

Inglee, and Lori Maes, for their tremendous assistance in the handling of this very controversial piece of legislation.

As Members can see, if we work in a bipartisan spirit toward the accomplishment of a goal, we can achieve great numbers success. And certainly the numbers on final passage of this bill today reflect that.

We hope that we will be able to resolve with the Senate some of the differences that we have and are optimistic that we will do so. But without the tremendous success of all of the Members, including my staff person, Nancy Tippins, who worked so tremendously with me on this, we would not be where we are today.

We are going to send to the President and to the administrative branch a good bill. I think under the leadership of the State Department of Madeleine Albright that the administration certainly will have an adequate amount of money to spend in the fashion that they see fit, especially if the Senate sees fit to adopt the procedures that we have sent to them today.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, and that I may include tabular and extraneous material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HASTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, and rule XXIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 2264.

□ 1719

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, with Mr. Goodlatte in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July

31, 1997, the bill is considered as having been read the first time.

Under the rule, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER].

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] for his work and to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] who has, with great skill and effort, provided strong support in making this a bipartisan bill. As a result of their efforts, as well as that of many Members, we have resolved many contentious issues such as ergonomics regulations issued by OSHA, methylene chloride regulations and a new Hyde amendment. These initiatives and agreements are the work of many Members of the subcommittee who labored very hard to achieve the compromises reflected in this bill and preserve the broad support for it.

I particularly want to express my gratitude to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] and the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY] for their tireless efforts in achieving a compromise on revisions to the Hyde language in the bill.

The bill I bring to the floor, Mr. Chairman, is the result of a lengthy process of consideration by the subcommittee. We held 31 days of hearings spanning some 14 weeks. In addition to our normal practice of carefully reviewing estimates with the administration, we had 214 public witnesses and 67 Members testify before the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot govern this country by simple agreement between the congressional leadership and the President. While their suggestions and recommendations are very helpful, these suggestions are no substitute for the legislative process that has served this country well for 200 years. As a result, this bill reflects congressional priorities while at the same time reflecting many of the President's concerns and initiatives.

NIH is provided, Mr. Chairman, for example, with a 6 percent increase. The increased funds are being spent on areas of particular national concern including cancer, diabetes and heart disease. However, all Institutes receive an increase over the President's request. The President's request was for only 1.2 percent; we have provided a 6 percent increase.

The Centers for Disease Control is provided an \$87 million increase as compared with the President's proposal in the budget agreement to cut CDC by \$19 million. Increases in the bill include preventive health, chronic and environmental disease prevention and infectious disease surveillance.

The Community Health Center program is increased by \$25 million, and for health professions we rejected the

President's proposed cuts and added \$13 million over the last year. Ryan White AIDS treatment is increased by \$172 million over last year and \$132 million over the President's requested level.

In education, the bill provides funding very close to the President's request, but again reflects congressional priorities. The Chapter VI program, the former education block grant which provides broad discretion to local officials to meet local needs, is increased by \$40 million to \$350 million. The President proposed to terminate it.

IDEA State grant funding, that is, funding for special education, is increased by \$305 million over last year. In fiscal 1997, Members will recall, we increased funding by \$790 million, making for a total increase of over \$1.1 billion in the last 2 years and taking some of the pressure off local school taxes.

College work-study is increased by \$30 million. We have also funded a "whole school reform" effort which I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will discuss in his remarks.

We have also tried to reflect the President's priorities in the bill. Head Start, education technology, job training and the Job Corps are all fully funded.

The maximum Pell grant is set at \$3000.

Funds are set aside for the President's Opportunity Areas for Youth, Literacy and the expansion of Pell grant eligibility, all pending separate authorizations.

I would note that with all the rhetoric coming from the administration on the Results act and performance-based management, not one of these new initiatives was based on improvements and outcomes and not one has included the measures by which we will measure these new programs.

The bill also continues efforts at reform. Funding for block and State grant programs are increased by \$500 million over the President's requested levels. These programs represent a Republican approach giving greater local control and fewer Washington strings. Conversely, while not all I would want, the bill terminates 25 programs with 1997 funding totaling \$250 million.

Programs that cannot justify funding levels on the basis of effectiveness are frozen or cut in the bill. Goals 2000 State grants are cut by \$18 million below last year and \$145 million below the President's request. Safe and Drug Free Schools and Eisenhower Professional Development are both frozen at last year's level.

Mr. Chairman, as Members well know, the legislative riders present the committee with some of the most difficult issues that we face. They have made passing bills very difficult and have often served to complicate negotiations with the Senate and with the administration. They make broad, consensus-based bills like the one we bring to Members today virtually impossible. As chairman, I worked very hard in conjunction with the gentleman from

Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], as well as other Members, to resolve these many difficult issues.

We have included most of the legislative provisions that were in last year's bill, including a prohibition on human embryo research, and the prohibition on the issuance by the NLRB of regulations relating to single-site bargaining.

As I indicated at the beginning of my remarks, the bill also contains compromise language on ergonomic standards and finally we have reached an agreement on the Hyde language assuring that Federal payments to enroll recipients in managed care plans cannot be used to pay for abortions, except for cases of rape or incest or to save the life of the mother.

In this regard, I particularly want to express my opposition to the Istook amendment on family planning. I am a strong supporter of voluntary family planning. I believe that this amendment, though different in its drafting from versions offered in the full committee and last year during consideration of the bill, would have the same impact. It would undermine voluntary family planning completely.

In deterring teens from seeking family planning services, this amendment actually will cause unwanted pregnancies and, unfortunately, abortions. It will discourage these young women from seeking treatment for sexually transmitted diseases.

There are many other problems with this amendment which I will discuss when it is offered. I would only note that this provision is, at its root, an issue for consideration by the authorizing committee and should be considered there. More importantly, it will disrupt the potential for the kind of broad support that will allow this bill to pass, go to conference and give us the ability for the first time to negotiate with the President from a position of strength.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that this bill represents an example of bipartisanship working to find the common ground that we need to govern this country. I commend it to the Members. I think that it is in very good shape and we have worked very closely together and I believe that it is a bill that should be adopted by the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 12 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in politics and in governance, there is a time to define differences and there is a time to reconcile those differences. Over the last 2 years, on this bill perhaps more than any other, we have certainly defined our differences. They have been defined to a fare-thee-well, and these bills have been centrally involved in two government shutdowns, protracted debate between the two parties, between the White House and the Congress, and between the two Houses of the Congress.

This year this bill is in quite different shape. It is here because Members in both parties have tried to listen to each other and tried to swallow some things that we differ on in the interest of reaching an ability to reconcile some of the deep differences that we have.

I hope that we can stand here unified on both sides of the aisle and support the package as it is presented from the committee. It is far from perfect and it certainly is very different in some ways from what I would like to see. But in contrast to past years, this is, I think, a reasonable effort at compromise, and I look forward to supporting it, if this bill stays together.

This bill provides a total of \$80 billion for the Labor-HHS-Education agencies. The bill is one-tenth of 1 percent below the Clinton request for this bill. It provides 99 percent of the President's education and training budget request, which is \$257 million more in funding than would have been possible if the committee had stuck with the 602(b) allocation for the subcommittee which was sent up by OMB in the first place.

□ 1730

This bill is just .2 percent below the total requested for priority programs. Within that overall total, we have, as is the Congress's prerogative, rearranged some of the spending priorities. Funding for the Department of Education is \$29.3 billion, \$2.8 billion more than in 1997. With the advance funding for the reading initiative, the total amount provided is \$31.56 billion, or .2 percent over the budget request. The bill fully funds the America Reads Initiative by providing \$260 million in advance funding. It provides \$800 million in additional funding for existing literacy programs consistent with the America Reads Initiative, including title I, which is increased \$150 million over the request, Head Start, which is funded at the budget request and after-school learning centers, which are funded at the budget request.

The bill rejects some reductions suggested by the administration, including a \$122 million suggested cut in community services programs. It provides an increase for CDC, Centers for Disease Control, of \$83 million compared to the President's request to essentially freeze that budget. It fully funds the Job Corps. It does a lot of good things. It also falls far short of a lot of the country's needs because of our lack of resources.

But I would like to talk for a moment about a new initiative which this committee has included in this bill. Additional resources alone are not enough to improve the quality of education in this country. I think we also have reached a bipartisan conclusion that we simply have to have basic reforms in the way schools are administered, the way they are organized, the way they are motivated, the way teachers are taught, the way kids are

taught, and the way parents and communities are involved in the support of education. That is why I am pleased that the committee is bringing to the floor a new \$205 million initiative which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and I have recommended to the committee, which includes \$150 million in additional funding for title I and \$50 million under the fund for the improvement of education, in order to provide the ability for local schools to apply for start-up grants so that they can participate in the school reform movement sweeping the country.

For the last 20 years, we have focused our efforts to improve education on attempts to improve the performance of individual children, and there is nothing wrong with that. But there is also a considerable body of opinion which tells us that it is not enough to focus simply on one classroom, or one child at a time unless you have a total atmosphere of reform present on a school-by-school basis. And so we are bringing this reform package to the Congress.

In contrast to many other initiatives in many past Congresses, this is about the only initiative I can think of in the past 15 years which has united virtually every single group in the education community, that has united teachers unions with school boards. It has also brought into the coalition the chief State school officers of the 50 States, the title I administrators from around the country, the National Parent-Teachers Association and many other groups in support of this initiative.

This initiative has in large part been driven by the New American Schools movement, which originally had its genesis in an effort put together by a group of nationally known American businessmen headed by David Kearns who used to run Xerox Corporation. They basically looked at the problems that we were facing in public education. They commissioned the Rand Corporation to study the research to determine what worked and what did not work in the area of school reform, and they have helped around the country to achieve a situation in which some 700 schools have been able to use one model or another to try to improve school performance.

But 1 percent school involvement is not enough, in our view, and this should help some 4,000 schools get into the act of rethinking from the bottom up how those schools are organized, how they are administered and how children are taught within those schools. It is, I think, an exciting initiative not just because of the promise that it holds for progress in academic performance, it is also an exciting initiative because we have bipartisan support for something that can truly move the reform effort forward on the basis not of political ideology but on the basis of what works.

I would like to say one other thing. I know that there are a number of individuals in the caucus of the majority

party who are concerned about this bill and would like to see it shaped far more in their image. Let me simply say to those folks, there are a good many people on this side of the aisle who feel the same way coming from the opposite direction. There are many provisions in this bill that I would prefer not be here. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], for instance, pushed incredibly hard for a provision on ergonomics with which I strongly disagree and most of us on our side of the aisle did, but in the interest of accommodation and trying to build bipartisan consensus, we worked out our differences and the gentleman from Texas has been able to deliver what he considers progress in that area.

The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] was able to persuade the committee to adopt a proposal, about which I frankly have great misgivings, with respect to methyl chloride. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DICKEY] was able to convince the committee to include a provision on the NLRB with which I basically disagree, as do most members of our subcommittee on this side of the aisle, and other members of the subcommittee. And the majority caucus were also able to include provisions that we frankly do not agree with, but as Will Rogers said a long time ago, "When two people agree on everything, one of them is unnecessary."

The fact is, in a body of 435 people, if we are going to produce a product which can reach consensus in that body and also receive the support of the President of the United States, we have to have compromises. We have them.

I would simply say to people on both sides of the aisle, we can, if you want, go down last year's road of having division after division after division demonstrated on this floor, or, having already demonstrated the great difference of opinion that we have on a number of these issues, we can try to reach for consensus and produce a bill which we know will be signed by the President and a bill which we know can pass by the fiscal year's end so that we do not have to run the risk of again shutting down government.

I would urge Members on both sides of the aisle to recognize that in the end this institution will be served best if people recognize that we have fought out these differences fiercely in the committee and support the effort that the committee has produced. People are free obviously to offer any amendments that they want, but I do not believe that the interest of either party or this institution will be served by offering amendments for consideration that we know will simply blow up the bill. We have had too much of that the past years and I hope that we have reached the time when we will choose to resolve differences, move forward to new issues and hopefully also in the process produce something that is useful and good for the workers, for the children and for the ill of our society who are served by this legislation.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS SUBMITTED BY THE HONORABLE DAVID OBEY AND THE HONORABLE JOHN PORTER

THE ROAD TO BETTER AMERICAN SCHOOLS

No topic has more consistently been the focus of public debate over the last two decades than the reform of our educational system. Parents know that the competition for jobs and pay which their children will face will be quite different from what they themselves faced only a few years ago. How they fare will be determined not just by how their skills stack up against other workers in their own community but how those skills compare with those of workers around the globe. The relationship between living standards and work skills will become increasingly direct.

As a result, school improvement has been a central agenda item at local school board meetings across the country. It absorbs much of the deliberative time of each state legislature. It is a frequent topic of debate here in Congress and it is a matter of great concern to not only parents and students but corporate leaders and tax payers as well.

Yet the road to school reform has proven elusive. Teachers in many schools complain with apparent justification that students are spending so much time taking newly mandated standardized tests that it has significantly cut back the time available for instruction. In some classrooms, computers purchased with the promise of revolutionizing instruction sit idle day after day serving only as icons of the difficulty of changing the fundamental problems which face our schools. Some thoughtful school board members have reluctantly concluded that the only two things that will really bring positive change to our schools is an infusion of more talented teachers and an infusion of more disciplined and motivated students—two things that they ultimately feel powerless to change.

But in the midst of this debate and the many failed efforts to revolutionize public instruction a promising set of ideas about school organization has taken hold and begun to produce extremely promising results. There is no single father to these new ideas. In fact, they include more than a half a dozen detailed models developed separately by educators at universities in different parts of the country. Each of these models for reforming schools has its own special set of characteristics, but all of the models would significantly change the way that the overwhelming majority of American schools now operate. Strikingly, all of these models have a great deal in common with one another.

Among those who have brought forth proposals for change are James Comer at Yale, Henry Levin at Stanford, Ted Sizer at Brown and Robert Slavin at Johns Hopkins. Each has his own special area of emphasis. The Comer School Development Program for instance focuses on the organization of school decision making. Levin's Accelerated Schools puts forth a curriculum proposal for challenging students identified for remediation. Sizer's Coalition of Essential Schools focuses on the "triangle of learning," the relationship between students, teachers and curriculum. Slavin's Success for All and Roots and Wings call for reallocating resources into the most essential elements for school success, curriculum, instruction and family support.

While the area of emphasis differs from one model to the next, all of these models are based on the concept that effective reform is a school wide proposition. In other words, you can't make sufficient progress by working on one classroom or one teacher or the curriculum for one subject area at a time,

the whole school has to be the target for change. All share the concept that parents have to be centrally engaged at every step of the decision making and evaluation process. All concur that a great deal of autonomy is needed for individual schools and that the current top down authority structure existing within most schools has got to go. Each of these concepts requires principals to significantly redefine their roles. They must become consensus builders rather than autocratic directors. They must learn to bring teachers and parents into the decision making process and create a community wide commitment to the behavioral and academic standards of the school.

All argue that the school boards, superintendents and other administrators in the school system have to be aware of the need for these changes and actively support schools attempting change. All are supported by an outside set of experts who are available to advise and help the schools, teachers and principals to successfully retool their school. Finally, each of these concepts is far more than an academic treatise on what people living in the real world should be doing. Each of these models has been developed into real functioning programs being used in a cross section of communities with very specific and detailed guidelines for approaching the real life—every day problems of teaching and learning.

Over the last three decades the principle tool for raising educational performance nationwide has been the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 and specifically Title I of that Act. Through Title I, the federal government has focused substantial additional resources on underachieving children in lower income schools. What we have learned from these new "whole school" models is that the improvements in academic performance of Title I children can be more broadly based and more long lasting if the focus on individual children takes place in an environment in which parents and teachers are working together for goals they both agree with and played a role in developing.

The most remarkable fact about these models is the extent to which they have succeeded in improving school and student performance without becoming better known to the public or even to many in the education community. Among the organizations that have recognized the potential such models hold for improving the effectiveness of American schools are the Annenberg Foundation, the Edison Project and New American Schools. New American Schools was created by business leaders from a number of the nation's largest corporations and began working with local school districts in 1992 to help certain selected schools adapt to one or another of seven selected school reform models—each representing a different version of "whole school" reform. More than 500 schools in 25 states have participated for much of that period and another 200 schools have been added recently. While that is a tiny fraction of the more than 100,000 elementary and secondary schools across the country, it is providing a solid information base for examining the potential of these reforms. The Rand Corporation has been hired to evaluate this information. While understanding the long term impact of alternate education approaches on student achievement necessarily takes many years, the early results from these experiments have in many instances been dramatic.

A number of schools in Prince George's County, Maryland using the ATLAS model (a variation on the Comer School Development Program) raised their reading scores by 30% on the Maryland Performance Assessment Program. The proportion of students scoring satisfactory or excellent on the exam tripled

within a three year period beginning in 1992. Most schools experienced a dramatic decline in discipline problems and a dramatic increase in levels of school attendance.

The John F. Kennedy Elementary School in Louisville, Kentucky increased its scores on the Kentucky statewide assessment by 43% in reading and 48% in math using the National Alliance reform model. In three years, the school rose from among the lowest-scoring schools in the state to the top 10%.

The Success for All model developed at Johns Hopkins University appears to have been particularly successful in boosting achievement among language minority students. In six schools located in Baltimore and Philadelphia, first grade students were three months ahead of their counterparts in other elementary schools by the end of their first year. By the end of second grade they were almost a year ahead of their counterparts.

The Hansberry Elementary School in the Bronx increased the percentage of student who passed the New York State essential skills test from 22% to 50% in reading and from 47% to 82% in math in only two years beginning in 1993. Hansberry used a model developed by the Hudson Institute known as the Modern Red Schoolhouse.

The Rand Corporation noted that "By any number of measures, New American Schools has accomplished a great deal in its first four years of programmatic activity * * * What began as an effort to create small number of outstanding designs for schools has expanded to a comprehensive strategy to reform education."

While these new approaches to improving schools may represent fundamental change from the way most schools now operate, it is important to recognize that these approaches are very consistent with the kinds of organizational changes being brought about in numerous other institutions in society. Just as American business has learned that enhancing the role and input of workers and suppliers creates a common commitment that improves the product and boosts productivity, the full engagement of teachers and parents in the learning process can and is producing similar results in schools. In fact, one might well argue that the standard structure of American schools has changed so little in the last half century that these types of institutional reforms can have an even greater impact on the classroom than businesses have managed to produce in factories or offices.

We do not know all that we would like to know or should know in order to fully revolutionize the nation's schools. We do not know for certain which of these models works best or which is best suited for particular types of schools or to meet particular types of problems. But we certainly do know enough to know that we should begin. We have sufficient experience to know that many more schools should be participating—that we should not only be experimenting with these approaches in all of the states instead of only half, but that we should have a number of schools working with these reforms in each region of every state.

That is why we encouraged the Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor-Health, Human Services and Education to provide \$200 million to start such a whole school reform effort in the education appropriation bill for the coming school year. These funds would be apportioned by state education officials and the Department of Education to school districts interested in making a serious commitment to school improvement. Schools with differing ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds would be selected as would schools facing differing problems in

improving academic performance. Each participating school would receive a grant of at least \$50,000 a year to implement a research tested model for whole school reform. The funds would be used to help the school get the necessary outside expertise, hire the staff necessary to facilitate change and train existing personnel to meet the challenges of making fundamental changes in the manner in which the schools operate. The effort would provide a large number of school districts across the country with first hand experience and information to determine whether they wish to provide additional schools with the resources necessary to make the proposed changes.

We have had an extended debate in this country about school reform and that debate will no doubt continue. But it is time to do more than debate. We now have proposals to reform our schools that are not just academic theories but are producing real results in real classrooms across America. With a relatively small amount of outside resources, communities can restructure schools in ways that make them significantly more effective. We should now move to insure that a broader spectrum of our nation's schools have a chance to move forward with these reforms and determine for themselves the impact these changes have on student learning and school effectiveness.

EXAMPLES OF WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM MODELS *Accelerated Schools*

Accelerated Schools, developed at Stanford University, is a whole school reform model that focuses on an accelerated curriculum that emphasizes challenging and exciting learning activities for students who normally are identified for remediation. One of the key ideas behind Accelerated Schools is that rather than remediating students' deficits, students who are placed at risk of school failure must be accelerated—given the kind of high-expectations curriculum typical of programs for gifted and talented students. The program's social goals include reducing the dropout rate, drug use, and teen pregnancies.

The Accelerated Schools model is built around three central principles. One is unity of purpose, a common vision of what the school should become, agreed to and worked toward by all school staff, parents, students and community. A second is empowerment coupled with responsibility, which means that staff, parents and students find their own way to transform themselves. A third element, building on strength, means identifying the strengths of students, of staff and of the school, and then using these as a basis for reform. School staff are encouraged to search for methods that help them to realize their vision. There is an emphasis on reducing all uses of remedial activities and on adopting engaging teaching strategies, such as project-based learning. The schools implement these principles by establishing a set of cadres which include a steering committee and work on groups focused on particular areas of concern. Accelerated schools are located in 39 states, including Colorado, Texas and California.

ATLAS (Authentic Teaching, Learning and Assessment of All Students)

The ATLAS Program, builds on concepts embodied in the School Development Program and the Coalition of Essential Schools, but adds other unique elements. One of these is a focus on pathways—groups of schools made up of high schools and the elementary and middle schools that feed into them—whose staff work with each other to create coordinated and continuous experiences for students. Teams of teachers from each pathway work together to design curriculum and

assessments based on locally defined standards. Teachers collaborate with parents and administrators to form a learning community that works together to set and maintain sound management policies.

The intent of the model is to change the culture of the school to promote high institutional and individual performance. The emphasis of the design is on helping school staffs create classroom environments in which students are active participants in their own learning. Project-based learning is extensively used. Assessment in ATLAS schools emphasize portfolios, performance examinations, and exhibitions. Community members are active participants on the school governing teams and the schools develop programs to encourage parental involvement. ATLAS schools are operating in Norfolk, Virginia; Prince George's County, Maryland; Gorham, Maine; Seattle, Washington; and Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Audrey Cohen College of System of Education

Audrey Cohen College of System of Education is based on the teaching methods used at the Audrey Cohen College in New York City. This whole school reform model focuses student learning on the study and achievement of meaningful "purposes" for each semester's academic goals. A holistic and purpose-driven curriculum is the centerpiece of the model. Curriculum and instruction are organized around a single, developmentally appropriate purpose for each semester, cumulating to 26 purposes in a K-12 system. Embedded in each purpose are content areas such as English and math, and essential skills such as critical thinking and researching. Each purpose culminates in a "constructive action" undertaken by the class to serve the community. For example, in fourth grade, one purpose is "we work for good health." Students achieve their purpose by using their knowledge and skills to plan, carry out, and evaluate a "constructive action" to benefit the community and larger world. Leadership is emphasized. These fundamental changes in the curriculum and instruction become the organizing principles for all other school activities. The total effect is intended to make the school and its programs more coherent and focused.

The purposes help the school and its officials identify key community resources to involve in the educational enterprise. The constructive actions help to bring the community into the school and the school into the community—making schools, parents and children active partners in improving the community. Schools are implementing the Audrey Cohen model in San Diego, California; Phoenix, Arizona; Miami, Florida; Hollandale, Mississippi; Seattle, Washington; and Dade County, Florida.

Coalition of Essential Schools

The Coalition of Essential Schools is based at Brown University. The Coalition is not a reform model per se, but an organization dedicated to "Nine Common Principles of Essential Schools". The Nine Principles involve certain ideas about school reform that include building support and collaboration among teachers, students and the families of those students in the community. The Coalition focuses on the relationship between students, teachers and the curriculum—the "triangle of learning".

In order to become a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools, a school submits a statement of its long-term goals and an action plan. The action plan must state how structures, pedagogy, curriculum and assessment will change, and it must include a statement of faculty commitment to student learning and engagement. Community support must be solicited throughout the process and a school-site coordinator is identified

to work as a liaison between the school, and regional or state coordinator, and the Coalition. Membership in the Coalition includes a responsibility to participate in a network with other Coalition Schools, and to meet expectations that include commitment, whole-school involvement, documentation and assessment of progress, and funds to support school reform activities over a multi-year period.

Co-NECT Schools

Co-NECT schools focus on complex interdisciplinary projects that extensively incorporate technology and connect students with ongoing scientific investigations, information resources, and other students beyond their own school. Co-NECT uses technology to enhance every aspect of teaching, learning, professional development, and school management. Cross-disciplinary teaching teams work with clusters of students. Most students stay in the same cluster with the same teachers for at least two years. Teaching and learning center of interdisciplinary projects that promote critical skills and academic understanding. Teams of educators and parents set goals. Performance-based assessments are extensively used. In addition to understanding key subject areas, graduates of the Co-NECT school demonstrate the acquisition of specific critical skills, identified as sense-maker, designer, problem-solver, decisionmaker, communicator, team worker, project-oriented worker, and responsible, knowledgeable citizen.

A school governance council, which includes teachers, parents, business/community representatives, and administrators, runs the school. In addition, the school design team provides local input concerning the implementation, performance assessment, and accountability of the Co-NECT approach at that particular school. The Community Support Board fosters access to the local community to support the Council and design team. Mentoring and volunteers are encouraged and community input sought for standard-setting. Co-NECT schools are operating in Cincinnati, Ohio; Dade County, Florida; Memphis, Tennessee; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; San Antonio, Texas; and Worcester, Massachusetts.

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB)

Expeditionary Learning Outward Bound (ELOB) is built on ten design principles and operates on the belief that learning is an expedition into the unknown. Expeditionary Learning draws on the power of purposeful, intellectual investigations—called learning expeditions—to improve student achievement and build character. Learning expeditions are long-term, academically rigorous, interdisciplinary studies that require students to work inside and outside the classroom. In Expeditionary Learning schools, student and teachers stay together for more than one year, teachers work collaboratively through team teaching and shared planning, and there is no tracking.

Schools using this whole school reform model are in Baltimore County, Maryland; Boston, Massachusetts; Cincinnati, Ohio; Dade County, Florida; Decatur, Georgia; Denver, Colorado; Dubuque, Iowa; Memphis, Tennessee; New York City, New York; San Antonio, Texas; and Portland, Oregon.

Modern Red Schoolhouse

The Modern Red Schoolhouse whole school reform model helps all students achieve high standards through the construction of a standards-driven curriculum; employment of traditional and performance-based assessments; effective organizational patterns and professional-development programs; and implementation of effective community-in-

volvement strategies. The model focuses on high standards in core academic subjects—English, geography, history, mathematics and science. Students master a rigorous curriculum designed to transit common culture, develop character, and promote the principles of democratic government. Modern Red Schoolhouses are divided into three divisions, rather than 12 grades: primary, intermediate and upper. To advance to the next division, students must meet defined standards and pass “watershed assessment”. Students complete investigations, give oral reports, answer essay questions and take multiple choice exams. Student progress is monitored through an Individual Education Compact, negotiated by the student, parent and teacher. This compact establishes goals, details parent and teacher responsibilities, and lists services the school, parents or community should provide.

Schools using this model are in Indianapolis, Columbus, and Beech Grove, Indiana; Franklin and Lawrence, Massachusetts; New York City, New York; Philadelphia, Pennsylvania; Memphis, Tennessee, and San Antonio, Texas.

National Alliance for Restructuring Education (NA)

The National Alliance for Restructuring Education is a partnership of states, districts, schools and expert organizations created to change the educational system through a five-point set of priorities called “design tasks”: the design tasks are standards and assessments, learning environments, high-performance management, community services and supports, and public engagement. The model uses results-based, high performance management at the school and district levels with decentralized decisionmaking to restructure the learning environment to support student achievement and provide professional support to teachers and schools.

Alliance sites adapt for education the principles and techniques developed by American business known as high-performance management. These include strategic management, total quality management, decentralized decisionmaking and empowerment, and accountability and incentive systems. At the school level, principals are trained in these areas to better support the integration and implementation of design tasks. Alliance sites at the state, district and school levels are tasked with developing methods for informing and involving parents and the public in the school and restructuring process. Schools in the National Alliance are in Arkansas; Kentucky; Vermont; Rochester, New York; San Diego, California; and Chicago, Illinois.

Roots and Wings

Roots and Wings is a comprehensive, whole school reform model for elementary schools to ensure that all children leave elementary school with the skills required for success. It is based on the Success For All reading program developed at Johns Hopkins University and incorporates science, history, and math to achieve a comprehensive academic program. The premise of the model is that schools must do whatever it takes to make sure all students succeed. Roots and Wings schools provide at-risk students with tutors, family support, and a variety of other services aimed at eliminating obstacles to success.

The Roots component of the model is aimed at preventing failure. It emphasizes working with children and their families to ensure that children develop the basic skills and habits they need to succeed. The Wings component emphasizes a highly motivating curriculum with instructional strategies that encourage children to grow to their full

potential and aspire to higher levels of learning. The design reallocates resources into a system of curriculum, instruction and family support designed to eliminate special education and low achievement.

Roots and Wings provides schools with innovative curricula and instructional methods in reading, writing, language arts, mathematics, social studies, and science. The curriculum emphasizes the use of cooperative learning throughout the grades. In each activity, students work in cooperative groups, do extensive writing, and use reading, mathematics, and fine arts skills learned in other parts of the program. Schools using this model are in Anson County, North Carolina; Memphis, Dade County, Cincinnati, Elyria and Dawson-Bryant, Ohio; Columbus, Indiana; Everett, Washington, Flint, Michigan; Modesto, Pasadena and Riverside, CA; Rockford, Illinois, St. Mary's, Baltimore and Baltimore County, Maryland.

School Development Program

The School Development program is a comprehensive, whole school approach to reform based on principles of child development and the importance of parental involvement. The program was developed at Yale and implemented initially at two elementary schools in New Haven, Connecticut.

Each school creates three teams that take particular responsibility for moving the whole school reform agenda forward. A School Planning and Management Team, made up of teacher, parents and administration, develops and monitors implementation of a comprehensive school improvement plan. A Mental Health Team, composed on school staff concerned with mental health such as school psychologists, social workers, counselors and teachers, plans programs focusing on prevention, building positive child development, positive personal relations, etc. The third major component of the model is a Parent Program designed to build a sense of community among school staff, parents, and students. The parent Program incorporates existing parent participation activities (such as the PTA) and implements additional activities to draw parents into the school, to increase opportunities for parents to provide volunteer services, and to design ways for having the school respect the ethnic backgrounds of its students.

The three teams in School Development Program schools work together to create comprehensive plans for school reform. Schools take a holistic approach in looking for ways to serve children's academic and social needs. The School Development Program is operating in schools in 25 states, including Connecticut, Illinois, Maryland, Michigan, New York, North Carolina, and Pennsylvania.

Talent Development Model for High Schools

The Talent Development Model for High Schools was developed at Johns Hopkins University to fill a major current void in American education—a dearth of proven models of high school effectiveness. The Talent Development Model provides a comprehensive package of specific high school changes for at-risk students based on the proposition that all students can succeed in school given appropriate school organization, curriculum, instruction, and assistance as needed to assure their success. The model focuses on a common core curriculum of high standards for all students and emphasizes the creation of small learning communities through the establishment of career-focused academies as schools-within-the-school.

Essential components include (1) making schoolwork relevant by providing a career focus, (2) providing increased opportunities for academic success, (3) providing a caring and supportive learning environment

through enhanced teacher-student interactions, and (4) providing help with student problems, including academic, family problems, substance abuse, disciplinary problems, and employment needs. The Talent Development High School provides assistance to students from social workers and mental health professionals on the school staff and by referrals to an alternative after-hours school in the building designed to meet the needs of students who present the most difficult disciplinary problems. The first Talent Development High School was established at Patterson High School in Baltimore, Maryland. Additional Talent Development sites are being evaluated in Washington, DC, Philadelphia, Chicago and Los Angeles.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
STATE TITLE I DIRECTORS,
Washington, DC, September 4, 1997.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. OBEY: The National Association of State Title I Directors believes Title I (Compensatory Education) will be more effective with the reform efforts outlined in the Whole School Reform initiative approved by the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services and Education. School reform and improvement will not occur without specific support. As it stands today, on average each school teacher annually has over 200,000 interactions with students, parents, and other professionals. To expect these professionals to be able to teach and reform their instructional programs and techniques without specific support is unreasonable. Therefore, we ask that you continue to push for funding for the Whole School Reform effort and reject any attempt to transfer funds out of this initiative. We understand that Congressman Riggs is considering offering an amendment to transfer funds for this reform effort, we hope that this (and any other similar amendments) will be defeated.

Sincerely yours,
RICHARD LONG, Ed.D.
Executive Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF TEACHERS,
Washington, DC, September 4, 1997.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 950,000 members of the American Federation of Teachers (AFT), I urge you to oppose the amendment sponsored by Mr. Riggs to H.R. 2264, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

The AFT supports the Whole School Reform Initiative included in H.R. 2264, as reported from committee. The \$150 million under Title I—Demonstrations of Innovative Practices Program and \$50 million under the Fund for the Improvement of Education would provide schools assistance to fund promising educational strategies, including effective approaches to whole school reform. The AFT believes the real hope for improving public education is by expanding known, effective proven programs and strategies. Parents, the public, and teachers want "what works" in the public schools. They want schools in which students achieve at high levels in basic subjects and in which all students are safe and secure.

