, urging you to work with the Congress to ensure that the environmental literacy plans and programs of the No Child Left Inside Act are incorporated into the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

He writes in his letter, "We believe that having an environmentally literate workforce is critical to our bottom line and the ongoing strength of our company. To be ready for the 21st Century workforce and for the transition to a green economy, we believe that every student must be prepared with basic environmental knowledge and skills and environmental education must begin in our nation's elementary and secondary schools." I applaud you for including environmental education as part of your initiative to help more students in high-need schools receive a "well-rounded education." Do you agree with the idea that environmental education is also important for our students to be college and career-ready? How can we ensure that the Department's proposed new investments in environmental education will be available to all students so that every student is prepared for the green economy?

Representative Carolyn McCarthy (D-NY) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

The FY11 budget you submitted and the Blueprint creates a new "Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students" program. A number of separate programs are combined into this one program, including the Safe and Drug Free Schools program. As you know, I am a strong proponent of school safety and look forward to continuing to work together on these efforts. You and I both know well the effects that schools and community violence can have on our students' ability to learn.

1. Can you describe how you see the "Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students" program working to address physical violence in schools?

2. The Department calls for school climate surveys, along with expulsion, suspension, and discipline data, to create a data-driven understanding of school safety. The blueprint does not reference incident-based law enforcement data as a part of the overall data collection and assessment. Does the Department agree with me about

the need to incorporate incident-based law enforcement data for crimes which have occurred at schools and on school campuses into this overall data-driven approach to school safety?

3. In the July, 2009, Committee joint hearing on strengthening federal school safety policy, we heard testimony stressing the importance of having a balanced and comprehensive approach to school safety which includes activities related to prevention, intervention, security, and emergency preparedness. The Department's approach and philosophy appears to have a strong focus on climate and prevention activities, which is good. Will the Department also include activities which support the security and emergency preparedness measures?

4. The Department's blueprint calls for priority awards of competitive safe schools grants to districts partnering with nonprofit and community-based agencies. Can this priority also include not only nonprofits and community based organizations, but also give priority to schools partnering with first responders, public safety agencies, emergency management agencies, public mental health agencies, public health agencies, and other government organizations that can help with school safety planning?

5. Does the administration believe corporal punishment in schools is an effective discipline technique? Does the Department have data on the effectiveness of corporal punishment? How is effectiveness of corporal punishment measured? Does the Department have data on whether States that permit corporal punishment have less disciplinary problems than other schools?

6. The Blueprint raises the notion of holding parties besides educators accountable, but it appears that for the most part it is educators that are the overwhelming focus of the accountability system. How can we ensure that teacher assessments are based on multiple measures and that teachers are given the professional development they need to be effective?

7. Who should we hold accountable when students fails to progress on science tests when their classroom is not equipped with a laboratory? Is that the responsibility of the teacher, the district, or the state?

8. If there are issues of safety, deteriorating school buildings, a lack of teaching materials, poor curriculum, poor leadership shouldn't the district and states be held accountable?

9. If parents do not attend parent-teacher conferences, fail to intervene on discipline issues or help their children with their homework shouldn't they be held accountable and provided with any resources needed to help them in this areas of shared responsibility?

Representative Dina Titus (D-NV) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

I am pleased to see that you and the Administration are committed to making federal education dollars work smarter by making significant changes to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and I look forward to working with you on this reauthorization.

In particular, I applaud your focus on rewarding schools and districts for the progress they are making, and on helping struggling schools to improve, not just punishing them if they fall behind.

The Administration's reauthorization blueprint proposes to consolidate 38 existing programs into 11 new programs and places a much greater emphasis on competitive grants. While I appreciate the Administration's desire to make the various funding streams work better together, as well as the innovation that can be spurred by competition, I have some concerns about how this change might impact schools in my district.

In Nevada, education has been underfunded since statehood, and the current budget crisis has made that worse. A major shift to competitive grants, I fear, will result in even less funding and fewer resources, leaving our students at a disadvantage.

1. What are the Administration's plans to ensure that school districts in states that may not have resources to compete aggressively for funding are not denied important resources, especially for programs which you have proposed to fold into other funding streams?

2. Additionally, for states such as Nevada where the legislature must plan the budget two years in advance, how does the Department intend to move towards competitive grants while still providing states and districts with the stability they need to plan ahead?

Representative Lynn Woolsey (D-CA) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

1. Secretary Duncan, please provide more detail about how funding would be made available through state and local education agencies in the proposed Effective

Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education Program. Specifically, if core subjects of learning like music and the arts are grouped with other non-tested subjects, will each subject of learning be allotted a specific share of federal funds?

2. Secretary Duncan, how can we be assured that the funds in the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education Program will be used to address the need for the complete education of all children? Will new Department of Education policies provide incentives and reward communities for including broad curriculum offerings—including music and arts education—in their goals for a complete and quality education for all children and to prepare them for college and the workforce?

3. We've unfortunately seen a narrowing of the curriculum in recent years where states are spending less time on non-tested subjects like music and arts and more time on tested subjects. Can you provide assurances that the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education Program would not allow the continuation of the narrowing of the curriculum?

4. I was pleased to hear you mention the importance of getting more girls and minorities interested in STEM education. How do you plan to use the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Program to increase interest and access at the Kindergarten through twelfth grade level?

5. States and districts have struggled for years to develop appropriate assessment tools students with disabilities. What ideas does the Administration have to encourage the improvement of assessments and accommodations policies for students with disabilities?

6. How can we ensure that every student will be "ready-to-learn" when he or she enters the classroom?

7. Will the funding in the President's Budget for Promise Neighborhoods be sufficient to ensure that all of our students receive the necessary support services to succeed in the classroom?

Representative Jared Polis (D-CO) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

First, I would like to commend you for putting forward a bold vision and plan for education reform and innovation. The blueprint's principles and framework offer a roadmap for overhaul to help us create a world-class education system that serves the needs of all children and raises the bar to the level needed for global leadership in college graduates, not merely competitiveness. In particular, I'm very pleased that the plan recognizes the critical role of public school choice as a tool for fostering, rewarding, expanding and replicating successful educational entrepreneurship that proves how we can get the job done and close the achievement gap against the odds. And it's very encouraging that this increased emphasis on successful models is coupled with a strong commitment to ensuring high levels of accountability and oversight from all parties involved in the chartering process.

The blueprint recommends expanding high-performing public charter schools, which is desperately needed, as demand has far outpaced supply, with more than 700,000 children currently on charter school waiting lists nationwide. However, even this large unmet demand is artificially low when one considers that the majority of parents do not even know about their child's eligibility for choice. In a survey of eight large urban districts, only one out of five parents of students eligible for public school choice indicate they had been notified by their school districts and of those who parents who were notified, the majority indicated that the information received was incomplete or unhelpful.

1. Can you discuss the Department's proposal for ensuring that parents are not only notified, but well-informed, about their public school choice rights and options? I'm afraid that unless we get this right this time around, we will continue to have only 1% participation rates among eligible students.

Your proposal indicates a single competitive grant program "to start or expand high-performing public charter schools."

1. Can you describe in more detail how you envision a competitive grant program that combines both new charter schools, which cannot have a track record of success, and the expansion of top-performing schools that have a demonstrated record of success?

2. Don't you think that we need to continue investing in start-ups, but also have a dedicated program just for scaling up success?

Every day, students who are, or are perceived to be, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) are subjected to pervasive discrimination, including harassment, bullying, intimidation and violence. Surveys indicate as many as nine in 10 LGBT students have been bullied. Such actions deprive students of equal educational opportunities and contribute to high rates of absenteeism, dropout, adverse

health consequences, and academic underachievement among LGBT youth. But unlike other forms of discrimination, such as on the basis of race, color, sex, religion, disability or national origin, civil rights protections do not explicitly include sexual orientation or gender identity.

As the Department and Congress work towards ensuring safe and nurturing learning environments so that each and every child can learn and thrive, I think that it's critical for us to protect LGBT students from discrimination and harassment. That is why I have introduced HR 4530, the Student Non-Discrimination Act in January, to prohibit discrimination based on a student's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in our public schools. The Act is modeled after Title IX's prohibition of sex discrimination.

1. Can you please share with us your views on this issue and whether you think that prohibiting this type of discrimination would help achieve our goal of equal educational opportunity?

Representative Rush Holt (D-NJ) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

1. In your testimony you make clear that "we are calling on all states to develop and adopt standards in English language arts and mathematics that build to college and career readiness * * *". I have a simple question, why not science Secretary Duncan?

2. I want to commend your Administrations emphasis on data, but we need to move beyond year old data reported at the state level. I believe that LEA based data systems, that includes real time data from teacher created formative assessments can be a critical tool to allow teachers to identify the exact learning needs of their students, adjust classroom actions, and help identify the professional development needs of teachers. Would you support the creation of a new grant to help establish LEA data systems?

