

which France uses to produce 80 percent of its power—so when we slow ourselves down, we are delaying urgent action on global warming and on dealing with our dependence upon foreign oil.

That was a very good example the Senator used. I salute his interest and his call for a biennial budget, a 2-year budget, and his focus on the practical problems our failure to deal with appropriations bills on time cause, and it can be shared all around the room.

TEACHER INCENTIVE FUND

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, I wish to speak about a casualty of the budget process. It is a very disheartening development, and I hope it is an oversight, not the first symbol of the new Democratic Congress's education agenda because I don't think it should be, and I cannot believe that it would be. I don't believe that the Senator from Massachusetts, the Senator from Iowa, the Senator from Rhode Island, and others who care about education would agree that killing the Teacher Incentive Fund should be held up and said here is the way the Democrats plan to approach education. But, in fact, that is what came over from the House of Representatives. What they did was kill a Federal program, passed in a bipartisan way in No Child Left Behind called the Teacher Incentive Fund. They reduced the Teacher Incentive Fund from \$100 million a year to \$200,000 in this current year. What does the program do? It helps reward outstanding teachers and principals of children who attend low-income, poor-performing schools. That is what it does. This cut threatens a crucial effort to improve the Memphis schools and also other schools all across our country in 16 major cities and States.

It is a disheartening development and one I hope will change. The loudest criticism I hear of the No Child Left Behind bill is it is not properly funded. What kind of response is it to say we are going to knock \$100 million out of the most important program that helps to train teachers and principals to help low-income children in poor-performing schools succeed? That doesn't make much sense to me.

So I have submitted an amendment—it is on file—which would increase the teacher incentive fund from \$200,000 this year to \$99 million, which is the level that was approved in the appropriations bill. It is also the level President Bush requested for the current year. The funding comes out of funds available under the education title of the Labor, HHS, Education section of the joint funding resolution. Unlike a traditional appropriations bill, the resolution doesn't fully allocate all of the dollars under the education title. So as a result, I have been advised by the Legislative Counsel's Office that our amendment doesn't need an offset.

I will add that President Bush, in the budget we received this week, has asked for \$200 million for next year. So

this would permit us to do what was intended to be done by the No Child Left Behind bill.

I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, let me mention a few of the details of the Teacher Incentive Fund, so that we can understand what happened in the House of Representatives. The Democratic majority in the House reduced the teacher incentive fund from \$99 million to \$200,000. The proposed cut jeopardizes 5-year grants that were made to 16 grantees, largely serving big-city schools and low-income students with low academic achievement. The cut will take away funds from Chicago, Denver, Memphis, Houston, Dallas, and Philadelphia. The proposed cut will take away funds from State programs in New Mexico and South Carolina. Many of these programs were developed in full consultation with teachers and principals and with their unions. As an example, Philadelphia's grant application was written and endorsed by the local teachers union. So I am trying to figure out who is against this? It would not be the teachers, principals, or the districts. Neither Democrats nor Republicans. So how did it get cut from \$100 million to \$200,000?

One of the most critical problems we have to solve today is how to retain outstanding teachers and principals. The more we understand about low-performing schools, the more we understand that, except for the parent, the most important people in that child's ability to succeed are the teacher and the principal. The quality of the teacher and the quality of the school leaders are the most important factors. The elimination of funding, as has been done by the joint funding resolution, could have a significant impact upon the Teacher Incentive Fund. As a result, for example, of the joint funding resolution, the Department of Education has already decided that they will have to delay the national evaluation of the Teacher Incentive Fund until 2008. So we have delayed, for a year, helping these children be exposed to teachers and principals who have more capacity, and we won't learn anything from that evaluation for another extra year.

The proposed cut in funding in the current year will undermine the current grant competition that is going on. Applications are due on February 12, 2007. So say you are sitting in Providence, Knoxville or San Francisco, and you are in the midst of an application to bring in New Leaders for New Schools or some other group, they say to the school district: OK, we will train all your teachers, send them to the Wharton School in the summer and work with them for a year, and on a continuing basis we will help these principals and teachers; we will help

the principals become better school leaders. But then the New Leaders for New Schools will say you have to give the principal some autonomy, let them hire and fire the best teachers, let them make decisions. So there is this alliance. In many cases, the teachers union is involved, as in the Philadelphia case. They make concessions. So everybody is working together to try to say: What can we do to help these low-performing schools succeed?

