

Interview questions for Carol Rasco from *Education Daily*

for Friday, Feb. 25, interview at 2:30 p.m.

1 ■ Does the request by President Clinton for only a 4.6 percent increase in funding for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and a 6 percent increase for IDEA--which is funded at \$2 billion--overall, while asking for \$6 billion, a 17 percent increase, for Chapter I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, indicate that children with disabilities are a lower priority than those served by Chapter I?

2 ■ Is any kind of initiative contemplated by the Administration for coordinating federal funding streams to states' education, health and social services agencies and to help states structure their efforts in a more collaborative, cost-effective way? Can you share the specifics of such efforts?

3 ■ The administration seems to have a vision of the Education and Labor Departments joining forces to prepare the future generation for the workforce of tomorrow. Can you expound on that vision?

4 ■ Can you detail the role schools would play as servicers/providers under President Clinton's health care plan? Would it make school administrators responsible to another bureaucracy?

5 ■ Do any of President Clinton's school reform proposals specifically address the overrepresentation of minorities in special education classes and the underrepresentation of blacks and other minorities in leadership and professional roles, other than the general statement that "all means all?" What can be done to strengthen the role of historically black colleges and universities and others serving minorities?

6 ■ Should inclusion of persons with disabilities in society be addressed in the same way as we increasingly are addressing problems of acceptance encountered by women, minorities and ethnic groups? Is there a plan to accomplish this and what is being done to increasingly address the problems encountered by all these minorities?

7 ■ Sen. Bob Dole earlier this month expressed concern that the needs of children with

disabilities were not being served by Goals 2000 school reforms. He says that educational goals, standards and assessment are not now working for students with disabilities to effect their inclusion in the public education system. Will they be included in testing and assessments and what accommodations should be made for them?

8 ■ Where does the administration stand on the question of full inclusion of disabled children in the public school classroom and maintenance of the continuum of options in special education?

9 ■ What will we see in President Clinton's IDEA reauthorization plan? Will include any major initiatives or changes?

10 ■ Will the administration continue to seek funding for IDEA early intervention programs once state systems are in place?

11 ■ Does the Clinton administration have specific civil rights priorities for education? Will the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights be more aggressive? And does the administration believe the legacy of Brown v. Board of Education is being served?

Should those rights be extended to children with disabilities as well as blacks and other minorities?

12 ■ Lastly: In his speech before the American Council on Education this week, President Clinton recognized the problem of violence in schools. He said the federal government could offer local leaders "supporting tools" for an ultimatum on weapons in schools. What tools? What level of support?

Submitted to Roslyn Miller, executive assistant to Carol Rasco, by Tom Huestis, *Education Daily* and *Special Education Report*, Wednesday, Feb. 23, 1994.

Nike Smith

12/12

Background for Education Daily Interview

Question 1: Does the request by President Clinton for only a 4.6 percent increase in funding for Part B of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act and a 6 percent increase for IDEA--which is funded at \$2 billion overall, while asking for \$6 billion, a 17 percent increase, for Chapter I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, indicate that children with disabilities are a lower priority than those served by Chapter I?

NOTE: ED DAILY'S NUMBERS ARE INCORRECT (the requested funding for Title I is 7 billion: a 10.5 percent increase).

o We believe our request for IDEA programs represents a significant commitment to improving educational opportunities for children with disabilities. Our request for State Grant programs (the Part B Grants to States and Preschool Grants programs and the Part H Grants for Infants and Families program) provides an overall increase of 6.5 percent over the 1994 level. The request would provide sufficient funds to help States cover increased costs and serve an additional 151,000 children aged 3 through 21 years. Notably, it would maintain the Federal share of the excess costs of educating children with disabilities at 7 percent.

o The increase for Title I (currently Chapter 1) Grants to Local Educational Agencies program to \$7 billion (+10.5%) reflects the Administration's resolution to invest substantial additional funding in Title I if the program is restructured to emphasize attainment to high academic standards and to direct more of the funds to schools and communities with high concentrations of children from low-income families. More funds are needed to reach more schools with poor children and to provide all children served under Title I with the kind of intensive services they need to reach high standards.

o One important difference between these two programs is the relative significance of Federal dollars in supporting services. In the area of special education, State and local agencies are required under section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act to provide a free appropriate public education (FAPE) to all children with disabilities regardless of how much Federal money they receive. While the Federal dollars play an important role in improving services to children, a child's access to FAPE does not depend on Federal support.

In the case of Compensatory Education, the assistance

provided to States under Chapter 1 constitutes the major source of funding for these services to poor children. The number of children served and the quality and intensity of the services are directly tied to the amount of Federal support.