3. In his speech before students, parents, and faculty at Hudson Valley Community College on September 21, 2009 the President presented a compelling case for how R&D is the life blood of innovation and America's future capacity to compete effectively in a global economy. That's why the federal government invests tens of billions of dollars each year in R&D in such sectors as defense ($80B), medicine ($30B), and energy ($10.5B). But what about education? The cabinet level agency with the lowest federal R&D budget—about $300 million—is the US Department of Education) The ARRA, for example, invested $22 billion in federal R&D programs but zero for education. With your clear emphasis on innovation in education, shouldn't R&D in education be a top priority too?

4. Would the Administration be willing to support a reduction in the intensity and frequency of testing so that, particularly in the elementary grades, tests are used to evaluate and adjust instructional practice and not just force schools into the "failed" designation?

5. By narrowing the kindergarten gap through the provision of high quality preschool, we are able to produce dramatically better readers and writers of English by 3rd grade. Yet, these lessons—widely accepted by research—are not reflected in the priorities of the Administration. Would you be willing to consider a special incentive—perhaps a floor on spending on preschool and kindergarten—to divert attention to a high-quality early start for children from poor families?

6. In President Obama's State of the Union address he mentioned that a world-class education is the best anti-poverty program. What role do you see school libraries playing in a world-class education, and what is the administration doing to promote school libraries?

7. You always talk about funding programs that work—and Abbott pre-k has certainly proven itself—in that mindset, will you include high-quality pre-k in the Department's proposal for ESEA reauthorization? Could providing a high-quality pre-k programs as an instructional intervention be available under Title I to LEAs and schools identified for improvement? Will providing high-quality pre-k and strengthening instruction across pk-3 continuum be included as an eligible "rigorous school intervention model" under Title I School Improvement Grants, which you are proposing to re-name "School Turnaround Grants"?

8. You and the President have made numerous speeches in recent months calling on the need for students to possess 21st century skills like problem-solving, critical thinking, teamwork, entrepreneurship, and creativity and whether they have the knowledge of content and skills to thrive and find work when they graduate. How do you and the Department propose we implement that talk? Where do you see the placement and utilization of those skills within a new Elementary and Secondary Education Act?

9. Every day, students who are, or are perceived to be, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) are subjected to pervasive discrimination, including harass-

ment, bullying, intimidation and violence, which is harmful to both students and our education system. These hurtful actions deprive students of equal educational opportunities and contribute to high rates of absenteeism, dropout, adverse health consequences, and academic underachievement among LGBT youth. Left unchecked, discrimination can lead, and has led, to life-threatening violence and to suicide. How can schools respond to and prevent discrimination against LGBT students? What is the role of the federal government in ensuring that these students have access to educational opportunities that are equal to their peers?

Chairman George Miller (D-CA) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

The idea of using the Individualized Education Program (IEP) to measure growth for students with disabilities in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act's accountability system was raised during questions. IEPs are not valid and reliable measures of academic proficiency or growth towards academic achievement standards, nor do IEPs provide any comparability for system accountability. Can you please clarify your position on this issue?

Additionally, during questions, you spoke of measuring "like students against like students." Could you provide us with a better understanding of this statement? Please elaborate on your efforts to ensure that all students, including students with disabilities, are included in growth models in order to achieve the goal of career and college-readiness.

Representative Marcia Fudge (D-OH) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

1. Secretary Duncan, both you and the President emphasize the need for students to possess 21st century skills, such as problem-solving, critical thinking, teamwork, entrepreneurship, and creativity. I agree that these skills, coupled with academic excellence, will best prepare students for the global workforce. Where do you see the development of those skills within a new Elementary and Secondary Education Act? Is there a role for public-private partnerships in developing these skills?

2. Every student in this country deserves a solid academic foundation and the opportunity to study higher level subjects that both interest them and make them more competitive for college. Unfortunately, many schools, especially those in low-income areas, lack the resources to provide their students with educational options such as foreign languages and AP courses. However, some school districts provide specialized courses to students through online courses. In your opinion, does access to specialized online courses provide students with educational opportunities they may not otherwise have, and if so, what can Congress do to encourage more schools to take advantage of online or virtual courses?

3. I applaud the Administration's and Chairman Miller's promotion of Promise Neighborhoods. I am pleased that President Obama's budget request expands the program by reforming schools and augmenting social services for children. Will the latter be done through grants given to existing or newly launched Promise Neighborhoods? If not, does the Administration support increasing Promise Neighborhood implementation grants?

I also have a question regarding the not yet release guidance for Promise Neighborhood grants already appropriated. Will preference be given to neighborhoods in cities currently without an existing promise neighborhood or children's zone?

4. As you said in your remarks, President Obama's budget request includes additional Race to the Top funding, including a new competition for school districts. How do you imagine this new program will be structured? Also, with this and the other competitive grants, will technical assistance be given to smaller school districts that lack the resources to hire a grant writer?

Please send an electronic version of your written response to the questions in Microsoft Word format to the Committee by March 31, 2010, the date on which the hearing record will close. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Committee.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER, *Chairman.*

U.S. CONGRESS,
[VIA FACSIMILE],
Washington, DC, March 30, 2010.

Hon. ARNE DUNCAN, *Secretary,*
U.S. Department of Education, 400 Maryland Avenue SW, Washington, DC.

DEAR SECRETARY DUNCAN: Thank you for testifying at the Committee on Education and Labor's hearing on, "The Obama Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization Blueprint," on March 17, 2010.

Committee Members have additional questions for which they would like written responses from you for the hearing record.

Representative Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R-WA) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

1. Implementing standards-based education was a key element of NCLB, the premise of which is continued in your blueprint. I believe we need benchmarks against which to measure students' progress and their future success. Yet, I think we can all agree that having high standards does not alone guarantee high achievement. What do college and career ready standards mean under your proposal? How do they differ from the current state standards? How does your proposal ensure that students will achieve these standards? What has been left out of the discussion is curriculum. What role does curriculum play in ensuring that students achieve?

2. Your proposal puts significant emphasis on evaluating the effectiveness of teachers. A recent survey conducted by the Gates Foundation reveals that teachers agree that students are leaving high school unprepared for college and careers. I find this unacceptable. We entrust our children to teachers to help prepare them for their futures. If teachers were in the private sector, they would be fired for failing to perform. Yet, many believe that nothing can be done. A group of superintendents in my district recently stated, "Our hands are tied in dealing with mediocre teachers—the unions have become so strong and so much a voice in the state and local governing [sic] there is no ability to fire or release mediocre teachers. Until the state or federal government steps in and helps districts deal with this issue, we will have a difficult time reaching the accountability models proposed." What elements in your proposal will eliminate these barriers and create incentives to encourage teachers to be more effective in the classroom?

3. One of the most overlooked accomplishments of NCLB is the progress made for disabled students. Yet, your proposal makes only passing reference to special needs students. How does your proposal protect and further these students' successes?

Representative Bill Cassidy (R-LA) has asked that you respond in writing to the following questions:

1. My Congressional district includes a number of small elementary and secondary school districts that receive fewer resources under the Title I program, on a per student basis, than larger school districts located in more populated areas, because Title I funding allocation formulas tend to favor large school districts. Smaller schools have fewer students to spread their fixed Administrative costs for things, such as computer systems. Therefore, it seems logical to say that smaller school districts should receive more per student, not less. If it is true that small districts have a higher administrative cost per student, then why do they receive less money than large districts? Will you consider reworking the Title I formulas to address this issue? This will ensure that federal dollars are fairly allocated to students no matter what size community in which they live.

2. No Child Left Behind allows parents to have options to transfer their children out of poor performing schools and into higher-performing schools in the area, or receive supplemental educational services (SES) in the community, such as tutoring, after-school programs, or remedial classes. As an advocate of parental choice, I want to ensure that parents still have the right to move their child out of a failing school or receive student support services. During the March 3 Full Committee hearing, you stated, "I am not at all in opposition to supplemental services. In fact, you will be hard pressed to find a bigger advocate for tutoring and more time than me." But the Administration's blueprint eliminates the requirement that school districts provide parents with public school choice and SES, choosing to focus its efforts on turning around low-performing schools. Why did the Administration eliminate these parental options? What options will parents have to remove their kids from low-performing schools or to receive extra academic help if a school turnaround model takes 4 or 5 years to implement?

3. You define "Challenge" schools as being the lowest-performing 5% of schools in a state, and require them to implement one of four turnaround models: a Transformation, a Turn-Around, a Restart, or a School Closure. In the first three types, teacher tenure will surely be a significant challenge. Will the Department of Edu-

cation recommend how states and school districts should navigate this challenge and how states may grant principals more control over removing ineffective teachers?

4. The blueprint requires states to implement assessment systems to adequately measure student growth. Will the Department provide grants or funding for states to establish these data systems to collect and publicize growth in English, math, science, graduation rates, and college enrollment rates?