Providing selected schools across the country with resources to cover the additional costs of implementing academic programs that are known to work is an especially good use of limited resources. The AFT has done considerable investigation of promising means of school reform and has determined that the spread of instructional programs that meet the criteria of having high aca-

demic standard, being strongly research-based, having demonstrated effectiveness in raising student achievement, being replicable in diverse and challenging circumstances, and with assistance available from networks of researchers and practitioners offers the strongest promise of educational improvement. The Whole School Reform Initiative in H.R. 2264 would help school adopt programs that meet these important criteria.

I urge you to support the Whole School Reform Initiative and vote against the Riggs Amendment.

Sincerely,
GERALD D. MORRIS,
Director of Legislation.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 4, 1997.
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2.3-million members of the National Education Association (NEA), we urge you to oppose the Riggs amendment to H.R. 2264, the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies Appropriations bill.

NEA supports the Whole School Reform Initiative included in H.R. 2264 as reported from committee. The \$150 million targeted to the Demonstrations of Innovative Practices Program and the \$50 million for the Improvement of Education would provide schools with the assistance needed to fund and promote innovative and effective approaches to whole school reform. The Riggs amendment would shift \$200 million away from this excellent proposal.

As you are aware, schools want effective options for creating high-performance education systems, but they need targeted resources and expert technical assistance to help them adopt these reforms. The Whole School Reform Initiative, as reported from committee, holds out the best promise for helping schools effect these reforms.

NEA urges you to vote against the Riggs Amendment.

Sincerely,
MARY ELIZABETH TEASLEY,
Director of Government Relations.

NATIONAL SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, September 4, 1997.
Hon. DAVID R. OBEY,
House of Representatives, Rayburn House Office
Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OBEY: On behalf of the National School Boards Association (NSBA) and the 95,000 school board members we represent through our federation of 53 states and territories, we strongly endorse the whole school reform proposal in the FY 1998 appropriations bill. The additional \$200 million in resources to support the adoption by schools of research-based, whole school reform models is an important innovation. Research has shown us that for long-lasting reform to take place, the principal, teachers, parents, and staff—the entire school—must reflect the reform principles. The whole school reform proposal in the Labor, HHS, Education FY 1998 appropriations bill will move this process forward.

Thank you for your leadership on this important issue and allowing us to work with you. For further information please call Laurie A. Westley, Assistant Executive Director, at 703-838-6703.

Sincerely,
WILLIAM B. INGRAM,
President.
ANNE L. BRYANT,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL PTA,
NATIONAL HEADQUARTERS,
Chicago, IL, September 4, 1997.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
Ranking Member, Appropriations Subcommittee
on Labor, Health and Human Services, Edu-
cation, and Related Agencies, House of Rep-
resentatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. OBEY: I am writing to reiterate our support for your bi-partisan proposal—adopted as part of H.R. 2264, the House Appropriations Committee FY 1998 funding bill for the Department of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education—that would direct \$200 million to whole-school reform initiatives.

We understand that Representative Riggs plans to offer an amendment to redirect this \$200 million to Title I basic grants. While we wholeheartedly would support an increased funding allocation for Title I basic grants, we cannot afford to take this money away from whole-school reform initiatives.

We know that effective school reform demands a strong commitment of financial resources and appropriate technical assistance to ensure successful implementation. There are numerous, proven, research-based models of effective schools that communities can replicate if they have the tools. The funding set aside for this purpose in H.R. 2264 would provide the important financial support schools need to implement these whole-school reforms.

We believe the whole-school reform initiative would nicely complement Title I in helping economically and educationally disadvantaged students achieve educational success. We strongly support the \$200 million in supplemental assistance for whole-school reform and we oppose Mr. Riggs' amendment to eliminate funding for this purpose.

Sincerely,
SHIRLEY IGO,
Vice President for Legislation.

COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS,
Washington, DC, September 4, 1997.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Council of the Great City Schools, the coalition of the nation's largest central city school districts, writes to urge opposition to Congressman Riggs' amendment to H.R. 2264, the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations bill, which would transfer \$200 million for the F.I.E. and Title I Whole School Reform Demonstration initiative into Title I Basic Grants.

On July 28, 1997 the Council wrote to the Subcommittee Chairman Porter and ranking member Obey supporting the Whole School Reform initiative as an important stimulus to facilitate the broader use of effective educational practices and models. The Council is confident that these new School Reform initiatives will be used in the schools which have the greatest need for substantive reform.

The Council is concerned that the amendment transfers funds into a formula vehicle which is no longer authorized by the House Committee of Education and the Workforce. Additionally, the transfer amendment does not target the very limited education funds to high need school districts in a manner which either Subcommittee Chairman Porter or authorizing committee Chairman Goodling have encouraged.

The Council, therefore, requests your opposition to the Riggs transfer amendment.

Sincerely,
JEFFREY A. SIMERING,
Director of Legislative Services.

NEW AMERICAN SCHOOLS,
Arlington, VA, July 14, 1997.

Hon. DAVID R. OBEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OBEY: It is our understanding the Subcommittee on Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations will be meeting soon to consider the fiscal year 1998 budget request for the Department of Education. We also understand that the Subcommittee will be considering your proposal to provide approximately \$200 million in additional resources to the Department to support a new school reform initiative.

We are writing to express the strong support of the New American Schools Development Corporation for this initiative and for your efforts. As you know, the New American Schools Development Corporation is a bipartisan, nonprofit organization launched in 1991 by American corporate and foundation leaders to help schools adopt systemic reforms to achieve world class, high performing schools. Utilizing corporate and foundation support, we financed the research and development of seven comprehensive, schoolwide reform designs and tested these designs in schools and districts across the country. We are currently working with over 700 schools that are implementing these innovative whole school reform designs with considerable success. Secretary Riley recently commended our efforts in his 1997 Annual State of American Education address.

We believe that the results we are seeing in New American Schools justify a significant public investment at this time to spur the adoption of these and other proven whole school reform designs that have the greatest potential to improve the daily instructional experiences of children on a large scale. We have found that schools want effective options for creating high performance education systems, but that they need targeted resources and expert technical assistance to help them adopt these reforms. Your proposal to provide approximately \$200 million in start-up funding to support whole school reform in a significant number of schools would provide a powerful impetus to effective school reform in this country.

Sincerely,

DAVID T. KEARNS,
Chairman.
JOHN L. ANDERSON,
President.

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH
ASSOCIATION,

Washington DC, July 24, 1997.

Congressman DAVID OBEY, Ranking Member,
Subcommittee on Labor-HHS-Education,
2462 Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OBEY: I am writing you on behalf of IGER, an informal coalition of groups interested in sound policy development for the federal education research program. The groups identified below endorse the central ideas proposed by the subcommittee as the whole-school reform initiative, and the general comments offered below. I understand that others in our coalition, such as the NEA and AFT, already have written letters supporting the proposed school reform strategy.

We note with satisfaction that the Subcommittee on Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations has recommended that substantial funding be provided for start-up costs associated with whole-school reform. Many who have studied improvement have concluded that whole-school reform represents one of the most promising approaches to sustainable education achievements, and we applaud the fact that bulk of the funds will be provided to the most needy schools.

We applaud, also, the emphasis given to development of sound evaluation plans as a condition of receiving the grants, as well as the requirements stipulated for on-going professional development, high academic standards, and community involvement.

We agree with the committee that there are a number of whole-school reform programs for which effectiveness is evidenced by a sound research program, using control groups. However, we caution the committee that there are many more reform programs basing their success only on anecdotal evaluations, than there are programs which have the demonstrated results demanded in the legislation. This is not to challenge the promise of the reform efforts sure to be stimulated by the legislation. Rather, it is to urge that, as opportunity arises, the committee consider the need for a continuing program of research—perhaps best conducted through the institute structure provided by OERI—to complement this innovation with additional, hard data about conditions for effective school reform. Similarly, in addition to providing technical support for schools undertaking to evaluate their efforts, we urge support for a substantial third-party evaluation of this exciting national commitment.

We appreciate the committee's continuing support for federal research, statistics, and the regional laboratories, and look forward to working with you to make this exciting new program a success.

Sincerely,

GERALD E. SROUFE,
for the American
Educational Research
Association.

HOWARD SILVER,
for the Consortium of
Social Science Associations.

DAVID JOHNSON,
for the Federation of
Behavioral, Psychological,
and Cognitive Sciences.

KAREN ANDERSON,
for the National
School Boards Association.

RICHARD HERSHMAN,
for the National Education
Knowledge Industry Association.

COUNCIL OF CHIEF STATE
SCHOOL OFFICERS,

Washington, DC, July 25, 1997.

Representative DAVID OBEY, Ranking Member,
House Appropriations Committee, 1016
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OBEY: On behalf of the state commissioners and superintendents of education, I commend your leadership in securing a \$405 million increase for Title I ESEA in the FY98 Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations bill. We commend especially your initiative in appropriating \$150 million in start up funds for the Whole School Reform provisions, authorized under Part E, Title I, "Demonstrations of Innovative Practices," with an additional \$50 million for this purpose to the Fund for the Improvement for Education and \$5 million for technical assistance and evaluation.

Title I is an essential resource to assist the nation's most economically and educationally disadvantaged students achieve at the high standards they need to compete in the global economy. We applaud the bipartisan agreement on FY98 funding for Title I which substantially exceeds the Administration's request in additional money and provides first-time funding of Whole School Reform.

Funding of the Whole School Reform program is especially important. Research establishes clearly the importance of comprehensive strategies which combine all resources of a school to raise student achievement. The strategy is especially true for schools with large proportions of low achieving students. The Whole School Reform funds will more than double the resources available for states to assist Title I schools in refocusing their resources toward better performance. Combined with Title I provisions for schoolwide projects in schools with high concentrations of poverty and the state program improvement funds for technical assistance to low-performing schools, these funds offer the additional resource needed to change school practice while other resources maintain continuing direct services to students.

As the FY98 appropriation for education moves through the House and to conference with the Senate bill, we support strongly the Subcommittee's \$405 million increase for Title I and the Whole School Reform funding. Thank you again for your leadership in achieving the bipartisan commitment to serve the students most in need of help. An increase in their performance is essential if our nation's capacity for a high skills/high wage economy is to be realized. We look forward to working with you through the process.

Sincerely,

GORDON M. AMBACH,
Executive Director.

NATIONAL SCHOOL
BOARDS ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, July 17, 1997.

Hon. ARLEN SPECTER,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR SPECTER: On behalf of the National School Boards Association (NSBA) and the 95,000 school board members we represent through our federation of 53 states and territories, we strongly urge the FY 1998 funding for K-12 education programs be a high priority. We applaud the bipartisan spirit of the subcommittee bill and the attempts to best the Clinton Administration funding in many programs, especially Title 6 and IDEA. We also applaud Congressman David Obey's (D-WI) whole school reform proposal and the fiscal increase for Title 1. Sadly, these collective increases will not meet the needs in school districts to address exploding enrollments of high-needs children.

Our members' strong support for the \$1 billion increase for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act has been nearly matched by the Senate own expressions of the need for the funds in S. 1, the Majority Leader's highest legislative priority, and later in the Senate Budget Resolution, as well as numerous statements throughout the pendency of the IDEA legislation. Last month the reauthorization of IDEA became law; it provides both the programmatic framework and the urgency for the increase. The long-standing federal commitment to fund IDEA at 40 percent of the excess cost of special education adds to the importance of a \$1 billion increase.

As you search for ways to increase the IDEA appropriation to \$1 billion, we fervently hope you will not look to other K-12 education programs. The education of some children should not be jeopardized to pay for the education of other children; that would be a travesty.

For further information, please call Laurie A. Westley, Assistant Executive Director, at 703-838-6703. Thank you for your support.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. INGRAM,
President.

ANNE L. BRYANT,
Executive Director.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
TEACHERS,
555 NEW JERSEY AVENUE, N.W.,
Washington, DC, July 15, 1997.

Congressman DAVID OBEY,
*Ranking Member, Labor, Health and Human
Services, Education and Related Agencies,
Appropriations Subcommittee.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OBEY: On behalf of the American Federation of Teachers, I would like to support adoption of your report language on effective schools as a part of the FY 1998 education appropriations.

The AFT believes there exist in schools throughout the US a number of rigorous educational programs that are solidly based on research, have records of demonstrated effectiveness in improving student achievement of higher academic standards, are supported by networks of researchers and experienced practitioners, and are known to be replicable in diverse and challenging circumstances. The programs meeting these criteria mark a path that other schools can follow with confidence. Some examples of these programs are Success for All, Roots and Wings, Core Knowledge, Direct Instruction, High Schools that Work, International Baccalaureate, and Advanced Placement. No doubt other such programs can be identified, as well.

It is of great importance that schools—especially schools with high concentrations of disadvantaged students—be encouraged to adopt high standards, rigorous educational programs that we know work. Rather than educational fads and ideologically-driven schemes, it is the research-based, widely replicated, demonstrably effective, and network supported programs that will produce solid academic gains for all children.

Sincerely,

GERALD MORRIS,
Director of Legislation.

NATIONAL PTA HEADQUARTERS,
Chicago, IL, July 22, 1997.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
*Ranking Member, Appropriations Subcommittee
on Labor, Health and Human Services,
Education, and Related Agencies,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR MR. OBEY: I am writing in support of your proposal—adopted as part of the House Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education appropriations bill for fiscal year 1998—to direct \$200 million to the Department of Education for whole-school reform initiatives.

The nearly 6.5 million members of the National PTA understand that effective school reform demands a strong commitment of financial resources and appropriate technical assistance to ensure successful implementation. We know that good schools share common elements including strong parental and community support, challenging academic standards, and ongoing professional development opportunities. Your proposal, which considers these factors, would provide important financial support for schools that are trying to implement these whole-school reforms.

We believe your initiative would nicely complement proven programs like Title I in helping economically and educationally disadvantaged students achieve educational success. We support an increased Federal funding commitment for Title I and the supplemental assistance offered in your whole-school reform initiative.

Thank you for your efforts on behalf of America's children.

Sincerely,

SHIRLEY IGO,
Vice President for Legislation.

THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS,
Reston, VA, July 30, 1997.

Hon. DAVID R. OBEY,
*U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OBEY: The 43,000 members of the National Association of Secondary School Principals congratulate you on your success in gaining the approval of the House Appropriation Committee to provide \$200 million for a new national initiative to develop innovative, successful schools throughout the country.

Your proposal reflects the recommendations of our report, *Breaking Ranks: Changing an American Institution*, that was prepared by NASSP in partnership with the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. A copy of this report is enclosed.

The clear message in this report is that school reform is not driven by a single person or issue but involves the whole school and community.

Upon releasing this report, NASSP formed the National Alliance of High Schools and is conducting seminars and workshops around the country to assist schools in implementing the recommendations contained in this report.

Your initiative could be used by high schools around the country to assist them in restructuring their school to best serve the needs of the students as recommended in this report. We applaud your foresight and look forward to working with you to ensure that our nation's students and schools are ready for an ever changing world.

If we can be of any assistance, please contact me at (703) 860-7333.

Kind personal regards,

TIMOTHY J. DYER,
Executive Director

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, July 15, 1997.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
*Rayburn House Office Building, Washington,
DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE OBEY: It is NEA's understanding that the Subcommittee on Labor-HHS-Education Appropriations will be meeting soon to consider the FY 1998 budget request for the Department of Education. NEA also understands that the Subcommittee will be considering a proposal by you to provide approximately \$200 million in additional resources to the Department to support a new school reform initiative.

The NEA's more than 2.3 million members labor daily in schools and communities across America to support and sustain school reform initiatives. Your proposal would provide important assistance.

As you are aware, schools want effective options for creating high-performance education systems, but they need targeted resources and expert technical assistance to help them adopt these reforms. Your proposal to provide approximately \$200 million in start-up funding to support whole school reform in a significant number of schools would provide a powerful impetus to effective school reform in this country.

Sincerely,

MARY ELIZABETH TEASLEY,
Director of Government Relations.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE
TITLE I DIRECTORS,

Washington, DC, July 18, 1997.

DEAR SENATOR: On behalf of the National Association of State Title I Directors, I urge you to support the goals and intent of the school reform plan recently approved by the House Labor, Health and Human Services, Education Appropriations Subcommittee.

The National Association of State Title I Directors (NASTID) released a study this

week assessing the status of the Title I program. The study entitled "Title I: A Program in Transition" provides information on how the program is changing based on survey results from 43 states. While the program is clearly still in transition, the survey responses are encouraging.

With the passage of the Improving America's School Act in 1994, Congress redefined the Title I program. The program was refocused to align content and performance standards, hold all students responsible for meeting those standards, expand opportunities for professional development, expand parental participation, and implement schoolwide reform. It is this last goal—schoolwide reform—that holds the promise for dramatic school improvements which will enhance student achievement. Schoolwide reform requires the active participation of teachers and parents in setting goals and achieving changes. It involves the dedication of the entire community to the effort with an emphasis on intensive and ongoing professional development for administrators, teachers and staff, increased technical assistance, and other services needed to achieve the desired changes.

The National Association of State Title I Directors supports efforts to encourage and facilitate schoolwide reforms and improvements. Federal support for school reform initiatives coupled with a continued commitment to proven programs like Title I would ensure that our neediest students receive the benefits of improved schools and strong programs designed to enhance learning.

We hope that you will be able to maintain at least last year's commitment to serve the same number of children, while supporting a needed new "Whole School Reform" initiative.

Sincerely,

RICHARD LONG,
Executive Director.

COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS,
Washington, DC, July 28, 1997.

Hon. DAVID OBEY,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN OBEY: The Council of the Great City Schools, the coalition of the nation's largest central city school districts, support the school improvement approach using research-based models and effective practices reflected in your Whole School Reform initiative in the Title I and FIE accounts of the FY98 appropriations. Virtually every school district, including the most disadvantaged, have a number of schools and programs which are documenting success. Yet, the adaptation and replication of such effective practices in other schools or systemwide has not been mastered. Your Whole School Reform demonstrations provide an important stimulus to facilitating the broader use of effective programs.

Additionally, the Council would like to commend you and the Subcommittee for investing over \$400 million in new funding for Title I, and for using a targeted funding approach. The 1994 Census update has demonstrated that there are 28 percent more low-income children in the nation than under the 1990 Census count. Without this additional investment, particularly for the poorest schools, the per child purchasing power of each Title I dollar would have dropped by nearly one-third, based on this increased number of poor school-age children.

The Council supports your initiative and looks forward to working with you to enact it.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL CASSERLY,
Executive Director.

COMMITTEE FOR EDUCATION FUNDING,
Washington, DC, July 18, 1997.

Member,
Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The Committee for Education Funding, a nonpartisan coalition of 88 organizations representing the broad spectrum of the education community, commends the remarkable bipartisan effort of the House Appropriations Subcommittee for Labor, Health and Human Services and Education on FY98 spending for education. The bill reported on July 15 takes a solid first step for education funding within the constraints of the subcommittee's budget allocation. Considering the degree to which this allocation falls short of human investment needs and priorities, the subcommittee made a substantial commitment to education.

We commend particularly the increase in the maximum Pell grant to \$3,000 and the additional funds set aside to expand access to more students. The bill also makes an important investment in whole school reform beyond the President's request for Title I and restores vital Title VI and Impact Aid funding.

There are areas where the bill falls short which must be addressed as the process continues. This includes restoration and increases needed in campus-based student aid; real growth in programs for professional development, vocational education and other critical programs; fulfillment of Congressional commitments to students with disabilities; and full funding of the budget agreement priorities for elementary, secondary, and postsecondary education.

Again, we commend the bipartisan spirit that has produced this bill and urge the committee to make additional critical improvements as the appropriations process moves forward to a final bill.

Sincerely,

CARNIE C. HAYES,

President.

EDWARD R. KEALY,

Executive Director.

WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM CASE STUDY SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The School Development Program uses child development and relationship theories and principles to improve the academic and psychosocial functioning of students. The collaboration of teachers, administrators, staff, families and community residents, all of whom have a stake in the education of the community's children, is key to the process. The program recognizes the importance of adult relationships and the role of parents and community in schools, while placing children and their needs at the center of all school decisions.

West Mecklenburg High School, Charlotte, North Carolina

West Mecklenburg High School is one of the oldest schools in Charlotte, North Carolina. Once regarded as the country school for the west side of the community, it now serves a highly transient, commercial and industrial area near the airport. In the last five years, the student body has grown by 33% to 1600 students who are largely of middle to lower economic status. In 1992, the school experienced a major upheaval, with the addition of over 300 at-risk students from a competing high school. Incidents with guns and knives rose sharply. Out of 11 high schools in the district, West Mecklenburg was in the bottom quartile. When a new principal introduced the School Development Program in 1992, transformation of the school became a team effort. Within two years, SAT scores had risen by an average of 16 percentage points, the number of students

making the honor roll had jumped 75%, the number of students enrolled in advanced-level courses had increased 25%, and attendance rates had gone from 89% to almost 94%. In 1996, West Mecklenburg High School won a Redbook America's Best Schools Project Award for Significant Improvement and an Outstanding Program Award from the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools.

Comments

"We recruited a very small nucleus of parents who were bold enough to go into their neighborhoods, knock on doors, make telephone calls, look parents eye to eye, and ask for their involvement." West Mecklenburg High School principal.

"If you want to talk about moving from the bottom of the heap and bring one of only two high schools in the district that was able to reach its benchmark goals—through using the SDP process—in two years, then based on the growth pattern, you would consider West Mecklenburg to be the number one high school in Charlotte-Mecklenburg." SDP Director for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Public Schools

ATLAS (AUTHENTIC TEACHING, LEARNING, AND ASSESSMENT FOR ALL STUDENTS)

The ATLAS (Authentic Teaching, Learning, and Assessment for all Students) whole school reform model is a variation of the School Development Program. The model focuses on the organization of school decision making, creating a personalized learning environment for all students, and bridging the gap between home, school, neighborhoods and work. ATLAS communities revolve around pathways—groups of schools made up of a high school and the elementary and middle schools that feed into it. Teams of teachers from each pathway work together to design curriculum and assessments based on locally defined standards. The teachers in each pathway collaborate with parents and administrators to form a learning community that works together to set and maintain sound management policies.

Norview High School, Norfolk, VA

Norview High School is located in Norfolk, Virginia—an urban center in the southeastern part of the state—and forms an ATLAS pathway with Tanners Creek Elementary and Rosemont Middle School. Norview's 1700 member student body is predominantly African-American students, where 40% of the students qualify for free or reduced lunch. The faculty has successfully revised the class schedule to provide 90 minute classes, allowing more time for in-depth assignments and independent projects. Students demonstrate what they have learned through student portfolios, performance examination, and exhibitions. Families and community members are exhibition judges, who ask questions that help determine how well students understand what they have learned.

Since Norview began with ATLAS in 1992, the number of students scoring above 1000 on combined SAT scores has increased over 300%. Parental involvement has increased to nearly 100 percent. Large numbers of parents are attending student-led parent conferences and enrolling in literacy training. In 1996, Norview High School was one of 19 schools recognized nationally for innovation in the classroom by the Redbook Magazine Blue Ribbon School Award.

Comments

"I won't go to a traditional program. I work more with this, but I don't regret it because my kids are taking responsibility for their own learning." ATLAS teacher.

"We have been most impressed with the positive outcomes of Gorham's involvement in the ATLAS project * * * During conferences held recently, we had the pleasure

of hearing our son explain what he had learned in school. Most rewarding of all, we saw evidence of tremendous growth and involvement in the quality of his work." ATLAS parent.

SUCCESS FOR ALL

Success for All is an elementary whole school reform program designed to ensure that all children are successful in reading, writing, and language arts from the beginning of their time in school. It uses innovative curricula and extensive professional development in grades pre-K to six; one-to-one tutoring for primary-age children struggling in reading; and extensive family support activities.

Lincoln Elementary School, Palm Beach County, Florida

Lincoln Elementary School, located in the shadow of the beachfront resort hotels, serves a very impoverished population of 1,230 students, 94% of whom are African-American. Eighty-six percent of the students qualify for free or reduced price lunches. Lincoln was one of the lowest-achieving schools in Palm Beach County, and was on the Florida State list of critically low-achieving schools. However, since implementing Success for All, reading scores have improved so much that it is no longer on that list. In 1996-97, Lincoln's reading comprehension scores increased an average of 12 percentage points. Students also made substantial progress on Florida's writing test.

Comments

"We've bought in. And one of the things that's important is that the staff does buy in to the program". Success for All principal.

"This is the first book I have found that makes a profound, positive impact on the literacy of a whole school population. Success for All works. My students are happy, productive readers." Success for All elementary school principal.

ROOTS AND WINGS

This elementary school reform model builds on the Success for All reading program and incorporates science, history, and math to achieve a comprehensive academic program. The premise of the model is that schools must do what it takes to make sure all students succeed. To that end, Roots and Wings schools provide at-risk students with tutors, family support, and a variety of other strategies aimed at eliminating obstacles to success. While the "roots" of the model refer to mastery of basics, the "wings" represent advanced accomplishments that students achieve through interdisciplinary projects and a challenging curriculum.

Lackland City Elementary School, San Antonio, Texas

Lackland City Elementary School, located in the southwest quadrant of San Antonio, Texas, originally served primarily military families, but now the community is primarily working class families employed in the private sector. The student body is primarily Hispanic; many students live with one parent and depend on public assistance. Student mobility is 40 percent. Lackland City Elementary successfully implemented the Success for All reading component in all grades. Special effort was put into making sure that all students had opportunities to take books home to read. Additional support was provided for reading by having older students listen to younger students read during breakfast served to most students in the school. The school began implementation of the Roots and Wings math component in the third, fourth, and fifth grades in the fall of 1996. The family support component has been in place since 1994. The school's focus on community involvement has led to a partnership with a local hospital to provide immunization services at the school.

Working with the Roots and Wings model, 84% of students achieved grade level objectives on the Texas statewide assessment in reading, and 85% achieved grade level objectives in math—representing an increase of 35 percentage points over the previous year. All students read books of their choice at home for at least 20 minutes each night. The school reports that 99% of parents listing to or discuss the reading with their children and sign a reading response form each week.

Comments

"When using the basal, many students acted like the dreaded math. After we had begun Math Wings and had gone over several lessons, there was a change. Now students get ready very quickly, more students get their homework in, and there is an enthusiasm for math and teamwork . . . More kids are excited, working on-task and enjoying it. It's great to see them enjoying it. I enjoy it more too." Roots and Wings teacher

NATIONAL ALLIANCE FOR RESTRUCTURING EDUCATION

The National Alliance is a partnership of schools, states and national organizations created to change the educational system through a five-point set of priorities called "design tasks". The design tasks include: standards and assessments, learning environments, high-performance management, community services and supports, and public engagement. This whole school reform model uses results-based, high performance management at the school and district levels with decentralized decision-making to restructure the learning environment to support student achievement and provide professional support to teachers and schools. The National Alliance seeks to enable all graduating high school students to attain the Certificate of Initial Mastery, a credential representing a high standard of academic accomplishment.

John F. Kennedy Elementary School, Louisville, Kentucky

Once known for all the wrong reasons, John F. Kennedy Elementary School—an inner city school in Louisville, Kentucky—has improved student performance remarkably over the past five years working with the National Alliance whole school reform model. Teachers and parents credit the school's remarkable improvement to its commitment to ensuring that all children achieve at high levels and a relentless focus on student achievement.

The school increased its scores on the Kentucky statewide assessment by 43% in reading and 48% in math. Over a three-year period, the school rose from among the lowest-scoring schools in the state to the top 10%. The school's principal, who was once summoned to the superintendent's office to explain a high kindergarten failure rate, in 1996 received a visit from the state commissioner of education who came to present her with a prestigious Milliken Family Foundation award.

Comments

"No child is lost in the shuffle at Kennedy." National Alliance Parent

"I could see us getting stronger and stronger. We began to focus on quality work for our students. Our students have many challenges on a personal level—families in distress, families where children are displaced, in homeless shelters. . . . We can give these children extra hugs and love and let them know we care. But when it comes to academic performance, there can be no excuses . . . We say, 'If you want an A, then this is what's required.'" Principal, John F. Kennedy Elementary School

MODERN RED SCHOOLHOUSE

The Modern Red Schoolhouse whole school reform model strives to help all students

achieve high standards in core academic subjects—English, geography, history, mathematics and science. Modern Red Schoolhouses are divided into three divisions, rather than 12 grades: primary, intermediate and upper. To advance to the next division, students must meet defined standards and pass "watershed assessments". Students complete investigations, give oral reports, answer essay questions and take multiple choice exams. Student progress is monitored through an Individual Education Compact, negotiated by the student, parent and teacher. This compact establishes goals, details parent and teacher responsibilities, and lists services the school, parents or community should provide.

Beech Grove Middle School, Beech Grove, Indiana

Beech Grove Middle School is located in a stable, suburban community outside of Indianapolis, Indiana. Its 500-student body is primarily Caucasian. Beech Grove began working with the Modern Red Schoolhouse model in the fall 1994. Staff have created a process to review, revise and develop new interdisciplinary, thematic curriculum units. Teachers track student work against the curriculum. The school leadership team works with the principal to make curricular and budgetary recommendations focused on increased student achievement. Each classroom is equipped with a phone, supported by voice mail, that has increased parent to teacher communication. The school has established a student mentoring program in partnership with a local high school with help from the school's community involvement task force.

In 1996, sixth-grade students experienced a 13% increase in total battery scores over the year before. Administrators and teachers attribute the increases in student achievement to enhanced and enriched curriculum content associated with the Modern Red Schoolhouse.

Comments

"We've been extremely pleased with our daughter's progress and willingness to learn. She loves the computer workshops. I would choose the Modern Red Schoolhouse again and again. Progressing at her pace is great and allows the child to feel successful. Super is our rating for MRSh!" Modern Red Schoolhouse Parent

This is gifted and talented program for all students." Modern Red Schoolhouse Parent

AUDREY COHEN COLLEGE SYSTEM OF EDUCATION

The Audrey Cohen College System of Education focuses student learning on the study and achievement of meaningful "purposes" for each semester's academic goals. Each purpose culminates in a "constructive action" undertaken by the class to serve the community. For example, in fourth grade, one purpose is "we work for good health"; in grade ten, a purpose is "I use science and technology to help shape a just and projective society". In the early grades, each class addresses its "purpose" as a group, planning and implementing a "constructive action" in the community with the guidance of a teacher. Older students plan and implement their own "constructive action" with teacher involvement. Embedded in each "purpose" are content areas such as English and math, and essential skills such as critical thinking and researching. Leadership is emphasized and students are expected to meet high academic standards. These fundamental changes in the curriculum and instruction become the organizing principles for all other school activities.

Simmons Elementary School, Hollandale, Mississippi

Simmons Elementary School, an Audrey Cohen College School of six years, is located

in Hollandale, a small rural town in the lower Delta region of western Mississippi. Simmons, which serves a high percentage of low-income students in one of the poorest communities in the country, has become a success story after state test scores were released in 1995. Across most grades, overall performance rose from the 30-40th percentile to the 50-60th percentile in the 1995-96 school year. Student scores continued to increase through 1996 when fifth grade students ranked third of all districts in the state in language, ninth in reading and 16th in mathematics.

Comments

"The 1994-95 school year has been very rewarding. I'm very much pleased with the relationships that have advanced between the school and the community. The Audrey Cohen College System of Education is really an asset to our rural, Delta town. The students in Hollandale have made some permanent changes in this town due to their Constructive Actions." Simmons Elementary School principal

"Sam is excited about each purpose and wants to participate in each step. He uses his mind for ideas of his own. He will be asked to do this to survive in his adult life. This is usually begun in college of private schools. I am extremely pleased that you allow this ability to grow at this young age." Audrey Cohen College parent

CO-NECT

The Co-NECT whole school reform model focuses on complex interdisciplinary projects that extensively incorporate technology and connect students with ongoing scientific investigations, information resources, and other students beyond their own school. Co-NECT schools use technology to enhance every aspect of teaching, learning, professional development, and school management. Cross-disciplinary teaching teams work with clusters of students. Most students stay in the same cluster with the same teachers for at least two years. A school team of teachers, administrators and parents sets goals for the school and monitors results. Performance-based assessments are used extensively.

Riviera Middle School, Dade County, Florida

Riviera Middle School is located in suburban Dade County, Florida—a community of mostly middle-income families outside of Miami. The school has primarily Hispanic students, of which 48% qualify for free or reduced price lunch. In 1995, the school began working with Co-NECT with a week-long training session for the staff. During the three years prior to becoming a Co-NECT school, Riviera had begun the process of training staff in how to use technology in the classroom, wiring all classrooms, and setting up a school-wide network. Working with Co-NECT, Riviera began using the technology to enhance a rigorous and challenging project-based curriculum.

After only one year of using the Co-NECT model, Riviera students' reading scores rose by 17% on the Florida statewide writing test. Riviera students also raised their math and reading scores by 3 percentile points across all grades. Faculty and student morale are at an all time high, and the school continues to be featured in local media as an outstanding example of the integration of technology into the classroom.