Today, in a roundtable we had about No Child Left Behind, I suggested we are not talking about No Child Left Behind in the correct way. We are catching people doing things wrong instead of catching people doing things right. The truth of the matter is that across our country we have about 100,000 schools, more or less, and in about 75 percent of those schools, they are succeeding in what we call adequate yearly progress. Those schools are succeeding in adequate yearly progress. Now, those schools, I would say, are high-achieving schools. What we find is most of the schools I would call achieving schools. Any school that has succeeded in No Child Left Behind for a couple of years I would call a highest achieving school. One which has succeeded for 1 year would be a high-achieving school. One with only one subgroup of children who don't quite make the standards, I would call that an achieving school. So we have mainly 15, 20 percent of our schools where we need to go to work and do things differently.

These children can succeed. Memphis has a large number of low-performing schools, as we call them, but it is not because the children cannot learn. I was there during spring break last year at one of the new public charter schools in Memphis. They go to school early in the morning and leave at 5 in the afternoon. They were in AP biology courses in the 10th grade. They can all learn. They needed extra help in a different way, and the difference it has made there starts with a good school leader and an excellent teacher. Memphis plans to take this money from the Teacher Incentive Fund and take every single one of its principals through this year-long training, the summer programs, the continuing education, and then Memphis decided to give those teachers autonomy.

So that is what we are killing when we kill this program, not just in Memphis, but in many other school districts. The northern New Mexico network, the DC public schools, the Chicago public schools, Denver, Mare Island Technology Academy in California, Houston, Guilford County, NC, Alaska, the whole State of South Carolina, a couple of districts in Texas—they are all in the middle of this. They are making applications for more. They expect these to be 5-year grants. They are doing what we asked them to do, and then we come along and kill the program right in the middle of the year.

I ask unanimous consent to print after my remarks a list of the current grantees and programs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 1.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, following that, I ask unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a letter from Secretary Margaret Spellings of the Department of Education pointing out what difficulty this decision by the House of Representatives will cause to the teacher incentive fund.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See Exhibit 2.)

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. President, finally, let me make this observation. I was visited today by representatives of the Tennessee Education Association. I have not always gotten along well with the Tennessee Education Association because of the subject we are discussing today. In 1983, I proposed the first master teacher program in the country, the first attempt by a State to pay teachers more for teaching well and to reward principals in the same way. The National Education Association went apoplectic for over a year. We had a brawl for a year and a half. We finally passed a program and our Career Ladder Program lasted for several years, until I got out of office is really what happened, and then it gradually went away. Mr. President, 10,000 teachers were rewarded, paid more, their retirement pay was more, and we talked about that today. I appreciated very much their visit because this includes some teachers who were part of that Career Ladder Program. They are the leadership of the teachers' union, the teachers' association in Tennessee. They came to see me about it, and they were very honest.

They said any program that picks one teacher out and rewards outstanding teaching or rewards an outstanding principal is difficult to do because it is hard to make it fair. But we must do it. Almost everyone agrees that if we make any progress in education, especially with low-income children in poor performing schools, we have to find a way to pay good teachers more and good principals more and keep them in those schools. We have to do it.

So this teacher incentive fund is a real casualty here, and I hope the majority whip, the assistant Democratic leader—he is here—I know he cares deeply about education, about the program in Chicago which is part of this.

Maybe it is an oversight. Maybe it is a casualty that both Republicans and Democrats have had to deal with over the past 2 months. What I hope is, if there are any amendments allowed to this joint funding resolution, this amendment will be one of them. If it is not, I hope we can work together in the Senate, as well as in the House, and do what President Bush has asked us to do, not only put \$200 million in for next year, but send a signal to the big city

school districts across America: Don't give up, we want to help you train and hire outstanding teachers and outstanding principals.

EXHIBIT 1

(Purpose: To provide additional funds for the Teacher Incentive Fund)

On page 72, line 20, strike "of which not to exceed \$200,000" and insert "of which \$99,000,000".