Please send an electronic version of your written response to the questions in Microsoft Word format to the Committee by March 31, 2010, and these questions are only arriving today, I ask that you provide your responses as soon as possible. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Committee.

Sincerely,

GEORGE MILLER, *Chairman.*

[Secretary Duncan's responses to the questions submitted follow:]

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF LEGISLATION AND CONGRESSIONAL AFFAIRS

December 20, 2010

Honorable George Miller
Chairman
Committee on Education and Labor
United States House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515

Dear Mr. Chairman:

Thank you for your Committee's follow up questions from the March 17, 2010, hearing on "The Obama Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization Blueprint." Please see the enclosed document for responses to questions that Members of the Committee submitted.

If you have any issues or questions about our responses, please contact Gabriella Gomez, Assistant Secretary for the Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs, at 202-401-0020.

Sincerely,

Gabriella Gomez
Assistant Secretary
Office of Legislation and Congressional Affairs

Enclosure

Answers to Questions Submitted for the Record

3.17.10 House Education and Labor Committee Hearing: "The Obama Administration's Elementary and Secondary Education Act Reauthorization Blueprint"

3.17.10 McMorris Rodgers 1. *Implementing standards-based education was a key element of NCLB, the premise of which is continued in your blueprint. I believe we need benchmarks against which to measure students' progress and their future success. Yet, I think we can all agree that having high standards does not alone guarantee high achievement. What do college and career ready standards mean under your proposal? How do they differ from the current state standards? How does your proposal ensure that students will achieve these standards? What has been left out of the discussion is curriculum. What role does curriculum play in ensuring that students achieve?*

Access to a challenging curriculum is an important part of supporting student achievement. Our Effective Teaching and Learning proposal would support state and local efforts to implement high-quality curricula, as would various efforts at other agencies.

Asking states to adopt college- and career-ready standards for all students is a core part of our proposal. Under our proposal, states can either choose to work with other states on common state-developed standards, or work with their 4-year public university system to ensure that mastery of their standards would prepare students for postsecondary success without the need for remedial course and a career.

We agree that high standards alone do not guarantee achievement, but we believe that high standards and high expectations are a critical piece of the puzzle. Our proposal also promotes effective teaching and learning to these high standards, a rigorous and fair accountability system, supports for diverse learners, a well-rounded and complete education, addressing the full range of student needs, and innovation and continuous improvement throughout the education sector.

3.17.10 McMorris Rodgers 2. *Your proposal puts significant emphasis on evaluating the effectiveness of teachers. A recent survey conducted by the Gates Foundation reveals that teachers agree that students are leaving high school unprepared for college and careers. I find this unacceptable. We entrust our children to teachers to help prepare them for their futures. If teachers were in the private sector, they would be fired for failing to perform. Yet, many believe that nothing can be done. A group of superintendents in my district recently stated, "Our hands are tied in dealing with mediocre teachers – the unions have become so strong and so much a voice in the state and local governing [sic] there is no ability to fire or release mediocre teachers. Until the state or federal government steps in and helps districts deal with this issue, we will have a difficult time reaching the accountability models proposed." What elements in your proposal will eliminate these barriers and create incentives to encourage teachers to be more effective in the classroom?*

Nothing in school makes a bigger difference for students than the quality of teaching they receive. We're proposing a significant increase in investment in teachers, with the goal of having a great teacher in every classroom.

The Department awarded approximately $437 million in new Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF) grants this fall to support State and district efforts to create ways to reward success and drive reform. TIF programs reward teachers and principals who improve student achievement, using fair and transparent evaluations of teacher and principal effectiveness. And grantees must demonstrate that they are implementing performance-based compensation as part of a coherent and integrated strategy for strengthening the educator workforce. We are asking states and districts to work together with teachers to build evaluation systems that meaningfully differentiate teachers and leaders based on the results they achieve, and we will support them in using this information to make decisions around support, compensation, and advancement.

Our ESEA reauthorization proposal includes $2.5 billion in formula funding for States to establish a clear standard for what an effective teacher is, design fair and rigorous teacher evaluation systems, and develop and implement plans to make sure that all students are taught by effective teachers who get the support they need. The proposal also includes $950 million in competitive funding for States and districts that are ready to lead the way in working with teachers to build compensation systems that attract, reward and retain effective teachers and leaders, particularly in high-need schools and subjects or areas. And, we propose $250 million in competitive funding for teachers and $170 million for principals and other school leaders to support State and district efforts to develop and work with the best teacher and leader preparation programs.

3.17.10 McMorris Rodgers 3. *One of the most overlooked accomplishments of NCLB is the progress made for disabled students. Yet, your proposal makes only passing reference to special needs students. How does your proposal protect and further these students' successes?*

We agree that NCLB did a good job of bringing to light persistent achievement gaps between subgroups of students, including between students with disabilities and their non-disabled peers. We would continue to require that students with disabilities be included in accountability, and by measuring student performance based on student growth, not just on absolute proficiency, schools, districts, and states will have a better picture of how students with disabilities are performing and whether they are making progress. We will shine a bright light on achievement gaps by requiring the disaggregated reporting of results for students with disabilities, as well as other subgroups, and by asking states to specifically identify schools with the largest, persistent achievement gaps and to implement data-driven interventions to close those gaps. Our proposal also asks states to set performance targets for each subgroup, and these targets will be based on a more meaningful standard of college- and career-readiness. We want to make sure that students with disabilities are fully included in all aspects of education through encouraging the use of

universal design, and our proposal includes a cross-cutting priority for projects that specifically address the needs of students with disabilities. Throughout our proposal, we will make certain that students with disabilities are included in all programs and that their unique needs are taken into account, and we will increase support for the inclusion and improved outcomes of students with disabilities. We also want to work with Congress to help ensure that teachers and leaders are better prepared to meet the needs of diverse learners.

3.17.10 Cassidy 1. *My Congressional district includes a number of small elementary and secondary school districts that receive fewer resources under the Title I program, on a per student basis, than larger school districts located in more populated areas, because Title I funding allocation formulas tend to favor large school districts. Smaller schools have fewer students to spread their fixed Administrative costs for things, such as computer systems. Therefore, it seems logical to say that smaller school districts should receive more per student, not less. If it is true that small districts have a higher administrative cost per student, then why do they receive less money than large districts? Will you consider reworking the Title I formulas to address this issue? This will ensure that federal dollars are fairly allocated to students no matter what size community in which they live.*

Title I is a critical program that provides much-needed support for districts and schools serving disadvantaged students. We are committed to keeping Title I as a formula program, and look forward to working with Congress to ensure that Title I funds reach the students who need them.

3.17.10 Cassidy 2. *No Child Left Behind allows parents to have options to transfer their children out of poor performing schools and into higher-performing schools in the area, or receive supplemental educational services (SES) in the community, such as tutoring, after-school programs, or remedial classes. As an advocate of parental choice, I want to ensure that parents still have the right to move their child out of a failing school or receive student support services. During the March 3 Full Committee hearing, you stated, "I am not at all in opposition to supplemental services. In fact, you will be hard pressed to find a bigger advocate for tutoring and more time than me." But the Administration's blueprint eliminates the requirement that school districts provide parents with public school choice and SES, choosing to focus its efforts on turning around low-performing schools. Why did the Administration eliminate these parental options? What options will parents have to remove their kids from low-performing schools or to receive extra academic help if a school turnaround model takes 4 or 5 years to implement?*

Our plan calls for transparency, accountability, and high-quality options for families. We will call on States and districts to provide parents with a clear, easily understandable report card with key information about their child's school, including not just how their school is doing, but how it measures up against other schools, and key information such as teacher and leader quality, graduation rates, and school climate data.

Our reauthorization proposal also provides $490 million for the Supporting Effective Charter Schools and Promoting Public School Choice programs, which support charter schools, other

autonomous public schools, magnet schools, inter- and intra-district choice programs, and online learning options. School districts will continue to be free to offer these various options, including supplemental educational services, to parents and students, but now will have flexibility that they do not have under current law, which dictates to school districts which options they must use and when, regardless of local conditions and needs.

3.17.10 Cassidy 3. *You define "Challenge" schools as being the lowest-performing 5% of schools in a state, and require them to implement one of four turnaround models: a Transformation, a Turn-Around, a Restart, or a School Closure. In the first three types, teacher tenure will surely be a significant challenge. Will the Department of Education recommend how states and school districts should navigate this challenge and how states may grant principals more control over removing ineffective teachers?*

The decision on which model to implement is a local one, and we believe it should be based on the model that best meets local needs. We also know that effective implementation is dependent on the close collaboration of the school district and school administrators, teachers, parents and other partners. We encourage districts to involve all stakeholders, including local teachers' unions, early in the process of implementing these reforms, to ensure that the district can implement fully and effectively the selected intervention model. We have been and will continue to provide extensive technical assistance to help districts and schools implement their reforms.