Comments

"We already had a lot of equipment, and our teachers were well trained in using complex software programs . . . But the emphasis in Co-NECT is not the equipment, it's how you use it". Riviera Middle School principal

"My kids are straight-A students. There was no reason to pull them out of a traditional school setting. But I wanted them to

do more than just read, memorize and be tested on things they could forget in six weeks. Co-NECT had more to offer them to help them become better-rounded students. This program helps them develop not just academic skills, but also skills to become self-starters, self-thinkers and self-motivators." Co-NECT Parent

EXPEDITIONARY LEARNING OUTWARD BOUND

The Expeditionary Learning whole school reform model is based on the belief that learning is an expedition into the unknown. Expeditionary Learning draws on the power of purposeful, intellectual investigations, called learning expeditions, to improve student achievement and build character. Learning expeditions are long-term, academically rigorous, interdisciplinary studies that require students to work inside and outside the classroom. In Expeditionary Learning schools, students and teachers stay together for more than one year, teachers work collaboratively through team teaching and shared planning, and tracking is eliminated.

Lincoln Elementary School, Dubuque, Iowa

Lincoln Elementary School, a 400-student school located in a lower, middle class neighborhood in Dubuque, Iowa, has been working with Expeditionary Learning since 1993. Faculty teach "learning expeditions" in every grade as a primary curriculum vehicle. Students now look forward in each grade to the "famous" expeditions. Teachers plan together by grade-level or clusters. All students have portfolios. A ropes course installed in the gym is used in all classes to develop teamwork and risk-taking for teachers and students. Test scores have improved significantly—4th graders improved in the Iowa Test of Basic Skills from the 43rd national percentile in 1992 to the 80th percentile in 1994. Parental participation in school affairs has increased dramatically.

Comments

"I felt like a real scientist looking into a microscope, and when I found the specimen I felt awesome. When you are done with the expedition, you go home and tell your mom and dad what you learned and they practically don't even know what you are talking about. Six weeks ago, I would never have known about pond life." Fifth grade Expeditionary Learning student, Dubuque, Iowa.

EVIDENCE OF THE RESULTS OF WHOLE SCHOOL REFORM

"Do we need many more models of how we can fix troubled schools? Yes, of course we do and fortunately, help is readily available. Dedicated educators like James Comer, Henry Levin, E.D. Hirsh, Deborah Maier, Ted Sizer, Marc Tucker and Gene Bottoms are doing the hard work of creating new models of excellence. The models are each unique in their own way. But they all have one common denominator—they all set high standards." Fourth Annual State of American Education Address, Secretary Richard Riley, 1997.

A 1997 study sponsored by the Department of Education found that students in several schools using schoolwide reforms began the study far below the national average, yet made academic gains toward or exceeding national means. In some schools the gains were dramatic. Progress made by students in the schools using Success for All and Comer School Development was particularly encouraging. The initially low-achieving students in the Success for All and Comer schools began the study with reading comprehension levels below even the average for low-achieving students in high-poverty schools. Yet, over their first three years in school, students in the Success for All and

Comer schools produced achievement scores that substantially exceeded both those of other students in high-poverty schools, and equaled or exceeded those of initially low-achieving students in typical schools." Special Strategies Studies for Educating Disadvantaged Children: Final Report, 1997.

Since 1992, elementary students from a group of schools in Prince Georges County, Maryland using the ATLAS model (a variation of the Comer School Development Program) raised their reading scores by 30 percent on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP). The proportion of all students in the ATLAS pathway scoring satisfactory or excellent on the exam tripled between 1992 and 1995.

At Norview High School—an ATLAS school in Norfolk, Virginia, the number of students scoring above 1000 on combined SAT scores has increased over 300% since the school began implementing the ATLAS model. In 1996, Norview High School was one of 19 schools recognized nationally for innovation in the classroom by the Redbook Magazine Blue Ribbon School Award.

After the principal at West Mecklenburgh High School in Charlotte, North Carolina, reorganized the school using the Comer School Development Program, the number of students on the honor roll jumped 75%, the number of students enrolled in advanced classes increased 25%, and attendance rose from 89% to 94%.

Evaluation of seven years of continuous data on the six original Success for All schools in Baltimore and Philadelphia showed that students increase their reading performance significantly compared to a matched control school, as measured by reliable and valid instruments. Researchers found that Success for All students tend to perform about three months ahead of control students by the first grade and more than a year ahead by the fifth grade, indicating that the program has not only an immediate effect on students' reading performance, but also that the effect increases over successive years of use by schools. Research and Development Report, Center for Research on the Education of Students Placed At Risk, Johns Hopkins University, October 1996.

Success for All has had particularly promising results for language minority students. Schools using Lee Connigo—the Spanish version of Success for All—in Philadelphia found that Lee Connigo students at the end of the 2nd grade were nearly a grade ahead of students in control schools.

In one review of promising schoolwide reforms, researchers reported significant achievement gains for students in schools using several New American School designs, including Roots and Wings, ATLAS, Co-NECT, Modern Red Schoolhouse, Expeditionary Learning, and the National Alliance for Restructuring Education, Promising Programs for Elementary and Middle Schools: Evidence of Effectiveness and Replicability, Olatokunbo Fashola and Robert Slavin, January 1997.

Using the Modern Red Schoolhouse model, the Hansberry Elementary School in the Bronx, New York increased the percentage of students who passed New York State's essential skills test from 22% to 50% in reading and from 47% to 82% in math from 1993 to 1995. In two years, Hansberry School also doubled its score on the Degrees of Reading Power exam, which measures how many students are reading at or above the 50th percentile.

The John F. Kennedy Elementary School in Louisville, Kentucky increased its scores on the Kentucky statewide assessment by 43% in reading and 48% in math, working with the National Alliance reform model. Over a three-year period, the school rose

from among the lowest-scoring schools in the state to the top 10%.

The Riviera Middle School is located in suburban Dade County, Florida and began working with the Co-NECT reform model in August 1995. Since 1995, SAT scores are up 3 percentile points in both reading math across all grades, and the school continues to be featured in local media as an outstanding example of the integration of technology into the curriculum.

A group of Expeditionary Learning schools in Dubuque, Iowa raised test scores in reading and math from 1992 to 1994 on the Iowa Test of Basic Skills. At Lincoln Elementary, 4th graders improved from the 43rd national percentile in 1992 to the 80th percentile in 1994. At Table Mound Elementary, 4th graders' percentiles increased from 39 in 1992 to 80 in 1994 when they were retested in the 6th grade.

Lackland City Elementary School began working with the Success For All model in the fall of 1994, and implemented the math component of Roots and Wings in the fall of 1996. Over 80% of students are achieving grade level objectives in reading and math, and the school reports that 99% of parents help their children with reading for 20 minutes each night.

Significant improvement in student outcomes was achieved by the Central Park East schools in New York City using the principles of the Coalition of Essential Schools. New Leaders for Tomorrow's Schools, North Central Regional Educational Laboratory, Winter 1995.

By developing its own secondary school, Central Park East in New York City—a member of the Coalition of Essential Schools—increased the percentage of elementary school graduates going on to college from two-thirds to 91 percent.

A study of Roots and Wings carried out in four pilot schools in St. Mary's County, Maryland—where an average of 48 percent of students qualified for free lunch and 21 percent were Title 1 eligible—in rural southern Maryland found that Roots and Wings students showed substantial growth on Maryland School Performance Assessment Program 3rd and 5th grade assessments. The number of Roots and Wings students achieving satisfactory or excellent increased by twice as much as the state rate in all subjects tested (reading, language, writing, math, science, and social studies). Bold Plans for School Restructuring: The New American Schools Development Corporation Designs, 1996.

From 1993 to 1995, the number of Roots and Wings 3rd graders scoring satisfactory or better increased by almost 19%, while the percentage of other Maryland 3rd graders scoring at least satisfactory increased only 8%. Statewide, 5th graders gained an average of 6 percentage points, compared with a gain of 13 percentage points for Roots and Wings 5th graders.

Recent data analysis from studies of a New York school district indicate significant effects on student achievement in schools using the Comer School Development program. Sixteen schools were arranged into groups based on the degree to which they were effectively implementing the Comer model. In schools implementing Comer to a high degree, 61% of students were at or above the national average in math scores and 56% were above in reading scores. In schools implementing Comer to a low degree, 40% of students were at or above the national average in math scores and only 36% were above in reading scores. Researchers found a significant correlation between the effectiveness of implementation of the Comer model and student outcomes. Comer School Development Program Effects: A Ten Year Review, 1986–1996, Norris Haynes and Christine Emmons, 1997.

An assessment of Comer effects (1987) in the Prince George's County Schools revealed that average percentile gains on the California Achievement Test were significantly greater for Comer schools than for the district as a whole. At the third grade level, program schools gained about 18 percentile points in mathematics, 9 percentile points in reading, and 17 percentile point in language. The district as a whole registered gains of 11, 4, and 9 percentile points respectively in math, reading and language. At the fifth grade level, Comer schools recorded gains of 21, 7, and 12 percentile points in math, reading and language compared to gains in 11, 4, and 7 percentile points for the district as a whole. Academic gains were linked to the degree and quality of implementation of the Comer School Development Program. Rallying the Whole Village: The Comer Process for Reforming Education, 1996.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, together with my thanks for the absolutely wonderful job that he has done in working with the subcommittee to bring the bill to the floor in its present form.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding me this time. I congratulate him and the gentleman from Wisconsin for the outstanding job that they have done on bringing this most extraordinarily difficult bill thus far.

The fact is, as has been just said by the gentleman from Wisconsin, we currently have a consensus which offers to the Members of the House a bill which fundamentally intact can be presented to the Senate, and if it comes back in roughly the same way, we have every expectation will be signed into law, without all the controversy and the rancor that has taken place in this bill in years past.

I would urge all Members to consider that we went through an exercise in the spring on the disaster relief bill to guarantee that government would stay open and that the Government would be funded at last year's level if we could not reach an agreement. Because of a Presidential veto, that discussion became moot. But we do not have to have a cataclysm. We do not have to disrupt the people's business and erupt into a major political warfare this year if we would understand that we do not, any one of us, get everything we want. But, we must work the magic of this body, in the House of Representatives, and the others do in the other body, to come together, to reach a consensus and to arrive at the consensus, thereby sending it to the President of the United States for his signature in the hopes that he will adopt our consensus.

So far, so good. I am happy that I can say for the most part I think Members will vote for this bill, in bipartisan fashion. But we do have a number of Members on both sides who have, as has been indicated by the gentleman from Wisconsin, who are unhappy with

the bill as it currently stands. About a month ago, some Members were advising that they might unload 100, 150 amendments on this bill. I am pleased to report to our friends here that that does not seem to be likely, that those Members that were interested in just totally transforming the face of this bill have used their discretion to narrow their differences. I do not expect a lot of amendments. I expect frankly, certainly fewer than 15 or 10 on our side, and I do not know how many on the Democrat side.

That is a step in the right direction. But obviously there are going to be Members, maybe many Members, who have critical differences with some provisions that are in the bill and who might be vitally unhappy that other issues of interest to them are not included in the bill. To them, regardless of whether they are on the Republican or the Democrat side, let me simply say that, folks, it takes 218 to pass this bill and move it to the other body. Over there it takes 51 to pass it. From the conference, it takes 218 in this body to adopt the conference report, and again 51 over there to adopt the conference report, whereupon that final report will go to the President for his signature, and again currently I expect the President's signature.

That can change. We can decide to dig in. We can opt for total and absolute conflagration or confrontation, whatever we want to call it. I do not think that is going to happen. I commend any Members who have wanted to start out on that road and who have withdrawn that approach in favor of an isolated, single amendment approach.

But let me simply try to calm the tenor of their vehemence or the voracious arguments that they might make on behalf of their positions and say that sooner or later, sooner or later the appropriations bill governing labor, health, and education and related issues will pass. That will take place and it will be signed into law. Either within the next few weeks or the next few months or next year, we are going to get a 1998 labor, health appropriations bill, because it has got to.

□ 1745

I hope very strongly that it is not next year, that it is not 3 months from now, and that it will be within the next couple of weeks. I urge my friends who are thinking that this bill is so defective that they cannot support it to rethink their position for this reason:

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] has, indeed, come a long way when he approved the compromise, the bipartisan compromise between those who were fervently pro-life and those who are fervently not, to adopt the Hyde abortion language to extend HMO, something that has never been done before. They came together; we have language in this bill which reaches that compromise.

The ergonomics language pointed out by the gentleman from Wisconsin has

been fought by the minority not just since 1994, but whenever it has come up in the past. It has been fought; it has been defeated. We have language which, small and large business alike emphatically embraces.

Under the leadership of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BONILLA], we have got the Dickey-Wicker amendment preventing research funds, U.S. funds expended for embryo research. We have tons of money for medical research, cancer research. We eliminate 20 new programs. Twenty new programs are completely terminated because of their inefficiency and their waste.

In this bill alone, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WICKER] did prevail for the first time, and he has been trying for several years to help small manufacturers of furniture in the South to overcome the EPA restrictions on methochloride, and the list goes on and on.

This bill is a consensus. I commend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], I commend the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], I commend all the staff for working together to bring people together to get a bill that can pass and can be signed into law. And I urge any Members who are dissatisfied that it is not a good enough deal to understand that we in the majority will only prove that we can govern if, in fact, we can produce a reasonable bill with as little rancor as possible.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 seconds.

Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to follow up the chairman's comments by expressing my appreciation for the fact that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and the staff have worked intensely hard. They have worked in a very fair manner, in a very open manner, and the staff has worked incredibly hard to produce many of the answers that the Members like to claim credit for, and I simply want to express my appreciation for all of that work and hope that that spirit can continue.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. STOKES], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my distinguished ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for yielding to me, and I rise in support of H.R. 2264.

First, I want to commend our chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for their joint efforts in producing what I think is an excellent bill.

Mr. Chairman, this year's bill includes enhanced funding for a number of critical quality of life programs that we can be especially proud of. For example, the bill funds for the first time the Youth Opportunity Areas Initiative. The program would be funded at \$125 million.

This employment training program is long overdue and is absolutely essential to effectively addressing the continuing double-digit unemployment and the underemployment among our Nation's out-of-school youth. These are young people that in many instances have given up on the system and on themselves and they have been allowed to waste away.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation cannot afford to give up on any of its citizens. It is for this reason that I am pleased that our colleagues from the authorizing committee are working to fully authorize this program.

Members will be interested to note our colleagues in the Senate share our commitment to out-of-school youth and have provided \$250 million for the youth opportunity areas in their fiscal year 1998 appropriations measure. It is my hope that in conference we can work to come somewhat closer to the Senate figure.

Mr. Chairman, while more needs to be done to enhance support for this important program and others in H.R. 2264, communities across the country will benefit from the \$324.4 million increase provided for Head Start. Our Nation's neediest children will continue to benefit from the Head Start Program's comprehensive development and early learning activities.

The \$32 million increase provided for the TRIO programs would help to expand the success of TRIO's activities to additional students. The Nation's continued investment in the TRIO program is absolutely essential. This program is specifically designed to improve the recruitment, retention, and graduation rates of minority and other disadvantaged students.

For health professions' training programs, the bill restores and enhances funding by providing an appropriation of \$306.5 million, a \$13.7 million increase. Within the appropriations provided, the bill provides significant increases for minority and disadvantaged health professions students. For example, the measure includes a \$2.6 million increase for the Centers of Excellence, a \$3.2 million increase for the Health Careers Opportunity Program, and a \$2.4 million increase for the Scholarships for Disadvantaged Students Program.

The bill also includes a \$16.4 million increase for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. These funds will go a long way toward helping to improve and strengthen academic and related areas of infrastructure needs in our Nation's historically black colleges and universities. The \$10 million increase for magnet schools would help communities to better carry out school desegregation plans.

The bill also includes a \$172 million increase for the Ryan White AIDS program; a \$24 million increase for consolidated health centers; \$30.4 million increase for substance abuse and mental health services; and the \$764.4 million increase for biomedical research.

Now while we can be encouraged by these enhancements, there are many important areas of the bill that need to be strengthened, including youth violence prevention, safe and drug-free schools, magnet schools, health care and substance abuse services, and employment training. I look forward to working with my colleagues in conference to strengthen these very important programs.

Mr. Chairman, I know that in working together we can further strengthen H.R. 2264. Thus, I urge my colleagues to join together in voting yes on H.R. 2264.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK], a valued member of our subcommittee, and I might add an active member of our subcommittee.

Mr. ISTOOK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time. I appreciate the hard effort that so many people have put into this particular piece of legislation, but I really rise not as a member of the subcommittee but as a father because there are so many things in this piece of legislation that affect so many aspects of our lives, our kids and their education, our health, our nutrition, the Labor Department, and all of the impact upon where we work, and, indeed, it also affects very, very directly the relationship between us and our children.

I have five children, two boys and three girls, and all three of my girls are teenagers, and I pay attention when a situation happens such as happened in Illinois recently, when it is disclosed that a 37-year-old teacher begins an affair with a 13-year-old girl, carries it on for a year and a half, and, to continue the affair, takes her to a title X clinic funded by our taxpayers' money to obtain contraception.

Now, if this were to any other type of clinic, they would be required to report a situation that involves something such as statutory rape or child abuse or sexual abuse of a minor. Well, see, title X has a Federal requirement that whatever happens with anyone who comes into a title X clinic, whether they be 30 or 40 or 20 or 15 or 12 or 11, nothing will be told to anyone. A total confidentiality requirement is written into the Federal regulations which supersede State law, and anyone else that would be required to report this incident to the parents or the authorities has to stay quiet under title X.

That is why we have an amendment in this particular bill that is being offered for this particular bill that says providers that are given Federal funding in these are not exempt and must comply with any laws regarding the reporting of child abuse, child molestation, sexual abuse, rape, or incest.

This is a key provision that will be debated, but I think it is one of the most important things because this bill hits us where we live and our families, and the Federal Government should not be inducing people to be able to conduct such activity without even parents being told.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. LOWEY], a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I fully supported this bill as it was reported by committee. It was a bipartisan effort of which I am quite proud.

Since the beginning of the last Congress, the Labor-HHS education bill has been the focus of contentious debate, which even led to a Government shutdown. At long last, the committee under the strong leadership of the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], has succeeded in producing a bill which reflects our shared priorities.

In keeping with the bipartisan spirit of the bill, the committee voted to oppose all new controversial legislative riders. I strongly urge my colleague to oppose the Goodling and Istook amendments. They are opposed by the administration, highly controversial, and do not belong in this bill. And let me say at the outset, if these amendments pass, support for the bill by Members of this body will be jeopardized and it would be very unfortunate if that occurs.

The bill, as reported by committee, recognizes the clear need for an increased investment in our children's education, and I am pleased that we were able to provide \$2.8 billion more than last year in discretionary funds for education. In particular, I am pleased that new funds have been provided to keep our schools open after hours in order to improve reading and other academic skills and that we have increased funding for magnet schools.

I salute the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for developing a school reform proposal that would build upon the most successful models across the country, including several located in New York.

I also want to note that we have increased the maximum Pell grant by \$300 per student. We made a number of significant increases in health programs. We were able to provide NIH with a 6-percent increase over last year. This will allow NIH to increase funding for breast cancer research so that advances in prevention and treatment will continue to move forward. We were also able to provide a modest increase for the Centers for Disease Control, the agency which safeguards our Nation's public health.

In the labor area, I am particularly pleased that we provided \$170 million more than last year for adult job training. These funds will help to assist those on welfare so that they can better obtain decent paying jobs.

Of course there are some programs that I believe should be better funded than they are in this bill. Specifically, I am disappointed that there is no money for the State Students Incentive Grant Program and no increase for teacher training under the Eisenhower

program. I am also deeply concerned about the inadequacy of funds for aging services, particularly for senior centers and meal programs, and I hope that we can move toward the Senate levels on these programs.

I am also concerned that the committee has not provided adequate funds to cities to care for people with AIDS nor to prevent HIV infection and the spread of AIDS. Worker protection programs are also now funded at adequate levels.

But this is a very good bill that meets so many of the important needs of our constituents. Please let us keep it free of new controversial riders.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER], a very, very able member of our subcommittee.

□ 1800

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, not that I am overly excited about all the details in the bill, but as a fiscal conservative, I have some problems with it. But the bottom line is, with the election last November stating we are going to have a Democratic President and Republican Congress, we must work together.

I am concerned that the total amount of money is too much. I wish we could have frozen the amount of money and forced ourselves here to reprioritize how money should be spent in the committee.

I wish we were not funding all the new programs. I do not think we need to fund new programs. We need to get a better handle on the spending we have to date.

I wish we could zero out some more programs that we do not need any more. We have over 200 education programs in this bill. Maybe the total amount of dollars is okay for education, but do we need 200 programs?

A lot of them are small programs. We made a big effort last year to start reducing those programs. We are moving in the right direction. I wish we could continue more in that direction to consolidate programs and not have as many programs.

There are big programs like LIHEAP, and I know that is a major issue with the ranking member of this committee that I think has outlived its need in this country. It was started back in the Jimmy Carter days when he was President. We have changed. That is \$1 billion a year. I would rather put it in the National Institutes for Health.

There are some programs that I think are overfunded in this program, and I wish we could change them. I think NLRB is almost \$200 million for government lawyers. I do not think we need that much money for the NLRB.

I think Howard University is getting \$18,000 a year subsidy for every student at the school. I support Howard University, but I wonder, do we need to provide \$18,000 for every student there? I think we could make a better use of

our dollars and spread it out for all the other minority universities and colleges around the country.

And then there are some programs that I think we should even increase more. I was delighted that the NIH got an increase of 6 percent. That is a \$764-million increase. The President requested only a 2.6-percent increase. I think we could do even better. If we are going to have a goal to go to \$25 billion of funding for something that, to me, is a Federal priority, that is good for this country, that is one of the crown jewels of the Federal Government, I think we need to continue pushing that.

But the bottom line is, we need to govern. The President was elected last November and we need to work out a compromise. This is the best we can do. I commend the chairman for the work he has done.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California [Ms. PELOSI], also a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for giving me this time, and I rise in support of the Labor-HHS-Education appropriations bill for fiscal 1998, as presented. In particular, I commend our chairman, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], chairman of the full committee; the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], ranking member of the full committee and ranking member of the subcommittee, for negotiating an excellent bipartisan bill, a bill in which the subcommittee can take considerable pride. I congratulate the gentlemen.

This bill is a refreshing change from the last 2 years when the bill has been the focus of deep ideological disputes in spite of the good intentions of our chairmen, and a vehicle for sending objectionable legislative riders to the President.

Thankfully, we have returned to the bipartisan tradition which has historically characterized this bill. As our former chairman, Mr. Natcher, would say, this is a good bill.

As Members know, the bill deals with Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education. With regard to labor programs, the bill makes significant changes in job training, including the Job Corps, and increases for job, youth, and adult job training by \$237 million over this year's funding.

At the same time, the bill adequately funds worker protection programs, and unlike the last 2 years, does not include riders designed to weaken the protection of American workers.

I am particularly pleased that under an agreement negotiated by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], OSHA will be able to continue its important work in developing an ergonomic standard and will be able to assist business in the next year to adopt important changes in the work environment designed to prevent repetitive stress injuries.

As a recent GAO study concludes, ergonomic programs work, reducing injuries and reducing workers' compensation costs by 31 to 91 percent.

Of particular note, the bipartisan agreement also provides the committee will refrain from any further restrictions on issuing ergonomics standards beyond 1998.

With regard to health, the bill is a significant improvement over the past agreement, which proposed to phase in a 16-percent reduction in public health programs.

Remarkably, this bill provides for a 6-percent increase in important biomedical research programs, including important research on breast cancer. It expands on our Federal response to new and emerging infectious diseases, and restores proposed cuts to training programs in the health professions.

In addition, the bill provides almost \$300 million for the AIDS Drug Assistance program, an increase of \$132 million, or 79 percent over comparable 1997 funding. This funding will make the difference between life and death for thousands of Americans living with HIV disease. While I wish we had done more to fund important HIV prevention outreach activities, my hope is by the time this bill emerges from conference with the Senate, the problem will be resolved.

With regard to education, I am pleased that so many of the President's important education priorities have been accommodated in this bill. In particular, I am very pleased at the increase of \$93 million in the bilingual program and with the investment in support services and professional development to improve the quality of these programs.

I am also pleased with the high priority placed on direct financial assistance for students in higher education.

Mr. Chairman, for all these reasons, this bill is a great improvement over the spending levels assumed in the budget agreement. My hope is that the careful bipartisan work that has brought us to this point is not disrupted by hostile amendments during floor consideration. I urge my colleagues reject amendments that would derail this important legislation.

Mr. Chairman, I commend once again the chairman of the full committee and our ranking member for their leadership.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington, [Mr. NETHERCUTT] a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H.R. 2264, the Labor-HHS appropriations bill. I know I speak on behalf of the entire Congressional Diabetes Caucus when I thank Chairman PORTER for his efforts to combat diabetes. Along with Speaker GINGRICH, who has drawn the Nation's attention to this terrible disease, Chairman PORTER has persuaded NIH to examine its funding priorities.

This bill will do much to help the 16 million diabetics in our country. It increases funding for NIH by 6 percent and for the National Institute on Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, [NIDDK] by 7.5 percent.

Along with funding provided through the Balanced Budget Act, the increase in this bill will begin to make up for past funding discrepancies between NIDDK and the other Institutes of the National Institutes of Health.

Over the last 10 years, funding for diabetes research has not even kept pace with inflation, despite the increases provided to NIH by Congress. So it is my hope and my expectation that a significant portion of the 7.5-percent increase will go toward combating diabetes, a deadly disease in our country.

The bill also includes legislation I have introduced, the Diabetes Research Amendments Act, to establish a diabetes working group to outline future diabetes research priorities. A report under these amendments will be submitted to Congress within 1 year, which, in essence, will be a blueprint, a national blueprint, for future diabetes research. This plan is necessary to best direct the funding dollars and to begin a redoubling of our effort to advance a cure for diabetes.

So I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] and I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and others who had a hand in crafting this bill, and including the very significant efforts to assist in combating the disease of diabetes that affects so many people around our country.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland, [Mr. HOYER] a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Wisconsin, and want to rise in support of H.R. 2264.

For the past 3 years, the bill that came to this floor had very controversial riders and did not provide, in my opinion, adequate funding for education. My colleagues and I have repeatedly argued to increase the Nation's commitment to education.

This year's bill, by and large, provides funding at levels that are good for our children, good for our families, and good for our Nation. The bill does a better job in meeting the needs of children, families, and schools for quality education.

For example, the bill invests \$4.3 billion in Head Start, a \$324 million increase over the past fiscal year, a program that Ronald Reagan said works, with a goal of serving 1 million children by the year 2002. Not enough, but better.

The bill acknowledges the commitment we must make to our children's education by funding initiatives such as Even Start and After School Centers. The bill provides for an 11-percent increase for education over last year, timely, when we have more students in our public schools than at any time in our history.

Specifically, the bill gives a much needed increase in funding to title I, bilingual education and special education. The bill recognizes important programs that enhance educational resources and improve professional development, such as the National Board of Professional Teaching Standards and the National Education Goals Panel.

Unfortunately, however, the bill spends \$145 million less than the President requested on Goals 2000 and provides the \$260 million for the President's America Reads program for fiscal year 1999, rather than 1998.

Additionally, the bill does not fully fund the Eisenhower Professional Development program, which assists communities in improving the quality of their teachers, a critical objective.

I would like to have seen the full funding for these important initiatives in this bill, but I will remain faithful to our bipartisan agreement and support this bill.

Like my predecessors on my side of the aisle, I will support this bill with a caveat, and that caveat, Mr. Chairman, is that we do not go down the road that we went down in 1995 and 1996 and add to this bill amendments that are clearly unacceptable, not only to the President of the United States, but to the American people. I would hope we do not do that.

There are amendments pending which, very frankly, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], courageously, in my opinion, and with wisdom and in the best traditions of bipartisan leadership, rejected in our subcommittee. But if they are added on the floor, I am worried that this bill, with the good provisions in it for labor, for education, and for the health of the American public will not go forward.

I would hope that we would not see that, and, if we do not see that, I intend to support this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], my friend and colleague.

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this bill. Chairman Porter and the subcommittee have accomplished a true feat, a bipartisan bill that manages to fund the most critical programs within its jurisdiction, despite the tight allocation for fiscal year 1998.

I am just going to highlight some of the points in the bill, because I do not have time to go through the thoroughness of the issues that are covered so well.

The bill provides a 6-percent increase for the National Institutes of Health. Chairman Porter has truly been a champion of biomedical research and has once again demonstrated his commitment to this critical priority.

The legislation appropriates \$1.2 billion for the Ryan White AIDS Program, 17 percent more than 1997. HIV-AIDS prevention received a \$5 million increase, less than 1 percent over last

year's level, and we hope that funding will be increased.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for once again including report language I submitted on HIV-AIDS in women, STDs, autoimmune diseases, and violence prevention among youth.

It also appropriates \$2.4 billion for the Centers for Disease Control, an increase of \$87 million over last year, including increases for breast and cervical cancer screening, sexually transmitted disease prevention, preventive health services block grant, chronic and environmental disease prevention, lead poison prevention and injury control, among others.

The title X family planning program receives a \$5 million increase. The bill includes full funding for the Violence against Women Act and provides a \$72 million increase for battered women's shelters.

The legislation also provides critical increases in education funding from Healthy Start to Head Start; Even Start, student financial aid, it provides an increase in funding over present levels. Students with disabilities will have programs increased to the tune of \$4.3 billion.

As a strong advocate for providing telecommunications service, I am also pleased the Technology Literacy Challenge Fund is also funded and the Women in Apprenticeship in Nontraditional Occupations.

Mr. Chairman, I could really go on for about 5 more minutes, but frankly, I will use these last seconds to simply say again, my commendation, my congratulations, to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member, and to members of the subcommittee for their fine work.

While difficult decisions had to be made, I believe that this subcommittee has crafted a bill worthy of our support. I urge my colleagues to vote for this bill.

□ 1815

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Connecticut [Ms. DELAURO], also a member of the subcommittee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill, which I hope to be able to vote in favor at the end of this debate. I particularly want to commend Chairman PORTER and our ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], for the fine work and the extraordinary amount of time and effort they have put into putting this bill together and trying to deal with the numerous interests of Members, and more than that, with the issues that face this subcommittee, which face the people of this country.

I am particularly pleased that it contains a substantial increase for health research at the NIH, for disease prevention work at the Centers for Disease Control, and for important educational programs, such as Head Start and IDEA.

The bill is not ideal. It does not contain funds for breast and cervical cancer screening, for a program which would serve women between the ages of 40 to 50 who will become eligible for mammograms, and I truly do look forward to working with the chairman in conference to be able to raise this figure.

I would have hoped to have had an opportunity and preferred additional funding for the Goals 2000 State efforts to raise the quality of education in our public schools, and am disappointed that it continues to deny poor women access to abortion services.

I believe overall this is a good bill. My hope is that the bipartisan agreements will be maintained and there not be controversial changes made, those that are threatened; and my hope is that those controversial changes will not jeopardize the bill through unwise amendments.

There have been several amendments which will be proposed which undermine national, State and local efforts to bring our schools up to meet the highest education standards. I hope my colleagues will join me in strenuous opposition to these amendments. The Whole School Reform initiative of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] will ensure that our schools teach our children to read, write, and to do basic mathematics, giving them the tools they need to compete in a global economy. Our children will compete for jobs in a national and even a global marketplace. We must be sure that our local school systems are given the tools that they need to meet those national and global expectations.

I will oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ISTOOK] of the title XV Family Planning Program. There is no doubt this parental notification amendment will increase teen pregnancy, teen abortion, and sexually transmitted disease. Similar amendments were defeated by bipartisan votes on the floor last year and in full committee this year. I urge my colleagues to vote against these amendments, which would undermine the fine work that was done by the chairman and the ranking member and other members of the subcommittee.

What we need to have and what we need to support is a clean bipartisan bill of which we can all be proud, and which helps to meet the needs of the American people who so desperately depend on the work we do in this committee, which addresses almost every aspect of people's lives in this country.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in addition to noting and thanking the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, for the key role he has played, and my ranking member the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the ranking member on the full committee for the excellent work he has done to make this a bipartisan bill.

I want to note that we have two new members this year on our subcommittee, the gentlewoman from Kentucky, Ms. ANNE NORTHUP, on our side, and the gentlewoman from Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, on the Democratic side, in a reprise. We are glad to have both of them with us.

In addition, I want to thank the staff of our full Committee on Appropriations. They have been extremely helpful to us every step of the way, led by Jim Dyer, as they have been to all of the other subcommittees during this very difficult appropriation season on the House floor. They really do a tremendous job for our country and for the House of Representatives.

I also want to thank Mark Mioduski and Cheryl Smith of the minority staff of the committee for the excellent cooperation and courtesy they have extended to us, and I want to thank my own subcommittee staff, Tony McCann, the clerk, Bob Knisely, Sue Quantius, Mike Myers, Francine Mack, and Laura Stephens. Each of them do excellent work, and I do not know how we could possibly bring this bill forward without the kind of attention to detail that they have had. Laura is on detail to the committee from the Department of Veterans Affairs, and she has been a great help to us recently.

I would also thank our previous detailee, Gloria Corral, from the Department of Education. Gloria was with us for several months earlier in the year and did a fine job, as well.

Finally, I want to thank Julie DeBolt and David Sander of my own personal staff for the fine job and hard work they have done all year long in reference to this bill.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of funding in the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations bill for historically black colleges and universities in the United States. I am also elated to note that this bill appropriates more funding to historically black colleges and universities than what was officially requested in the President's budget proposal. In all, this funding is indicative of Congress' commitment to the preservation of educational opportunity for students of color in our Nation.

