

plan for its failure to “recognize the full diversity of decision makers” and for failing to “describe mechanisms for two-way communication with stakeholders.”

The Global Change Research and Data Management Act would address these criticisms by requiring the Administration to identify and consult with members of the user community in developing the USGCRP research plan. The bill would also mandate the involvement of the National Governors Association in evaluating the program plan from the perspective of the user community. These steps would help to ensure that the information needs of the policy community will be met as generously as the funding needs of the academic community.

The 1990 law outlined a highly specific organizational structure for the USGCRP. My bill would eliminate this detailed organizational structure and provide the President with the flexibility to assemble an Interagency Committee and organizational structure that will best deliver the products Congress is requesting. My bill would, however, retain many of the key features of current law—the requirements for a ten-year strategic plan, for periodic assessments of the effects of global change on the natural, social, and economic systems upon which we depend, and for increased international cooperation in global change science.

My bill would establish a new interagency working group to coordinate federal policies on data management and archiving. Advances in computer, monitoring, and satellite technologies have vastly expanded our ability to collect and analyze data. We must do a much better job of managing and archiving these important data resources to support the work of current and future scientists and policymakers.

As was clear from the impasse on the climate provisions of the energy bill in the 107th Congress, we have yet to agree on how much more information, if any, is needed before we take actions to slow the effects of human activities on global change. These are tough policy questions that we will continue to wrestle with. This bill does not offer specific policy direction, but it does affirm the need for the continued strong federal support for global change research, and it does map out a new emphasis on production of information needed to inform these important policy debates. As the world's leader in science and technology, it is incumbent on us to develop solutions that will protect our planet's resources and permit continued economic and social progress for our nation and for the world.

HONORING DR. WILLIS K. “BILLY”
DUFFY JR.

HON. LORETTA SANCHEZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 2003

Ms. LORETTA SANCHEZ of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Willis K. “Billy” Duffy Jr., a member of one of Orange County's pioneering black families.

Mr. Duffy was born in a small house in Santa Ana, where his father became the first black property owner in 1920. He attended Santa Ana High School where he became an all-State football star and student body president.

At 17, Billy graduated high school early to train as a Tuskegee Airman during World War II. He then went home to attend UCLA where he played halfback on the football team.

Billy also studied dentistry at Howard University in Washington, DC, and ran a successful practice in Los Angeles before his retirement in 1992. He was also active with the NAACP and the Los Angeles Police Department.

Billy's drive and ambition for success was truly an inspiration to those he met. During Black History month, we should all reflect upon the contributions of citizens like Billy Duffy who have made significant contributions to our Nation.

INTRODUCING THE REALIZING THE
SPIRIT OF IDEA ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 2003

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to introduce the “Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act” with my colleague Representative RUSH HOLT (D-NJ) who serves on the Committee for Education and the Workforce.

For twenty-five years the federal government has made hollow promises to fully fund the Individual with Disabilities in Education Act or IDEA. This legislation makes good on these promises. However, it does more than that. By linking funding to better outcomes, it also makes sure that the spirit of IDEA is truly realized for children with disabilities.

IDEA opened the school doors to children with disabilities. But, more needs to be done to make special education work for these students. National statistics suggest that there is still a sizable disparity in the outcomes of students with disabilities when compared to other students.

When compared to students without disabilities, between 19 and 42 percent fewer students with disabilities are able to pass state proficiency examinations.

The drop out rate for students with disabilities is double that of other students.

Only 55 percent of students with disabilities receive a regular high school diploma (compared to 75 percent of individuals within the general school population).

Individuals with disabilities are 50 percent less likely to attend college than are individuals who are not disabled.

Students with disabilities often avoid the painful experience of school and their attendance suffers.

The Census Bureau reports that 50 percent of individuals with disabilities are employed, compared with 84 percent of individuals without disabilities.

The under-funding of IDEA could help explain why students with disabilities fare so poorly on these critical outcomes. While Congress has doubled federal appropriations for IDEA over the last decade, federal funding for IDEA is still less than half of what Congress originally promised.

Unfortunately, recent increases in federal funding have translated into very modest improvement in the overall outcomes of children with disabilities. This would suggest that we not only need more federal funding for stu-

dents with disabilities, but we need to use our resources more wisely.

Disappointingly, the Republican bill, the “Improving Education Results for Children With Disabilities Act of 2003 (HR 1350),” provides no financial incentives for states and local school districts to close the glaring gaps in educational achievement for students with disabilities. The Republican bill requires that states and local school districts meet new performance standards, but guarantees no new funding if they achieve these goals.