3.17.10 Cassidy 4. *The blueprint requires states to implement assessment systems to adequately measure student growth. Will the Department provide grants or funding for states to establish these data systems to collect and publicize growth in English, math, science, graduation rates, and college enrollment rates?*

Earlier this year, the Department announced $250 million in State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) grants to 20 States, to support the enhancement of state data systems that can collect, house and report on assessment data, including student growth data, graduation and college enrollment rates. Overall, 42 States and the District of Columbia have received SLDS grants. The Department has requested an additional $65 million in the fiscal year 2011 budget for this purpose. States would also be able to use certain State set-aside funds under our reauthorization proposal to support the development and use of an SLDS or the integration of achievement data into an SLDS.

3.17.10 Grijalva 1. *You mentioned in your testimony that you see the middle grades as an integral part of a cradle-to-career education plan, yet I have not yet heard anything that acknowledges the unique educational situation of middle grades. The middle grades are a fundamental transitional point for students, and the dropout crisis will not be addressed successfully without addressing the crux of when students fall irreparably behind – these are the*

middle grades and not high school. Can you please expand on your testimony by explaining the place of middle grades in dropout prevention and college and career readiness?

We strongly agree that the middle grades are a critical time in students' education, and a strong education in the middle grades can help determine a students' success in high school and beyond. To that end, our fiscal year 2011 budget proposal includes $100 million for College Pathways and Accelerated Learning, which would provide middle and high school students with rigorous college-level and accelerated courses, particularly in schools with high concentrations of low-income students.

Additionally, we recently awarded $47 million in High School Graduation Initiative grants. These grants allow States and districts to focus efforts on dropout prevention and dropout recovery for students in grades 6-12.

And, in our proposal for supporting State and district efforts to implement dramatic interventions in the bottom five percent of schools, we encourage districts to include the middle grades in those efforts.

3.17.10 Grijalva 2. *I am pleased to see that both the Blueprint and the Department's Fiscal 2011 budget request propose new investments to improve teaching and learning in all content areas, including environmental education.*

Former Education Secretary Riley said in a recent statement:

If we want to have a green-jobs economy, we need to give our young people the skills to get the good-paying jobs that will become more and more available and attractive in the coming decade. Indeed, environmental literacy and education are at the very foundation of a sustainable green-jobs economy. We cannot have one without the other. We have an urgent need to raise student achievement and expand the academic pipeline for STEM-related subjects. Environmental literacy is one sure way to engage young people by giving them hands-on experience outside the classroom. Environmental literacy is good for the environment, good for education and a smart way to grow our economy.

Do you agree with Secretary Riley's statement? How can we ensure that the Department's proposed new investments in environmental literacy will get to those students who are most in need of better environmental education, specifically the economically and educationally disadvantaged students in our urban centers?

Environmental education is an important part of a complete education that prepares students to succeed in college and careers. Our proposal for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would provide support for states, districts, and schools to improve environmental education, as well as other subjects. Through these programs, students better understand their role in supporting a clean and sustainable environment, as well as the need to

know and use math and science to have access to and be successful in some of the fastest growing careers, such as geophysicist, LEED-certified architect, or renewable energy technician. We would share the best practices from these efforts with States and districts around the country, including in urban areas, to help ensure that every student is prepared to contribute to a green economy. We also will work with other agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, to support efforts to ensure that more students have access to science learning opportunities.

3.17.10 Grijalva 3. *The Chairman and CEO of Norfolk Southern Corporation – a Fortune 300 Company – recently sent you a letter with copies to our Committee, urging you to work with the Congress to ensure that the environmental literacy plans and programs of the No Child Left Inside Act are incorporated into the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.*

He writes in his letter, "We believe that having an environmentally literate workforce is critical to our bottom line and the ongoing strength of our company. To be ready for the 21st Century workforce and for the transition to a green economy, we believe that every student must be prepared with basic environmental knowledge and skills and environmental education must begin in our nation's elementary and secondary schools." I applaud you for including environmental education as part of your initiative to help more students in high-need schools receive a "well-rounded education." Do you agree with the idea that environmental education is also important for our students to be college and career-ready? How can we ensure that the Department's proposed new investments in environmental education will be available to all students so that every student is prepared for the green economy?

Environmental education is an important part of a complete education that prepares students to succeed in college and careers. Our proposal for Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education would provide support for states, districts, and schools to improve environmental education, as well as other subjects. Through these programs, students better understand their role in supporting a clean and sustainable environment, as well as the need to know and use math and science to have access to and be successful in some of the fastest growing careers, such as geophysicist, LEED-certified architect, or renewable energy technician. We would share the best practices from these efforts with States and districts around the country, including in urban areas, to help ensure that every student is prepared to contribute to a green economy. We also will work with other agencies, such as the National Science Foundation, to support efforts to ensure that more students have access to science learning opportunities.

3.17.10 McCarthy 1. *Can you describe how you see the "Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students" program working to address physical violence in schools?*

The Administration recognizes the need for continued support of efforts to ensure that schools provide a safe and supportive environment free from physical violence and substance abuse. The Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program would address these problems by consolidating the existing funding streams into a single comprehensive program that focuses on prevention and

that drives resources to where they are most needed and in a manner that will address local needs.

Furthermore, we envision a Federal role that incorporates several components, including research and evaluation, dissemination of best practices, and support for data-driven decision-making.

3.17.10 McCarthy 2. *The Department calls for school climate surveys, along with expulsion, suspension, and discipline data, to create a data-driven understanding of school safety. The blueprint does not reference incident-based law enforcement data as a part of the overall data collection and assessment. Does the Department agree with me about the need to incorporate incident-based law enforcement data for crimes which have occurred at schools and on school campuses into this overall data-driven approach to school safety?*

Incident data describing the frequency and severity of school-based violence and crime will continue to remain a vital part of school safety evaluation. Our proposal calls for educators to collect and use both incident data and data collected from students, staff, and families to build a holistic view of school-based violence as well as the underlying protective and risk factors that influence the severity and frequency of school crime. This combination will provide educators with the information they need to effectively reduce violence in our schools.

3.17.10 McCarthy 3. *In the July, 2009, Committee joint hearing on strengthening federal school safety policy, we heard testimony stressing the importance of having a balanced and comprehensive approach to school safety which includes activities related to prevention, intervention, security, and emergency preparedness. The Department's approach and philosophy appears to have a strong focus on climate and prevention activities, which is good. Will the Department also include activities which support the security and emergency preparedness measures?*

Yes, the Department agrees we must continue to invest in ensuring schools are secure and prepared for emergencies, and also will continue to work with other federal agencies, such as the Departments of Homeland Security and Justice, in our work in this area. For example, within the $410 million requested for the first year of the new Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, the Department would continue to reserve funding for Project SERV (School Emergency Response to Violence) to ensure that funds are available to provide crisis response services to schools. We look forward to continuing to work with Congress on this issue.

3.17.10 McCarthy 4. *The Department's blueprint calls for priority awards of competitive safe schools grants to districts partnering with nonprofit and community-based agencies. Can this priority also include not only nonprofits and community based organizations, but also give priority to schools partnering with first responders, public safety agencies, emergency*

management agencies, public mental health agencies, public health agencies, and other government organizations that can help with school safety planning?

Partnerships with an array of public agencies and other organizations are a critical element of the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program. Partnerships between local education agencies and either community based organizations or local government entities would be among the eligible entities that could apply for a Successful, Safe and Healthy Students grant.

3.17.10 McCarthy 5. *Does the administration believe corporal punishment in schools is an effective discipline technique? Does the Department have data on the effectiveness of corporal punishment? How is effectiveness of corporal punishment measured? Does the Department have data on whether States that permit corporal punishment have less disciplinary problems than other schools?*

Corporal punishment generally is a matter of state and local law. The Obama Administration supports positive solutions to addressing student behavior and school safety – for example, the Department's Office of Special Education Programs funds the Center on Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports, with a Web site (http://www.pbis.org/) where additional information and technical assistance on PBIS can be obtained.

3.17.10 McCarthy 6. *The Blueprint raises the notion of holding parties besides educators accountable, but it appears that for the most part it is educators that are the overwhelming focus of the accountability system. How can we ensure that teacher assessments are based on multiple measures and that teachers are given the professional development they need to be effective?*

Our proposal asks people at all levels – from students and families, to teachers and principals, to district, state, and nonprofit leaders – to share responsibility for student success. Unlike NCLB, to ensure that accountability no longer falls solely at the doors of schools, our proposal would do more to hold districts and states accountable for actually supporting and improving their schools, as well as increasing student achievement and closing achievement gaps.

To make sure that educators receive the support they need, we're proposing historic funding dedicated for teachers and principals, including for professional development – a 10 percent increase over last year to $3.9 billion. We're also asking districts to improve evaluation systems for teachers and principals by working with teachers, principals and other stakeholders. These systems must consider both student learning and other measures and provide educators with better information to improve their practice.