Among many universities, Howard University, my alma mater, here in Washington, DC, will stand to receive approximately \$210 million. This money will be used for the continued procurement of academic and educational programming, and to fund much needed renovation efforts throughout various dormitories. I graduated phi beta kappa from Howard in 1973. The wonderful experience and enriching environment of Howard shaped the way in which I view and live in today's world. It is because of Howard University and funding for historically black colleges and universities that I am able to address this distinguished body as a Member of the U.S. House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, historically black colleges and universities have graduated many leaders in the world of law, finance, ministry, and government. The late Justice Thurgood Marshall led a fight to end the vestiges of racial segregation. Dr. Martin Luther King Jr., was a

leader in the civil rights movement in the 1960's. People not just in the United States, but around the world, have benefited from the contributions and efforts of many graduates of historically black colleges and universities.

Mr. Chairman, as we stand on the brink of the 21st century, it is readily apparent that education is the means by which success is achieved. In our increasingly technical and sophisticated world economy, it is exorbitantly important that we launch an indefatigable initiative toward educational success for all Americans. I believe that the mission of historically black colleges and universities throughout our Nation comport with the mission.

So in conclusion, I exhort my colleagues to vote in support of increased funding for historically black colleges and universities in America. Let us say yes to our children's futures, say yes to our children's success, and say yes to the success of our nation for the years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise to commend the chairman of our subcommittee, my colleague from Illinois, Mr. PORTER, for his leadership on this bill because this is a good bill that will have an impact on virtually every American family.

Our subcommittee worked hard to prioritize the resources for the many important health and education programs included in this legislation.

High priority was given to continued funding for the National Institutes of Health, which receives a \$764.5 million or a 6 percent increase over the 1997 level and \$427.1 million more than requested by the President. As I have said many times, NIH remains the preeminent biomedical research program of its kind anywhere in the world. Our investment in unlocking the mysteries of diseases and identifying new, life-saving therapies are repaid many times over in lower health care costs, a higher quality of life, and a cure for many diseases for which there was no successful treatment just a few years ago.

We have continued to make great strides in the war on cancer including breast and prostate cancer, in addition to heart disease, stroke, diabetes, Alzheimer's disease, Parkinsons disease, mental illness, sickle cell anemia, arthritis, osteoporosis, and other diseases that rob the young and old of years of life and lead to much pain and suffering. When we are so close to winning the battle on so many fronts, this is not the time to retreat from our commitment to remain the world leader in biomedical research.

A health care area of special interest to our committee, where a small continuing investment over the past few years has paid off, is the National Marrow Donor Program. Established by Congress in 1986, we are celebrating the 10th anniversary of a working national marrow donor registry that matches potential donors with patients in need of a transplant who would otherwise die from leukemia or any one of 60 other fatal blood disorders.

Since bringing to my colleagues attention the need for a national registry to provide access to a large pool of prospective unrelated individuals who might have matching bone marrow for patients in need of transplants, I have had nothing but unwavering support from the members of this committee and my colleagues in the House and Senate. The result

of this effort is a program that is a true medical miracle which is saving lives every day throughout our Nation and around the world.

Later this year, The National Marrow Donor Program will register its three millionth prospective donor. My colleagues may recall that early in my search for a home for the national registry, some Federal officials told me we would never recruit more than 50,000 volunteers who were willing to donate their bone marrow to a complete stranger.

We proved them wrong and in doing so have given a second chance at life to thousands of men, women, and children. As the registry continues to grow, so do the number of transplants. More importantly, we have given hope to thousands of families who otherwise would have faced the prospect of certain death for a loved one.

This hope circles the globe as we exchange bone marrow on a regular basis with 14 other nations who have patterned their national registries after our own. Because genetics play such a crucial role in a successful match, this access to potential bone marrow donors from throughout the world has helped save the lives of patients here who were unable to find a matched donor in our national registry. Indeed, bone marrow is crossing international borders on a weekly basis, saving lives here and abroad. Nothing I can think of will help bring the nation's of the world closer together.

Our committee has included in the bill \$15,270,000 for the continued operations of the national registry under the oversight of the Health Resources and Services Administration [HRSA]. Responsibility for the registry was transferred in 1995 from NIH to HRSA. The Navy continues to play a leading role in providing operational support and direction to the program with additional funding made available by our Appropriations Subcommittee on National Security.

Other small, but significant health care programs established and supported by our subcommittee are also saving lives throughout our Nation. With the \$13 million included in this legislation for the Emergency Medical Services Program for Children we are increasing public awareness and training health care professionals for the unique emergency medical needs of acutely ill and seriously injured children. More than 40 States have now established training programs to improve the quality of care available for children. The leading cause of death for them continues to be accident and injury.

We have made a significant investment in this bill in other areas of preventative health care. Notably, we have included \$145 million for the Centers for Disease Control's breast and cervical cancer screening program to provide early cancer detection for many low- and middle-income women who otherwise would not receive life-saving early warnings.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, within the Department of Health and Human Services, we have included \$14 million for the National Youth Sports Program, which gives many disadvantaged youth their first exposure to a college campus. In addition to inspiring these children to stay in school so they can one day attend college, the program also provides health care screening, hot meals, math and science enrichment, and a strong anti-drug and anti-violence message.

Our subcommittee has also provided for the educational needs of our Nation's children

from their preschool years through college. Once again we have increased Head Start funding, this year by \$324 million to more than \$4.3 billion. This is good news for Pinellas County, FL, which I am proud to say is home to a nationally recognized Head Start program that does an outstanding job in preparing our youngest students for their entry into elementary school.

Also included in this legislation is \$7.7 billion in grants to State and local education agencies for disadvantaged youth. This is \$395 million more than is available for the current year. We have provided an additional \$350 million for school improvement programs, \$556 million for safe and drug free school programs, and \$4.3 billion for special education.

In the area of higher education, our committee has maintained its emphasis on providing direct assistance to college students. The bill includes funding to allow the maximum Pell Grant to rise to \$3,000. In addition, we have increased funding for Federal work-study programs, TRIO, and minority institutions.

Among the myriad of Federal agencies funded in this bill, we continue our support for the Social Security Administration and the Medicare contractors, to allow them to process claims in a timely manner and to update their technological base to improve service to older Americans.

Mr. Speaker, as I said at the outset, this is one appropriations bill which touches virtually every American family. It is also one that makes major investments in improving quality of life through health care services, important biomedical research, educating our children, and providing for the needs of our older Americans. It is a bill that deserves the support of every Member of this House because it will improve the way of life for every congressional district.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the order of the House of Thursday, July 31, 1997, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Amendments printed in House Report 105-214 may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and only at the appropriate point in the reading of the bill, are considered as read, are not subject to amendment except as specified in the report or pro forma amendments for the purpose of debate, and are not subject to a demand for a division of the question.

The amendment at the desk offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. HYDE] shall be considered in lieu of amendments Nos. 1 and 2 in the report and shall be considered as though printed as amendment No. 1.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the Chair may accord priority in recognition to a Member offering an amendment that he has printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Those amendments will be considered as read.

The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole may postpone a request for a

recorded vote on any amendment and may reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the time for voting on any postponed question that immediately follows another vote, provided that the time for voting on the first question shall be a minimum of 15 minutes.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2264

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR
EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING ADMINISTRATION
TRAINING AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICES

For necessary expenses of the Job Training Partnership Act, as amended, including the purchase and hire of passenger motor vehicles, the construction, alteration, and repair of buildings and other facilities, and the purchase of real property for training centers as authorized by the Job Training Partnership Act; the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act; the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act; the National Skill Standards Act of 1994; and the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; \$5,162,601,000 plus reimbursements, of which \$3,872,463,000 is available for obligation for the period July 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999; of which \$118,491,000 is available for the period July 1, 1998 through June 30, 2001 for necessary expenses of construction, rehabilitation, and acquisition of Job Corps centers; of which \$200,000,000 shall be available from July 1, 1998 through September 30, 1999, for carrying out activities of the School-to-Work Opportunities Act; and of which \$100,000,000 shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1999 through June 30, 2000 for Opportunity Areas for Out-of-School Youth only if specifically authorized by subsequent legislation: *Provided*, That \$52,502,000 shall be for carrying out section 401 of the Job Training Partnership Act, \$69,285,000 shall be for carrying out section 402 of such Act, \$7,300,000 shall be for carrying out section 441 of such Act, \$5,000,000 shall be for all activities conducted by and through the National Occupational Information Coordinating Committee under such Act, \$1,063,990,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part A of such Act, and \$129,965,000 shall be for carrying out title II, part C of such Act: *Provided further*, That no funds from any other appropriation shall be used to provide meal services at or for Job Corps centers: *Provided further*, That funds provided for title III of the Job Training Partnership Act shall not be subject to the limitation contained in subsection (b) of section 315 of such Act; that the waiver described in section 315(a)(2) may be granted if a substate grantee demonstrates to the Governor that such waiver is appropriate due to the availability of low-cost retraining services, is necessary to facilitate the provision of needs-related payments to accompany long-term training, or is necessary to facilitate the provision of appropriate basic readjustment services; and that funds provided for discretionary grants under part B of such title III may be used to provide needs-related payments to participants who, in lieu of meeting the enrollment requirements under section 314(e) of such Act, are enrolled in training by the end of the sixth week after grant funds have been awarded: *Provided further*, That service delivery areas may transfer funding provided

herein under authority of titles II, parts B and C of the Job Training Partnership Act between the programs authorized by those titles of the Act, if the transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further* That service delivery areas and substate areas may transfer up to 20 percent of the funding provided herein under authority of title II, part A and title III of the Job Training Partnership Act between the programs authorized by those titles of the Act, if such transfer is approved by the Governor: *Provided further*, That, notwithstanding any other provision of law, any proceeds from the sale of Job Corps center facilities shall be retained by the Secretary of Labor to carry out the Job Corps program: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of Labor may waive any of the statutory or regulatory requirements of titles I-III of the Job Training Partnership Act (except for requirements relating to wage and labor standards, worker rights, participation and protection, grievance procedures and judicial review, nondiscrimination, allocation of funds to local areas, eligibility, review and approval of plans, the establishment and functions of service delivery areas and private industry councils, and the basic purposes of the Act), and any of the statutory or regulatory requirements of sections 8-10 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (except for requirements relating to the provision of services to unemployment insurance claimants and veterans, and to universal access to basic labor exchange services without cost to job seekers), only for funds available for expenditure in program year 1998, pursuant to a request submitted by a State which identifies the statutory or regulatory requirements that are requested to be waived and the goals which the State or local service delivery areas intend to achieve, describes the actions that the State or local service delivery areas have undertaken to remove State or local statutory or regulatory barriers, describes the goals of the waiver and the expected programmatic outcomes if the request is granted, describes the individuals impacted by the waiver, and describes the process used to monitor the progress in implementing a waiver, and for which notice and an opportunity to comment on such request has been provided to the organizations identified in section 105(a)(1) of the Job Training Partnership Act, if and only to the extent that the Secretary determines that such requirements impede the ability of the State to implement a plan to improve the workforce development system and the State has executed a Memorandum of Understanding with the Secretary requiring such State to meet agreed upon outcomes and implement other appropriate measures to ensure accountability: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor shall establish a workforce flexibility (work-flex) partnership demonstration program under which the Secretary shall authorize not more than six States, of which at least three States shall each have populations not in excess of 3,500,000, with a preference given to those States that have been designated Ed-Flex Partnership States under section 311(e) of Public Law 103-227, to waive any statutory or regulatory requirement applicable to service delivery areas or substate areas within the State under titles I-III of the Job Training Partnership Act (except for requirements relating to wage and labor standards, grievance procedures and judicial review, nondiscrimination, allotment of funds, and eligibility), and any of the statutory or regulatory requirements of sections 8-10 of the Wagner-Peyser Act (except for requirements relating to the provision of services to unemployment insurance claimants and veterans, and to universal access to basic labor ex-

change services without cost to job seekers), for a duration not to exceed the waiver period authorized under section 311(e) of Public Law 103-227, pursuant to a plan submitted by such States and approved by the Secretary for the provision of workforce employment and training activities in the States, which includes a description of the process by which service delivery areas and substate areas may apply for and have waivers approved by the State, the requirements of the Wagner-Peyser Act to be waived, the outcomes to be achieved and other measures to be taken to ensure appropriate accountability for federal funds.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. EVANS

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. EVANS:

Page 2, line 15, after "reimbursements," insert "of which \$2,500,000 shall be available for purposes of carrying out section 738 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homeless Assistance Act (relating to homeless veterans' reintegration projects);"

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], and the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking Democratic member of the subcommittee, for their efforts in producing this bill.

Likewise, I appreciate the hard work of all members on the subcommittee on this legislation, and I also want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the full committee, for his most important contributions, and likewise members of the full committee as well.

In particular, I am very pleased that the full committee has provided \$2 million in funding for the National Veterans Training Institute. This is a sound investment and money well spent, which will enable the continued provision of essential training. Again, I am most thankful to this committee for its actions.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment that I offered for myself and my colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], provides an additional \$2.5 million for the homeless, the Homeless Veterans Reintegration Project, a program administered by the Assistant Secretary of Labor for Veterans' Employment and Training.

I understand \$2.5 million has already been designated in H.R. 2264 for homeless veterans under the Department of Labor pilots and demonstrations, and I appreciate the committee's concern for veterans. Nonetheless, the problem of homeless veterans is so severe that additional funding is necessary.

There is virtually no disagreement that one-third of the homeless men in this country are veterans, and that approximately 60 percent of those individuals are veterans of the Vietnam war. This means, Mr. Chairman, that every night in this great country of ours more than 280,000 veterans are sleeping in homeless shelters or on our streets.

Since 1987, this program, a modest, cost-effective program designed to help homeless veterans reenter and succeed in the job market, has proven its worth. More than 41,000 homeless veterans have received help and support from the community-based organizations funded under this program, and many were placed in jobs at a cost of less than \$15,000 per veteran.

Few government programs can claim to have achieved so much with so little. Our amendment provides \$2.5 million for this needed program, the funding level authorized under section 11448 of title 42, United States Code. Rather than increasing spending in order to fund this important program, our amendment would simply earmark this \$2.5 million of the more than \$5 billion provided for the Department of Labor's Employment and Training Administration.

Earlier this year the Committee on Veterans' Affairs voted without dissent to fund this program. Republicans and Democrats came together, as they are doing tonight, to show their support for the men and women who served honorably in our Nation's Armed Forces.

I urge my colleagues to demonstrate their commitment to America's veterans and support the Evans-Filner amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am glad to yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER], and to wish him a happy birthday, as well.

Mr. FILNER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me, and I thank him for his service to our Nation's veterans as ranking member of the Committee on Veterans Affairs.

Mr. Chairman, a source of particular satisfaction to me as a Member of Congress has been my service on the Committee on Veterans' Affairs. Veterans are special and unique members of our American family, and it has been an honor to work on their behalf.

I am also privileged to represent the extraordinary residents of San Diego, CA, who have earned a nationwide reputation as a community committed to service to homeless veterans. It was the city of San Diego that created the Stand Down, a program which provides health care, legal assistance, dental treatment, clothing, and employment assistance for homeless veterans. This program has been replicated all over the country, and thousands of veterans have benefited because of the creativity and commitment of the veteran community in San Diego.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] and myself extends this kind of benefits to homeless veterans all over this Nation. So on behalf of the good and caring citizens of San Diego, on behalf of America's homeless veterans, I urge my colleagues to support the Evans-Filner amendment.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the amendment.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the chairman has indicated that the committee would like to accept this amendment. Let me say that in addition to this amendment, I have very serious reservations about this bill. I think this is a question of philosophy about which direction the Republican Party should lead this country.

Mr. Chairman, this bill increases spending dramatically over the balanced budget bill that we brought forth in 1995. It increase funding in many categories beyond what President Clinton had asked for in his own budget submission to this Congress. It has policy implications in the area of education, where we will be directing schools, that they have the opportunity now at the Federal level to enter into some new program called a Whole Learning Reform program.

The Federal Government should not be involved in making those decisions. We should not have the Federal Government funding a national test for education. That is the beginning of the problems with this bill.

It also goes into social policy, which many of us would find unacceptable in this Congress, not what we asked for in the Contract With America, or when Republicans went to the American people and asked them for a mandate to be the majority party in this Congress.

One example of that would be a provision in the bill that would allow funds to be used for the distribution of needles to drug users. That is not a Republican platform. It does not help us to reduce drug use in this country. It is not something that we as a Republican Congress should be passing and sending to the President.

I think the philosophy of this bill is to some extent dictated by the budget agreement that our leaders and the President entered into earlier this year, but it goes beyond the general agreement that we would expand Government rather than shrink the Departments of Health, Education, and Welfare, the Department of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services, the Department of Education, the Department of Labor. It goes beyond the notion that their budgets would increase, and starts to make very liberal decisions in terms of social policy of the funding within those budgets.

□ 1830

I think it would be time for this Republican Congress to have a debate on what is the direction we want to take. Do we want to continue on this budget agreement that expands the role of government? Or do we want to take time and correct the work of this committee and reduce the size of government in some areas, and at least say those areas where we are spending more money, we are going to turn over control to the States and take it away

from the bureaucracy here in Washington?

Now, this is not to say that there are not some very good provisions in this bill. And I do say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] that I commend his efforts in the areas of ergonomics, for example, where the committee has stated there is a lot of bad science that is being foisted upon us in an effort to create more regulations at the Department of Labor. The chairman's bill does put a moratorium for a year on that misguided regulation going into effect.

But, Mr. Chairman, what we need to do in the course of the debate on this bill is have a debate about fundamental principles in the Republican Party, address some very serious questions in this bill, and attempt to lead rather than capitulating to leadership from 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. McINTOSH] that, yes, this bill does increase spending over last year, and I am not happy with that. But the leadership of the Republican Party and the Democratic Party, and the President, agreed earlier this year that there would be tax cuts and that there would be restraints on entitlement spending. In return for those changes in policy, they also agreed that there would be increases in programs that the President considered his priorities.

Mr. Chairman, we have gotten the tax cuts and we have gotten the restraints on entitlement spending. Those bills have been passed and signed into law by the President. Like it or not, an agreement has to be at least substantially carried out, and this bill contains many of the President's priorities.

Mr. Chairman, when Republicans took control of the Congress, this bill carried major cuts in programs when it passed the House of Representatives; a total of \$9 billion. While many of the cuts were not in the enacted bill that year, nor did it survive in last year's bill, we certainly have restrained the rate of increase in spending in these accounts over what it might have otherwise been.

With respect to the whole school reform that the gentleman mentions, I would urge the gentleman very, very strongly to look at exactly how this works. It does not put the Government in the reform business. It allows local schools operating under State law, if they wish, to apply for funds on a competitive basis so that they may engage in whole school reform. I believe this is a far better expenditure of money than our present title I program from which the funds derive.

Other issues are going to be shaped on the floor of the House of Representatives as they should be. I would like to be able to please every single Member of the House of Representatives and offer a bill that everyone instantly

said, "I agree with." That obviously is not possible. But what we have to do is try to find the center, try to work with one another and find the common ground on which to govern, and to pass a bill that can meet the expectations of the American people. That is what this process is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I think we have done some good things, things that the gentleman from Indiana and others would support very strongly. But obviously there is a certain price to pay for the things that we get. We have to also give something. We have attempted to do both and to find that common ground.

I believe that we have done that in this bill. And while it will not please everyone, and never can, I believe it is a bill that can please the majority of Members in the House and I would very definitely commend it to them.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am not in the slightest going to get into a debate about the philosophy of the Republican Party. I simply want to take this time to indicate that on this side of the aisle, we would also accept the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], if that is indeed what is before us at this point.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. GOODLATTE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, let me address the point of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], because I do think there is a philosophical difference between whether we should seek the center or stand for principles that are outside the center. Principles of a smaller government, less Federal intrusion into our school systems and into our State levels, and perhaps that is the core question that we should be debating as we talk about the problems that we have with this bill.

Mr. Chairman, one of the problems, for example, that I encountered in the last week as I toured schools throughout central Indiana and visited with the students and teachers and parents, is I asked them what are the concerns that they have that I, as a member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, would like to address. They time and time again said that they were chasing Federal dollars. They spent a lot of their time filling out forms in order to get the few dollars that they desperately needed, and then found they could not use them for the needs in their classroom.

Mr. Chairman, one school needed additional computers and they found they did not qualify for the computer grant, and so they had to chase other dollars. Another school said, we want to teach the basics but we found that we have to apply for these fancy programs coming out of Washington. And

then once we apply to them, we have to spend all of our time filling out forms rather than teaching our children what they need to know in math, reading, writing, the basic knowledge and skills that Congress says they want us to teach.

The message they sent to me to bring back here was: Get out of the way in Washington. Stop having most of the money have strings attached to it and send it to us in a block grant to the schools where we can decide how it would best be used.

One of the things that I think we have to correct in this bill are provisions like the Whole School Reform Act that comes with strings. They have to apply under that program to take certain actions in order to receive the money; 200 million dollars' worth of funding is now tied to new strings. They wanted old strings from the previous Congress, or the Congress before that, that had authorized them but they had never been funded. So we will be creating a brandnew spending program as a result of that.

There are other questions that I hope we can engage in this debate with the chairman. In some cases we seem to have decided that not only would we agree and compromise and take the President's budget number, we would outdo the President and spend more in certain categories. I do not think that should be our position as we move forward with this bill.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want to say I have a great deal of respect for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. He is a leader in our party and on this committee. But I do have to fundamentally disagree on that philosophical question of whether we should approach the center or whether we should govern from a conservative, principled approach in this Congress.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I was in the Cloakroom and I heard the discussions of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH], and I wanted to tell him that I know I have been discussing, and many members of the committee have been discussing for many years, trying to enhance the ability of local providers of education who have the primary responsibility with greater opportunities to access Federal dollars without having to go through so many hoops.

Mr. Chairman, I have introduced a bill which is called the Family Services Improvement Act. The gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SHAYS] is a cosponsor. Senator Hatfield had a bill in the last Congress which tried to simplify the way in which communities access dollars.

If I can make a very crude analogy, a funnel at the top where there are a lot of individual programs, but the child at the bottom of the funnel that we all want to serve, either for health reasons

or social service or educational reasons, they have to figure out how to access all of these dollars.

What the bill essentially tries to do is to get the Feds to facilitate that service being performed in a funnel type where it comes in here, but it comes out in a spout at the end not exactly the way the gentleman from Indiana would want it, but in a form that does not put local education or social service agencies or other agencies to the unbelievable difficulty of trying to figure out how we help Mary Jane or Charlie Brown.

So, Mr. Chairman, although it is not directly on point, I wanted to call the gentleman's attention to that, because I think it would be something that perhaps in a bipartisan way we could work on to facilitate what I think both of us want done, although we may have different perspectives on exactly what the ways and means of doing it would be.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the comments of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER] and would hope to be able to address them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] has expired.

(On request of Mr. PORTER, and by unanimous consent, Mr. MCINTOSH was allowed to proceed for 3 additional minutes.)

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. HOYER], but I think we have to be careful we do not keep the old encumbered form of bureaucracy and say that we are going to give a roadmap at the local level on how to go through the paperwork, because they still have to go through the paperwork and spend the time and the money and the resources to do that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, what the gentleman will like about the bill is that it eliminates most of the paperwork and says that there is one form for all of these programs, and it will be the Federal problem of figuring out. But we would only have one form.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, see, what I would hope we could do is move to something like title VI where we don't have to justify on a form; we would say that we are going to provide the resources and those at the local level decide how they want to spend them.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCINTOSH. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I do not think I heard the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. MCINTOSH] correctly. But if I can say so, I think the role of the Federal Government in education is to supplement or complement the primary role of local schools in educating our children. It is not to supplant them in any way or to require a certain curricula or anything else. And it is not, very definitely, to provide a separate

tax source removed from local control simply to funnel money to local schools. That is not the purpose.

Mr. Chairman, if it is the basics that the gentleman wants to emphasize, that should be done, and is done, in every school in America by State and local school districts using State and local funds. That is where it ought to be. We should not be putting the Federal Government into the business of raising the money to provide for basics to be taught. That is done by the State and local school districts.

Mr. Chairman, 95 percent of the money spent in this country is spent by State and local school districts on education. That is the way it ought to be. The Federal Government's role should be to provide national encouragement on things of national interest. And that is exactly what we are doing in this program.

I think the gentleman from Indiana would agree that we are not attempting in any way to supplant local schools or to provide a taxing source removed from the people at the local level to support basics. That is not the role of the Federal Government at all.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Mr. Chairman, again reclaiming my time, in response to the gentleman from Illinois, I agree that is not the role of the Federal Government. The concern I have with this bill is that there is a new program that creates a carrot and says if schools want to get some of these Federal dollars, they have to start teaching the way we think they should teach. And we are going to have a situation where we have got, as my wife says, folks jumping over dimes to go for a nickel because they are going to end up spending a great deal of money trying to apply for those programs.

We would be much better off if we let them spend their money on the basics and we said, "We have got this \$200 million. We are going to give it to you to spend as you see fit on improving the teaching of the basics." I think if we are going to spend money at the Federal level, we should always say we are going to send it with the least amount of restrictions and strings attached to it.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wanted to say first off that I think the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] is well-conceived in the sense of if there is any group in America that has been neglected in the homeless population, it has been the veterans and people who have sacrificed for our country and put their lives at risk deserve that special attention, and I support that.

We have a homeless shelter particularly targeted for veterans that a few Vietnam veterans have put together in Ft. Wayne, and I have been proud to help them and I know that it has been very difficult for them to get attention, because often they get ignored in the process.

□ 1845

I want to address a broader question off of that. That is, in areas where the Federal Government has not been, there is this temptation to say that every time we see a needy group or every time we see a problem that we are going to plunge into that. As we debate tonight and tomorrow and probably into next week this bill, this bill is at the heart of the differences between the two parties and how we are going to govern, and differences in our own party as to what the role of the Federal Government should be in education, what the role of the Federal Government should be in abortion, what the role of the Federal Government should be in labor policy, what the role of the Federal Government should be in health policy.

Many of us are concerned, and I say this as someone who supported the budget agreement. Understanding that at times you have to have compromises and at times you have to move forward because the President is of a different party, the Senate may not agree with the House, and in the House we have a very narrow majority, there are pragmatic things that enter into getting what you can, but many of us feel we went too far in this bill. We were willing to live with many of the funding dollars in that, begrudgingly, and many of us were very divided over that subject.

But there is also the matter, if we are going to spend the money, how are we going to spend the money and in what areas?

We made many pledges. Many of them probably were, needless to say, overdramatic or probably unrealistic; nevertheless, many millions of American people believed that when we said we were going to eliminate the Department of Education and we were going to eliminate the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, we were going to eliminate this organization or that organization, that we were at least going to fight for that.

Now we are faced with a bill that in many of these cases is not eliminating, it is increasing its funding, something that surely we did not run on and say we were going to do. It has caused a lot of grief. And this bill consolidates many of these things; and now not only are we looking at increasing the money in some of the things that many of us came here very concerned about. I myself can hardly believe that we have a real dollar increase in Title X which, while we have many abortion issues that we face in this Congress, is the most controversial because it has the most money going to the organizations that do most of the abortions. Yet, it increases.

We see increases in other categories. We see whole new programs. We can have a debate and we certainly will have a debate on the Whole School program. You have got some of the discussion here and we will have that in the education section.

As I have talked with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] today, and as I have visited schools around the country, first when I was a staff director on the Republican side with the children-families committee, then working with Senator COATS in the Senate, and now being on the Committee on Education and the Workforce, I have seen the merits of some of the ideas in this, school-based management, more flexibility in the schools to make determinations. But what I do not think is appropriate is to have something come in without having gone through the authorizing committee.

The point is that it is authorized, but it was authorized dormant; in other words, it has no funds in it. This Republican-controlled Congress never passed this bill, never moved this bill. Furthermore, it was put in at the tail end in the appropriations subcommittee process and did not get fully aired because even if some of us and, for example, we will hear in this debate that the Heritage Foundation thinks that this is a good idea. The Heritage Foundation has no position on this. The Heritage Foundation has done reports that suggest that it is a good idea at the local level. They do not have a position on Federal initiative.

And while we say we are not controlling local schools, the fact is that when we put the money out, particularly if you have a State law that says you cannot override local union contracts, if you have a State law that says you cannot do some of the things in the Little Red Schoolhouse reform and other types of things like that, and you have 50 to 100 districts that want to get into this pool of money, there will be tremendous pressure on the State legislatures to change their State law.

It is a tad cute to say we are not doing these things from the Federal level when, in fact, we are dumping \$200 million into a program that was not funded, that was dormant, has never passed a Republican Congress. And all of a sudden when we say we are reducing Goals 2000, this is much more sweeping than Goals 2000.

In Indiana, it may indeed be a good program. Why not debate it and go through a regular process similar to the National Literacy Initiative?

We will be debating a number of these. We feel there should be a whole debate on this process. We are not trying to be obstructionist.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

I rise to speak on behalf of the Evans amendment to H.R. 2264. This is a positive proposal which is bipartisan, which helps to assist the homeless veterans and increases from \$2.5 million to \$5 million this very important program which is section 738 of the Stewart B. McKinney Homes Assistance Act, named for a former member of Congress who actually initiated this program and deserves a great deal of cred-

it as a former Member from Connecticut.

I believe that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS] has shown again his great leadership for veterans; and working with the gentleman from California [Mr. FILNER] and others on both sides of the aisle, I had the pleasure of working with the Committee on Veterans' Affairs with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS], I know how important this issue is to people in my home State of Pennsylvania where many veterans have resided. And some are not only looking for proper health care from this Congress, proper vocational assistance, but now, where we can help those who are homeless, making a big difference.

This will certainly go a long way, I think, in making those steps in a positive way to help our veterans, many of whom gave their lives for others, who are now trying to still make a go of it and are trying to make sure that they have the quality of life that they deserve for the sacrifice they made for this country.

I rise in strong support of the Evans amendment. I believe it really makes this bill even more positive. I thank the gentleman for his leadership and look forward to working with him again on other pro-veteran bills.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the American people in my district are deeply concerned about a number of issues, and I am deeply concerned about some issues that we address in this legislation, issues which have not come to the fore until just the last few hours of this debate.

Parents in America want their children educated. One of the things we do in this country is we pay taxes in the hopes that we will give our children the best possible education. Yet what is happening in education in America today is that there is a great debate going on about how we improve education.

I have listened to that debate and I have listened to the citizens of my district talk about it. They want their children to get the best possible education because they care deeply about their children's success as they go forward. But they discovered one thing that is vitally important. It is something that I thought we heard in Washington, D.C., but it appears maybe we have not.

They have discovered out in America that education policy cannot be set in Washington, D.C., that it is simply too far away from the living rooms and the family rooms and the bedrooms of the children studying at home to set education policy thousands of miles away here in Washington, D.C.

So when I ran for the United States Congress, I ran on the promise that I would work to return to the local parents, teachers, students and administrators in the schools in my district

the control of their education and their education dollars, so that those parents working beside the administrators in their schools could decide education policy for their children.

For that reason, I got elected and I am pleased about that. But I have discovered in this bill something that gives me great concern. In this bill, we have decided that that is the wrong policy. In this bill, we have decided once again that the Federal Government should do the carrot-and-stick routine, that the Federal Government should decide what form of education reform works.

Here is what we say in the bill: We say that we are going to reward those schools who pursue what is called Whole School Reform. And we even specify in report language that we will make this \$150 million available, but only available to those schools who will follow the Whole School Reform model.

And in report language, we set forth that they should either follow the school development program developed by Yale University psychiatrist James Comer, or the Success for All and Roots and Wings programs developed by Johns Hopkins University, or the Modern Red Schoolhouse program developed by Hudson Institute.

So here we are saying, you local parents, you local administrators, those of you that are charged with educating your children and care most about their education, we will give you \$150 million. You just have to jump through one Federal hoop. You have to agree to abide by one of these three programs. You have to spend the \$150 million as we in Washington say it should be spent.

Let me tell you, that is not what I was sent to Washington to do. That is not the kind of legislation that I believe America wants. I do not care if you are Republican or Democrat. I do not care if you are a liberal or conservative. I think this is an issue which transcends politics.

I think American parents, whether they are liberal or conservative, Republican or Democrat, rich or poor, believe they know better how to educate their kids than some bureaucrat thousands of miles away in Washington, D.C., or some professor at the Hudson Institute or Yale University or Johns Hopkins.

Yet we are saying, as a United States Congress, there is \$150 million in this bill which you parents may have, but only if you let us decide on the education policy. I think that is wrong. I think we are making a grave mistake by including that kind of policy in this bill.

It is not what the American parents want. They trust their teacher. You sit back and think about it: The one person you have to trust in your life is the teacher that your child spends a good portion of every day with.

This last Tuesday was the first day of school for my kids. I took them both to

school. I have a 15-year-old and an 11-year-old. I had met their teachers before. I care about them, and I trust their teachers, but I have never met a single professor from Yale University or Hudson Institute that I want deciding how my children get educated.

I trust the PTA at my school and the administrators at my school, but I thought we, as a Nation, had moved beyond this idea of dictating Federal education policy in Washington, D.C. Yet in this bill, I hope that my colleagues are listening and I hope their constituents are listening to them, we break that promise and we set education policy in Washington, D.C. That is dead wrong.