Question 2: Is any kind of initiative contemplated by the Administration for coordinating federal funding streams to states' education, health and social services agencies and to help states structure their efforts in a more collaborative, cost-effective way? Can you share the specifics.

- o The Administration will work through the President's Community Enterprise Board to support coordination of services and reduce federal barriers to coordination, through such mechanisms, as waivers, regulatory review, technical assistance, etc.... The board is supporting efforts such as the President's Empowerment Zone initiative and Indiana and West Virginia's consolidated education/social service plans.
- o The Administration's Goals 2000: Educate America Act and its proposed Elementary and Secondary Education Act promote comprehensive planning, as well as the coordination of education services with other health and social services. For example, under the Administration's proposal for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act reauthorization, local education agencies can use Title I funds as "glue money" to promote coordination of education, health and social services for children. In addition, the waiver authorities in both bills could allow states and locals considerable freedom to pool resources, as long as accountability for program goals and results is maintained.

Question 3: The Administration seems to have a vision of the Education and Labor Departments joining forces to prepare the future generation of the workforce of tomorrow. Can you expound on that vision?

Education and training are the foundation upon which a productive workforce is built, and well-educated, well-trained people are our country's greatest resource. In the past, a high school education was enough to get a job that paid a decent living. But the majority of the new jobs our economy is creating are for people with more than a high school education.

More education and training mean higher incomes. For example, in 1990, people with a four-year college degree earned on average twice as much as those with a high school diploma, and four times as much as those who did not finish high school. And the gap between what the well-educated earn and what the poorly educated earn is growing. So, the Administration faces a double challenge: how to increase productivity by increasing the overall skills of the workforce, and how to reduce inequality between our highly-skilled, well-paid citizens and those without those skills.

In order to address this double challenge, the Administration has developed a broad vision of education and training that transcends the old "boxes" and recognizes the inevitable links between education, training, and jobs. Our vision cuts across government agencies, incorporating programs of the Departments of Education and Labor, and some other agencies, as well. The vision incorporates the following principles:

- o high standards for all students and for all education and training programs;
- o a smooth school-to-work transition;
- o lifelong learning--recognizing that increasingly, workers cannot depend on a single set of skills for a single job that lasts a lifetime; and
- o second chances for those who have been left behind or left out by the modern economy.

Our legislative agenda--major portions of which are nearing passage by the Congress--seeks to implement these principles.

- o Goals 2000 provides the template for a learning system based on challenging standards for all students, ensuring that all Americans will leave this part of the system having mastered a solid set of competencies that will prepare them for further learning and for good

jobs.

- o Implementation of the **School to Work Opportunities Act** will ensure that young people--especially the 75 percent of them who do not get a four-year college degree--acquire skills and experience that are meaningful in the context of today's workforce needs. There has been unprecedented cooperation between the Departments of Education and Labor to draft this bill.
- o A reauthorized **Elementary and Secondary Education Act** will help schools in disadvantaged communities to ensure that their students have a real chance to achieve the standards and acquire the skills they need, including by concentrating federal education dollars where the need is greatest.
- o And the soon to be introduced bill for dislocated workers will provide access to information, training, job search assistance, and other support for those who have lost jobs through one-stop career centers.

Question 4: Can you detail the role schools would play as servicers/providers under President Clinton's health care plan? Would it make school administrators responsible to another bureaucracy?

- o Schools are already heavily involved in providing health services, particularly to children with special health needs. The Health Security Act would assist schools in this effort in several ways. First, all children and youth, including those with disabilities, will have improved health coverage for health care and preventive services. Second, there will be a substantial program for children with special health care needs that would create uniform benefits across the nation.
- o Schools will also have a larger role as part of the Public Health Services access and capacity building initiative. The access initiative specifically addresses school health by creating two new programs to support the special needs of school-aged youth in high risk settings. The school-linked and school-based health center initiative will support through grants and loans several thousand centers to provide physical and mental health services. The initiative allows schools to work with local community health providers and gives communities the opportunity to design its own programs to meet its own needs. For schools that apply for and receive funding under the school-linked and school-based health center initiative, the health center will improve services for all children in the school. For children with disabilities, this means that teachers and others working with them will get more support in providing health-related services, making it easier to meet their needs and fully include children with disabilities in the regular classroom.
- o In addition, Title III would create a comprehensive health education program in grades K-12 in high-risk schools that will focus on behavior that results in the majority of health programs among adolescents and adults, with an emphasis on specific local needs. The \$50 million program would be administered by state and local education agencies, in close collaboration with state and local health agencies.