3.17.10 McCarthy 7. *Who should we hold accountable when students fail to progress on science tests when their classroom is not equipped with a laboratory? Is that the responsibility of the teacher, the district, or the state?*

I believe that educators and policy makers at all levels need to take responsibility for the issues you describe. Our ESEA reauthorization proposal takes unprecedented steps to require accountability for resource equity at every level of the system. Over time, districts will be required to ensure that their high-poverty schools receive state and local funding levels (for personnel and relevant nonpersonnel expenditures) comparable to those received by their low-poverty schools. States will be asked to measure and report on resource disparities and develop a plan to tackle them.

Our proposal recognizes and supports the crucial role that families and communities play in their child's education. We will fund states and districts in investing in the best models for engaging and supporting families in their children's educations, and we will invest in surveys of parents that provide meaningful feedback on how parents feel about their children's schools. Parents will have access to high-quality information about their school's effectiveness, the effectiveness of their school's teachers and leaders, and other relevant information. All of these elements will help to ensure accountability for correcting the conditions you describe.

3.17.10 McCarthy 8. *If there are issues of safety, deteriorating school buildings, a lack of teaching materials, poor curriculum, poor leadership shouldn't the district and states be held accountable?*

I believe that educators and policy makers at all levels need to take responsibility for the issues you describe. Our ESEA reauthorization proposal takes unprecedented steps to require accountability for resource equity at every level of the system. Over time, districts will be required to ensure that their high-poverty schools receive state and local funding levels (for personnel and relevant nonpersonnel expenditures) comparable to those received by their low-poverty schools. States will be asked to measure and report on resource disparities and develop a plan to tackle them.

Our proposal recognizes and supports the crucial role that families and communities play in their child's education. We will fund states and districts in investing in the best models for engaging and supporting families in their children's educations, and we will invest in surveys of parents that provide meaningful feedback on how parents feel about their children's schools. Parents will have access to high-quality information about their school's effectiveness, the effectiveness of their school's teachers and leaders, and other relevant information. All of these elements will help to ensure accountability for correcting the conditions you describe.

3.17.10 McCarthy 9. *If parents do not attend parent-teacher conferences, fail to intervene on discipline issues or help their children with their homework shouldn't they be held accountable and provided with any resources needed to help them in this areas of shared responsibility?*

Engaging parents and families in education is critical to improving outcomes for all students, particularly for students in high-need schools. Our proposal focuses on identifying and promoting the most effective practices while treating family engagement as an integrated

strategy and cross-cutting priority. Our Title I proposal will require that districts and schools develop comprehensive, systemic plans for sustained family engagement, and fund those plans with at least two percent of their Title I-A funds – twice the amount under current law.

Rather than implementing a checklist of activities, districts and schools will develop family engagement strategies that increase student achievement and ensure a welcoming environment, ongoing two-way communication, and strong collaboration between families, and their teachers, schools, and districts. We are also proposing a new Family Engagement and Responsibility Fund which will enable states to set aside one percent of their Title I, Part A funding to create a significant new funding stream dedicated to enhancing and improving family engagement in their states. Grants would fund districts and non-profits (including community-based organizations and Parent Information and Resource Centers) in implementing programs that promote family engagement, empowerment, and responsibility. The Family Engagement and Responsibility Fund will allow states to support, identify, and disseminate best practices.

Further, we have proposed $410 million for the Successful, Safe, and Healthy Students program, under which states and districts would assess families' experiences and attitudes on school engagement, school safety, and the overall school environment. This school-level information would be made publicly available and would help direct funds to address local needs, such as family engagement. We have proposed $210 million for the Promise Neighborhoods program which would create a cradle through college and career continuum of supports in high-poverty communities to provide effective schools, comprehensive services, and strong family supports. Our proposal also provides $1.2 billion for a strengthened 21st Century Community Learning Centers program which will provide additional time and comprehensive supports to students and families.

Our parent and family engagement plan calls for transparency and accountability by providing better information for families about their child's school and on teacher and principal effectiveness as well as maintaining current Title I requirements that families be notified of the accountability status of their district and school. And, we have called for school districts to include parents in decisions concerning school turnaround. The combination of these interconnected proposals will ensure that families have the information they need about their children's schools to make informed decisions and enhance the ability of teachers and leaders to include families in the education process.

3.17.10 Titus 1. *What are the Administration's plans to ensure that school districts in states that may not have resources to compete aggressively for funding are not denied important resources, especially for programs which you have proposed to fold into other funding streams?*

Our proposal maintains critical formula funding, which States can take into account in long-term planning, and includes an historic increase for competitive grant programs. In administering

competitive programs, we intend to value both need and quality, and want to ensure that rural and other high-need communities receive the funding they need to help students succeed.

3.17.10 Titus 2. *Additionally, for states such as Nevada where the legislature must plan the budget two years in advance, how does the Department intend to move towards competitive grants while still providing states and districts with the stability they need to plan ahead?*

Our proposal maintains critical formula funding, which States can take into account in long-term planning, and includes an historic increase for competitive grant programs. In administering competitive programs, we intend to value both need and quality, and want to ensure that rural and other high-need communities receive the funding they need to help students succeed.

3.17.10 Woolsey 1. *Secretary Duncan, please provide more detail about how funding would be made available through state and local education agencies in the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education Program. Specifically, if core subjects of learning like music and the arts are grouped with other non-tested subjects, will each subject of learning be allotted a specific share of federal funds?*

Under Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Curriculum, we would encourage coordination across programs and across States and districts and encourage the use of funds for evidence-based practices that will have the greatest impact on teaching and learning. Under this program, the Department would have the option to hold a broad competition across subjects, designate a specific subject or subjects to be supported in a particular year, or support interdisciplinary projects cutting across a number of subjects.

3.17.10 Woolsey 2. *Secretary Duncan, how can we be assured that the funds in the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well-Rounded Education Program will be used to address the need for the complete education of all children? Will new Department of Education policies provide incentives and reward communities for including broad curriculum offerings – including music and arts education – in their goals for a complete and quality education for all children and to prepare them for college and the workforce?*

Research has shown that a curriculum enriched with the arts has a positive impact on students, particularly low-income, high need students. We will encourage states, districts and schools to provide broad curriculum offerings through a variety of ways, including the flexibility of the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well Rounded Education program to empower districts to decide for which subjects they most need additional support and to use the funds for that purpose. We believe that program will help to address the concern that we share with you about students having access to a broad curriculum.

3.17.10 Woolsey 3. *We've unfortunately seen a narrowing of the curriculum in recent years where states are spending less time on non-tested subjects like music and arts and more time on tested subjects. Can you provide assurances that the Effective Teaching and Learning for a*

Well-Rounded Education Program would not allow the continuation of the narrowing of the curriculum?

Research has shown that a curriculum enriched with the arts has a positive impact on students, particularly low-income, high need students. We will encourage states, districts and schools to provide broad curriculum offerings through a variety of ways, including the flexibility of the Effective Teaching and Learning for a Well Rounded Education program to empower districts to decide for which subjects they most need additional support and to use the funds for that purpose. We believe that program will help to address the concern that we share with you about students having access to a broad curriculum.

3.17.10 Woolsey 4. *I was pleased to hear you mention the importance of getting more girls and minorities interested in STEM education. How do you plan to use the proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics Program to increase interest and access at the Kindergarten through twelfth grade level?*

The President has set a clear vision that by 2020, the United States will once again lead the world in producing college graduates. The disciplines of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) are an important part of college- and career-readiness, and we particularly must increase the number of students pursuing STEM education who are traditionally underrepresented in the STEM fields. To that end, we have proposed the Effective Teaching and Learning: STEM Program, a competitive grant to States (or States in partnership with other entities) to support State and local efforts to implementiand support a comprehensive strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction and support to students from prekindergarten through grade 12, particularly in high-need districts. Our proposal allows priority to be given to states that propose to prepare more students, including students from underrepresented groups, for advanced study and careers in STEM.

3.17.10 Woolsey 5. *States and districts have struggled for years to develop appropriate assessment tools students with disabilities. What ideas does the Administration have to encourage the improvement of assessments and accommodations policies for students with disabilities?*

The Race to the Top Assessment program provided approximately $330 million over four years to consortia of States to develop a new generation of assessments that are valid, support and inform instruction, provide accurate information about what students know and can do, and measure student achievement against college-and career-ready standards designed to ensure that all students gain the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in college and the workplace. The assessments must be designed to assess the broadest possible range of students, including students with disabilities.

The new General Supervision Enhancement Grants (GSEG) also provided $47 million over four years to States or consortia of States to develop alternate assessments based on alternate academic achievement standards for students with the most significant cognitive disabilities.

These assessments and proper accommodations for students with disabilities are essential to their full inclusion in ESEA's accountability system.