Mr. Chairman, I include for the RECORD the following:

SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
MISSION AND VISION OF THE SCHOOL
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The School Development Program is committed to the total development of all children by creating learning environments that support children's physical, cognitive, psychological, language, social and ethical development.

Our vision is to help create a just and fair society in which all children have the educational and personal opportunities that will allow them to become successful and satisfied participants in family and civic life.

CORE BELIEFS OF THE SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAM

We believe that "it takes a whole village to raise a child," noting especially that: children's most meaningful learning occurs through positive and supportive relationships with caring and nurturing adults; parents are children's first teachers; all parents, and staff members, and community member, regardless of position, has an important contribution to make towards improving students' education; and in order to bring out the best in children, adults must interact more collaboratively and sensitively with each other on behalf of children.

We believe children: should be at the center of the educational enterprise; are capable of higher learning; learn through various pathways: physical, cognitive, psychological, language, social, and ethical; and who develop well learn well.

We believe that teachers: work in supportive environments which maximize their ability to teach and prepare students for life beyond school; and develop positive relationships with parents to make the necessary bonds for effective teaching and learning.

We believe school communities: must be structured to promote collaborative decision making in order to create a culture of inclusion; should promote learning as a lifelong process; should embrace cultural, linguistic and ethnic differences to enhance the educational process for all people; use data from all levels of the system—student, school, and district to inform educational policies and practices; should view change as an ongoing process guide by continuous constructive feedback; design curriculum, instruction and assessment to align with and promote child and community development and high content area standards; provide administrators with the support they need to lead and manage schools; and promote organizational synergy among school boards, educators, and parents.

A BRIEF HISTORY AND SUMMARY OF THE SCHOOL
DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

The School Development Program (SDP) was established in 1968 in two elementary

schools as a collaborative effort between the Yale University Child Study Center and the New Haven Public Schools. The two schools involved were the lowest achieving in the city, had poor attendance, and had serious relationship problems among students, staff, and parents. Staff morale was low. Parents were angry and distrustful of the schools. Hopelessness and despair were pervasive.

The Child Study Center staff—social worker, psychologist, special education teacher, and child psychiatrist—provided the traditional support services from these disciplines but focused more on understanding the underlying problems and how to correct them. Problems were identified on both sides—family stress and student underdevelopment in areas necessary for school success, as well as organizational, management and child development knowledge and skill needs on the part of the school staff.

Because of pre-school experiences in families under stress, a disproportionate number of low-income children presented themselves to the schools in ways that were understood as "bad," under-motivated, and demonstrating low academic potential. The behavior, in fact, reflected underdevelopment, or else development that was appropriate on the playground, at home or other places outside of school, but inappropriate at school.

The school staffs lacked training in child development and behavior, and understood school achievement solely as a function of genetically determined intellectual ability and individual motivation. Because of this, the schools were ill-prepared to modify behavior or close the developmental gaps of their students. The staffs usually responded with punishment and low expectations. Such responses were understandable given the circumstances, but they usually led to more difficult staff-student interactions and, in turn, to difficult staff-parent and community interactions, staff frustration, and a lower level of performance by students, staff and parents.

Even when there was a desire to work differently, there was no mechanism at the building level to allow parents, teachers, and administrators first to understand the needs, then to collaborate with and help each other address them in an integrated, coordinated way. This led to blame-finding, fragmentation, duplication of efforts, and frustration. There was no sense of ownership and pride in the school. The kind of synergism that develops when people work together to address problems and opportunities could not exist.

The model took shape in response to the conditions in the schools. Dr. Comer and his colleagues, working collaboratively with parents and staff, gradually developed the current nine-component process model (3 mechanisms, 3 operations, and 3 guiding principles). In the first category is (1) a School Planning and Management Team representative of the parents, teachers, administrators and support staff; (2) a Student and Staff Support Team (formerly called the Mental Health Team; and (3) Parent Team.

The School Planning and Management Team carries out three critical operations: the development of a (4) Comprehensive School Plan with specific goals in improving school climate and academic areas; (5) staff development activities based on building-level goals in these areas; and (6) periodic assessment which allows the staff to modify the program to meet identified needs and opportunities.

Successful implementation of the School Development Program requires several important guiding principles and agreements. All the adult stakeholders agree to use (7) a "no fault" approach to solving problems. This allows school teams to use all their time and energy on problem solving. Many

groups get bogged down and are unable to move forward because blame creates defensive behavior and conflict. When people use "no fault," they can speak up without fear of attack or blame.

The School Development Program uses (8) consensus decision making rather than voting as the way to make decisions. Discussions keep the developmental needs of children in mind. One of the principal benefits of consensus decision making is that it minimizes "winner-loser" behavior and a variety of negative feelings that are common when decisions are made by voting.

Participants on the School Planning and Management Team (9) collaborate with the principal who is often the team's leader. Team members cannot paralyze the principal and on the other hand the principal cannot use the group as a "rubber stamp." In some cases, a staff member rather than the principal serves as a leader of the governance and management team. When this happens, it is often after all involved have become comfortable with the process, but sometimes it occurs at the outset. This works when it is a genuine arrangement to promote leadership from within the staff, and not as an act of disengagement. With this arrangement, it is important for the principal to be present and fully involved both in meetings and in facilitating the process. These nine components, developed in the 1968-69 school year, continue to make up the essential elements of the School Development Program.

A BRIEF SUMMARY OF SCHOOL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM EFFECTS

Past efforts to document the effects of the School Development Program have been consistent with our philosophy that educational improvement embodies academic as well as personal and social growth. To document the effects, a combination of three research strategies are used: (1) quantitative (e.g., Surveys), (2) qualitative (e.g., our ethnographic protocols), and (3) theory development. These strategies have been employed to document academic effects, behavior and school adjustment effects, self-concept, and our school climate.

Studies conducted by the School Development Program and other researchers provide evidence of significant SDP effects on school climate, student attendance, and student achievement. SDP effects are usually first manifested in the improvement of the school climate, indicated by improved relationships among the adults in the school, better collaboration among staff members, and greater focus on the child as the center of the education process. Research showed that schools in which the SDP guiding principles ("no fault" problem solving, consensus decision making and collaboration) were followed consistently, there was a significantly greater decline in absenteeism and suspension rates compared to the district as a whole. Comparative studies of SDP and non-SDP schools reported significantly higher self competence, self-concept, and achievement for SDP students than for non-SDP students.

Qualitative analyses of more than 130 interviews of parents, students, teachers, principals, and other school personnel from ten schools indicated (a) improved parental and community involvement, (b) strong, positive climate, (c) increased team work and greater coordination, (d) greater focus on child-centered issues for comprehensive school planning, and (e) greater top-down and bottom-up management. These analyses also showed that the Student and Staff Support Teams (formerly called Mental Health Teams) focused primarily on prevention rather than crisis management. These teams established stronger linkages between schools and communities in order to better

facilitate services to students. The three SDP structures (School Planning and Management Team, Student and Staff Support Team and the Parent Team) and the three guiding principles served as vehicles for bringing the school and community together to resolve conflicts and reach solutions.

HUDSON INSTITUTE'S MODERN RED SCHOOLHOUSE TO MOVE TO NASHVILLE

INDIANAPOLIS, IN.—Hudson Institute's Board of Trustees announced today that its highly-touted education project, The Modern Red Schoolhouse, will become an independent entity and relocate to Nashville, TN. Named "Modern Red Schoolhouse Institute," the new organization will receive funding from Alternative Public Schools, Inc., a Nashville-based educational services firm.

Designed and tested over the past five years, Hudson's critically-acclaimed program strives to make all students high achievers in core academic subjects by building upon the virtues of traditional American education while incorporating modern technology in the classroom. It also relies on proven student learning techniques, the wisdom of teachers and parental involvement.

Hudson's Modern Red Schoolhouse was one of eleven plans funded by the New American Schools Development Corporation in 1992 to design "break-the-mold" schools that would revitalize American education. Hudson worked in partnership with school districts in Indiana, Arizona and New York to reinvent the qualities and virtues of "little red schoolhouses" within a contemporary context.

In making the announcement, Hudson Institute's president Leslie Lenkowsky, Ph.D. emphasized, "Since Hudson began the Modern Red Schoolhouse, the program has grown from a glimmer in the minds of Hudson's researchers to a well-tested and favorably-evaluated blueprint for comprehensive school restructuring. The Nashville-based managers of the program will bring new resources and marketing 'know-how' necessary for the program to become a model that schools throughout the United States will adopt as well."

He further remarked, "The evolution of Modern Red Schoolhouse into its own Institute is an outstanding example of how Hudson can best utilize its talent, expertise and resources for research and development—then turn over finely-tuned and successful products to other organizations for implementation."

Specifically in Indiana, the following school districts collaborated in the Modern Red Schoolhouse program design: select Indianapolis Public Schools, the Metropolitan School District of Lawrence Township in Marion County, Beech Grove City Schools, Bartholomew Consolidated School Corporation in Columbus, and Eastern Howard School Corporation in Greentown. Schools in Evansville and Michigan City were also included.

Headquartered in Indianapolis, Hudson Institute's experience in education policy research dates to the 1977 publication of *Our Children's Crippled Future: How American Education Has Failed*. Hudson scholars continue to contribute a number of major books and reports to the debate over the state of American education, including current research on America's charter schools.

In addition, Hudson Institute operates the Educational Excellence Network, a nationally-known clearinghouse on educational issues for scholars and policymakers. Hudson Senior Fellows Carol D'Amico, Chester E. Finn, Jr., and Bruno Manno, who each played a critical role in developing Modern Red Schoolhouse, will remain at Hudson where

they have a full agenda of new education-related projects currently underway or planned for the future. In addition, former Modern Red Schoolhouse co-director Denis P. Doyle will rejoin Hudson to develop a new set of school reform efforts centered on the use of technology.

Additional information covering Hudson Institute's education programs and on-going research is available on Hudson's website, WWW.HUDSON.ORG/HUDSON.MEDIA ADVISORY: To arrange an interview with Dr. Lenkowsky, contact Gail McDaniel at (317) 549-4115.

This Modern Red Schoolhouse Homepage has been moved to: <http://www.mrsh.org>

MODERN RED SCHOOLHOUSE ON THE WORLD-WIDE WEB PREFACE

The little red schoolhouse of yesteryear, at least as idealized in American memory, was an institution that drew people together for common purposes, to share in one of the most important responsibilities of any community: rearing the next generation to take its place in that community by socializing the young, transmitting the culture, and equipping future workers, citizens, and parents with essential knowledge, skills, and habits. The Modern Red Schoolhouse intends to reinvent some of the key virtues of the little red schoolhouse in a modern context and with a modern mission to be a place where all children will learn and achieve academic standards that are truly world class.

This is not to say that all children will learn in the same way, or at the same time, or at the same pace. To this challenge, Modern Red Schoolhouse offers a set of teaching methods tailored to identify and nurture the potential that exists in every child. The Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are high. But they come with the expectation that all children will be afforded many routes towards their attainment. Like its nineteenth-century namesake, the Modern Red Schoolhouse does not lose sight of the fact that mastery of subject matter is the only acceptable goal for all children, wherever they may come from and however they may learn.

The standards documented here will be met by Modern Red Schoolhouse students in eight core subjects defined as English language arts, geography, history, mathematics, science, the arts, foreign languages, and health and physical education. The Modern Red Schoolhouse curriculum consists of Hudson Units both Foundation Units and Capstone Units. Foundation Units are developed or selected at each school for the primary purpose of instruction, although Foundation Units also include some built-in assessment. Capstone Units are developed by Advanced Systems, Inc., assessment contractor for the Modern Red Schoolhouse, in collaboration with teachers at cooperating schools. Their primary purpose is to assess students' academic progress, but because they are integral to curriculum, they also include some built-in instruction. Schools will arrange a series of Hudson Units to meet the individual learning needs of each student. All the performance objectives of all the Hudson Units successfully completed by each student will lead that student to achievement of the standards. All the Capstone Units, supplemented by examinations in each subject, form a Watershed Assessment of the standards which signal students' readiness to move to the next level of schooling.

All Modern Red Schoolhouse students are expected to meet the standards that follow with a few modest qualifications. The foreign language standards assume that students will become proficient speakers of two languages: English and one other. This does

not preclude students from pursuing study of a third language; in fact, they are encouraged to do so. The arts encompass three arts disciplines: visual arts, music, and drama. Students are expected to meet standards for all three through the intermediate level. Advanced level students will achieve the advanced standards for one arts discipline of the student's own choosing.

The Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are the result of two years of the combined thinking of teachers, administrators, community members, and national subject specialists. During the design phase, representatives of participating school districts began to identify high standards in eight core subjects. The College Board's Advanced Placement standards were used as an initial benchmark to help participants articulate what students should know and be able to do at the time of graduation from high school. Although students in the Modern Red Schoolhouse will reach these standards at different rates and therefore at different ages, the three levels are roughly equivalent to what students should know and be able to do at the end of grades 4, 8, and 12.

Successive drafts of the standards were reviewed by the Modern Red Schoolhouse Standards and Assessment Task Force. This document is the result of considerable revision by a team of subject specialists, all with broad experience in setting high standards and helping students to achieve them. Their joint experience includes work for the Advanced Placement program, the Council for Basic Education, the National Council of Teachers of English, the National Endowment for the Humanities, the Mathematical Association of America, the National Science Teachers Association, and a combined hundred years in classrooms at all levels. Drafts of the standards have been reviewed by subject specialists at Advanced Systems, Inc. and teachers in member schools, whose suggestions have prompted additional revisions. The greatest challenge offered by these standards raising student achievement to meet them will be addressed through innovative curriculum and not by lowered expectations.

While the Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are unique, they are not inconsistent with the recommendations of professional associations striving for excellence in education. We have borrowed heavily from other sets of standards developed in recent years in the great national effort to reform America's schools. We are indebted to the work of the National Assessment Governing Board whose National Assessments of Educational Progress in language arts, geography, mathematics, science, and the arts helped inform the standards. We drew from the College Board's various teacher's guides to their Advanced Placement courses. Publications from the following professional associations informed the development of the standards in their respective disciplines: the Association of American Geographers, the Bradley Commission on History in Schools; the National Center for History in the Schools (UCLA-NEH); the National Council for Teachers of Mathematics; the American Association for the Advancement of Science; National Standards in Foreign Language Education project; and the National Association for Sports and Physical Education.

In addition to these, the standards have been informed by the U.S. Department of Education's "James Madison" series and the U.S. Department of Labor's SCANS reports. Standards for the primary and intermediate levels were also informed by E.D. Hirsch's "Cultural Literacy" inventory and Smart Start by Patte Barth and Ruth Mitchell.

We are indebted especially to the work of the following authors and associations:

In English language arts:

Barth, P. and R. Mitchell. *Smart Start*. North American Press, 1992.

Gadda, G., E. Jensen, F. McQuade, and H. Wilson. *Teacher's Guide to Advanced Placement Courses in English Language and Composition*. The College Board, 1985.

McQuade, F. *Teacher's Guide to Advanced Placement Courses in English Literature and Composition*. The College Board, 1993.

Reading Framework for the 1992 and 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. National Assessment Governing Board, U.S. Dept. of Education.

Reading and Thinking: A New Framework for Comprehension. Massachusetts Department of Education, 1987.

Writing Framework for the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress. National Assessment Governing Board, U.S. Dept. of Education.

In Geography:

Geography Framework for the 1992 and 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. U.S. Dept. of Education, 1992.

Geography (K-6 and 7-12): Themes, Key Ideas, and Learning Opportunities. Geography Education National Implementation Project, 1989.

Guidelines for Geographic Education. Association of American Geographers, 1984.

In History:

Historical Literacy. Bradley Commission on History in the Schools, 1989.

History-Social Science Framework. California Department of Education, 1988.

Holt, T. *Thinking Historically*. The College Board, 1990.

National History Standards Project. National Center for History in the Schools, UCLA-NEH Research Program, ongoing.

In Mathematics:

Edwards, E.L. *Algebra for Everyone*. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1990.

Curriculum and Evaluation Standards for School Mathematics. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1989.

Mathematics Assessment: 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. Submitted to the National Assessment Governing Board by The College Board, 1992.

Meiring, S.P., R.N. Rubenstein, J.E. Schultz, J. de Lange, and D.L. Chambers. *A Core Curriculum: Making Mathematics Count for Everyone: Addenda Series, Grades 9-12*. National Council of Teachers of Mathematics, 1992.

Silver, E., J. Kilpatrick, and B. Schlesinger. *Thinking through Mathematics: Fostering Inquiry and Communication in Mathematics Classrooms*. The College Board, 1990.

In Science:

Fulfilling the Promise: Biology Education in the Nation's Schools. National Research Council, 1991.

National Committee on Science Education Standards and Assessment. National Research Council, 1993 (draft).

Project 2061: Science for all Americans. American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989.

Science Framework for the 1994 National Assessment of Educational Progress. National Assessment Governing Board, U.S. Dept. of Education.

Science and Technology Education for the Elementary Years. National Center for Improving Science Education, 1989.

Scope, Sequence, and Coordination of Secondary School Science. The Content Core: A Guide for Curriculum Designers. National Science Teachers Association, 1986.

The Modern Red Schoolhouse has also integrated character education into the academic curriculum of its students. In his essay "Character Education in Our Schools" (published separately by Modern Red School-

house), Kevin Ryan of Boston University discusses the need for character education and the attempt by the Modern Red Schoolhouse to effectively address this issue. However, discussions about dealing with this subject are best made with the community. Therefore, individual schools are advised to develop their character education programs with the help and guidance of the school's parents and communities. In preparing the curriculum, especially in health and physical education, we encourage educators to review not only the standards enumerated here, but also Kevin Ryan's essay. It discusses in more detail the reasons for character education and the specific goals of the Modern Red Schoolhouse program. This essay can be obtained separately from the Hudson Institute.

The Modern Red Schoolhouse standards are anchored in beliefs and principles that most Americans today as they did a century ago know to be true and valid. We believe that standards can serve as an anchor for those principles while at the same time preparing graduates to take their place in the communities of the twenty-first century.

SALLY B. KILGORE, Ph.D.,

Director.

WELCOME TO THE HOME OF SUCCESS FOR ALL™ AND ROOTS & WINGS™

Success For All™ (SFA) and Roots & Wings™ are comprehensive school restructuring programs for students in grades Pre-K to Six.

The idea behind the SFA™ program is to organize resources to focus on prevention and early intervention, to ensure that virtually every student will succeed in reading throughout the elementary grades—and no student will be allowed to "fall between the cracks." This highly successful model is currently in use in 750 schools in 37 states.

The goal of Roots & Wings™ is to ensure every child a firm foundation in the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in today's world, and to go far beyond this to higher-order learning and integration of knowledge.

Roots refers to strategies designed to ensure that every child meets world class standards—effective instructional programs in reading, writing, and language arts; tutoring for children struggling with reading; integrated health, mental health, and social services; and family support. These elements are based on Success for All™.

Wings refers to improvements in curriculum and instruction designed to let children soar. A key component of Wings is a science and social studies program called WorldLab™, which includes a set of simulations in which students will be able to apply knowledge and skills in flexible, creative, and integrated ways to solve problems. Children in WorldLab™ design and test efficient vehicles, explore African culture and agriculture, write a new U.S. Constitution, or investigate sources of pollution in local waterways.

MathWings™, based on NCTM standards, provides practical constructivist approaches to math emphasizing cooperative learning, complex problem solving, games, and discovery.

SUCCESS FOR ALL™

Tutors

In grades 1-3, specially trained, certified teachers work one-on-one with any students who are failing to keep up with their classmates in reading. First grade students have priority for tutoring.

Eight-week assessments

Students in grades 1-5 are assessed every eight weeks to determine whether they are making adequate progress in reading. This information is used to assign students to tutoring, to suggest alternative teaching strategies in the regular classroom, and to make

changes in reading group placement, family support interventions, or other means of meeting students' needs. The school facilitator coordinates this process with the active involvement of teachers in grade-level teams.

Early learning (preschool and kindergarten)

Whenever possible, a half-day preschool program is provided for all four-year-olds. The program emphasizes language development, readiness, and positive self-concept. A full-day kindergarten program continues the emphasis on language, using children's literature and big books, as well as oral and written composition, activities promoting the development of concepts about print, alphabet games, and math concept development. Peabody Language

Reading and writing programs

During reading periods, students are regrouped across age lines for 90 minutes so that each reading class contains students reading at one level. This eliminates the need to have reading groups within the class and increases the amount of time for direct instruction. Also, use of tutors as reading teachers during reading time reduces the size of most reading classes. The reaching program in grades K-1 emphasizes the development of language skills and launches students into reading using phonetically regular storybooks supported by careful instruction that focuses on phonemic awareness, auditory discrimination, and sound blending as well as meaning, context, and self-monitoring strategies. Students become fluent as they read and reread to one another in pairs.

At the second through fifth grade levels, students use school or district selected reading materials, basals, and/or trade books in a carefully structured set of interactive opportunities to read, discuss, and write. This program emphasizes cooperative learning activities built around partner reading, identification of characters, settings, and problem solutions in narratives, story summarization, writing, and direct instruction in reading comprehension skills. At all levels, students read books of their choice for twenty minutes each evening as homework. Classroom libraries of books are developed for this purpose. For schools with Spanish bilingual programs, Success For All™ provides a Spanish reading curriculum, *Exito Para Todos*, in grades 1-5.

Writing is emphasized throughout the grades. Writing instruction uses a writer's workshop format in which students plan, draft, revise, edit, and publish compositions with feedback at each stage from teachers and peers.

Cooperative learning

Cooperative learning is the vehicle that drives the Success For All™ curriculum. Students work together in partnerships and teams, helping one another to become strategic readers and writers. Emphasis is placed on individual accountability, common goals, and recognition of group success.

Family support team

The family support team works with parents in ensuring the success of their children. The team focuses on promoting parent involvement, developing plans to meet the needs of individual students having difficulty, implementing attendance plans, and integrating community and school resources. The team is composed of the principal or assistant principal, facilitator, social worker, and other personnel.

Facilitator

A full-time facilitator works with teachers in each Success For All™ school to help them implement the reading program. In addition, the facilitator coordinates eight-

week assessments, assists the Family Support Team, facilitates staff support teams, plans and implements staff development, and helps all teachers make certain that every child is making adequate progress.

Staff support teams

Teachers in the Success For All™ program support one another through the training and implementation process in coaching partnerships, grade level teams, and other staff team configurations. These teams become a catalyst for the dissemination of new material, goal setting, and problem solving, and they provide a supportive forum for discussion around new instructional strategies.

Professional development

Professional development for Success For All™ requires three days for all teachers before the program begins. Success For All™ consultants return to the school for three two-day visits during the school year to work with principal, facilitators, and teachers to build a strong implementation. Success For All™ facilitators are available for telephone consultation during the year. Building facilitators follow up on initial training with classroom visits, coaching, and team meetings.

FOR ALL/ROOTS & WINGS™ FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Where is the program used?

What are the results?

What are the costs?

How do schools adopt Success for All™?

Where can I get more information?

Where is the program used?

As of the 1996-97 school year, Success For All™ is being implemented in more than 473 schools in over 126 districts in more than 37 states in all parts of the United States.

What are the results?

Success For All™ has been evaluated in several school districts. In each, matched Success For All™ and control schools have been compared on individually administered reading scales and other measures. The results have consistently favored Success For All™. In average grade equivalents, Success For All™ students perform approximately three months ahead of comparison students by the first grade, and more than a year ahead by fifth grade. Effects are particularly strong for students who are most at risk, those in the lowest 25% of their grades. Effects of the Spanish version of Success For All™, *Lee Conmigo*, have also been strong. Positive effects have also been found on district-administered standardized tests. Success For All™ has produced substantial reductions in retentions and special education referrals and placements.

What are the costs?

Cost is based on the size and location of the individual school, and number of schools collaborating in training. Sample costs for a school of about 500 students in Pre-kindergarten through fifth grade range from \$45,000 to \$58,000 for Year 1; \$45,000 to \$52,000 for Year 2; and \$45,000 to \$52,000 for Year 3. (Add approximately \$55 for each student over 500.) These estimates include training, materials, follow-up visits, and other services. Actual costs will vary for different situations, depending in part on distances from training centers and local capacity to provide some training and follow-up and will be calculated for the individual school. (For more information see Considerations for Adoption)

How do schools adopt Success For All™?

We encourage district and school staff to review program materials, view video tapes, and visit nearby Success For All™ sites. Schools must apply to become a Success For All™ or Roots & Wings school. The applica-

tion process insures that the school staff are aware of the elements of the program, have the resources to implement the program successfully, and agree as a staff to make the commitment to implement the program. A positive vote of 80% or more of all teachers is required.

Where can I get more information?

For awareness materials or information on training, school visits, or other assistance, contact us at: Success For All™ Program, Johns Hopkins University, 3505 N. Charles St., Baltimore, MD 21218. Phone: 410-516-8896 (in Maryland), or 1-800-548-4998, fax us at: 410-516-8890, or you can browse our Web site.

SUCCESS FOR ALL/ROOTS AND WINGS SUMMARY OF RESEARCH ON ACHIEVEMENT OUTCOMES

(By Robert E. Slavin, Nancy A. Madden, and Barbara A. Wasik)

Ms. Martin's kindergarten class has some of the brightest, happiest, friendliest, and most optimistic kids you'll ever meet. Students in her class are glad to be in school, proud of their accomplishments, certain that they will succeed at whatever the school has to offer. Every one of them is a natural scientist, a storyteller, a creative thinker, a curious seeker of knowledge. Ms. Martin's class could be anywhere—in suburb or ghetto, small town or barrio—it doesn't matter. Kindergartners everywhere are just as bright, enthusiastic and confident as her kids are.

Only a few years from now, many of these same children will have lost the spark they all started with. Some will have failed a grade. Some will be in special education. Some will be in long-term remediation, such as Title I or other remedial programs. Some will be bored or anxious or unmotivated. Many will see school as a chore rather than a pleasure and will no longer expect to excel. In a very brief span of time, Ms. Martin's children will have defined themselves as successes or failures in school. All too often, only a few will still have a sense of excitement and positive self-expectations about learning. We cannot predict very well which of Ms. Martin's students will succeed and which will fail, but we can predict—based on the past—that if nothing changes, far too many will fail. This is especially true if Ms. Martin's kindergarten happens to be located in a high-poverty neighborhood, in which there are typically fewer resources in the school to provide top-quality instruction to every child, fewer forms of rescue if children run into academic difficulties, and fewer supports for learning at home. Preventable failures occur in all schools, but in high poverty schools failure can be endemic, so widespread that it makes it difficult to treat each child at risk of failure as a person of value in need of emergency assistance to get back on track. Instead, many such schools do their best to provide the greatest benefit to the greatest number of children possible, but have an unfortunately well-founded expectation that a certain percentage of students will fall by the wayside during the elementary years.

Any discussion of school reform should begin with Ms. Martin's kindergartners. The first goal of reform should be to ensure that every child—regardless of home background, home language, or learning style—achieves the success that he or she so confidently expected in kindergarten, that all children maintain their motivation, enthusiasm, and optimism because they are objectively succeeding at the school's tasks. Any reform that does less than this is hollow and self-defeating. What does it mean to succeed in the early grades? The elementary schools' definition of success, and therefore the parents'

PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

and children's definition as well, is overwhelmingly success in reading. Very few children who are reading adequately are retained, assigned to special education, or given long-term remedial services. Other subjects are important, of course, but reading and language arts form the core of what school success means in the early grades.

When a child fails to read well in the early grades, he or she begins a downward progression. In first grade, some children begin to notice that they are not reading adequately. They may fail first grade or be assigned to long term remediation. As they proceed through the elementary grades, many students begin to see that they are failing at their full-time jobs. When this happens, things begin to unravel. Failing students begin to have poor motivation and poor self-expectations, which lead to continued poor achievement, in a declining spiral that ultimately leads to despair, delinquency, and dropout.

Remediating learning deficits after they are already well established is extremely difficult. Children who have already failed to learn to read, for example, are now anxious about reading, and doubt their ability to learn it. Their motivation to read may be low. They may ultimately learn to read but it will always be a chore, not a pleasure. Clearly, the time to provide additional help to children who are at risk is early, when children are still motivated and confident and when any learning deficits are relatively small and remediable. The most important goal in educational programming for students at risk of school failure is to try to make certain that we do not squander the greatest resource we have—the enthusiasm and positive self-expectations of young children themselves.

In practical terms, what this perspective implies is that schools, and especially Title I, special education, and other services for at-risk children, must be shifted from an emphasis on remediation to an emphasis on prevention and early intervention. Prevention means providing developmentally appropriate preschool and kindergarten programs so that students will enter first grade ready to succeed, and it means providing regular classroom teachers with effective instructional programs, curricula, and professional development to enable them to see that most students are successful the first time they are taught. Early intervention means that supplementary instructional services are provided early in students' schooling and that they are intensive enough to bring at-risk students quickly to a level at which they can profit from good quality classroom instruction.

The purpose of this report is to describe the current state of research on the achievement outcomes of Success for All, a program built around the idea that every child can and must succeed in the early grades, no matter what this takes. The idea behind Success for All is to use everything we know about effective instruction for students at risk to direct all aspects of school and classroom organization toward the goal of preventing academic deficits from appearing in the first place; recognizing and intensively intervening with any deficits that do appear; and providing students with a rich and full curriculum to enable them to build on their firm foundation in basic skills. The commitment of Success for All is to do whatever it takes to see that all children become skilled, strategic, and enthusiastic readers as they progress through the elementary grades. In addition, this report describes research on Roots and Wings, a program that adds to Success for All programs in mathematics, science, and social studies (Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996).

Success for All

Success for All exists as a separate program and also serves as the reading/writing/language arts component for Roots and Wings. Success for All is built around the assumption that every child can read. We mean this not as wishful thinking or as a philosophical statement, but as a practical, attainable reality. In particular, every child without organic retardation can learn to read. Some children need more help than others and may need different approaches than those needed by others, but one way or another every child can become a successful reader.

Success for All began in one Baltimore elementary school in 1987-1988, and since then has expanded each year of additional schools. As of Fall, 1996, it is in about 450 schools in 120 districts in 31 states throughout the United States. The districts range from some of the largest in the country, such as Baltimore, Houston, Memphis, Philadelphia, Cincinnati, Cleveland, Chicago, New York, and Miami, to such middle-sized districts as Richmond, Virginia; Rockford, Illinois; and Modesto and Riverside, California, to tiny rural districts, including two on the Navajo reservation in Arizona. Success for All reading curricula in Spanish have been developed and researched and are used in bilingual programs in California, Texas, Arizona, Florida, Illinois, New York, New Jersey, and Philadelphia. Almost all Success for All schools are high-poverty title I schools, and the great majority are schoolwide projects. Otherwise, the schools vary widely.

Success for All and Roots and Wings have somewhat different components at different sites, depending on the school's needs and resources available to implement the program (Slavin et al., 1996b). However, there is a common set of elements characteristic of all Success for All and Roots and Wings schools. These are described on the following pages.

Reading Program

Success for All and Roots and Wings use a reading curriculum based on research, on effective practices in beginning reading (e.g., Adams, 1990), and on effective use of cooperative learning (Slavin, 1995; Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987).

Reading teachers at every grade level begin the reading time by reading children's literature to students and engaging them in a discussion of the story to enhance their understanding of the story, listening and speaking vocabulary, and knowledge of story structure. In kindergarten and first grade, the program emphasizes the development of oral language and pre-reading skills through the use of thematically-based units which incorporate areas such as language arts and writing under a science or social studies topic. A component called Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) involves the students in listening to, retelling, and dramatizing children's literature. Big books as well as oral and written composing activities allow students to develop concepts of print as they develop knowledge of story structure. There is also a strong emphasis on phonemic awareness activities which help develop auditory discrimination and support the development of reading readiness strategies.

Reading Roots is typically introduced in the second semester of kindergarten or in first grade. This K-1 beginning reading program uses as its base a series of phonetically regular but meaningful and interesting minibooks and emphasizes repeated oral reading to partners as well as to the teacher. The minibooks begin with a set of "shared stories," in which part of a story is written in small type (read by the teacher) and part is written in large type (read by the stu-

dents). The student portion uses a phonetically controlled vocabulary. Taken together, the teacher and student portions create interesting, worthwhile stories. Over time, the teacher portion diminishes and the student portion lengthens, until students are reading the entire book. This scaffolding allows students to read interesting literature when they only have a few letter sounds. Letters and letter sounds are introduced in an active, engaging set of activities that begins with oral language and moves into written symbols. Individual sounds are integrated into a context of words, sentences, and stories. Instruction is provided in story structure, specific comprehension skills, metacognitive strategies for self-assessment and self-correction, and integration of reading and writing.

Spanish bilingual programs use an adaptation of Reading Roots called Lee Connigo ("Read With Me"). Lee Connigo employs the same instructional strategies as Reading Roots, but uses Spanish reading materials.

When students reach the primer reading level, they use a program called Reading Wings, an adaptation of Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (CIRC) (Stevens, Madden, Slavin, & Farnish, 1987). Reading Wings uses cooperative learning activities built around story structure, prediction, summarization, vocabulary building, decoding practice, and story-related writing. Students engage in partner reading and structured discussion of stories or novels, and work toward mastery of the vocabulary and content of the story in teams. Story-related writing is also shared within teams. Cooperative learning both increases students' motivation and engages students in cognitive activities known to contribute to reading comprehension, such as elaboration, summarization, and rephrasing (see Slavin, 1995). Research on CIRC has found it to significantly increase students' reading comprehension and language skills (Stevens et al., 1987).