EXHIBIT 2

CURRENT GRANTEES

NORTHERN NEW MEXICO NETWORK (NEW MEXICO)

The Northern New Mexico Network for Rural Education, a Non-Profit Organization, is partnering with four New Mexico school districts: Espanola Schools, Springer Schools, Cimarron Schools and Des Moines Schools. They seek funding for the Teacher Incentive Fund to implement a performance-based compensation program to serve a region of the state where high levels of poverty, high concentrations of Native American and Hispanic students, and extreme rural conditions pose unique challenges to public education systems. Three of the school districts—Cimarron, Des Moines and Springer—are small (less than 500 students), and serve a large geographical area—all over 1,000 square miles. The fourth district, Espanola, serves almost 5,000 students.

NEW LEADERS, INC. (D.C. PUBLIC SCHOOLS)

This project includes a coalition among D.C. Public Schools, New Leaders for New Schools, Mathematica, Teachscape, and Standard & Poors to provide direct compensation to teachers and principals who have demonstrated their ability to move student achievement. D.C. Public Schools' currently works with the Center for Performance Assessment to "incentivize" the creation of more standards and data-driven classrooms and schools. The project plans to complement this current effort in the District of Columbia where the achievement gap is particularly troubling due to the over 90 percent of public school students coming from poverty stricken families.

CHICAGO PUBLIC SCHOOLS (ILLINOIS)

The Chicago Public Schools, in collaboration with the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching (NIET), proposes the Recognizing Excellence in Academic Leadership (REAL) program. At the center of REAL is the NIET Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). The TAP performance-based compensation system—including multiple evaluations and opportunities for new roles and responsibilities—will drive recruitment, development, and retention of quality staff in 40 high need schools that serve approximately 24,000 students in the Chicago public school system.

SCHOOL DISTRICT NO. 1 FOR THE CITY AND COUNTY OF DENVER (COLORADO)

The Denver Public Schools proposes a two-fold district-wide expansion of its Professional Compensation System for Teachers (ProComp). First, Denver PS will develop, implement, and evaluate a performance-based compensation system for principals through a national strategic partnership with New Leaders for New Schools. Second, Denver PS will strengthen its professional development, information and technology, and student assessment systems to ensure ProComp is consistently and rigorously implemented district-wide.

NEW LEADERS, INC. (MEMPHIS CITY SCHOOLS)

This project includes a coalition among Memphis City Schools, New Leaders for New Schools, Mathematica, Teachscape, and Standard & Poors to maximize their pros-

pects of attracting, developing, supporting, and retaining a community of high-performing educators to drive academic achievement in the short and long-term. The project will likely span 17 schools that directly affect 10,000 students in Memphis City Schools—the largest school district in the state of Tennessee and the 21st largest in the nation.

MARE ISLAND TECHNOLOGY ACADEMY (CALIFORNIA)

Mare Island Technical Academy, an LEA, proposes to expand a current project to award incentives to teachers and principals instrumental in increasing student achievement. It will also award incentives to those taking the lead in implementing Strategic Plan and Professional Learning Communities initiatives in 2 independent middle and high school charter schools serving a total of 780 students with 32 teachers and 2.5 principals/administrators, in Vallejo, CA. Mare Island attracts a percentage of neighborhood students from 2 elementary schools within a block of Mare Island: Loma Vista with a 61.4% and Wiedenmann with a 67.0% free or reduced-price lunch rate.

HOUSTON INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (TEXAS)

The Houston Independent School District is the largest public school district in Texas and the seventh largest in the United States. Houston ISD proposes Project S.M.A.R.T. (Strategies for Motivating and Rewarding Teachers), an incentive plan for teachers that focuses on teacher effectiveness and growth in student learning. The proposed performance-pay program will provide incentives to 109 teachers and principals at Houston ISD campuses. A total of 27 schools have been targeted for inclusion of the S.M.A.R.T. program using TIP funds.

GUILFORD COUNTY SCHOOLS (NORTH CAROLINA)

Guilford County Schools has proposed a financial recruitment/retention project for the 2006-2007 school year called Mission Possible and plans to expand the program to an additional seven schools using TIF funds. The seven schools proposed for expansion include: Bessemer Elementary, Cone Elementary, Falkener Elementary, Union Hill Elementary, Allen Middle, Aycock Middle, and Penn Griffin Middle.