3.17.10 Woolsey 6. *How can we ensure that every student will be "ready-to-learn" when he or she enters the classroom?*

Early learning is an important component of a comprehensive, cradle to career strategy that is essential to meeting the President's 2020 goal that the U.S. once again lead the world in college graduation rate, and is embedded throughout our ESEA reauthorization proposal. We must get schools out of the catch-up business.

Our ESEA proposal supports early learning in a number of ways, such as continuing to allow support of preschool through Title I formula funds; promoting a birth through college to career agenda (Promise Neighborhoods); and encouraging states and districts to undertake ambitious, systemic, comprehensive reforms of their education systems that will dramatically improve student outcomes, and we believe that early learning can be a critical part of those efforts.

Our fiscal year 2011 budget proposal includes $9.3 billion over 10 years for the Early Learning Challenge Fund for grants to States to improve the quality of early learning programs to help children enter kindergarten ready to succeed, $210 million for the Promise Neighborhoods program; $450 million for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy comprehensive Pre-K through grade 12 program; and $300 million for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) comprehensive Pre-K through grade 12 program. We look forward to continuing to work with Congress, through ESEA reauthorization and other avenues, to ensure strong support for early learning programs.

3.17.10 Woolsey 7. *Will the funding in the President's Budget for Promise Neighborhoods be sufficient to ensure that all of our students receive the necessary support services to succeed in the classroom?*

Promise Neighborhoods is a comprehensive, place-based strategy for improving the academic and developmental outcomes of the residents from a geographically defined area. Promise Neighborhoods funding alone is not sufficient to ensure that all students are successful. However, we believe the program will catalyze other public and private investments to support significant gains in academic achievement, healthy development, and college and career success.

3.17.10 Polis 1. *Can you discuss the Department's proposal for ensuring that parents are not only notified, but well-informed, about their public school choice rights and options? I'm afraid that unless we get this right this time around, we will continue to have only 1% participation rates among eligible students.*

Our proposal would invest $490 million in the Supporting Effective Charter Schools and Promoting Public School Choice programs, which would ensure students and families have the information they need to make real choices about their educational options. The grants would be provided, on a competitive basis, to eligible entities to implement comprehensive plans for increasing educational options for students, especially students in low-performing schools. High-quality educational options for parents would include charter schools, other autonomous public schools, magnet schools, inter- and intra-district choice programs, and online learning options. These grants would require the development and implementation of innovative and effective strategies and activities that help parents, students, and the community to identify and access such options. Choices are only as good as the information parents receive about them, so this plan would fund methods of sharing key information about school effectiveness with parents and communities. We also have proposed to double the amount of Title I funds for family engagement.

3.17.10 Polis 2. *Your proposal indicates a single competitive grant program "to start or expand high-performing public charter schools." Can you describe in more detail how you envision a competitive grant program that combines both new charter schools, which cannot have a track record of success, and the expansion of top-performing schools that have a demonstrated record of success?*

We agree that both support for start-ups and scaling up success are important, and envision holding separate competitions to ensure that we could support both high-quality start-ups and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools.

3.17.10 Polis 3. *Your proposal indicates a single competitive grant program "to start or expand high-performing public charter schools." Don't you think that we need to continue investing in start-ups, but also have a dedicated program just for scaling up success?*

We agree that both support for start-ups and scaling up success are important, and envision holding separate competitions to ensure that we could support both high-quality start-ups and the replication and expansion of high-quality charter schools.

3.17.10 Polis 4. *Every day, students who are, or are perceived to be, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) are subjected to pervasive discrimination, including harassment, bullying, intimidation and violence. Surveys indicate as many as nine in 10 LGBT students have been bullied. Such actions deprive students of equal educational opportunities and contribute to high rates of absenteeism, dropout, adverse health consequences, and academic underachievement among LGBT youth. But unlike other forms of discrimination, such as on the*

basis of race, color, sex, religion, disability or national origin, civil rights protections do not explicitly include sexual orientation or gender identity.

As the Department and Congress work towards ensuring safe and nurturing learning environments so that each and every child can learn and thrive, I think that it's critical for us to protect LGBT students from discrimination and harassment. That is why I have introduced HR 4530, the Student Non-Discrimination Act in January, to prohibit discrimination based on a student's actual or perceived sexual orientation or gender identity in our public schools. The Act is modeled after Title IX's prohibition of sex discrimination.

Can you please share with us your views on this issue and whether you think that prohibiting this type of discrimination would help achieve our goal of equal educational opportunity?

We share your concern about the negative impact of bullying and harassing behavior on all students, including LGBT students. Bullying and harassment prevent young people from focusing on their studies and thereby disrupt the learning process: as such, they are education issues that are a priority for our Administration. We believe that schools must provide safe, disciplined, and nurturing environments for all of their students and establish school climates that are conducive to learning and healthy youth development.

The U. S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services are currently co-sponsoring a National Bullying Prevention Campaign, with materials and a web site online at www.bullyinginfo.org. The campaign includes information for children on how to respond to bullies as well as information for schools, families, and other adults on what steps to take in addressing the problem. In particular it includes a tip sheet on "Bullying Among Children and Youth on Perceptions and Differences in Sexual Orientation."

Building on this collaborative work, an interagency steering committee was launched in early 2010 to focus on bullying prevention work across the federal government. Co-chaired by Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools and Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, the committee also includes representatives from the U.S. Departments of Justice, Agriculture, and Interior, as well as the Centers for Disease Control. In August 2010, the Administration held a major national summit on bullying, and early next year, the White House will host a conference to raise awareness and equip young people, parents, educators, coaches and other community leaders with tools to prevent bullying and harassment.

President Obama has said that "We've got to dispel the myth that bullying is just a normal rite of passage, or an inevitable part of growing up. It's not," and that "We have an obligation to ensure that our schools are safe for all of our kids. Every single young person deserves the opportunity to learn and grow and achieve their potential, without having to worry about the constant threat of harassment."

More recently, the Department's Office of Civil Rights issued guidance to help schools respond to and prevent bullying and harassment. That guidance and related information is available at

http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/guidance-targeting-harassment-outlines-local-and-federal-responsibility.

3.17.10 Holt 1. *In your testimony you make clear that "we are calling on all states to develop and adopt standards in English language arts and mathematics that build to college and career readiness...". I have a simple question, why not science Secretary Duncan?*

Following the lead of the nation's governors and state education leaders, our proposal calls on all states to adopt state-developed standards in English language arts and mathematics that build toward college- and career-readiness by the time students graduate from high school. At the same time, states continue to implement statewide science standards and aligned assessments in specific grade-spans. States may include such assessments in their accountability system.

Our reauthorization proposal also provides a new investment in improving teaching and learning in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM). This new program would provide $300 million in competitive grants to States (or States in partnership with other entities) to support State and local efforts to implement and support a comprehensive STEM strategy for the provision of high-quality STEM instruction to students from prekindergarten through grade 12. Our fiscal year 2011 budget also continues and expands Race to the Top, for which in fiscal year 2010, STEM was a competitive priority, and provides for a competitive preference in the Investing in Innovation program for STEM.

3.17.10 Holt 2. *I want to commend your Administrations emphasis on data, but we need to move beyond year old data reported at the state level. I believe that LEA based data systems, that includes real time data from teacher created formative assessments can be a critical tool to allow teachers to identify the exact learning needs of their students, adjust classroom actions, and help identify the professional development needs of teachers. Would you support the creation of a new grant to help establish LEA data systems?*

We agree that timely, relevant data are essential – and that year old, state level data are insufficient for instructional improvement. That is why we have identified multiple levers for building local capacity to use data, including formative assessments. First, under the Race to the Top assessment competition, applicants were able to include in their proposals for comprehensive assessment systems the formative and interim assessments that can support classroom practice. Second, under our Blueprint, we have emphasized the need to build capacity for effective use of data, and would allow LEA's to set-aside funds for such capacity building. And, earlier this year, the Department announced $250 million in State Longitudinal Data Systems (SLDS) grants to 20 States, to support the enhancement of state data systems that can collect, house and report on assessment data, including student growth data, graduation and college enrollment rates. Overall, 42 States and the District of Columbia have received SLDS

grants. The Department has requested an additional $65 million in the fiscal year 2011 budget for this purpose. We look forward to working with you to ensure that teachers and students are able to benefit from the use of data.