In addition to these story-related activities, teachers provide direct instruction in reading comprehension skills, and students practice these skills in their teams. Classroom libraries of trade books at students' reading levels are provided for each teacher, and students read books of their choice for homework for 20 minutes each night. Home readings are shared via presentations, summaries, puppet shows, and other formats twice a week during "book club" sessions.

Materials to support Reading Wings through the sixth grade (or beyond) exist in English and Spanish. The English materials are built around children's literature and around the most widely used basal series and anthologies. Supportive materials have been developed for more than 100 children's novels and for most current basal series. Spanish materials are similarly built around Spanish-language novels and basals.

Beginning in the second semester of program implementation, Success for All and Roots and Wings schools usually implement a writing/language arts program based primarily on cooperative learning principles (see Slavin, Madden, & Stevens, 1989/90).

Students in grades one to three (and sometimes 4 to 5 or 6) are regrouped for reading. The students are assigned to heterogeneous, age-grouped classes most of the day, but during a regular 90-minute reading period they are regrouped by reading performance levels into reading classes of students all at the same level. For example, a 2-1 reading class might contain first-, second-, and third-grade students all reading at the same level. The reading classes are smaller than home rooms because tutors and other certified staff (such as librarians or art teachers) teach reading during this common reading period. Regrouping allows teachers to teach the whole

reading class without having to break the class into reading groups. This greatly reduces the time spent in seatwork and increases direct instruction time, eliminating workbooks, dittos, or other follow-up activities which are needed in classes that have multiple reading groups. The regrouping is a form of the Joplin Plan, which has been found to increase reading achievement in the elementary grades (Slavin, 1987).

Eight-Week Reading Assessments

At eight-week intervals, reading teachers assess student progress through the reading program. The results of the assessments are used to determine who is to receive tutoring, to change students' reading groups, to suggest other adaptations in students' programs, and to identify students who need other types of assistance, such as family interventions or screening for vision and hearing problems. The assessments are curriculum-based measures that include teacher observations and judgments as well as more formal measures of reading comprehension.

Reading Tutors

One of the most important elements of Success for All and Roots and Wings is the use of tutors to promote students' success in reading. One-to-one tutoring is the most effective form of instruction known (see Wasik & Slavin, 1993). The tutors are certified teachers with experience teaching Title I, special education, and/or primary reading. Often, well-qualified paraprofessionals also tutor children with less severe reading problems. In this case, a certified tutor monitors their work and assists with the diagnostic assessment and intervention strategies. Tutors work one-on-one with students who are having difficulties keeping up with their reading groups. The tutoring occurs in 20-minute sessions during times other than reading or math periods.

In general, tutors support students' success in the regular reading curriculum, rather than teaching different objectives. For example, the tutor will work with a student on the same story and concepts being read and taught in the regular reading class. However, tutors seek to identify learning problems and use different strategies to teach the same skills. They also teach metacognitive skills beyond those taught in the classroom program. Schools may have as many as six or more teachers serving as tutors depending on school size, need for tutoring, and other factors.

During daily 90-minute reading periods, certified tutors serve as additional reading teachers to reduce class size for reading. Reading teachers and tutors use brief forms to communicate about students' specific problems and needs and meet at regular times to coordinate their approaches with individual children.

Initial decisions about reading group placement and the need for tutoring are based on informal reading inventories that the tutors give to each child. Subsequent reading group placements and tutoring assignments are made using the curriculum-based assessments described above. First-graders receive priority for tutoring, on the assumption that the primary function of the tutors is to help all students be successful in reading the first time, before they fail and become remedial readers.

Preschool and Kindergarten

Most Success for All and Roots and Wings schools provide a half-day preschool and/or a full-day kindergarten for eligible students. The preschool and kindergarten programs focus on providing a balanced and developmentally appropriate learning experience for young children. The curriculum emphasizes the development and use of language. It

provides a balance of academic readiness and non-academic music, art, and movement activities in a series of thematic, interdisciplinary units. Readiness activities include use of the Peabody Language Development Kits and Story Telling and Retelling (STaR) in which students retell stories read by the teachers. Pre-reading activities begin during the second semester of kindergarten.

Family Support Team

Parents are an essential part of the formula for success in Success for All and Roots and Wings. A Family Support Team works in each school, serving to make families feel respected and welcome in the school and become active supporters of their child's education as well as providing specific services. The Family Support Team consists of the Title I parent liaison, vice-principal (if any), counselor (if any), facilitator, and any other appropriate staff already present in the school or added to the school staff.

The Family Support Team first works toward good relations with parents and to increase involvement in the schools. Family Support Team members may complete "welcome" visits for new families. They organize many attractive programs in the school, such as parenting skills workshops. Most schools use a program called "Raising Readers" in which parents are given strategies to use in reading with their own children.

The Family Support Team also intervenes to solve problems. For example, they may contact parents whose children are frequently absent to see what resources can be provided to assist the family in getting their child to school. Family support staff, teachers, and parents work together to solve school behavior problems. Also, family support staff are called on to provide assistance when students seem to be working at less than their full potential because of problems at home. Families of students who are not receiving adequate sleep or nutrition, need glasses, are not attending school regularly, or are exhibiting serious behavior problems, may receive family support assistance.

The Family Support Team is strongly integrated into the academic program of the school. It receives referrals from teachers and tutors regarding children who are not making adequate academic progress, and thereby constitutes an additional stage of intervention for students in need above and beyond that provided by the classroom teacher or tutor. The Family Support Team also encourages and trains the parents to fulfill numerous volunteer roles within the school, ranging from providing a listening ear to emerging readers to helping in the school cafeteria.

Program Facilitator

A program facilitator works at each school to oversee (with the principal) the operation of the Success for All and Roots and Wings models. The facilitator helps plan the program, helps the principal with scheduling, and visits classes and tutoring sessions frequently to help teachers and tutors with individual problems. He or she works directly with the teachers on implementation of the curriculum, classroom management, and other issues, helps teachers and tutors deal with any behavior problems or other special problems, and coordinates the activities of the Family Support Team with those of the instruction staff.

Teachers and Teacher Training

The teachers and tutors are regular certified teachers. They receive detailed teacher's manuals supplemented by three days of inservice at the beginning of the school year. In Roots and Wings schools, this level of inservice continues over a three-year period as the main program elements are phased in.

Throughout the year, follow-up visits are made to the school by project staff, who visit classrooms, meet with school staff, and conduct inservice presentations on such topics as classroom management, instructional pace, and cooperative learning. Facilitators also organize many informal sessions to allow teachers to share problems and problem solutions, suggest changes, and discuss individual children. The staff development model used in Success for All and Roots and Wings emphasizes relatively brief initial training with extensive classroom follow-up, coaching, and group discussion.

Advisory Committee

An advisory committee composed of the building principal, program facilitator, teacher representatives, parent representatives, and family support staff meets regularly to review the progress of the program and to identify and solve any problems that arise. In most schools existing site-based management teams are adapted to fulfill this function. In addition, grade-level teams and the Family Support Team meet regularly to discuss common problems and solutions and to make decisions in their areas of responsibility.

Special Education

Every effort is made to deal with student's learning problems within the context of the regular classroom, as supplemented by tutors. Tutors evaluate student's strengths and weaknesses and develop strategies to teach in the most effective way. In some schools, special education teachers work as tutors and reading teachers with students identified as learning disabled as well as other students experiencing learning problems who are at risk for special education placement. One major goal of Success for All and Roots and Wings is to keep students with learning problems out of special education if at all possible, and to serve any students who qualify for special education in a way that does not disrupt their regular classroom experience (see Slavin, Madden, Karweit, Dolan, Wasik, Shaw, Mainzer, & Haxby, 1991).

Roots and Wings

Roots and Wings (Slavin, Madden, Dolan, & Wasik, 1994; Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996) is a comprehensive reform design for elementary schools that adds to Success for All innovative programs in mathematics, social studies, and science.

Roots and Wings schools begin by implementing all components of Success for All, described above. In the second year of implementation they typically begin to incorporate the additional major components. MathWings is the name of the mathematics program used in grades 1-5. It is a constructivist approach to mathematics based on NCTM standards, but designed to be practical and effective in schools serving many students placed at risk. MathWings makes extensive use of cooperative learning, games, discovery, creative problem solving, manipulatives, and calculators.

WorldLab is an integrated approach to social studies and science that engages students in simulations and group investigations. Students take on roles as various people in history, in different parts of the world, or in various occupations. For example, they work as engineers to design and test efficient vehicles, they form a state legislature to enact environmental legislation, they repeat Benjamin Franklin's experiments, and they solve problems of agriculture in Africa. In each activity students work in cooperative groups, do extensive writing, and use reading, mathematics, and fine arts skills learned in other parts of the program.

As of Fall 1996, approximately sixty schools in fifteen states are adding either

MathWings or WorldLab to their implementations of Success for All, making themselves into Roots and Wings schools. Demonstration sites for the program are being established in many parts of the United States.

Research on Success for All and Roots and Wings

From the very beginning, there has been a strong focus in Success for All on research and evaluation. We began longitudinal evaluations of the program in its earliest sites, six schools in Baltimore and Philadelphia. Later, third-party evaluators at the Univer-

sity of Memphis—Steven Ross, Lana Smith, and their colleagues—added evaluations in Memphis, Houston, Tucson, Montgomery, Alabama, Ft. Wayne, Indiana, and Caldwell, Idaho. Most recently, studies focusing on English language learners in California have been conducted in Modesto and Riverside by the Southwest Regional Laboratory. Each of these evaluations has compared Success for All schools to matched comparison schools on measures of reading performance, starting with cohorts in kindergarten or in first grade and continuing to follow these students as long as possible (details of the eval-

uations design appear below). Vagaries of funding and other local problems have ended some evaluations prematurely, but most have been able to follow Success for All schools for many years. As of this writing, there are seven years of continuous data from the six original schools in Baltimore and Philadelphia, and varying numbers of years of data from seven other districts, a total of twenty-three schools (and their matched control schools). Information on these schools and districts is shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF SUCCESS FOR ALL SCHOOLS IN THE LONGITUDINAL STUDY

District/school	Enrollment	Percent free lunch	Ethnicity by percent	Date began SFA	Data collected	Pre-school?	Full-day K?	Comments
Baltimore:								
B1	500	83	B-96 W-4	1987	88-94	yes	yes	First SFA school; had additional funds first 2 years. Had additional funds first 4 years.
B2	500	96	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	
B3	400	96	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	
B4	500	85	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	
B5	650	96	B-100	1988	89-94	some	yes	
Philadelphia:								
P1	620	96	A-60 W-2 B-20	1988	89-94	no	yes	Large ESL program for Cambodian children.
P2	600	97	B-100	1991	92-93	some	yes	
P3	570	96	B-100	1991	92-93	no	yes	
P4	840	98	B-100	1991	93	no	yes	
P5	700	98	L-100	1992	93-94	no	yes	Study only involves students in Spanish bilingual program.
Charleston, SC:								
CS1	500	40	B-60 W-40	1990	91-92	no	no	
Memphis, TN:								
MT1	350	90	B-95 W-5	1990	91-94	yes	no	Program implemented only in grades K-2.
MT2	530	90	B-100	1993	94	yes	yes	
MT3	290	86	B-100	1993	94	yes	yes	
MT4	370	90	B-100	1993	94	yes	yes	
Ft. Wayne, IN:								
F1	330	65	B-56 W-44	1991	92-94	no	yes	SFA schools (& controls) are part of desegregation plan.
F2	250	55	B-55 W-45	1991	92-94	no	yes	SFA schools (& controls) are part of desegregation plan.
Montgomery, AL:								
MA1	450	95	B-100	1991	93-94	no	yes	
MA2	460	97	B-100	1991	93-94	no	yes	
Caldwell, ID:								
C1	400	20	W-80 L-20	1991	93-94	no	no	Study compares 2 SFA schools to Reading Recovery school.
Modesto, CA:								
MC1	640	70	W-54 L-25 A-17 B-4	1992	94	yes	no	Large ESL program for students speaking 17 languages.
MC2	560	98	L-66 W-24 A-10	1992	94	yes	no	Large Spanish bilingual program.
Riverside, CA:								
R1	930	73	L-54 W-33 B-10	1992	94	yes	no	Large Spanish bilingual & ESL programs; year-round school.

Key: B—African American; L—Latino; A—Asian American; W—White.

Evaluation Design

A common evaluation design, with variations due to local circumstances, has been used in all Success for All evaluations. Every Success for All school involved in a formal evaluation is matched with a control school that is similar in poverty level (percent of students qualifying for free lunch), historical achievement level, ethnicity, and other factors. Schools are also matched on district-administered standardized test scores given in kindergarten or (starting in 1991 in six districts) on Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT) scores given by the project in the fall of kindergarten or first grade. The measures used in the evaluations were as follows:

Woodcock Reading Mastery Test.—Three Woodcock scales—Word Identification, Word Attack, and Passage Comprehension—were individually administered to students by trained testers. Word Identification assesses recognition of common sight words, Word Attack assesses phonetic synthesis skills, and Passage Comprehension assesses comprehension in context. Students in Spanish bilingual programs were given the Spanish versions of these scales.

Durrell Analysis of Reading Difficulty.—The Durrell Oral Reading scale was also individually administered to students in grades 1-3. It presents a series of graded reading passages which students read aloud, followed by comprehension questions.

Gray Oral Reading Test.—Comprehension and passage scores from the Gray Oral Reading Test were obtained from students in grades 4-5.

Analyses of covariance with pretests as covariates were used to compare raw scores in

all evaluations, and separate analyses were conducted for students in general and for students in the lowest 25% of their grades.

The figures presented in this report summarize student performance in grade equivalents (adjusted for covariates) and effect size (proportion of a standard deviation separating the experimental and control groups), averaging across individual measures. Neither grade equivalents nor averaged scores were used in the analyses, but they are presented here as a useful summary.

Each of the evaluations summarized in this report follows children who began in Success for All in first grade or earlier, in comparison to children who had attended the control school over the same period. Students who start in it after first grade are not considered to have received the full treatment (although they are of course served within the schools).

Results for all experimental-control comparisons in all evaluation years are averaged and summarized in the following graph entitled "Comparison of Success for All and Control in Mean Reading Grade Equivalents and Effect Sizes 1988-1994" using a method called multi-site replicated experiment (Slavin et al., 1996a,b; Slavin & Madden, 1993).

For more details on methods and findings, see Slavin et al. (1996a,b) and the full site reports.

Reading Outcomes

The results of the multi-site replicated experiment evaluating Success for All are summarized in the following graph entitled "Comparison of Success for All and Control in Mean Reading Grade Equivalents and Ef-

fect Sizes 1988-1994" for each grade level, 1-5. The analyses compare cohort means for experimental and control schools; for example the Grade 1 graph compares 55 experimental to 55 control cohorts, with cohort (50-150 students) as the unit of analysis. In other words, each bar is a mean of scores from more than 5000 students. Grade equivalents are based on the means, and are only presented for their informational value. No analyses were done using grade equivalents.

Statistically significantly (p=.05 or better) positive effects of Success for All (compared to controls) were found on every measure at every grade level, 1-5. For students in general, effect sizes averaged around a half standard deviation at all grade levels. Effects were somewhat higher than this for the Woodcock Word Attack scale in grades 1 and 2, but in grades 3-5 effect sizes were more or less equivalent on all aspects of reading. Consistently, effect sizes for students in the lowest 25% of their grades were particularly positive, ranging from ES=+1.03 in first grades to ES=+1.68 in fourth grade. Again, cohort-level analyses found statistically significant differences favoring low achievers in Success for All on every measure at every grade level.

Roots and Wings

A study of Roots and Wings (Slavin, Madden, & Wasik, 1996) was carried out in four pilot schools in rural southern Maryland. The Roots and Wings schools serve populations that are significantly more disadvantaged than state averages. They average 48% free and reduced-price lunch eligibility, compared to 30% for the state; 21% of Roots and

Wings students are Title I eligible, in comparison to 7% for the state. The assessment tracked growth over time on the Maryland School Performance Assessment Program (MSPAP), compared to growth in the state as a whole. The MSPAP is a performance measure on which students are asked to solve complex problems, set up experiments, write in various genres, and read extended text. It uses matrix sampling, which means that different students take different forms of the test.

In both third- and fifth-grade assessments in all subjects tested (reading, language, writing, math, science, and social studies), Roots and Wings students showed substantial growth, as shown in the following graphs.*

The State of Maryland gained in average performance on the MSPAP over the same time period, but the number of Roots and Wings students achieving at satisfactory or excellent increased by more than twice the state's rate on every measure at both grade levels.

Effects on District-Administered Standardized Tests

The formal evaluations of Success for All have relied on individually administered assessments of reading. The Woodcock and Durrell scales used in these assessments are far more accurate than district-administered tests, and are much more sensitive to real reading gains. They allow testers to hear children actually reading material of increasing difficulty and responding to questions about what they have read. The Woodcock and Durrell are themselves nationally standardized tests, and produce norms (e.g., percentiles, NCEs and grade equivalents) just like any other standardized measure.

However, educators often want to know the effects of innovative programs on the kinds of group administered standardized tests they are usually held accountable for. To obtain this information, we have sometimes requested standardized test data for students in experimental and control schools, and some districts have done their own evaluations on their own measures. The following sections briefly summarize findings from these types of evaluations.

Baltimore, Maryland—Through the 1992-93 school year we collected CTBS scores for our five Success for All and control schools. On average, Success for All schools exceeded control schools at every grade level. The differences were statistically and educationally significant. By fifth grade, Success for All students were performing 75% of a grade equivalent ahead of controls (ES=+0.45) on CTBS Total Reading scores (see Slavin, Maden, Dolan, Wasik, Ross, & Smith, 1994).

Memphis, Tennessee—A longitudinal evaluation of three Memphis Success for All schools (now becoming Roots and Wings schools) by Ross, Smith, & Casey (1995) included an assessment of program effects on the Tennessee Comprehensive Assessment Program's (TCAP) Vocabulary and Reading Comprehension tests. On average, the three Success for All schools exceeded the three controls by an effect size of +0.38 in first grade and +0.45 in second grade. Again, these effects are educationally and statistically significant.

Flint, Michigan—Two schools in Flint, Michigan began implementation of Success for All in 1992. The percentage of students passing the Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) in reading at fourth grade has increased dramatically. Homedale Elementary had a pass rate of 2% in 1992, placing it last among the district's 32 ele-

mentary schools. In 1995, 48.6% of students passed, placing it first in the district. Merrill Elementary, 27th in the district in 1992 with only 9.5% of students passing, was 12th in 1995 with 22% passing. Over the same period the average for all Flint elementary schools only increased from 18.3% passing to 19.3%.

Ft. Wayne, Indiana—An evaluation in two schools in Ft. Wayne, Indiana (Ross, Smith, & Casey, 1995) found positive effects of Success for All on the reading comprehension scale of the ISTEP, Indiana's norm-referenced achievement test. In first grade, the effect size was +0.49 for students in general and +1.13 for the lowest-performing 25%. In second grade, effect sizes were +0.64, and in third grade, ES=+1.13.

Miami, Florida—(Dade County) An evaluation of three Success for All schools (currently becoming Roots and Wings schools) was carried out by Yuwadee Wongbundhit (1995) of the Dade County Public Schools. In comparison to three control schools, the Success for All schools gained seven percentile points from grades 1-2 while matched control schools lost five points on the Stanford Achievement Test (SAT-8). In grades 2,3, Success for All students gained only one percentile point, but controls lost eight.

Wichita Falls, Texas—Fannin Elementary School, the highest-poverty school in Wichita Falls, Texas, began implementation of Success for All in 1991. Its scores on the 1992 Texas Assessments of Academic Skills (TAAS) showed a dramatic improvement. The percentage of third-graders meeting minimum expectations in reading increased from 48% to 70% (during the same year, the district percentage declined by 3%). Fannin students also increased from 8% to 53% in the percentage of students meeting minimum expectations in writing.

Modesto, California—Two schools in Modesto, California have been implementing Success for All since 1991. Each year, their average NCE's in reading comprehension have increased significantly. In 1993, El Vista Elementary showed an NCE gain of 10.8; in grades two and three, the gains were 14.7 and 13.5, respectively. Orville Wright Elementary showed gains averaging 4.6 in grades 2-3. On the Spanish Aprenda, Orville Wright students using the Lee Conmigo program gained 9.5 NCEs. On the CLAS, California's experimental performance measure, both schools significantly exceeded their matched comparison group in 1993. Principals report that among students who have remained in the program since first grade, no third graders are reading below grade level.

Charleston, West Virginia—Chandler Elementary School began implementing Success for All in 1990. In the two years before the program was introduced, the school averaged an NCE score of 34. This increased to 43 in the first year after implementation and to 54 by the third year.

Changes in Effect Sizes over Years of Implementation

One interesting trend in outcomes from comparisons of Success for All and control schools relates to changes in effect sizes according to the number of years a school has been implementing the program. Figure 4, which summarizes these data, was created by pooling effect sizes for all cohorts in their first year of implementation, all in their second year, and so on, regardless of calendar year.

Figure 4 shows that mean reading effect sizes progressively increase with each year of implementation. For example, Success for All first-graders score substantially better than control first-graders at the end of the first year of implementation (ES=+0.49). The experimental-control difference is even higher for first graders attending schools in the

second year of program implementation (ES=+0.53), increasing to an effect size of +0.73 for schools in their fourth implementation year. A similar pattern is apparent for second- and third-grade cohorts.

The data summarized in Figure 4 show that while Success for All has an immediate impact on student reading achievement, this impact grows over successive years of implementation. Over time, schools may become increasingly able to provide effective instruction to all of their students, to approach the goal of success for all.

Success for All and English Language Learners

The education of English language learners is at a crossroads. For many years, researchers, educators, and policy makers have debated questions of the appropriate language instruction for students who enter elementary school speaking languages other than English. Research on this topic has generally found that students taught to read their home language and then transitioned to English ultimately become better readers in English than do students taught to read only in English (Garcia, 1991; Willig, 1985; Wong-Fillmore & Valadez, 1986). More recently, however, attention has shifted to another question. Given that students are taught to read their home language, how can we ensure that they succeed in that language? (See, for example, Garcia, 1994.) There is no reason to expect that children failing to read well in Spanish, for example, will later become good readers and successful students in English. On the contrary, research consistently supports the common-sense expectation that the better students in Spanish bilingual programs read Spanish, the better their English reading will be (Garcia, 1991; Hakuta & Garcia, 1989). Clearly, the quality of instruction in home-language reading is a key factor in the ultimate school success of English language learners, and must be a focus of research on the education of these children.

Francis Scott Key (ESL)—

An adaptation of Success for All to the needs of ESL students was evaluated at Philadelphia's Francis Scott Key Elementary School, a majority-Cambodian school in which virtually all children are in poverty. Francis Scott Key was evaluated in comparison to a similar Philadelphia elementary school.

Results: Asian Students—Success for All Asian students in grades 3-5, most of whom had been in the program since kindergarten, performed far better than control students. Differences between Success for All and control students were statistically significant on every measure at every grade level (p<.001). Median grade equivalents and effect sizes were computed across the three Woodcock scales. On average, Success for All Asian students exceeded control students in reading grade equivalents by almost three years in third grade (median ES=+1.76), more than 2 years in fourth grade (median ES=+1.46), and about three years in fifth grade (median ES=+1.44). Success for All Asian students were reading more than a full year above grade level in grade 3 and more than a half-year above in fourth and fifth grade, while similar control students were reading more than a year below grade level at all three grade levels.

Results: Non-Asian Students. Outcomes of Success for All non-Asian students were also very positive in grades 3-5. Experimental-control differences were statistically significant (p<.05 or better) on every measure at every level. Effect sizes were somewhat smaller than for Asian students, but were still quite substantial, average +1.00 in grade, +0.96 in grade 4, and +0.78 in grade 5. Success for All students averaged almost two years above grade level in third grade, more

* Graphs were not reproduced.

than a year above grade level in fourth grade, and about eight months above grade level in fifth grade; at all grade levels, Success for All averaged about 2.5 years higher than control students.

Fairhill (Bilingual)—The bilingual version of Success for All, Lee Conmigo, was first implemented at Fairhill Elementary School, a school in inner-city Philadelphia. Fairhill serves a student body of 694 students of whom 78% are Hispanic and 22% are African-American. A matched comparison school was also selected. Nearly all students in both schools qualified for free lunches. Both schools were Title I schoolwide projects, which means that both had high (and roughly equivalent) allocations of Title I funds that they could use flexibly to meet student needs.

Results: All students defined by district criteria as limited English proficient at Fairhill and its control school were pretested at the beginning of first grade on the Spanish Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test (PPVT). Each following May, these students were tested by native language speakers on three scales of the Spanish Woodcock.

ANCOVAs controlling for pretests showed that at the end of grade 2 Success for All students scored substantially higher than control on every measure ($p < .01$ or better). Control second-graders scored far below grade level on all three scales. In contrast, Fairhill students averaged near grade level on all measures. Effect sizes on all measures were substantial. Fairhill students exceeded control by 1.8 standard deviations on Letter-Word Identification, 2.2 on Word Attack, and 1.3 on Passage Comprehension. Fremont (Bilingual), Wright (Bilingual) and El Vista (ESL).

Data from first-graders in three California Success for All schools were analyzed together by Dianda and Flaherty (1995), pooling data across schools in four categories: English-dominant students, Spanish-dominant students taught in Spanish (Lee Conmigo in Success for All schools), Spanish-dominant students taught in English ("sheltered students"), and speakers of languages other than English or Spanish taught in English. The pooled results are summarized in Figure 5.

As is clear in Figure 5, all categories of Success for All students scored substantially better than control students. The differences were greatest, however, for Spanish-dominated students taught in bilingual classes ($ES = +1.03$) and those taught in sheltered English programs ($ES = +1.02$). The bilingual students scored at grade level, and more than six months ahead of controls. The sheltered students scored about two months below grade level, but were still four months ahead of their controls. Both English-speaking students and speakers of languages other than English or Spanish scored above grade level and about two months ahead of their controls. The effects of Success for All on the achievement of English language learners are substantially positive. Across three schools implementing Lee Conmigo, the Spanish curriculum used in bilingual Success for All schools, the average effect size for first-graders on Spanish assessments was $+0.88$; for second-graders (at Philadelphia's Fairhill Elementary) the average effect size was $+1.77$. For students in sheltered English instruction, effect sizes for all comparisons were also very positive, especially for Cambodian students in Philadelphia and Mexican-American students in California.

Comparing Success for All and Reading Recovery

Reading Recovery is one of the most extensively researched and widely used innovations in elementary education. Like Success

for All, Reading Recovery provides one-to-one tutoring to first graders who are struggling in reading. Research on Reading Recovery has found substantial positive effects of the program as of the end of first grade, and longitudinal studies have found that some portion of these effects maintain at least through fourth grade (DeFord, Pinnell, Lyons & Young, 1988; Pinnell, Lyons, DeFord, Bryk, & Seltzer, 1991).

Schools and districts attracted to Success for All are also often attracted to Reading Recovery, as the two programs share an emphasis on early intervention and a strong research base. Increasing numbers of districts have both programs in operation in different schools. One of the districts in the Success for All evaluation, Caldwell, Idaho, happened to be one of these. Ross, Smith, Casey, & Slavin (1995) used this opportunity to compare the two programs.

In Caldwell, two schools are using Success for All and one is using Reading Recovery. All three are very similar rural schools with similar ethnic make-ups (10-25% Hispanic, with the remainder Anglo), proportions of students qualifying for free lunch (45-60%), and sizes (411-451). The Success for All schools were somewhat higher than the Reading Recovery school in poverty and percent Hispanic. In 1992-93, one of the Success for All schools was in its second year of implementation and the other was a new school that was in its first year (but had moved a principal and some experienced staff reassigned from the first school). Reading Recovery was in its second year of implementation.

The study compared first-graders in the three schools. Figure 6 summarizes the results. As is clear from the figure, students in the Success for All schools performed somewhat better than students in the Reading Recovery school overall ($ES = +.17$). Differences for special education students were substantial, averaging an effect size of $+0.77$. Special education students were not tutored in the Reading Recovery school and were primarily taught in a separate resource room. These students scored near the floor on all tests. In contrast, Success for All special education students were fully mainstreamed and did receive tutoring, and their reading scores, though still low, showed them to be on the way toward success in reading.

Excluding the special education students, there were no differences in reading performance between tutored students in the Success for All and Reading Recovery schools ($ES = .00$). In light of earlier research, these outcomes suggest that both tutoring programs are highly effective for at-risk first graders.

A second comparison of Success for All and Reading Recovery was carried out by Ross, Nunnery, & Smith (1996) in the Amphitheater School District of Tucson, Arizona. Three high-poverty schools (about 25% Mexican American students) were compared. One used Success for All, one used Reading Recovery with a whole-language curriculum, and a control school used a whole-language approach without tutoring.

In this study, tutored as well as non-tutored first-graders scored substantially higher in Success for All than in Reading Recovery. For tutored students the difference averaged an effect size of 1.08, with mean grade equivalents of 1.85 for tutored students in Success for All, 1.20 for Reading Recovery students. For all students, Success for All students had an average grade equivalent of 2.18, the Reading Recovery school 1.73, and the control school 1.80, with mean effect sizes of $+0.68$ comparing Success for All and the Reading Recovery school and $+0.39$ comparing Success for All and control.

The comparison of Success for All and Reading Recovery supports a common-sense

conclusion. Success for All, which affects all students, has positive effects on all students. Reading Recovery focuses on tutoring and therefore produces its effects only on tutored students. These results suggest that Success for All may be most appropriate in schools serving many at-risk students, while Reading Recovery may be more practical when the number of students at risk of reading failure is small. Some schools have merged the two programs, combining the breadth and comprehensiveness of Success for All with the outstanding professional development for tutors provided by Reading Recovery. Such mergers of Success for All and Reading Recovery are being started in about a dozen schools located around the United States.

Success for All and Special Education

Perhaps the most important goal of Success for All is to place a floor under the reading achievement of all children, to ensure that every child performs adequately in this critical skill. This goal has major implications for special education. If the program makes a substantial difference in the reading achievement of the lowest achievers, then it should reduce special education referrals and placements. Further, students who have IEPs indicating learning disabilities or related problems are typically treated the same as other students in Success for All. That is, they receive tutoring if they need it, participate in reading classes appropriate to their reading levels, and spend the rest of the day in age-appropriate, heterogeneous classrooms. Their tutor and/or reading teacher is likely to be a special education teacher, but otherwise they are not treated differently.

The philosophy behind that treatment of special education issues in Success for All is called "neverstreaming" (Slavin et al. 1991). That is, rather than waiting until students fall far behind, are assigned to special education, and then may be mainstreamed into regular classes, Success for All schools intervene early and intensively with students who are at risk to try to keep them out of the special education system. Once students are far behind, special education services are unlikely to catch them up to age-appropriate levels of performance. Students who have already failed in reading are likely to have an overlay of anxiety, poor motivation, poor behavior, low self-esteem, and ineffective learning strategies that are likely to interfere with learning no matter how good special education services may be. Ensuring that all students succeed in the first place is a far better strategy if it can be accomplished. In Success for All, the provision of research-based preschool, kindergarten, and first grade reading, one-to-one tutoring, and family support services are likely to give the most at-risk students a good chance of developing enough reading skills to remain out of special education, or to perform better in special education than would have otherwise been the case.

That data relating to special education outcomes clearly support these expectations. Several studies have focused on questions related to special education. One of the most important outcomes in this area is the consistent finding of particularly large effects of Success for All for students in the lowest 25% of their classes. While effect sizes for students in general have averaged around $+0.50$ on individually administered reading measures, effect sizes for the lowest achievers have averaged in the range of $+1.00$ to $+1.50$ across the grades. Across five Baltimore schools, only 2.2% of third-graders averaged two years behind grade level, a usual criterion for special education placement. In contrast, 8.8% of control third-graders scored this poorly. Baltimore data have

also shown a reduction in special education placements for learning disabilities of about half (Slavin et al., 1992). A study of two Success for All schools in Ft. Wayne, Indiana found that over a two year period 3.2% of Success for All students in grades K-1 and 1-2 were referred to special education for learning disabilities or mild mental handicaps. In contrast, 14.3% of control students were referred in these categories (Smith, Ross, & Casey, 1994).

Taken together, these findings support the conclusion that Success for All both reduces the need for special education services (by raising the reading achievement of very low achievers) and reduces special education referrals and placements.

Another important question concerns the effects of the program on students who have already been assigned to special education. Here again, there is evidence from different sources. In the Ross et al. (1995) study comparing Reading Recovery and Success for All described above, it so happened that first-graders in special education in the Reading Recovery group were not tutored, but instead received traditional special education services in resource rooms. In the Success for All schools, first-graders who had been assigned to special education were tutored one-to-one (by their special education teachers) and otherwise participated in the program in the same way as all other students. As noted earlier (recall Figure 6), special education students in Success for All were reading substantially better ($ES=+.77$) than special education students in the comparison school. In addition, Smith et al. (1994) combined first grade reading data from special education students in Success for All and control schools in four districts: Memphis, Ft. Wayne, Indiana, Montgomery, Alabama, and Caldwell, Idaho). Success for All special education students scored substantially better than controls (mean $ES=+.59$).