NEW LEADERS, INC. (CHARTER SCHOOLS IN VARIOUS STATES)

This project includes a coalition among New Leaders for New Schools, Mathematica, and most of the nation's highest-performing charter schools and charter school networks, including the national KIPP network, Achievement First, Uncommon Schools, Aspire Public Schools, YES College Prep Schools—and others. The project will likely span 47 schools, 47 principals, and 1,186 teachers in charter schools throughout the nation.

CHUGACH SCHOOL DISTRICT (ALASKA)

Chugach School District serves as the fiscal agent of the Alaska Teacher and Principal Incentive Project, created in partnership with Lake and Peninsula School District, Kuspuk School District and Chugach (the fiscal agent). The Alaska Department of Education and Early Development and the non-profit Re-Inventing Schools Coalition are also participating in this proposed project. This project expands on Alaska's performance pay initiative funded by the Alaska Legislature.

SOUTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (SOUTH CAROLINA)

This project, which is a modified version of an existing Teacher Advancement Program (TAP), aims to implement a performance-based compensation system to address problems with recruitment and retention in 23

high-need schools in six districts. By the fifth year of the project, SC TIF has the potential to affect more than 60,000 children and 5,000 teachers and principals. These modifications include higher and varied teacher bonuses, the introduction of principal and assistant principal bonuses, more competitive Master and Mentor Teacher addendums, a new focus on marketing and recruiting, raising the value-added percentage in the performance pay from 50% to 60%, using MAP tests to give K-3 teachers an individual value-added score, and inclusion of related arts in the individual value-added gains calculations.

DALLAS INDEPENDENT SCHOOL DISTRICT (TEXAS)

For the past decade, the Dallas ISD has provided incentives to teachers, principals, and other campus staff based on the value-added performance of their students under the Outstanding School Performance Award program. This project builds on this history and existing apparatus to identify and reward effective principals based on a combination of direct and value-added measures of student achievement and reward effective teachers based on value-added measures of their students' achievement. In addition, the project includes refinement of the Dallas database for tracking student-teacher assignments; incentives for principals and teachers to participate in substantive, high-standards professional development; incentives for highly effective teachers to move to and stay in high needs campuses; and procedures for insuring the integrity of test results.

SCHOOL DISTRICT OF PHILADELPHIA (PENNSYLVANIA)

The overall purpose of Philadelphia's initiative is to pilot a performance-based staff development and compensation system that provides teachers and principals with clear incentives that are directly tied to student achievement growth and classroom observations conducted according to an objective, standards-based rubric at multiple points during each school year. Twenty high-need urban elementary schools (grades 3-8) that have demonstrated high degrees of faculty buy-in will participate in the pilot. Leaders from the School District of Philadelphia's administration and from the two unions representing all Philadelphia teachers and principals have designed the pilot and will oversee its implementation.

OHIO DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION (OHIO)

Key strategies of the Ohio Teacher Incentive Fund (OTIF) include implementing the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP) in the Cincinnati and Columbus City Schools, expanding the Toledo Review and Alternative Compensation System (TRACS) in the Toledo City Schools, and developing and implementing the Cleveland Teacher Incentive System, a program modeled on TRACS, in the Cleveland City Schools. OTIF is a cooperative venture of the Ohio Department of Education; Columbus, Cleveland, Cincinnati, and Toledo City Schools; and the National Institute for Excellence in Teaching.

EAGLE COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (COLORADO)

In the past five years, Eagle County School District has invested over \$4.5 million (not including performance awards) to implement a performance-based compensation system for teachers and principals based on the Teacher Advancement Program (TAP). This project is an expansion of the program and will utilize TIP grant funding to improve the quality of Master and Mentor teachers through increased salary augmentations and increased training. It will cover 13 high-need schools.

WELD COUNTY SCHOOL DISTRICT (COLORADO)

This project will be implemented in the 4 high-need schools in the Weld County School

District. The district currently ranks last in teacher compensation compared to neighboring districts. The project objectives state that by year 2, a comprehensive principal and teacher differentiated compensation system based on student achievement gains and classroom evaluations will be fully operational. The Superintendent of Student Achievement of this district will manage the project.