3.17.10 Holt 3. *In his speech before students, parents, and faculty at Hudson Valley Community College on September 21, 2009 the President presented a compelling case for how R&D is the life blood of innovation and America's future capacity to compete effectively in a global economy. That's why the federal government invests tens of billions of dollars each year in R&D in such sectors as defense ($80B), medicine ($30B), and energy ($10.5B). But what about education? The cabinet level agency with the lowest federal R&D budget--- about $300 million--- is the US Department of Education) The ARRA, for example, invested $22 billion in federal R&D programs but zero for education. With your clear emphasis on innovation in education, shouldn't R&D in education be a top priority too?*

We believe the President's Budget for fiscal year 2011 demonstrates that research and development in education is a high priority for the Administration. The President requested an increase of $60 million in appropriations for research, development, and dissemination in the Institute of Education Sciences, bringing the level of funding up from $200 million to $260 million. (These funds are in addition to spending on special education research and the research and development activities of the regional educational laboratories.) The request for research, development, and dissemination represents an increase of 30 percent in just one year in the investment in research and development. These funds are urgently needed to help us learn from the innovations States and districts will be pursuing with Recovery Act funds and to support research and development in important areas such as reading for understanding, math and science, effective use of data, and State and local reforms, especially those directed at persistently low-performing schools. The request also includes $500 million to continue the Investing in Innovation program, begun under the Recovery Act, to make grants to develop and validate promising practices, strategies, or programs for which there is potential but for which efficacy has not yet been systematically studied, as well as to expand innovative practices, strategies,or programs that have been proven effective in improving student outcomes.

3.17.10 Holt 4. *Would the Administration be willing to support a reduction in the intensity and frequency of testing so that, particularly in the elementary grades, tests are used to evaluate and adjust instructional practice and not just force schools into the "failed" designation?*

We agree that assessment results should be used to inform instruction and reforms, and not to punish districts or schools. We believe that measuring student growth towards college- and career- readiness will help teachers and students more accurately assess their progress, particularly with the use of improved state assessments, which we support, aligned to college and

career-ready standards. The recently awarded Race to the Top Assessment grants will help states design and implement state assessments better measure student knowledge and skills and reflect good instructional practices, and support a culture of continuous improvement in education. Additionally, in our ESEA reauthorization proposal, we would continue the development of the next generation of assessments under Title I through a formula grant to states to conduct research on, develop, evaluate, and improve State assessments. We also propose to significantly change how assessment results are used in ESEA accountability, by focusing on rewards for the top performing schools, greater flexibility for most other schools, and supporting dramatic reforms in the persistently lowest-achieving schools.

3.17.10 Holt 5. *By narrowing the kindergarten gap through the provision of high quality preschool, we are able to produce dramatically better readers and writers of English by 3rd grade. Yet, these lessons--widely accepted by research--are not reflected in the priorities of the Administration. Would you be willing to consider a special incentive--perhaps a floor on spending on preschool and kindergarten--to divert attention to a high-quality early start for children from poor families?*

Early learning is an important component of a comprehensive, cradle to career strategy that is essential to meeting the President's 2020 goal that the U.S. once again lead the world in college graduation rate, and is embedded throughout our ESEA reauthorization proposal. We must get schools out of the catch-up business.

Our ESEA proposal supports early learning in a number of ways, such as continuing to allow support of preschool through Title I formula funds; promoting a birth through college to career agenda (Promise Neighborhoods); and encouraging states and districts to undertake ambitious, systemic, comprehensive reforms of their education systems that will dramatically improve student outcomes, and we believe that early learning can be a critical part of those efforts.

Our fiscal year 2011 budget proposal includes $9.3 billion over 10 years for the Early Learning Challenge Fund for grants to States to improve the quality of early learning programs to help children enter kindergarten ready to succeed, $210 million for the Promise Neighborhoods program; $450 million for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy comprehensive Pre-K through grade 12 program; and $300 million for the Effective Teaching and Learning: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) comprehensive Pre-K through grade 12 program. We look forward to continuing to work with Congress, through ESEA reauthorization and other avenues, to ensure strong support for early learning programs.

3.17.10 Holt 6. *In President Obama's State of the Union address he mentioned that a world-class education is the best anti-poverty program. What role do you see school libraries*

playing in a world-class education, and what is the administration doing to promote school libraries?

Our proposed Effective Teaching and Learning: Literacy program would provide $300 million in grants to states specifically to support the development and implementation of comprehensive state and local strategies for providing high-quality literacy programs for students from pre-kindergarten through grade 12. A text-rich environment of classrooms and libraries filled with high quality reading materials engages and motivates students and is essential to student success. That is why our proposal allows grant funds to be used for expanding school or classroom library services, such as by purchasing books, materials, and equipment as well as improving media access, or increasing school library hours.

3.17.10 Holt 7. *You always talk about funding programs that work – and Abbott pre-k has certainly proven itself – in that mindset, will you include high-quality pre-k in the Department's proposal for ESEA reauthorization? Could providing a high-quality pre-k programs as an instructional intervention be available under Title I to LEAs and schools identified for improvement? Will providing high-quality pre-k and strengthening instruction across pk-3 continuum be included as an eligible "rigorous school intervention model" under Title I School Improvement Grants, which you are proposing to re-name "School Turnaround Grants"?*

We are committed to an early learning agenda beginning at birth and continuing through third grade, with seamless transitions between preschool and elementary school. Our proposal supports a continuum of learning that will close the achievement gap and ensure that every student graduates from high school ready to succeed in college and career. To provide a continuity of services, we must improve coordination between our public schools and early learning programs (including community-based programs such as Head Start) and services for young children. Our fiscal year 2011 budget proposal includes $9.3 billion over 10 years for the Early Learning Challenge Fund for grants to States to improve the quality of early learning programs to help children enter kindergarten ready to succeed.

Our proposal would continue to require districts to coordinate with early learning programs and services to improve school readiness and would allow them to use Title I funds to do so. Programs supporting professional development (including College- and Career-Ready Students and the Effective Teachers and Leaders programs) could include joint professional development activities for elementary school staff and early childhood educators. The programs could address such issues as school readiness across all the major domains of early learning and the transition to elementary school. Our proposal further provides Title I support of preschool by continuing to allow districts to use Title I funds to support high-quality preschool programs for eligible children, beginning at birth.

Our School Turnaround Grants proposal ensures intensive interventions in the bottom five percent of each state's schools. Districts will generally have flexibility to choose from four different turnaround models. Providing high-quality pre-k and strengthening instruction across the pre-k-3 continuum certainly could be part of a comprehensive turnaround strategy.

3.17.10 Holt 8. *You and the President have made numerous speeches in recent months calling on the need for students to possess 21st century skills like problem-solving, critical thinking, teamwork, entrepreneurship, and creativity and whether they have the knowledge of content and skills to thrive and find work when they graduate. How do you and the Department propose we implement that talk? Where do you see the placement and utilization of those skills within a new Elementary and Secondary Education Act?*

We're asking states to adopt rigorous standards in English Language Arts and mathematics that truly prepare students for college and a career, which means looking at evidence about what is needed to succeed in college and careers -- including complex problem-solving, and application of knowledge and skills, including communication skills. We're investing – through Race to the Top as well as ESEA – in supporting the development of assessments that better measure the full range of skills needed to succeed. Through programs like 21st Century Community Learning Centers, we are also providing support for students to take part in experiential or work-based learning in their schools and communities.

We must also ensure that teachers working with our neediest students have the skills and support they need to help all students develop these skills. We're proposing $3.9 billion to recruit, prepare, develop, support and reward effective teachers and leaders, a ten percent increase over last year. We're also proposing more than $1 billion to support a rigorous and complete education for students, especially high-need students. This would support improvements in improving teaching and learning to help students develop the knowledge and skills they need across subject areas, especially in our highest-need communities. This includes literacy and STEM subjects, and the many other subjects students must be exposed to in order to receive a complete education and succeed in college or the workplace – such as art, environmental education, foreign languages, financial literacy and history.

As schools address these challenges, we encourage them to work with public and private partners in their communities, such as through the Promise Neighborhood and Investing in Innovation programs. The Administration also encourages partnerships with business and STEM organizations through the Educate to Innovate Initiative - this campaign will include efforts not only from the Federal Government but also from leading companies, foundations, non-profits, and science and engineering societies to work with young people across America to excel in science and math.

3.17.10 Holt 9. *Every day, students who are, or are perceived to be, lesbian, gay, bisexual, or transgender (LGBT) are subjected to pervasive discrimination, including harassment, bullying, intimidation and violence, which is harmful to both students and our*

education system. These hurtful actions deprive students of equal educational opportunities and contribute to high rates of absenteeism, dropout, adverse health consequences, and academic underachievement among LGBT youth. Left unchecked, discrimination can lead, and has led, to life-threatening violence and to suicide. How can schools respond to and prevent discrimination against LGBT students? What is the role of the federal government in ensuring that these students have access to educational opportunities that are equal to their peers?

We share your concern about the negative impact of bullying and harassing behavior on all students, including LGBT students. Bullying and harassment prevent young people from focusing on their studies and thereby disrupt the learning process: as such, they are education issues that are a priority for our Administration. We believe that schools must provide safe, disciplined, and nurturing environments for all of their students and establish school climates that are conducive to learning and healthy youth development.