CONCLUSION

The results of evaluations of twenty-three Success for All schools in nine districts in eight states clearly show that the program increases student reading performance. In every district, Success for All students learned significantly more than matched control students. Significant effects were not seen on every measure at every grade level, but the consistent direction and magnitude of the effects show unequivocal benefits for Success for All students. Effects on district-administered standardized tests reinforce the findings of the studies using individually administered tests. This report also adds evidence showing particularly large impacts on the achievement of limited English proficient students in both bilingual and ESL programs, and on both reducing special education referrals and improving the achievement of students who have been assigned to special education. It compares the outcomes of Success for All with those of another early intervention program, Reading Recovery. It also summarizes outcomes of Roots and Wings, the next stage in the development of Success for All.

The Success for All evaluations have used reliable and valid measures, individually administered tests that are sensitive to all aspects of reading—comprehension, fluency, word attack, and word identification. Performance of Success for All students has been compared to that of matched students in matched control schools, who provide the best indication of what students without the program would have achieved. Replication of high-quality experiments in such a wide variety of schools and districts is extremely unusual. The equally consistent and dramatic impact of Success for All and Roots and Wings on district standardized tests and

state performance assessments are further evidence of the broad impact of these programs.

An important indicator of the robustness of Success for All is the fact of the more than 300 schools that have used the program for periods of 1-8 years, only eight have dropped out (in all cases because of changes of principals). Many other Success for All schools have survived changes of superintendents, principals, facilitators, and other key staff, major cuts in funding, and other serious threats to program maintenance.

The research summarized here demonstrates that comprehensive, systemic school-by-school change can take place on a broad scale in a way that maintains the integrity and effectiveness of the model. The 23 schools in nine districts that we are studying in depth are typical of the larger set of schools currently using Success for All and Roots and Wings in terms of quality of implementation, resources, demographic characteristics, and other factors. Program outcomes are not limited to the original home of the program; in fact, outcomes tend to be somewhat better outside of Baltimore. The widely held idea based on the Rand study of innovation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1978; McLaughlin, 1990) that comprehensive school reform must be invented by school staffs themselves is certainly not supported in research on Success for All or Roots and Wings. While the program is adapted to meet the needs of each school, and while school staffs must agree to implement the program by a vote of 80 percent or more, Success for All and Roots and Wings are externally developed programs with specific materials, manuals, and structures. The observation that these programs can be implemented and maintained over considerable time periods and can be effective in each of their replication sites certainly supports the idea that every school staff need not reinvent the wheel.

There is nothing magic about Success for All or Roots and Wings. None of their components are completely new or unique. Obviously, schools serving disadvantaged students can have great success without a special program if they have an outstanding staff, and other prevention/early intervention models, such as Reading Recovery (Pinnell, 1989) and the School Development Program (Comer, 1988) also have evidence of effectiveness with disadvantaged children. The main importance of the research on Success for All and Roots and Wings is not in validating a particular model or in demonstrating that disadvantaged students can learn. Rather, its greatest importance is in demonstrating that success for disadvantaged students can be routinely ensured in schools that are not exceptional or extraordinary (and were not producing great success before the program was introduced). We cannot ensure that every school has a charismatic principal or every student has a charismatic teacher. Nevertheless, we can ensure that every child, regardless of family background, has an opportunity to succeed in school.

The demonstration that an effective program can be replicated and can be effective in its replication sites removes one more excuse for the continuing low achievement of disadvantaged children. In order to ensure the success of disadvantaged students we must have the political commitment to do so, with the funds and policies to back up this commitment. Success for All and Roots and Wings do require a serious commitment to restructure elementary schools and to reconfigure uses of Title I, special education, and other funds to emphasize prevention and early intervention rather than remediation. These and other systemic changes in assess-

ments, accountability, standards, and legislation can facilitate the implementation of Success for All, Roots and Wings, and other school reform programs. However, we must also have methods known not only to be effective in their original sites, but also to be replicable and effective in other sites. The evaluations presented in this report provide a practical demonstration of the effectiveness and replicability of one such program.

REFERENCES

- Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1978). Federal programs supporting educational change: A model of education change. Vol. VIII: Implementing and sustaining innovations. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.
- Comer, J. (1988). Educating poor minority children. *Scientific American*, 259, 42-48.
- DeFord, D.E., Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., & Young, P. (1987). Ohio's Reading Recovery program: Vol. VII, Report of the follow-up studies. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Dianda, M.R., & Flaherty, J.F. (April 1995). Effects of Success for All on the reading achievement of first graders in California bilingual programs. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.
- Dianda, M.R., Madden, N.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1993, April). Lee Connigo: Success for All in schools serving limited English proficient students. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.
- Garcia, E.E. (1991). Bilingualism, second language acquisition, and the education of Chicano language minority students. In R.R. Valencia (Ed.), *Chicano school failure and success: Research and policy agendas for the 1990's*. New York: Falmer.
- Garcia, E.E. (1994, April). The impact of linguistic and cultural diversity on America's schools: A need for new policy. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- GAO, 1994. Limited English proficiency: A growing and costly educational challenge facing many school districts. Washington, DC: United States General Accounting Office.
- Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Ivory, G., & Calderón, M. (1993). The Bilingual Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition (BCIRC) project in the Ysleta Independent School District: Standardized test outcomes. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.
- Horwitz, R.I. (1987). Complexity and contradiction in clinical trial research. *American Journal of Medicine*, 82, 498-510.
- Levin, H.M. (1987). Accelerated schools for disadvantaged students. *Educational Leadership*, 44 (6), 19-21.
- Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L.J., & Wasik, B.A. (1993). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of a restructuring program for inner-city elementary schools. *American Educational Research Journal*, 30, 123-148.
- Matt, G.E., & Cook, T.D. (1994). Threats to the validity of research and syntheses. In H. Cooper & L.V. Hedges (Eds.), *The handbook of research synthesis* (pp. 503-520). New York: Russell Sage.
- McLaughlin, M.W. (1990). The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. *Educational Researcher*, 19(9), 11-16.
- Pinnell, G.S. (1989). Reading Recovery: Helping at-risk children learn to read. *Elementary School Journal*, 90, 161-182.
- Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., Bryk, A.S., & Seltzer, M. (1994). Comparing instructional models for the literacy education of high risk first graders. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 29, 8-38.
- Pinnell, G.S., Lyons, C.A., DeFord, D.E., Bryk, A.S., & Seltzer, M. (1991). Studying the effectiveness of early intervention approaches for first grade children having difficulty in reading. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University, Martha L. King Language and Literacy Center.
- Ross, S.M., Nunnery, J., & Smith, L. (1996). Evaluation of Title I reading programs: Amphitheater Public Schools. Year 1: 1995-96. Memphis: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.
- Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J., Casey, J., Johnson, B., & Bond, C. (1994, April). Using "Success for All" to restructure elementary schools: A tale of four cities. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.
- Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J., Casey, J., & Slavin, R.E. (1995). Increasing the academic success of disadvantaged children: An examination of alternative early intervention programs. *American Educational Research Journal*, 32, 773-800.

Sizer, T. (1984). *Horace's compromise: The dilemma of the American high school*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Slavin, R.E. (1986). Best-evidence synthesis: An alternative to meta-analytic and traditional reviews. *Educational Researcher*, 15(9), 5-11.

Slavin, R.E. (1987). Ability grouping and student achievement in elementary schools: A best-evidence synthesis. *Review of Educational Research*, 57, 347-350.

Slavin, R.E. (1994). School and classroom organization in beginning reading: Class size, aides, and instructional grouping. In R.E. Slavin, N.L. Karweit, B.A. Wasik, & N.A. Madden (Eds.), *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E. (1995). *Cooperative learning: Theory, research, and practice* (2nd Ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., & Wasik, B.A. (1992/93). Preventing early school failure: What works? *Educational Leadership*, 50(4), 10-18.

Slavin, R.E., Karweit, N.L., & Wasik, B.A. (1994). *Preventing early school failure: Research on effective strategies*. Boston, MA: Allyn & Bacon.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1993, April). Multi-site replicated experiments: An application to Success for All. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Atlanta.

Slavin, R.E., & Madden, N.A. (1994). *Implementing Success for All in the Philadelphia Public Schools* (Final report to the Pew Charitable Trusts). Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Slavin, R.E. & Madden, N.A. (1995, April). Effects of Success for All on the Achievement of English language learners. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1992). Success for All: A relentless approach to prevention and early intervention in elementary schools. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., & Wasik, B.A. (1996b). Every child, every school: Success for All. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., & Smith, L.J. (1994). "Whenever and wherever we choose . . ." The replication of Success for All. *Phi Delta Kappan*, 75(8), 639-647.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., & Smith, L.J. (1994, April). Success for All: Longitudinal effects of systemic school-by-school reform in seven districts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Ross, S.M., Smith, L.J. & Dianda, M. (1996a). Success for All: A summary of research. *Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk*, 1 (1), 41-76.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., Karweit, N.L., Dolan, L., Wasik, B.A., Shaw, A., Mainzer, K.L., & Haxby B. (1991). Neverstreaming: Prevention and early intervention as alternatives to special education. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 24, 373-378.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., & Stevens, R.J. (1989/90). Cooperative learning models for the 3 Rs. *Educational Leadership*, 47 (4), 22-28.

Slavin, R.E., Madden, N.A., & Wasik, B.A. (1996). *Roots and Wings*. In S. Stringfield S. Ross, & L. Smith (Eds.), *Bold plans for school restructuring: The New American Schools Designs*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Slavin, R.E., & Yampolsky, R. (1991). Effects of Success for All on students with limited English proficiency: A three-year evaluation. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University, Center for Research on Effective Schooling for Disadvantaged Students.

Smith, L.J., Ross, S.M., & Casey, J.P. (1994). Special education analyses for Success for All in four cities. Memphis, TN: University of Memphis, Center for Research in Educational Policy.

Stevens, R.J., Madden, N.A., Slavin, R.E., & Farnish, A.M. (1987). Cooperative Integrated Reading and Composition: Two field experiments. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 22, 433-454.

Wasik, B.A., & Slavin, R.E. (1993). Preventing early reading failure with one-to-one tutoring: A review of five programs. *Reading Research Quarterly*, 28, 178-200.

Willig, A.C. (1985). A meta-analysis of selected studies on the effectiveness of bilingual education. *Review of Educational Research*, 55, 269-317.

Wongbunhit, Y. (1995). *Evaluation of Success for All in the Dade County Public Schools*. Miami: Dade County Public Schools.

Wong-Fillmore, L., & Valadez, C. (1986). Teaching bilingual learners. In M.C. Wittrock (Ed.), *Handbook of research on teaching* (3rd Ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words, and I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Let me simply say that this debate is supposed to be on the Evans amendment. We have already accepted the amendment on both sides. There is obviously a little filibuster going on here. As long as there is, let me correct some of the misstatements that have been made on the House floor.

With respect to the school reform initiative contained in this bill, this is the exact opposite of control from Washington. What this bill attempts to do is to recognize that a whole group of American businessmen have tried to figure out what it is that makes schools work and what does not make them work. So instead of following their own individual political philosophy, they simply examined all of the research around the country to see what had been proven to improve student performance and what had not. And they simply came to the conclusion that there were roughly seven different models which helped to achieve much greater student performance.

The fact is that there are, in addition to a New American Schools Movement, there are a broad number of other efforts around the country to try to determine what works to improve schools. A number of Members have said, Gee, if school districts want to apply for this money, they have to fit into one of these molds or they cannot get the money." That is absolutely not the case.

What this legislation says is simply that we are making money available not to the Washington bureaucrats, but we are making money available primarily to the State chief school officers, and they will simply receive applications from school districts that want to get a little extra seed money to try to figure out how to improve the operation and organization of their local schools.

If they are not interested in doing it, they do not have to apply. If they are interested in applying, they do not have to follow anybody's single model. They do not have to follow the model of the Little Red Schoolhouse. They do not have to follow Professor Comer's model or anybody else's. These are simply seven illustrative models which the New American Schools Movement feels merit a look-see. But there are many others around the country, and if schools want to add their own wrinkles, they are perfectly free to do so.

In the end, State superintendents of public instruction will simply determine which grants seem to have the best chance to demonstrate success and

they will provide these start-up grants. That will simply enable local schools to put together whatever program is agreed to at the local level to reform their schools.

□ 1900

We have people in this Congress who do not like Goals 2000. We have people in this Congress who do not like testing. What we are saying is, "All right, if you don't like that, let's find some other way to encourage school reforms without Washington itself dictating what those reforms are going to be." I doubt very much that we would have the Fortune 500 corporate leaders who have encouraged this approach, I doubt very much that we would find any of them in favor of any approach being imposed from Washington. What we are simply trying to do is to assist local school districts, who often do not have the money available, to step back and reexamine their operations from top to bottom. We are simply trying to offer them some assistance.

We have had 20 years of research in this field. It is about time, it seems to me, that we start applying the results of that research. We spend billions of dollars on title I trying to deal with the problems of individual children, but we often approach that without having an atmosphere that is conducive to learning in the very schools where we are trying to improve individual child performance. And so this is simply an effort to allow local people to design whatever approach they want to take and get a little money to get some outside help, if they want it, to put together a program that works. That is all it is, and I would urge the Members if they are going to oppose this program to at least understand what it is they are opposing.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MILLER of California was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of California. I continue to yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I really do not want to say anything more than that. There are evidently some Members of the House who would prefer to create an argument for whatever reason they have. But to suggest that this is a model that imposes a solution on local schools is exactly the reverse from what it in fact is, and I doubt very much that we would find either the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] or me supporting anything which required local districts to produce anything but what they wanted to produce in order to improve their own local schools.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, I am not interested in an argument on the

issue. I am interested in the policy behind it. Perhaps I am misreading either the bill's language or the bill report. But let me tell the gentleman what they say. Because lots of times we have these general debates where we talk in great banal generalities but we never get down to the specifics. His proposition is that this language does not mandate any specific type of school reform.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, that is absolutely correct.

Mr. SHADEGG. That may be his intent, but that is in fact not what either the bill or the report says. If I might just quote from the bill and the report, we will talk about why I believe what he is doing is exactly that, mandating from Washington DC the specific kind of reform which will be acceptable. By the way, he says it is important that we go forward with school reform. I will tell the gentleman school reform is going forward in Arizona.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman does not have a question, I would like to take back the time.

Mr. SHADEGG. I have a question.

Mr. OBEY. What is it?

Mr. SHADEGG. I will tell the gentleman that school reform is going forward aggressively in Arizona. On page 65 of the bill, it says quite specifically at lines 21 through 23, "\$150 million shall be available under section 1002(g)(2) to demonstrate effective approaches to whole school reform." Whole school reform is a term of art. We look then to the report and the report repeats that same language twice. At two different points it says, this money is to be appropriated, actually it is a total of \$200 million, for whole school reform initiatives.

He says whole school reform initiatives let them do anything they want. Yet they do not.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if I can reclaim my time, if I might, and let the gentleman respond to the gentleman.

Mr. OBEY. Let me simply say, the gentleman can define whole school reform any way he wants. So can any local school district.

Mr. SHADEGG. Then the gentleman has no objection to striking the words "whole school reform"?

Mr. OBEY. We have not yielded. I would like to point out to the gentleman that I doubt that the Parent-Teachers Association of America, I doubt that the School Boards Association of America, I doubt that the School Administrators Association of America, I doubt that the title I administrators in the various 50 States, I doubt that the chief school officers of the 50 States would endorse a proposition which mandates on them requirements from Washington. They are supporting this because they believe this is the best way to make title I work. They believe that schools need the opportunity to review the way they are administered, the way teachers are trained and the way children are

taught, and there is nothing whatsoever wrong with that. One percent of schools in the country have already worked through the New American Schools model. There are other schools pursuing other models, and that is fine with me.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, if I might reclaim my time, I would like to join this debate and say I think the gentleman from Wisconsin is quite correct. If we are going to spend \$150 million of the public's money, we have some obligation to spend it in that area where we have some evidence that it will be an effective expenditure of the moneys. These kinds of reforms that are suggested in this legislation are those reforms that have years of research and demonstration behind them as to their effectiveness. There may be districts that want to reform in some other manner. Fine. Go ahead. But for those who believe, because this is not a matter of a demonstration. There are hundreds of school districts and hundreds of schools that are engaging in one or another of these programs, a total of thousands, where local communities, local school boards, local school administrators have initiated the effort and are reaping the benefits. If you want to do something else, you can do something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] has again expired.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. MILLER of California. We yield time to you and then you object to cut off the debate on a subject that you say is terribly important.

Mr. MANZULLO. I do not want to cut it off.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlemen will suspend.

Mr. MILLER of California. Is the gentleman objecting to my using the time? I was yielding to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. SHADEGG] so they could carry on, and I would just like to have the debate.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California will suspend.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois for unanimous consent.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] may restate his request.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to strike the requisite number of words.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would ask the gentleman from Wisconsin if I am correct, that the mechanism by which this works is that the funds are made available from the Secretary of Education to State education agencies. That would be the State Department of Education, let us say. No State has to apply for these funds. They can decide they do not want anything to do with this program and not apply. If they do apply, then they are granted funds and then the State parcels these funds out to the school districts that apply to them.

Mr. OBEY. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is correct.

Mr. PORTER. On a competitive basis. Then the school district can then decide what type of reform they wish to engage in and who they wish to hire to give them advice and counsel in that reform; is that correct?

Mr. OBEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. PORTER. From this Republican's perspective, this is exactly the kind of thing that we need to have in the public schools that I see problems in, where we have entrenched bureaucracies, often teachers unions, I have to say, sometimes entrenched administrators, people that are incompetent that we cannot get rid of, things that we need to address in a broad way to make the school work better. It seems to me that this is exactly the kind of program that will help the inner city schools that need the most help to push away all of that dead weight and get on with a program that works for their kids.

I believe very frankly that this will work extremely well from my philosophical and I think the philosophical standpoint of the gentleman from Arizona as well. This does not impose anything on the States. It does not impose anything on the school districts. It allows the school districts to make their own decisions as to how they want to reform, and it seems to me it gives them every opportunity to do so. This money is money that would otherwise be spent, in my judgment, on a program that does not work well, title I. It simply throws money at inner city schools without any real guidance as to how they use it and it is often used in ways that do not give a better opportunity to the kids. So I think it is good reform.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Let me speak very frankly about this. I have had some considerable difference with my own administration on the issue of testing, as has

the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], on the issue of Goals 2000. There is great debate about the value of either of those programs. I do not know whether Goals 2000 is going to turn out to be worth much or not, and I do not know whether their testing program is going to turn out to be worth much or not. What we have been trying to do is to find some way to encourage school reform on a neutral basis so that we can help local schools develop their own ideas, to have the time to think through what it is they want to do to improve teacher performance with only one requirement: that they agree afterward to have that approach evaluated so that we can determine which approaches really produce results and which ones do not. Because otherwise the administration can make its claims till the cows come home, so can its philosophical opponents, and we never reach a conclusion in this country although we spend billions of dollars on title I and billions of dollars on research. I supported title I for many years, but I have come to the conclusion that unless it is buttressed with whole school reform, it is not going to produce the kind of improved performance we need from children. I would think every conservative in this body would agree with that conclusion.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman from Illinois for yielding, and I thank my friend the gentleman from California for at least yielding me some time. We did not get to continue in that dialogue, which I would like to. It seems to me quite clear that if the words "whole school reform" had no meaning and if the schools were then free to do what they wanted to do, then there would be no objection to striking those words. But those words are replete in the report and they are specified in the bill. What I think they say and what I think you cannot deny is that this money, this \$150 million is going to be controlled from Washington. No, it is quite true that no one has to apply for the money, but that is the way Washington gets into public policy from the beginning and, that is, if you want the money, you must apply to the Federal Government and if you apply to the Federal Government, you must do whole school reform.

Mr. PORTER. Absolutely.

Mr. SHADEGG. The parents in my school districts do not want that. If the gentleman is genuine in saying that parents and teachers and students and local school administrators should control this money, then let me ask the gentleman, is he willing to strike from both the bill itself and from the report language all references to whole school reform?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(By unanimous consent, [Mr. PORTER] was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, what I hear this gentleman saying and what the gentleman from Indiana seemed to say earlier was that what you want the Federal Government to do is through taxation to raise the funds and then simply pass it to the local school districts to spend as they wish.

Mr. SHADEGG. It is called block grants.

Mr. PORTER. We went through that debate earlier with revenue sharing, and pretty much I think the country decided that it was the most irresponsible thing you could possibly ever do, to raise tax moneys at one level of government and have another level of government spend it in any way they wish. It seems to me that if the Federal Government wishes to encourage whole school reform and the States want to engage in it, we are providing that opportunity. Just to pass the money through and say spend it any way you want, that is the money that they ought to be raising at the local level, in fact are raising at the local level. They can spend that money any way they want.

Mr. SHADEGG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. SHADEGG. Let me just make this point clear. I do not want the money to be raised at the States, sent to Washington and given back with no controls. I want the money to stay in the States, because my parents want that. They believe they can spend it better than any Washington program. Short of getting to that, short of getting to leaving those moneys at home in Arizona, or Illinois, or Wisconsin or California, then I like the concept of block grants, because there is a simple point here. I do not know that whole school reform is the right idea, and I trust the parents in Arizona to shape education in Arizona. That was an issue when I campaigned. It was an issue before the 104th Congress and it is an issue before the 105th Congress. That issue is, are we going to control education reform and education policy from Washington or are we going to let parents in America, out there working with their teachers and their school administrators, decide? This bill has Washington deciding that. If it did not, then it would not say you get the money if you pursue a whole school reform initiative.

Mr. PORTER. If I could reclaim my time, just to respond to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has again expired.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 1 additional minute.)

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Arizona that if every school district out there

had the kind of money that my school districts had, that would be a fine concept.

□ 1915

We are dealing with school districts that are being provided a great deal of their tax money through title I that is basically unaccountable, and we are saying that we want to encourage them because they are producing students that are not achieving at the level of the rest of the country, we want to encourage them to really reform their schools to give these kids a real chance.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am not objecting to giving them the money, I support giving the money, but I do not support adding the strings which say, "You'll get the money only if you do whole school reform, i.e. Washington decides."

Mr. PORTER. OK, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman is against all Federal involvement in education, and that is fine philosophically, and I can understand. I assume the gentleman is against special education for handicapped students.

Mr. SHADEGG. Absolutely not.

Mr. PORTER. Math and science which is a Federal program and category.

Mr. SHADEGG. I am not even against all Federal involvement in education. What I am against is us telling schools how they have to reform.

We have public schools in Arizona, and they are a tremendous success.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] has expired.

(On request of Mr. OBEY, and by unanimous consent, Mr. PORTER was allowed to proceed for 2 additional minutes.)

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would simply like to make one point about the term "whole school reform."

We see some people in this country who say the only answer is to bring in computers. We see other people who look at a school and they say the only answer is to have the teacher retrained. We have someone else say the only answer is some other partial approach to the problem.

What our leading American businessmen have discovered through research that they financed on their own is that schools usually produce better performance if they think through how the entire school works rather than just thinking single shot, such as whether we need more computers or whether we need retraining for reading teachers and things like that.

That is all whole school reform means. It means to take a look at the way the entire school operates rather than having some single shot, slapdash approach at which we have usually thrown money through the years,

and it seems to me that conservatives would be far more interested in promoting this than they would be in simply continuing to shovel out large amounts of money without reviewing the way, in fact, we produce the best results for the children we are supposed to be here working for.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, this gentleman from Oregon is a bit confused by the debate between the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California to perhaps expand on this and elucidate to the many Members out there who are now listening with rapt attention what is at hand.

Mr. MILLER of California. Let me just say I think the gentleman from Illinois and the gentleman from Wisconsin have put it quite properly. We have spent, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] and I who sit on the committee, billions and billions of dollars in title I funds, and we have not exactly gotten the return that we think we should on that dollar.

A number of these programs, not all of them, but a number of these programs are about the reorganization of those dollars where we get a better bang for the buck. The John Hopkins program comes in because schools invite them in, and they go into low-income schools, and they take that title I money, and they reorganize it along some management techniques, along the wise use of resources, they get the school headed off in the right direction, and the fact of the matter is they get kids, a much, much higher percentage of kids, reading at grade level. They did not do that because we told them to do that; they did that because the local school board could no longer face the parents with the results that they were getting.

That is what these programs are about, and the fact of the matter is that these programs have research and pragmatic experience in districts, and there are thousands of districts and schools that are inviting these programs in because they work. So, if we are going to spend \$150 million, we ought to, as stewards of the taxpayers' money, put it where we think we can get the best return on their investment.

This is not an exclusive list. This is an illustrative list of programs that have some substance to them. I guess the flip side of whole school reform would be partial school reform; take that home to parents: Oh, we are going to reform part of the school.

The point is this: If they do not want to do it, do not come get the Federal money. We think we should put the money where there is a strong, strong demonstration that we are getting the results we want for these children, and that is what this amendment is about.

It is an alternative, as the gentleman pointed out, to some of the things the administration wanted to do. We thought, the committee thought they would go with some of the empirical evidence, and the fact of the matter is that these are being demonstrated over and over again in all different types of schools in all geographical locations that they are leading to effective change and they are improving the ability of children to compute and to read and to critically think and they are getting parents involved. But the first step has to come from a school district, from a school administrator or from the parents who are seeking to improve their schools and then they go to their States and make application.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. One principal in Maryland explained that what he was doing under his, and it is a Comer school; he explained he was spending about 30 percent of his time simply in the parking lot getting parents as they bring their kids to school every day, talking to the parents to tell them to get involved, to show them how they can get involved in volunteer programs in the schools, how they can get involved in programs that track what their own kids are doing so that we can involve the parents in buttressing what it is the children are learning.

I would like to ask what in God's name is wrong with that?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I say one of the Hopkins' programs, again one of the successes they have is they now have parents coming to the school, participating in their education. If they work, the parents are coming to the school, dropping their children off, spending time there, and a novel idea, they are serving them coffee so they can hang around and talk to the teachers.

The point of the matter is that these programs, in fact, work, and that is where we ought to be putting the dollars, and for those school districts that are turned off by the notion that they might have to reform the whole school, then they should go elsewhere and look for dollars.

In my area, in the San Francisco Bay area, the funding now to try to replicate this program is being picked up by industry who are announcing for the first time that they can improve the schools by an investment by the private sector in these very same programs. I mean, that is the kind of credibility we have in terms of the expansion and the workability of these programs.

Mr. TIERNEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEFAZIO. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TIERNEY. To the gentleman from Arizona, I just address one point that he made about the fact that these were specific programs that had to be identically followed. I mention the words, as my colleagues know, of a school in Salem, MA, which is in fact, a whole school concept. With the help of Salem State College, the community got together, teachers got together, parents came on board, they developed a curriculum, they developed a mission, they have a school that goes an hour longer every day, goes all year around, is successful and has 145 volunteers a week.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] has expired.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words on the Evans amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to respond to some of the debate here tonight. I am from Kentucky, which I believe is the only State that enacted whole school reform statewide, and I have talked for many, many times about the benefits of whole school reform. But I do not believe that it is something that we can enact at the Federal level and have it be effective. The truth is it is very difficult to enact at a State level so that it is effectively implemented by the schools in that State.

The fact is schools succeed school by school. They succeed as they develop their own plans, address what their teachers and what the needs are of their students, what the talents are of their teachers and how they best can meet the needs of their students.

When we have whole school reform, it requires a whole system of support. It requires a school to be able to overcome the provisions of the teacher contract. We cannot do that, Mr. Chairman, here tonight. We cannot do this at the Federal level because we see in this country that the responsibility for the organization and the efficient management of our schools is done in 50 States.

And so in every State we build up an expertise, an understanding of what the needs are and the way to address those needs. I personally do not believe that in every community in Wyoming the needs of schools are the same as in Louisville, Kentucky, and that is why we need each legislature to be able to freely address those needs.

The support for block grants and what we hear from superintendents around this country, and certainly in local districts, is, please, do not keep trying to push the direction and the way we organize our schools by the money that is trickled down to us; what we need is to be able to fill in the blanks and meet the needs of each neighborhood school based on the talents in that school and the needs that they have.

This bill and this whole school reform pushes schools to go in a very specific direction. The bill in the language

mentions the examples of whole school reform that would be accepted. Many of the things that exist in current State laws would not allow real whole school reform.

And, finally, let me say that in Kentucky whole school reform where it is successful is successful because our universities are training teachers in a different way. We have rewards and sanctions for schools that are not successful, and just because they adopted whole school reform, their scores have not all gone up; in fact, some have gone down. And so what we need is a State Department that can intervene in those schools, we need to adopt it as a whole support system, and for us in the Federal level to apply that on every State and every school, if they want the money, would be a terrible mistake.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTHUP. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. It is my understanding, and the gentleman from Wisconsin can correct me if I am wrong, but I believe that the States can structure this in any way they want to restrict the schools in their States to apply only in certain ways or in any way they wish to structure. I do not see that it interferes whatsoever in State direction on whole school reform, or they can choose not to participate in it at all.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Reclaiming my time to respond, please, Mr. Chairman, the problem is that whole school reform only works if there are the liberties to truly reform it. As my colleagues know, if a school says we would like to apply for this \$50,000 grant and they get it, but the State does not allow the provisions of this, say, to override teacher contracts, to change the size of classes, to do other things that are necessary for whole school reform, the effectiveness of it does not exist.

Mr. PORTER. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, the State has complete authority over the method under which the application is made. If they want to put those restrictions in place, they can certainly do so. I do not see the problem.

Mrs. NORTHUP. Mr. Chairman, if it is so clear that whole school reform is good, everyone of the 50 States could enact it today. They spend billions. In fact, they spend 95 percent of every dollar in the classroom they appropriate and spend at the State and local government. There is nothing that prohibits them from passing whole school reform in their school.

So if the evidence is so overwhelming, why has only one State in this country passed it, and why would we seek at the Federal level to override the wisdom of those States?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair notes that 5-minute debate by pro forma amendment may continue, but at this point the Chair will put the question on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. EVANS].

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1930

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I was looking for the appropriate juncture to join this debate and did not want to help us digress even further from the debate on the underlying amendment, but I have to say that this has been a remarkable discussion on something called Whole School Reform, a program that has never been reviewed or authorized by the majority party of the Congress, the Republican Party. I can say that from a position of authority, since I chair the Subcommittee on Early Childhood, Youth and Families.

I am looking through the statute now, trying to understand what the previous Democratic-controlled Congress that authorized something called Whole School Reform might have meant by Whole School Reform, and I think I have figured out what is going on in this debate: pure politics, educational payola, in an effort to craft, quote-unquote, a bipartisan bill that can get enough Democrat votes to pass the House of Representatives.

Now, my good friend, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who is a distinguished member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, did get it right. He said, this is new money. This \$150 million for Whole School Reform is really new money, because again it was authorized by a previous Democratically controlled Congress, and it goes along with the other new money in this bill, an increase of \$40 million for the Fund for the Improvement of Education, an increase of almost \$50 million for something called 21st Century Community Learning Centers.

All I can conclude, Mr. Chairman, from all of this is that the advice that we gave the appropriators when we went and testified before them to try to further increase Federal taxpayer funding for special education, given the fact that the Federal special education and civil rights statute has already been reauthorized by this Congress and signed into law by the President to try to increase funding to expand vocational and technical educational opportunities for our young people, especially the two-thirds of our young people who are not college-bound, or will not complete college, to try to drive technology down into the local schools, that advice was largely ignored in the desire to accommodate the request of the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee and the full committee and others who want money to promote Whole School Reform. Again, whatever that might be.

This money could be a lot better spent if in no other area of this bill than on improving education for children with learning disabilities. And

what happened to the idea? I say to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], who was a key participant in crafting that bipartisan legislation, what happened to the idea that we would make a good-faith effort of trying to come closer to that original 40 percent obligation on the part of Federal taxpayers for special education?

So I am strongly opposed, as an education subcommittee chairman, to all this new money, this payola being spread around this bill to try and get some sort of bipartisan agreement, when I know that we have greater priorities at the Federal level, and when I know that money is ultimately best spent driven down to the local level, because that is in keeping with the long-standing American tradition of public education, of local control and decentralized decision-making.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIGGS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

I would just say that in a number of these programs, one of the interesting by-products we are having is that the number of children that are later eligible for special education is substantially reduced because, by concentrating on basic skills at the earliest level, the grade level, we find it was really a reading problem that these children had that later caused them to be classified as eligible for special education. Those children are being maintained in the regular classrooms.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I do not doubt that at all. I will point out to the gentleman that we put an emphasis on early intervention in the IDEA amendments and, again, the money could be better spent there.

Mr. Chairman, I really question this money coming into this bill, being spent for, I think, very questionable or nebulous purposes, particularly when again those of us who serve on the authorizing committee were not consulted about this money, and this money again is apparently being made available in an effort to, if you will pardon the expression, buy Democrat votes for this bill.

I might also point out, and I do not usually get personal in debate, but we are attempting to do this now to accommodate one individual Member of the House out of 435 Members of the House, the distinguished ranking member of the subcommittee and full committee, who is opposed to us on the majority side of the aisle on every single major policy initiative in this Congress, whether we are talking about welfare reform in the last Congress, the bipartisan agreement to balance the budget in this Congress, or tax relief for American families and businesses.