Instead, the Republican legislation only authorizes appropriations to achieve full funding of IDEA over the next decade, but it leaves the fate of whether this will actually happen to the appropriations process. With Republicans recently voting to reduce spending on education in their budget, it is unlikely that schools will ever get full federal funding through the appropriations process. Just like the “No Child Left Behind Act,” the Republicans want better results from schools with less federal government funded resources.

In contrast, the “Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act” will dramatically increase the financial support for children with disabilities by making all funding mandatory. However, in order to receive increases, school districts must make sure special education students are not left behind. In return for mandatory increases in funding for IDEA, school districts must help these students: Increase their attendance, increase academic proficiency, lower the incidence of drop out, increase graduation rates, and improve rates of post-secondary employment and education.

The bill will also provide mandatory increases in funding for research and development as well as for programs that help infants and preschoolers with disabilities and their families.

Experts in the fields of special education, learning disabilities, child psychology and psychiatry and disability organizations agree that the “Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act” will improve the quality of education for students with disabilities. Attached, please find two letters of support for this legislation, one from academic experts and the other from advocates for people with disabilities.

Linking mandatory funding to accountability will profoundly change the way IDEA works by doing just that—making it work. The Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act is needed to move away from the status quo. Our children, regardless of their ability or disability, deserve more than a second-class education. Please join me in supporting the Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act. It is about time we give meaning to the phrase, Leave No Child Behind.

JUDGE DAVID L. BAZELON CENTER

FOR MENTAL HEALTH LAW,

Washington, DC, March 26, 2003.

Hon. PETE STARK,

Cannon House Office Building, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE STARK: The undersigned national mental health advocacy organizations are pleased to offer our support for the Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act, important legislation you will soon be introducing in the House.

On behalf of our diverse constituency, representing children with disabilities and their families, advocates, providers and professionals, we are concerned about the educational outcomes of students with disabilities who require special education and related services under the Individuals with

Disabilities Education Act (IDEA). As you well know, students with disabilities have lower rates of graduation, attendance and overall academic achievement than students without disabilities. Improving these rates and closing the gaps in academic performance between regular education and special education students is of vital importance to our constituencies and is a goal shared by your legislation.

The Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act would help children with disabilities benefit from education by providing schools with financial incentives to improve special education students' school performance. The mandatory federal funding provided under the legislation would be based on a school's ability to demonstrate improved outcomes on important measures, including attendance, graduation, drop out rates and post secondary education and employment. Furthermore, the legislation encourages schools to make use of available best practice interventions in an effort to assist students with special education needs to fully realize their academic potential—and ultimately realize the true spirit of IDEA.

We look forward to working with you this year to enact the Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act. Thank you for your continued leadership on behalf of students with disabilities and their families.

Sincerely,

LAUREL L. STINE,
Director of Federal Relations.

Submitted on behalf of:
American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.

American Counseling Association.
American Psychiatric Association.
American Psychological Association.
Children and Adults with Attention-Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder.

Federation of Families for Children's Mental Health.

National Alliance for the Mentally Ill.
National Association of School Psychologists.

National Association of Social Workers.
National Mental Health Association.

APRIL 2, 2003.

DEAR MEMBERS OF CONGRESS: As leading academic experts in the fields of special education, child psychology and education policy, we offer this letter of enthusiastic support for "The Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act" introduced by Representative Pete Stark. It will better educate and ultimately improve the lives of disabled children throughout the United States.

Congress enacted "The Individuals with Disabilities Education Act" (IDEA) over 25 years ago. The original intent of IDEA was to ensure that disabled children had access to the same quality public education as all other children. While IDEA has successfully opened the doors of public schools to children with disabilities, their rates of graduation, attendance, academic achievement and drop out lag well behind all other segments of the school population. After they leave school, young people with disabilities are twice as likely to be unemployed and typically do not receive a post secondary education.

We believe "The Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act" will provide the right incentives to make the spirit of the original IDEA legislation a reality. "The Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act" will dramatically increase the financial support for children with disabilities, and if a school continues to improve, will provide full federal funding. However, in order to receive increases, school districts must make sure disabled children are not left behind by closing the achievement gap between disabled students and their non-dis-

abled classmates. In return for mandatory increases in funding for IDEA, school districts must help disabled students increase their attendance, academic proficiency and graduation rate, lower the incidence of drop out, and improve rates of post-secondary employment and education.

Since IDEA was enacted, social science research has provided solutions that can improve the educational and career outcomes of children with disabilities. However, the current system primarily provides incentives for schools to focus on following the letter of the law rather than implementing education policies to improve students' performance. By holding schools accountable for improving the education of students with disabilities, this bill will encourage schools to implement empirically based interventions that research has demonstrated work.