Question 5: Do any of President Clinton's school reform proposals specifically address the overrepresentation of minorities in special education classes and the underrepresentation of blacks and other minorities in leadership and professional roles, other than the general statement that "all means all?" What can be done to strengthen the role of historically black colleges and universities and others serving minorities?

PART A - overrepresentation in special education:

- o All of President Clinton's school reform proposals are designed to ensure that all of America's students receive the challenging curriculum and high-quality instruction they need to reach high standards and achieve their greatest potential.

-- Both Goals 2000 and the Improving America's Schools Act will greatly improve the ability of minority students to reach high standards and thus reduce the overrepresentation of minorities in special education.

-- In addition, we will be linking all our reform efforts to help schools restructure with an emphasis on prevention: that is providing students who may be experiencing difficulty in school with services within the regular program so that they will be successful. Our ESEA bill emphasizes this approach and as we work on IDEA reauthorization we will be promoting improved linkages between special education and overall education reform.

- o Under the IDEA, we have a responsibility to assure that students with disabilities are appropriately served and that students are not inappropriately placed in special education. The over-placement of minority students has historically been a significant problem and one about which we are deeply concerned. Among the steps we will take to address this will be to revise our monitoring process of IDEA within the Office of Special Education Programs (OSEP) to specifically analyze racial placement data. When we find over-representation, we will, where appropriate, require that states take corrective action.
- o The Office of Civil Rights (OCR) currently monitors this issue on a local school district level utilizing a sampling technique. OSEP and OCR will be coordinating their activities to maximize their ability to address this issue.

PART B: underrepresentation of blacks and other minorities in leadership and professional roles:

- o President Clinton's higher education agenda is designed to

promote the representation of blacks and other minorities in leadership and professional roles.

-- The Direct Student Loan program will increase access to postsecondary education for all students. The program will make loans cheaper for students, will simplify the overly complex student financial aid system and, by providing income contingent repayment, will ensure that no student will ever be denied the opportunity to continue her education for financial reasons. By making it easier to finance a postsecondary education, the President will increase minority access to higher education and ultimately will increase the pool of minority leaders and professionals.

-- In addition the Administration has just released a new policy on race-targeted scholarships which encourages continued use of financial aid as a means to provide equal educational opportunity and to provide a diverse educational environment for all students.

- o In addition, OSEP is currently funding two Minority Outreach Centers (Hampton University and University of New Mexico) to strengthen the role of HBCU's and other institutions of higher education serving minorities. These centers provide technical assistance to minority entities, defined as HBCUs and other institutions of higher education with at least 25% minority enrollment to increase the capacity of these institutions to be competitive in developing proposals seeking OSEP funding for personnel development and other activities funded under the discretionary programs.

PART C: strengthening the role of historically black colleges and universities

- o In the last few months, President Clinton has signed the Executive Order on Historically Black Colleges and Universities and the Executive Order on Educational Excellence for Hispanic Americans. Both of these Executive Orders recognize the important and critical role that HBCUs and Hispanic Serving Institutions have played in promoting educational excellence. By signing these orders, the President has made a commitment to assist these institutions in fulfilling their important mission.
- o We hope to extend the HBCU and Tribal Community College default rate exemption so as to ensure their continued participation in the student loan program. Unless Congress agrees to extend this exemption, we face the possibility that many HBCU's and Tribal colleges will no longer be able to enroll students receiving federal financial aid and thus may have to close their doors.

- o Another top priority is to ensure that HBCUs and Hispanic Serving Institutions participate in the new direct student loan program. All institutions should be in a position to offer their students the benefits of the new Direct Student Loan program - including income contingent repayment.
- o In the President's proposed budget we have increased the maximum Pell grant from \$2300 to \$2400 per year. This will benefit many disadvantaged students who attend HBCUs and HSIs and rely heavily on grant aid to pay their tuition bills.

Question 6: Should inclusion of persons with disabilities in society be addressed in the same way as we increasingly are addressing problems of acceptance encountered by women, minorities and ethnic groups? Is there a plan to accomplish this and what is being done to increasingly address the problems encountered by all these minorities?

The problems of acceptance, and subsequent discrimination, that people with disabilities encounter are very similar to those encountered by other minority groups. Consequently, many of the civil right strategies that have been used with these groups are appropriate to also use in addressing issues of discrimination affecting persons with disabilities. We already have in place major pieces of legislation that ensure that the civil rights of people with disabilities are protected (e.g., Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the American's with Disabilities Act). However, as we have seen with other civil rights issues, legislation alone is not enough to change the attitudes, perceptions and behaviors of many people.

This Administration is highly committed to ensuring that people with disabilities be fully included and accepted in society. In order to achieve this, the Department has emphasized the importance of national leadership on the inclusion of people with disabilities.