So I again have to really question what the thinking and philosophy is behind the crafting of this legislation,

and suggest to my colleagues that we can find better ways to spend this money on Republican education priorities.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LARGENT. Just a question to the Chair: We just had a voice vote on the previous amendment while there were still Members standing at a microphone under an open rule, under the 5-minute rule, and the Chairman closed debate.

I am just wondering what the parliamentary procedure is on that, and could we expect that to occur on any of the other amendments that will be debated this evening and tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair was unaware of any other Members who were intending to debate that particular amendment. Members can be heard under the 5-minute rule to proceed, as the gentleman from California just did, to continue to debate other particular issues, but it was not pertinent or relevant to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that under normal circumstances the Chair will ask the question, "Are there any other Members that want to be heard on this particular amendment?" and that opportunity was not given to the House previously or to the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would state again that the Chair was unaware of any Members who wished to debate the issue involving the Evans amendment. The Chair will continue to recognize those Members under the 5-minute rule to debate issues, but the Chair has the prerogative to put the question on an amendment if no Member seeks recognition to further debate that amendment.

Mr. LARGENT. Mr. Chairman, is it parliamentary procedure for the Chair to ask the question, "Are there any other Members that desire to be heard on this amendment?" Is that part of the parliamentary procedure, "yes or no?"

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair ascertains that by whatever proper means the Chair chooses to use.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLING

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to the rule, I offer Amendment No. 17, printed in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 17 offered by Mr. GOODLING:

On page 2, line 15, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$21,000,000)".

On page 2, line 16, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$23,000,000)".

On page 3, line 9, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$21,000,000)".

On page 23, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

On page 68, line 17, after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$25,000,000) and after the second dollar amount insert "(increased by \$25,000,000)".

On page 78, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

On page 78, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

On page 85, line 5, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$1,500,000)".

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, first of all let me preface my remarks in relationship to this amendment by indicating that there are no Federal mandates dealing with curriculum in any local school district. There is only one Federal mandate dealing with curriculum in relationship to the States, and that is the one that I want to talk about, and that is the one to which my amendment applies.

IDEA is a Federal mandate, the only curriculum mandate from the Federal Government. It is a mandate on the State, who then mandates to the local level what they must carry out in relationship to IDEA.

When it was passed many years ago, 30 years ago, the Federal Government said we are giving the mandate and we are going to give you 40 percent of the money. Unfortunately, they gave 99 percent of the mandate, but about 8 percent of the money. Local school districts now are finding it very, very difficult to fund the special education mandate that comes from the Federal Government.

As a minority member working on the Committee on the Budget for 6 years in a bipartisan way, we tried to change that, and it did not work. Last year I said thank you to this committee, because as long as the mandate is there and we have the responsibility to put the money where our mouth is, this committee that is on the floor today saw fit to raise that amount rather dramatically. The idea was that we would keep doing that, hopefully until we got to the 40 percent.

We reformed IDEA this year, and I think we will bring about savings at the local level. We say, first of all, that when you get to a certain figure, the local level can reduce their expenditures. The State cannot, but the local government can.

We also have introduced in that legislation avenues to bring savings to the local government, because we try to get the attorneys out of the business in the beginning so that the school district is not spending the money on attorneys' fees, the parent is not spending money on attorneys' fees.

It was my hope, as I said, that we could get more. That was not possible with the way the budget agreement was written, and the committee did the best they could.

They have agreed to increase that amount, and I am very thankful for that. The increase that they would give us at the present time is \$25 million. That is taken from other programs in order to deal with this one unfunded mandate from the Federal Government in relationship to curriculum.

They also have agreed that they would seek the higher figure that the Senate has in their legislation, and for that, I am also very thankful.

So again we had one mandate from the Federal level. It is the largest unfunded mandate in the history of the Federal Government, I am sure. This will take us one step closer to, as a matter of fact, doing what was promised to local school districts many years ago, that we would put up 40 percent of the money from Federal funds in order to deal with that issue.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the committee, the chairman and the ranking member, for this effort, and again indicate that they have indicated to me that they would go for the higher figure in conference, the Senate figure.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I would say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] that I have the highest respect for the chairman of the authorizing committee, that we attempt to work together very closely, that this is a mandate upon local districts that takes local tax funds, that in the last fiscal year we raised spending for IDEA by \$790 million, and this year by \$325 million in the bill as it comes to the floor. This is an additional amount of \$25 million.

We are attempting to do everything we can to make this a high priority and to relieve local school districts of the cost of the program. It has been made, with the leadership of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a high priority in this bill.

Mr. Chairman, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PORTER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say also that on this side of the aisle, we accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate the chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce [Mr. GOODLING] for his tireless efforts on behalf of the children with special needs in our school system.

We worked and moved through this body unanimously a bill on IDEA that we had worked through the Senate. We had many differences as we worked through this process, and the gentleman deserves tremendous credit for that.

One of our concerns, as a party that ran on and was committed to not having unfunded mandates, was we set goals that unless we put adequate funding in cannot be met. I think this is an important step.

But one of the things that we will be debating as we go through this bill the next few days is, we believe that rather than creating new Federal programs,

like there are several in this bill, one we have been debating tonight, that have not gone through the committee process, that have not gone through a hearing process, that the money, if we agree, as we did in the budget agreement to spend the money on education, it should be spent in programs that we have already passed by this Congress, that we already have agreement in this Congress on, that we agree on as an appropriate Federal role.

There may be other pieces of legislation where we can work out a compromise, like we did on IDEA. How can we know, if we never have a hearing? How do we know, if we never move it through?

We, as Republicans, were sent here by the American people to say, hey, we want some changes in Washington; and many of the people who voted for us want to see a change in education policy.

As we go through this, I assume that they at least want to see when there are changes in education policies, that we go through a process of debate and we debate the proper role of the Federal Government and the State government and the local government; that we try to have parents involved in as many places as possible.

Like on IDEA, many people throughout America felt people with disabilities were not being treated fairly at the local level. As this bill has a constituency nationwide and as we looked at the failure of the local school systems to meet those needs, there was a decision made by the U.S. Congress, after many hearings and a process, to have a bill passed.

□ 1945

Then we moved to funding of that bill. Then we increased that. This time we fine-tuned it again, made some changes in the overlying bill, but now we are putting more funds into that.

If we are going to spend more money on education, many of us feel it should be spent in areas where we have this consensus, where we have this agreement, where people know what we are doing, not some kind of last-minute attempt to put something into a bill to circumvent what the party has stood for, and quite frankly, which we do not really know, as the chairman of the subcommittee said, of which I also serve on that subcommittee, it is not particularly comforting to all of a sudden hear there is this brand new program that went clear around the process.

I commend the chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his willingness on the amendment of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], and I commend Chairman GOODLING for his tremendous efforts on this.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I would like to engage the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, in my testimony before the subcommittee this past June, I referenced some revolutionary findings on how children learn to read that have recently come out of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, which is part of the National Institutes of Health. I am embarrassed to say that I did not realize that since 1985 they have been doing such research. Dr. Reid Lyons, of course, is the individual who has done this, and I think it would put to rest any debate between the phonics and whole language reading methods.

At that time I asked the subcommittee to set aside the \$500,000 to the Fund for Improvement of Education, to fund a special teacher training initiative in the district which would help train teachers consistent with Dr. Lyons' findings. There is no reason for him to put the money in from NIH, as a matter of fact, if the teachers are not trained.

I understand that such a set-aside has been included in the report to accompany H.R. 2264. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee whether it is his intention to include this as a statutory set-aside in the conference report to accompany this bill.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOODLING. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his inquiry, and for bringing this important research to our attention. As the gentleman has noted, we have included language in our report referencing this research, and instructing the Secretary of Education to give high priority to training D.C. teachers in these methods.

Conferences are always difficult, but I will do all I can to include the \$500,000 in this activity as bill language in the conference.

Mr. GOODLING. I thank the chairman.

Mr. PITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to engage the chairman in a colloquy on the issue that has come before members of the Amish community who reside in 20 States in this country. The Amish are a very committed, hard-working community who do not contribute to the social ills of our society. The Amish are not dependent on government programs.

Mr. Chairman, I am extremely concerned that their lifestyle has been threatened by recent actions taken by the Federal Department of Labor. As Members may know, the Amish have received fines for having their youth under the age of 18 working on their family farms and businesses. This has received attention at both the local and national level.

The Amish wish to have their youth work in vocational settings after completion of Amish school, which is equal to the eighth grade. I, along with several other colleagues in the Congress, have been working with the Department of Labor to find an administrative solution so the Amish can remain in their community and begin their professional training.

Mr. Chairman, it would greatly benefit the Amish communities in Pennsylvania and across the Nation if we found a solution to this problem. I request that the chairman include conference report language in the Labor-HHS appropriations bill urging the Department of Labor to continue its negotiations with the Members who have Amish constituencies, and to come to a compromise by the end of this year which will allow young Amish workers to continue to work in supervised settings.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I understand the concerns of the gentleman from Pennsylvania. The Amish who also live in my State have unique family values and have a unique situation, since they complete their formal schooling after the eighth grade. Accordingly, the Department of Labor has a responsibility to evaluate the Amish in that light. It is my hope that the Department of Labor will alleviate the problems that have been created for the Amish.

Moreover, I will work to include language in the conference report urging the Department of Labor to resolve this issue by the end of the year.

Mr. PITT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to engage in a colloquy with the chairman regarding our efforts to move people from welfare to work. I and many others fear that last year's welfare reform effort will not do enough to ensure that the goal we all share, a smooth transition into the job market for people now on welfare, would be achieved.

I am glad to see that the recently concluded bipartisan budget agreement includes a welfare-to-work jobs program to help make welfare reform a success, but it will take a great deal of work and resources for the Department of Labor to design and to implement welfare-to-work so it will be in place by October 1, 1997.

On July 17, 1997, the President sent to Congress a budget amount for \$6.2 million for the Labor Department to administer the \$3 billion welfare-to-work program. As we prepare to go to conference with the other body, it is important that these funds be provided to the Department of Labor.

I appreciate the chairman's recognition in the committee report of the likelihood that these funds would be

needed. Now that the budget agreement has been reached, I want to ask the gentleman if he would be willing to work with me as we go to the conference on this bill to ensure that the Labor Department has the resources it needs to administer this vital welfare-to-work effort.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. DELAURO. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman is a very valued member of our subcommittee. I appreciate very much her interest in the welfare-to-work efforts during the committee hearings this year, and I share her commitment to making welfare reform work. I want to let her know I will do everything in my power to make sure welfare-to-work is implemented successfully.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the Chairman's interest and efforts during the committee hearings this year. I share his commitment to making welfare reform work, and I will do everything in my power to make sure welfare-to-work is implemented successfully. I thank the chairman.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I want to comment briefly on the colloquy of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. PITTS, with Chairman PORTER, chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, I have a unique background probably in this Congress in the sense that my great-grandfather was actually Amish; that he left the Amish faith in the 1860's, but up until that point, the Souder family, of which there are many in Pennsylvania and Ohio, many of them have an Amish background.

It is a question of religious liberty in this country as to whether people are going to have some flexibility within our laws, as long as they do not affect other people, to be able to practice professions and do things to earn a living, as we see the land values up, particularly in the areas they live, or whether they have to keep going and trying to find wilderness, of which there is less and less in America, places where they do not bump into each other or where they can find land of a good price, which is why we see many of them going to South America.

As I see many of these people, many relatives of mine, squeezed as the urban area expands, many of them go into woodworking professions. As we combine this with the flexibility we have given them in the school system, we have run into real problems with the Department of Labor.

I have supported the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] and other Members from Pennsylvania where the problem has been highlighted in these meetings with the Labor Department, but it has also spread into Ohio and Indiana, and certainly very easily can spread further into other regions in Il-

linois and Iowa, where there are many Amish.

I want to make one other point with this, in addition to commending the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER]. That is, as we debate this bill, there have been a lot of discussions as to whether we are going to be obstructionists and offer lots of amendments. I had an amendment on this bill addressing this question. At the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] and working with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER], we felt that this colloquy would be a good first step to move this issue forward.

What we are doing tonight and tomorrow and whatever time is necessary is to have an honest debate on the issues. I wish we would work out most things like what has happened with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. PITTS] in his effort with the chairman. I want to commend them for their efforts, thank them on behalf of many people who are relatively defenseless, who do not have a lot of monetary power, who do not even generally vote. I want to thank them for their efforts, and I hope the Labor Department will hear their voices as they are crying out for how they can live with their religious freedom in our society.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

COMMUNITY SERVICE EMPLOYMENT FOR OLDER AMERICANS
(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

To carry out the activities for national grants or contracts with public agencies and public or private nonprofit organizations under paragraph (1)(A) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, \$343,356,000.

To carry out the activities for grants to States under paragraph (3) of section 506(a) of title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965, as amended, or to carry out older worker activities as subsequently authorized, \$96,844,000.

The funds appropriated under this heading shall be transferred to and merged with the Department of Health and Human Services, "Aging Services Programs", for the same purposes and the same period as the account to which transferred, following the enactment of legislation authorizing the administration of the program by that Department.

FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS AND ALLOWANCES

For payments during the current fiscal year of trade adjustment benefit payments and allowances under part I, and for training, for allowances for job search and relocation, and for related State administrative expenses under part II, subchapters B and D, chapter 2, title II of the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, \$349,000,000, together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent appropriation for payments for any period subsequent to September 15 of the current year.

STATE UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE AND EMPLOYMENT SERVICE OPERATIONS

For authorized administrative expenses, \$173,452,000, together with not to exceed \$3,332,476,000 (including not to exceed

\$1,228,000 which may be used for amortization payments to States which had independent retirement plans in their State employment service agencies prior to 1980, and including not to exceed \$2,000,000 which may be obligated in contracts with non-State entities for activities such as occupational and test research activities which benefit the Federal-State Employment Service System), which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund including the cost of administering section 1201 of the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996, section 7(d) of the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, the Trade Act of 1974, as amended, the Immigration Act of 1990, and the Immigration and Nationality Act, as amended, and of which the sums available in the allocation for activities authorized by title III of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U.S.C. 502-504), and the sums available in the allocation for necessary administrative expenses for carrying out 5 U.S.C. 8501-8523, shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1998, except that funds used for automation acquisitions shall be available for obligation by States through September 30, 2000; and of which \$173,452,000, together with not to exceed \$738,283,000 of the amount which may be expended from said trust fund, shall be available for obligation for the period July 1, 1998 through June 30, 1999, to fund activities under the Act of June 6, 1933, as amended, including the cost of penalty mail authorized under 39 U.S.C. 3202(a)(1)(E) made available to States in lieu of allotments for such purpose, and of which \$200,000,000 shall be available solely for the purpose of assisting States to convert their automated State employment security agency systems to be year 2000 compliant, and of which \$206,333,000 shall be available only to the extent necessary for additional State allocations to administer unemployment compensation laws to finance increases in the number of unemployment insurance claims filed and claims paid or changes in a State law: *Provided*, That to the extent that the Average Weekly Insured Unemployment (AWIU) for fiscal year 1998 is projected by the Department of Labor to exceed 2,789,000 an additional \$28,600,000 shall be available for obligation for every 100,000 increase in the AWIU level (including a pro rata amount for any increment less than 100,000) from the Employment Security Administration Account of the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated in this Act which are used to establish a national one-stop career center network may be obligated in contracts, grants or agreements with non-State entities: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this Act for activities authorized under the Wagner-Peyser Act, as amended, and title III of the Social Security Act, may be used by the State to fund integrated Employment Service and Unemployment Insurance automation efforts, notwithstanding cost allocation principles prescribed under Office of Management and Budget Circular A-87.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. OBEY:

On page 8, line 18, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$20,000,000)".

On page 9, line 22, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

On page 9 line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

On page 42, line 22, after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$32,835,000 for community based resource centers)".

On page 64, line 7, after the first dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$12,835,000)".

On page 64, line 7, after the second dollar amount insert the following: "(reduced by \$12,835,000)".

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, a moment ago the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING] offered an amendment to correct a misjudgment in the bill, and I am doing the same thing in this instance. I understand the amendment will be accepted by the majority.

Mr. Chairman, I am offering this amendment on behalf of myself and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO]. This would simply restore \$32 million for the child abuse prevention and treatment program, for the community-based family resource and support grant program within that program. It would pay for it with offsetting reductions in computers, in the contingency fund, and in Goals 2000 of \$12,800,000.

I do not think there is any controversy associated with the amendment. We are simply trying to provide the same level of funding that was provided last year to support community-based efforts at preventing child abuse.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, this is the only, only Federal money that goes directly to support State, local, and private coordinated efforts to prevent the growing epidemic of child abuse in this country. We had 1.4 million reported cases of child abuse in 1986, up to 3 million in 1996.

In my hometown of Springfield a precious little girl 3 years old, Tessa Lynn, needed some help, and that help never came. One day the police came in response to some calls by neighbors, and they checked her, and they were told she was asleep.

□ 2000

Well, now, she is asleep forever. She was horribly abused and murdered. We need more community-based programs to prevent child abuse, and this is the only one that receives any Federal funding.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge my colleagues to support it. It is not a new program. It is an authorized program. It is not an unfunded mandate. And it is a program which involves States, communities, and private organizations in a coordinated effort to save the lives of precious youth in this country.

Mr. Chairman, I insert the following for the RECORD:

STATE OF OREGON,
JOHN A. KITZHABER, GOVERNOR,
July 29, 1997.

Hon. PETER DEFAZIO,
House of Representatives, 2134 Rayburn House
Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DEFAZIO: Congressman Peter DeFazio is proposing an amendment to restore funding for local child abuse prevention grants to the states. The budget for the Federal Community-Based Family Resource Support Grant (CBFRS) was eliminated in

the House version of the Health and Human Services budget. The Senate version continues the grant at last year's funding level. Congressman DeFazio's amendment will restore the CBFRS budget and increase it by one million dollars. The offset comes from the office of the director of the National Institute of Health and by reducing funding for new buildings to last year's levels.

I strongly urge your support of the DeFazio amendment.

The CBFRS resources will play a very important role in preventing child abuse and neglect in Oregon. One of the most profound gaps in our service system is that of families who are at high-risk of and have an unfounded or undocumented case of child abuse or neglect. This gap lies along the continuum of services between the "wellness" (or primary prevention) role of the Commission on Children and Families and the role of the Department of Human Resources in protecting children through its Services to Children and Families division (SCF).

Oregon will use the CBFRS resources to address this gap by establishing "community safety nets" at the community and the state levels. These safety nets will be strong community and interagency partnerships designed to respond to the needs of those children and families who fall through the cracks. At my direction work has already begun to lay the foundation for the safety net project.

The restoration of the CBFRS grant will help get Oregon on the road to addressing one of the most serious gaps in our service system for children and families.

I urge your support of the DeFazio amendment. If you need further information, please contact Pam Curtis in my office at 378-6895.

Sincerely,

JOHN A. KITZHABER, M.D.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that we accept the amendment.

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the DeFazio-Fox amendment to the Labor, HHS, Education appropriations. This amendment would restore funding for the important community-based family resource and support grant program to prevent child abuse. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] for his leadership in this issue.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, instances of child abuse continue to increase sharply. In this environment I believe that it would be irresponsible for Congress to cut funding for child abuse prevention and treatment.

This program establishes a system of safety nets in our communities. These safety nets provide intervention services to at-risk children and their families. These are provided through counseling, training, and treatment services to local communities, including domestic violence prevention.

But unfortunately, funding for this program has been eliminated in the House version of the bill. I believe the program has had an outstanding positive effect. We cannot turn our back on our Nation's defenseless children.

As a former assistant DA in Pennsylvania, I have seen too many victims of child abuse, whether it be shaken-baby syndrome or other victims of abuse in other ways we have seen, whether, as the gentleman from Oregon talked about, the death of child abuse victims or those who have been starved.

Mr. Chairman, this will help reduce child abuse, help agencies identify child abuse, and increase prosecution of violent child abusers. The program provides such a large return for such a small investment we would be remiss in eliminating it, and we must, obviously, eliminate wasteful spending in any form and focus on funding programs that truly make a difference in the lives of our children and families, as this DeFazio-Fox amendment will.

Mr. Chairman, the program was authorized in the Child Abuse Prevention and Treatment Act of 1996 for 3 years. The U.S. Senate has seen the wisdom to continue this important bill, and I thank the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PORTER] for his agreement to this amendment, and I appreciate the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO].

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I neglected to say that I was offering the amendment on behalf of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. DEFAZIO] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX]. I apologize and I appreciate the gentleman's activity on the amendment.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FOX] for his support and his work on this amendment. This will save some children from the horrible fate that Tessa Lynn suffered in my own hometown.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] might answer a few questions about this amendment for me. I know it has been accepted, but I think it is important to clarify. The money and the goal I fully agree with. I think it is worthwhile. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman from Wisconsin explain to me again where this money is coming from and why we chose to take it from those various programs?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COBURN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, as I said, the money is to continue as the existing funding level, the community-based family resource and support grant program.

Mr. COBURN. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I understand what it is for.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will continue to yield, it is funded by taking \$12.8 million out of the administration's Goals 2000 program, and \$10 million out of the UI contingency fund, and \$10 million out of the UI computers fund.

Both of these accounts are very amply funded and neither account will be damaged by the reduction.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of title I be considered as read, printed in the RECORD, and open to amendment at any point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

The text of the remainder of title I is as follows:

ADVANCES TO THE UNEMPLOYMENT TRUST FUND
AND OTHER FUNDS

For repayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by sections 905(d) and 1203 of the Social Security Act, as amended, and to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund as authorized by section 9501(c)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended; and for nonrepayable advances to the Unemployment Trust Fund as authorized by section 8509 of title 5, United States Code, section 104(d) of Public Law 102-164, and section 5 of Public Law 103-6, and to the "Federal unemployment benefits and allowances" account, to remain available until September 30, 1999, \$392,000,000.

In addition, for making repayable advances to the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year after September 15, 1998, for costs incurred by the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund in the current fiscal year, such sums as may be necessary.

PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

For expenses of administering employment and training programs, \$84,308,000, together with not to exceed \$41,285,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

PENSION AND WELFARE BENEFITS
ADMINISTRATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Pension and Welfare Benefits Administration, \$82,000,000, of which \$3,000,000 shall remain available through September 30, 1999 for expenses of completing the revision of the processing of employee benefit plan returns.

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION
PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION
FUND

The Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation is authorized to make such expenditures, including financial assistance authorized by section 104 of Public Law 96-364, within limits of funds and borrowing authority available to such Corporation, and in accord with law, and to make such contracts and commitments without regard to fiscal year limitations as provided by section 104 of the Government Corporation Control Act, as amended (31 U.S.C. 9104), as may be necessary in carrying out the program through September 30, 1998, for such Corporation: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$10,433,000 shall be available for administrative expenses of the Corporation: *Provided further*, That expenses of

such Corporation in connection with the termination of pension plans, for the acquisition, protection or management, and investment of trust assets, and for benefits administration services shall be considered as non-administrative expenses for the purposes hereof, and excluded from the above limitation.

EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Employment Standards Administration, including reimbursement to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for inspection services rendered, \$298,007,000, together with \$993,000 which may be expended from the Special Fund in accordance with sections 39(c) and 44(j) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act: *Provided*, That \$500,000 shall be for the development and implementation of the electronic submission of reports required to be filed under the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act of 1959, as amended, and for a computer database of the information for each submission that is indexed and easily searchable by the public via the Internet: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to accept, retain, and spend, until expended, in the name of the Department of Labor, all sums of money ordered to be paid to the Secretary of Labor, in accordance with the terms of the Consent Judgment in Civil Action No. 91-0027 of the United States District Court for the District of the Northern Mariana Islands (May 21, 1992): *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor is authorized to establish and, in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3302, collect and deposit in the Treasury fees for processing applications and issuing certificates under sections 11(d) and 14 of the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, as amended (29 U.S.C. 211(d) and 214) and for processing applications and issuing registrations under title I of the Migrant and Seasonal Agricultural Worker Protection Act, 29 U.S.C. 1801 et seq.

SPECIAL BENEFITS

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses (except administrative expenses) accruing during the current or any prior fiscal year authorized by title 5, chapter 81 of the United States Code; continuation of benefits as provided for under the head "Civilian War Benefits" in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1947; the Employees' Compensation Commission Appropriation Act, 1944; and sections 4(c) and 5(f) of the War Claims Act of 1948 (50 U.S.C. App. 2012); and 50 per centum of the additional compensation and benefits required by section 10(h) of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, \$201,000,000 together with such amounts as may be necessary to be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation and other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year: *Provided*, That amounts appropriated may be used under section 8104 of title 5, United States Code, by the Secretary to reimburse an employer, who is not the employer at the time of injury, for portions of the salary of a reemployed, disabled beneficiary: *Provided further*, That balances of reimbursements unobligated on September 30, 1997, shall remain available until expended for the payment of compensation, benefits, and expenses: *Provided further*, That in addition there shall be transferred to this appropriation from the Postal Service and from any other corporation or instrumentality required under section 8147(c) of title 5, United States Code, to pay an amount for its fair share of the cost of administration, such

sums as the Secretary of Labor determines to be the cost of administration for employees of such fair share entities through September 30, 1998: *Provided further*, That of those funds transferred to this account from the fair share entities to pay the cost of administration, \$7,269,000 shall be made available to the Secretary of Labor for expenditures relating to capital improvements in support of Federal Employees' Compensation Act administration, and the balance of such funds shall be paid into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may require that any person filing a notice of injury or a claim for benefits under chapter 81 of title 5, United States Code, or 33 U.S.C. 901 et seq., provide as part of such notice and claim, such identifying information (including Social Security account number) as such regulations may prescribe.

BLACK LUNG DISABILITY TRUST FUND
(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For payments from the Black Lung Disability Trust Fund, \$1,007,000,000, of which \$960,650,000 shall be available until September 30, 1999, for payment of all benefits as authorized by section 9501(d) (1), (2), (4), and (7) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954, as amended, and interest on advances as authorized by section 9501(c)(2) of that Act, and of which \$26,147,000 shall be available for transfer to Employment Standards Administration, Salaries and Expenses, \$19,551,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Salaries and Expenses, \$296,000 for transfer to Departmental Management, Office of Inspector General, and \$356,000 for payment into miscellaneous receipts for the expenses of the Department of Treasury, for expenses of operation and administration of the Black Lung Benefits program as authorized by section 9501(d)(5) of that Act: *Provided*, That, in addition, such amounts as may be necessary may be charged to the subsequent year appropriation for the payment of compensation, interest, or other benefits for any period subsequent to August 15 of the current year.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH
ADMINISTRATION
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, \$336,205,000, including not to exceed \$77,941,000 which shall be the maximum amount available for grants to States under section 23(g) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which grants shall be no less than fifty percent of the costs of State occupational safety and health programs required to be incurred under plans approved by the Secretary under section 18 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; and, in addition, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration may retain up to \$750,000 per fiscal year of training institute course tuition fees, otherwise authorized by law to be collected, and may utilize such sums for occupational safety and health training and education grants: *Provided*, That, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, the Secretary of Labor is authorized, during the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, to collect and retain fees for services provided to Nationally Recognized Testing Laboratories, and may utilize such sums, in accordance with the provisions of 29 U.S.C. 9a, to administer national and international laboratory recognition programs that ensure the safety of equipment and products used by workers in the workplace: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to prescribe, issue, administer, or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order

under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 which is applicable to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees: *Provided further*, That no funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to administer or enforce any standard, rule, regulation, or order under the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 with respect to any employer of ten or fewer employees who is included within a category having an occupational injury lost workday case rate, at the most precise Standard Industrial Classification Code for which such data are published, less than the national average rate as such rates are most recently published by the Secretary, acting through the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in accordance with section 24 of that Act (29 U.S.C. 673), except—

(1) to provide, as authorized by such Act, consultation, technical assistance, educational and training services, and to conduct surveys and studies;

(2) to conduct an inspection or investigation in response to an employee complaint, to issue a citation for violations found during such inspection, and to assess a penalty for violations which are not corrected within a reasonable abatement period and for any willful violations found;

(3) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to imminent dangers;

(4) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to health hazards;

(5) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to a report of an employment accident which is fatal to one or more employees or which results in hospitalization of two or more employees, and to take any action pursuant to such investigation authorized by such Act; and

(6) to take any action authorized by such Act with respect to complaints of discrimination against employees for exercising rights under such Act: *Provided further*, That the foregoing proviso shall not apply to any person who is engaged in a farming operation which does not maintain a temporary labor camp and employs ten or fewer employees.

MINE SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Mine Safety and Health Administration, \$199,159,000, including purchase and bestowal of certificates and trophies in connection with mine rescue and first-aid work, and the hire of passenger motor vehicles; the Secretary is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public and private sources and to prosecute projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private; the Mine Safety and Health Administration is authorized to promote health and safety education and training in the mining community through cooperative programs with States, industry, and safety associations; and any funds available to the Department may be used, with the approval of the Secretary, to provide for the costs of mine rescue and survival operations in the event of a major disaster: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated under this paragraph shall be obligated or expended to carry out section 115 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977 or to carry out that portion of section 104(g)(1) of such Act relating to the enforcement of any training requirements, with respect to shell dredging, or with respect to any sand, gravel, surface stone, surface clay, colloidal phosphate, or surface limestone mine.

BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for the Bureau of Labor Statistics, including advances or re-

imbursements to State, Federal, and local agencies and their employees for services rendered, \$327,609,000, of which \$15,430,000 shall be for expenses of revising the Consumer Price Index and shall remain available until September 30, 1999, together with not to exceed \$52,848,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

DEPARTMENTAL MANAGEMENT SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses for Departmental Management, including the hire of three sedans, and including up to \$4,402,000 for the President's Committee on Employment of People With Disabilities, \$152,199,000; together with not to exceed \$282,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund: *Provided*, That no funds made available by this Act may be used by the Solicitor of Labor to participate in a review in any United States court of appeals of any decision made by the Benefits Review Board under section 21 of the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 921) where such participation is precluded by the decision of the United States Supreme Court in Director, Office of Workers' Compensation Programs v. Newport News Shipbuilding, 115 S. Ct. 1278 (1995): *Provided further*, That no funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Labor to review a decision under the Longshore and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act (33 U.S.C. 901 et seq.) that has been appealed and that has been pending before the Benefits Review Board for more than 12 months: *Provided further*, That any such decision pending a review by the Benefits Review Board for more than one year shall be considered affirmed by the Benefits Review Board on that date, and shall be considered the final order of the Board for purposes of obtaining a review in the United States courts of appeals: *Provided further*, That these provisions shall not be applicable to the review of any decision issued under the Black Lung Benefits Act (30 U.S.C. 901 et seq.).

WORKING CAPITAL FUND

The paragraph under this heading in Public Law 85-67 (29 U.S.C. 563) is amended by striking the last period and inserting after "appropriation action" the following: ". *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Labor may transfer annually an amount not to exceed \$3,000,000 from unobligated balances in the Department's salaries and expenses accounts, to the unobligated balance of the Working Capital Fund, to be merged with such Fund and used for the acquisition of capital equipment and the improvement of financial management, information technology and other support systems, and to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the unobligated balance of the Fund shall not exceed \$20,000,000."

ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR VETERANS EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING

Not to exceed \$181,955,000 may be derived from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to carry out the provisions of 38 U.S.C. 4100-4110A and 4321-4327, and Public Law 103-353, and which shall be available for obligation by the States through December 31, 1998.

OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For salaries and expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended, \$43,105,000, together with not to exceed \$3,645,000, which may be expended from the Employment Security Administration account in the Unemployment Trust Fund.

GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 101. None of the funds appropriated in this title for the Job Corps shall be used to pay the compensation of an individual, either as direct costs or any proration as an indirect cost, at a rate in excess of \$125,000.

(TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

SEC. 102. Not to exceed 1 percent of any discretionary funds (pursuant to the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act, as amended) which are appropriated for the current fiscal year for the Department of Labor in this Act may be transferred between appropriations, but no such appropriation shall be increased by more than 3 percent by any such transfer: *Provided*, That the Appropriations Committees of both Houses of Congress are notified at least fifteen days in advance of any transfer.

SEC. 103. Funds shall be available for carrying out title IV-B of the Job Training Partnership Act, notwithstanding section 427(c) of that Act, if a Job Corps center fails to meet national performance standards established by the Secretary.

SEC. 104. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to promulgate or issue any proposed or final standard regarding ergonomic protection before September 30, 1998: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the Occupational Safety and Health Administration from issuing voluntary guidelines on ergonomic protection or from developing a proposed standard regarding ergonomic protection: *Provided further*, That no funds made available in this Act may be used by the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to enforce voluntary ergonomics guidelines through section 5 (the general duty clause) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 654).

This title may be cited as the "Department of Labor Appropriations Act, 1998".

The CHAIRMAN. Are there amendments to the remainder of title I?

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I have a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, are we still on title I of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. The remainder of title I, from page 11 through page 25.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, further parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I did not understand that response. Are we now at the end of title I of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. This is the last call for title I.

Mr. PORTER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAHOOD) having assumed the chair, Mr. GOODLATTE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2264) making appropriations for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.