The U. S. Department of Education and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services are currently co-sponsoring a National Bullying Prevention Campaign, with materials and a web site online at www.bullyinginfo.org. The campaign includes information for children on how to respond to bullies as well as information for schools, families, and other adults on what steps to take in addressing the problem. In particular it includes a tip sheet on "Bullying Among Children and Youth on Perceptions and Differences in Sexual Orientation."

Building on this collaborative work, an interagency steering committee was launched in early 2010 to focus on bullying prevention work across the federal government. Co-chaired by Department of Education, Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools and Department of Health and Human Services, Health Resources and Services Administration, the committee also includes representatives from the U.S. Departments of Justice, Agriculture, and Interior, as well as the Centers for Disease Control. In August 2010, the Administration held a major national summit on bullying, and early next year, the White House will host a conference to raise awareness and equip young people, parents, educators, coaches and other community leaders with tools to prevent bullying and harassment.

President Obama has said that "We've got to dispel the myth that bullying is just a normal rite of passage, or an inevitable part of growing up. It's not," and that "We have an obligation to ensure that our schools are safe for all of our kids. Every single young person deserves the opportunity to learn and grow and achieve their potential, without having to worry about the constant threat of harassment."

More recently, the Department's Office of Civil Rights issued guidance to help schools respond to and prevent bullying and harassment. That guidance and related information is available at http://www.ed.gov/news/press-releases/guidance-targeting-harassment-outlines-local-and-federal-responsibility.

3.17.10 Miller 1. *The idea of using the Individualized Education Program (IEP) to measure growth for students with disabilities in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act's accountability system was raised during questions. IEPs are not valid and reliable measures of academic proficiency or growth towards academic achievement standards, nor do IEPs provide any comparability for system accountability. Can you please clarify your position on this issue?*

Additionally, during questions, you spoke of measuring "like students against like students." Could you provide us with a better understanding of this statement? Please elaborate on your efforts to ensure that all students, including students with disabilities, are included in growth models in order to achieve the goal of career and college-readiness.

The Secretary addressed accountability with regard to students with disabilities in a letter dated May 10, 2010, to the Consortium for Citizens with Disabilities (CCD). In the letter, the Secretary clarified that the ESEA proposal would continue to require schools, LEAs, and States to report disaggregated student outcome data and to hold schools, LEAs, and States accountable for the achievement of all subgroups of students. Regarding use of the IEP, the Secretary stated the following:

"Our ESEA reauthorization proposal is designed to support the needs of diverse learners. Specifically, schools must support all students and provide appropriate instruction and access to a challenging curriculum along with additional support and attention where needed. For a child with a disability, we envision that the IEP, as required under the IDEA, will continue to identify the services and supports a child needs to be able to access, and progress in, the general curriculum. We are not proposing to use, and would not support using, the IEP as the primary accountability tool under ESEA for measuring whether schools, LEAs, and States are successfully educating students with disabilities."

This letter from the Secretary supports the published non-regulatory guidance that can be found at http://www2.ed.gov/policy/elsec/guid/altguidance.pdf :

"There are at least two reasons why IEP goals or functional life skills are not appropriate achievement measures for AYP purposes. First, IEP goals are individualized for each student, and a student's progress toward each goal is measured for purposes of reporting progress to parents and for making individualized decisions about the special education and related services a student receives. In addition, for AYP determinations, test results must ensure consistency in the judgments made about schools. IEP goals are not designed for this purpose. Second, as required by Title I, schools are accountable for student achievement only in the content areas of reading/language arts and mathematics. IEP goals may address a broad range of individualized instructional needs, as well as behavioral and developmental needs, and might not be based on the State's academic content standards. IEP goals may cover a range of issues beyond reading/language arts and mathematics, such as behavior, social skills, or the use of adaptive equipment, and, as such, an examination of how well a student met his or her IEP goals is not

synonymous with achievement measured by an alternate assessment for AYP purposes. In addition, IEP goals might not be aligned to State standards, and it is not possible to set achievement standards based on those goals. While States and LEAs may develop assessments that measure students' progress toward IEP goals, such assessments are not required by Title I. In addition, while acquisition of functional life skills may be an important component of some students' IEPs, it is also critical that such students have access to the general curriculum and that their achievement be counted for AYP purposes."

3.17.10 Fudge 1. *Secretary Duncan, both you and the President emphasize the need for students to possess 21st century skills, such as problem-solving, critical thinking, teamwork, entrepreneurship, and creativity. I agree that these skills, coupled with academic excellence, will best prepare students for the global workforce. Where do you see the development of those skills within a new Elementary and Secondary Education Act? Is there a role for public-private partnerships in developing these skills?*

We're asking states to adopt rigorous standards in English Language Arts and mathematics that truly prepare students for college and a career, which means looking at evidence about what is needed to succeed in college and careers -- including complex problem-solving, and application of knowledge and skills, including communication skills. We're investing – through Race to the Top as well as ESEA – in supporting the development of assessments that better measure the full range of skills needed to succeed. Through programs like 21st Century Community Learning Centers, we are also providing support for students to take part in experiential or work-based learning in their schools and communities.

We must also ensure that teachers working with our neediest students have the skills and support they need to help all students develop these skills. We're proposing $3.9 billion to recruit, prepare, develop, support and reward effective teachers and leaders, a ten percent increase over last year. We're also proposing more than $1 billion to support a rigorous and complete education for students, especially high-need students. This would support improvements in improving teaching and learning to help students develop the knowledge and skills they need across subject areas, especially in our highest-need communities. This includes literacy and STEM subjects, and the many other subjects students must be exposed to in order to receive a complete education and succeed in college or the workplace – such as art, environmental education, foreign languages, financial literacy and history.

As schools address these challenges, we encourage them to work with public and private partners in their communities, such as through the Promise Neighborhood and Investing in Innovation programs. The Administration also encourages partnerships with business and STEM organizations through the Educate to Innovate Initiative - this campaign will include efforts not

only from the Federal Government but also from leading companies, foundations, non-profits, and science and engineering societies to work with young people across America to excel in science and math.

3.17.10 Fudge 2. *Every student in this country deserves a solid academic foundation and the opportunity to study higher level subjects that both interest them and make them more competitive for college. Unfortunately, many schools, especially those in low-income areas, lack the resources to provide their students with educational options such as foreign languages and AP courses. However, some school districts provide specialized courses to students through online courses. In your opinion, does access to specialized online courses provide students with educational opportunities they may not otherwise have, and if so, what can Congress do to encourage more schools to take advantage of online or virtual courses?*

We know that participation in a challenging curriculum, including programs such as Advanced Placement (AP) and International Baccalaureate (IB), is a key factor associated with a student's completion of a bachelor's degree. The impact of a challenging curriculum on rates of completion of a bachelor's degree is even higher for African-American and Hispanic students than it is for white students according to a 2006 study.

The Department's ESEA reauthorization proposal includes multiple programs that can increase low-income students' access to additional educational options in their current schools, through partnership programs with institutions of higher education, or through online programs.

The College Pathways and Accelerated Learning program supports expanding the availability of (AP/IB courses, dual-enrollment programs that allow students to take college-level courses and earn college credit while in high school, and "early college high schools" that allow students to earn a high school degree and an Associate's degree or 2 years of college credit simultaneously

In addition, the Expanding Educational Options program includes a Promoting Public School Choice competition that can support the development of online programs, and the continuation of the Investing in Innovation program includes a cross-cutting emphasis on education technology that could support the development of high-quality online courses.

3.17.10 Fudge 3. *I applaud the Administration's and Chairman Miller's promotion of Promise Neighborhoods. I am pleased that President Obama's budget request expands the program by reforming schools and augmenting social services for children. Will the latter be done through grants given to existing or newly launched Promise Neighborhoods? If not, does the Administration support increasing Promise Neighborhood implementation grants?*

I also have a question regarding the not yet release guidance for Promise Neighborhood grants already appropriated. Will preference be given to neighborhoods in cities currently without an existing promise neighborhood or children's zone?

Our proposal anticipates making grants to community based organizations attempting to start new or expand existing Promise Neighborhood efforts. The Department did not give preference to a planning grant applicant based on the existence or absence of other investments in neighborhood revitalization efforts.

3.17.10 Fudge 4. *As you said in your remarks, President Obama's budget request includes additional Race to the Top funding, including a new competition for school districts. How do you imagine this new program will be structured? Also, with this and the other competitive grants, will technical assistance be given to smaller school districts that lack the resources to hire a grant writer?*

Our general vision is that this district-level competition would support and encourage districts in taking on comprehensive and collaborative reforms and in implementing best practices to help their students succeed. Local school districts are responsible for supporting their schools', principals', teachers' and students' success, and around the country local leaders are taking bold steps to make a difference for their students, especially their highest-need students. We want to reward and support these districts.

In this and in other competitive programs, we want to set a high bar while we ensure a level playing field through a range of strategies, including better technical assistance, expanded outreach, and, where appropriate, a priority or consideration in the application process for particular types of applicants.

[Whereupon, at 5:24 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

○