"The Realizing the Spirit of IDEA Act" will improve IDEA; moreover, it provides schools the flexibility, incentives and supports necessary to have IDEA fulfill its original intent. That is why we encourage others to join with us and to help enact this important legislation.

Sincerely,

Gerald August, PhD, Professor of Psychiatry Division, of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, University of Minnesota Academic Health Center Medical School.

Russell A. Barkley, PhD, Professor, College of Health Professions, Medical University of South Carolina.

Caryn Carlson, PhD, Professor and Co-Director of Clinical Training, Department of Psychology, The University of Texas at Austin.

James Comer, MD, The Maurice Falk Professor of Child Psychiatry at the Yale University School of Medicine's Child Study Center.

Kenneth A. Dodge, PhD, William McDougall Professor of Public Policy Studies, Director, Center for Child and Family Policy, Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy, Duke University.

Douglas Fuchs, PhD, Professor and Co-Director, National Center for Research on Learning Disabilities, Vanderbilt University, Peabody College.

Terry B. Gutkin, PhD, Professor and Chair, Department of Counseling, College of Health and Human Services at San Francisco State University.

Alan E. Kazdin, PhD, John M. Musser Professor, Director, Child Study Center at Yale University School of Medicine.

Michael Cateldo, PhD, Professor of Behavioral Biology at Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine and Director of the Department of Behavioral Psychology at the Kennedy Krieger Institute.

Martha Bridge Denckla, MD, Director of the Developmental Cognitive Neurology Clinic and Batza Family Endowed Chair at the Kennedy Krieger Institute and Professor of Neurology, Pediatrics and Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine.

George DuPaul, PhD, Professor, Department of Education, Leigh University.

Elizabeth Glennie, PhD, Research Scholar, Center for Child and Family Policy Director, North Carolina Education Research Data Center, Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy, North Carolina Education Research Data Center at Duke University.

George W. Hynd, EdD, Distinguished Research Professor and Associate Dean, Office of Research and External Affairs, College at The University of Georgia.

Philip C. Kendall, PhD, Laura H. Carnell Professor of Psychology, Director, Child and Adolescent Anxiety Disorders Clinic at Temple University.

Thomas R. Kratochwill, PhD, Professor at University of Wisconsin-Madison, Depart-

ment of Educational Psychology, Division of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.

Risk Ostrander, EdD, Chief of Neuropsychology, Assistant Professor of Psychiatry, Division of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry at The Johns Hopkins University.

Evelyn R. Oka, PhD, Associate Professor and Co-Director, School Psychiatry, Associate Professor, Learning Technology and Culture Dept. of Counseling, Educational Psychology, and Special Education at Michigan State University.

John Reid, PhD, Senior Scientist at Oregon Social Learning Center.

Karen C. Stoiber, PhD, Professor, Department of Educational Psychology at University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee.

John R. Weisz, PhD, Professor, Departments of Psychology and Psychiatry and Biobehavioral Sciences at University of California, Los Angeles.

John W. Hagen, PhD, Professor of Psychology at University of Michigan, Executive Officer, Society for Research in Child Development.

Thomas Oakland, PhD, Professor of Educational Psychology, Norman Hall at University of Florida and President, International Foundation for Children's Education.

Thomas H. Ollendick, PhD, University Distinguished Professor, Director, Child Study Center, Department of Psychology at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Elizabeth Stearns, PhD, Research Scholar at Duke University, Terry Sanford Institute of Public Policy, Center for Child and Family Policy.

James R. Thompson, Chairperson, Department of Special Education at Illinois State University.

Patrick J. Wolf, PhD, Assistant Professor at Georgetown University Public Policy Institute.

IN RECOGNITION OF JUDGE
LESLIE CROCKER SNYDER

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 2, 2003

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw the attention of my colleagues to a remarkable woman, Judge Leslie Crocker Snyder. Judge Snyder currently sits on the New York Supreme Court where she presides over many high profile cases. This year, Judge Snyder will be the recipient of the National Police Defense Foundation's "Woman of the Year" Award. She is being awarded for her tremendous dedication to law enforcement and her success in both writing and interpreting important legislation.

Ms. Snyder began her career as an assistant district attorney in New York County where she became the first woman to try felony cases and homicides. She went on to become the chief and founder of the first Sex Crimes Prosecution Bureau in the United States. She has also co-authored a variety of legislation such as New York's Rape Shield Law, legislation concerning aggravated sexual abuse and other Penal Law Sex Crimes Reforms.

After leaving the New York County's District Attorney's office, Judge Snyder served as the Chief of Trials at the Office of the Special Prosecutor against Corruption in the Criminal Justice System and also worked for several years in private practice where she primarily