EXHIBIT 3

THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION,
Washington, DC, February 8, 2007.

Hon. LAMAR ALEXANDER,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR ALEXANDER: Thank you for your efforts to amend the Joint Funding Resolution, H.R. 20, to provide level funding (\$99 million) for the Teacher Incentive Fund (TIF).

As you may know, the lack of a fiscal year 2007 appropriation for TIF would have a significant impact on the program. The Department (ED) remains concerned that a lack of funding for TIF in fiscal year 2007 would jeopardize our ability to make timely continuation funding available for current grant recipients. While ED has reserved \$8.8 million from fiscal year 2006 funds to cover the increased costs proposed for the second year of operation for the 16 current TIF grantees, this amount will not cover all continuation costs for grantees.

A lack of fiscal year 2007 funding for TIF would also significantly limit our ability to support technical assistance to TIF grantees and ensure that information on teacher and principal compensation reform is available not only to TIF grantees, but also to the general public.

Finally, a lack of fiscal year 2007 funding would impact our ability to begin a national evaluation of the TIF program, which Congress called for when appropriating funds for this program. Our planned evaluation will be delayed until fiscal year 2008 unless funds are appropriated.

It should also be noted that a lack of funding in fiscal year 2007 may undermine the current TIF grant competition that is underway (with applications due on February 12, 2007). Potential grantees may be dissuaded from applying for TIF grants or spending time and resources developing high-quality applications if they believe the program's funding is in jeopardy.

Again, I thank you for your leadership on this important issue. Please do not hesitate to call if I can answer any additional questions.

Sincerely,

MARGARET SPELLINGS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The majority whip.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate is in morning business. The Senator from Illinois may speak for 10 minutes.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I say to my colleague from Tennessee, whose interest in education is well recognized, I couldn't agree with him more. Not only is this program important, it is important to me. When the superintendent of the Chicago Public School System, Arnie Duncan, called me yesterday and said we need this money, I said to him: I know you do. It breaks my heart that we cannot give it to you at this moment.

I can go through the sordid history that brought us to this continuing resolution—our failure to pass the appropriations bills in the normal fashion last year, extending the Government on a piecemeal basis with a CR, as we call them, for a few months, and now facing the awesome task of funding the rest of the year with certainly limitations in funding that have caused a great deal of deprivation. This is a clear illustration and example of a program that is worth funding and that should be funded.

I say to my friend from Tennessee, if we cannot resolve it in this particular bill—and I doubt that we can because of the extraordinary circumstances—please let me join him and let's have others join in making sure this program is solid and funded for the next fiscal year. It is a good program, an excellent program. I want to see it move forward.

The quality of teachers may be the single greatest determinant in the success of education. I certainly want to join the Senator from Tennessee in making that happen.

IRAQ

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I want to move to another topic and say for anyone who has followed the debate this week on Iraq, it has been a frustration. We came to the Senate with the clear direction of the American people to change course in Iraq. Unfortunately, the minority—the Republican minority—decided it was more important to change the subject than to change course. So they defeated our efforts to bring this issue of our policy in Iraq to a debate on Monday.

In the Senate, it takes 60 votes to do anything that is important or controversial. And so we needed help from the Republican side of the aisle because we only have 51 when we are at full complement, and with Senator JOHNSON recuperating, we only had 50. We needed 10 of their stalwarts to join us, to move forward and say: Let's have this debate on Iraq.

I was hopeful we would have that many. At least seven or eight Republican Senators said they disapprove of President Bush's plan to escalate this war. I thought that was a good starting point, and maybe others will join in to make sure there is a real debate.

Come time for the vote on Monday, we fell short. The Democrats came and voted, with all but one exception, to move forward on the debate, but our Republican friends would not join us. So the debate on Iraq stopped in its tracks. Efforts were made over the next day or two, with no success whatever, to try to revive this debate on Iraq. Now we find ourselves in a position where we moved to the next stage.

That debate was about the Warner resolution, a Republican from Virginia, with bipartisan sponsorship that we agreed on the Democratic side would be the vote. I don't know how more accommodating the majority could be to