Currently, we spend a great deal of federal discretionary dollars to support the inclusion of infants, toddlers, children, youth, and adults with disabilities in school and community settings. As more and more nondisabled children attend school - side by side - with their peers with disabilities we will see a new generation of children who will be more appreciative of individual differences and the contributions that diversity can engender. As more and more young adults with disabilities enter the work force, people who have little exposure to individuals with disabilities will have the opportunity to benefit from interacting with these workers.

With a coordinated and concentrated effort to include people with disabilities in all aspects of society, change will occur. It will require all of us to be vigilant and to address discrimination wherever we see it occurring. Change will occur if we all accept this responsibility.

Question 7: Senator Bob Dole earlier this month expressed concern that the needs of children with disabilities were not being served by Goals 2000 school reforms. He says that the educational goals, standards and assessments are not now working for students with disabilities to effect their inclusion in the public education system. Will they be included in testing and assessments and what accommodations should be made for them?

The Administration's Education Reform proposal, the Goals 2000: Educate America Act, is intended to address the needs of all children. To ensure that children with disabilities are not forgotten, the legislation includes a definition of "all children" that includes students with disabilities.

The legislation is clear throughout that the standards and assessment systems must include all students. However the legislation does not specify how this is to be done. It will be our challenge in implementing the legislation to ensure that the needs of children with disabilities are appropriately addressed.

Children with some cognitive disabilities may not be able to meet content standards in academic subjects. Some of these children are so significantly disabled that they need special performance standards that are tied to outcomes that will be meaningful for them in their lives. For other children, consideration will need to be taken of a range of ability levels.

Assessment systems also need to be sensitive to the diversity among children. In including children with disabilities in assessment, attention must be paid to the accommodations or adjustments that are necessary.

The Department is supporting an National Center on Educational Outcomes at the University of Minnesota; this Center is working on issues concerning the inclusion of children with disabilities in standards and assessments systems.

Question 8: Where does the Administration stand on the question of full inclusion of disabled children in the public school classroom and maintenance of the continuum of options in special education?

The Clinton Administration has a strong commitment to including people with disabilities in every facet of our communities. The Administration firmly believes that within the last twenty years, there have been major accomplishments in the education of disabled students in this country. However, we know more needs to be done.

We continue to believe that all children can learn to higher academic standards, and for many disabled students, that can be accomplished in the regular classroom. However, we do not advocate a "one size fits all" approach in making decisions about how students should be educated.

The continuum of alternative placements is an integral part of the IDEA regulations. The regular classroom in the neighborhood school should be the first placement option considered and teachers should be provided with the training and support they need to make the regular classroom in the neighborhood school the appropriate placement.

Also, there is a critical need for the parents of all disabled children to receive more and better information about the available options and support that may be needed for their children. The Administration believes that the more information parents have, the more effective they will be in the decision-making process affecting their children's education.

Question 9: What will we see in President Clinton's IDEA reauthorization plan? Will it include any major initiatives or changes?

we regard this reauthorization as a significant opportunity to improve all of the programs in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, building on 17 years of experience in implementing Public Law 94-142 and reflecting our overall objectives for school reform and increasing opportunities for all students to learn to high standards.

Among the major issues we are considering are how to align IDEA with Goals 2000 and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and how to provide for accountability for outcomes for children with disabilities. We are also reviewing the discretionary programs with the goal of ensuring that they are effectively used to support improved outcomes for students with disabilities.

Question 10: Will the Administration continue to seek funding for IDEA early intervention programs once state systems are in place?

The Administration is strongly committed to assisting States in establishing comprehensive and coordinated programs of early intervention services for infants and toddlers with disabilities because of the importance of these services in ensuring that young children with disabilities are ready to learn when they enter school.

In the short-term, we would expect to continue to provide assistance to help States improve the quality of their statewide systems even after they are fully in place. Current law requires States to have their systems in place in order to be eligible for FY 1993 funds (which is available for obligation by the Department of Education through September 30, 1994). However, given the complexity involved in implementing the required system we would anticipate States to continue to require assistance in administering their systems. For example, the substantial increase we have requested for the program for 1995 will help States to provide technical assistance to service providers, meet their training needs, improve their data collection, and their child find and outreach efforts.

Our long-term intention is to ensure that Federal support for early intervention programs is fully coordinated and provided as part of a comprehensive strategy for assisting States in meeting the needs of all young children with special needs, including children with disabilities. In this regard, we will be closely examining the role of the Grants for Infants and Families program administered by the Department of Education and its relationship to other programs that provide significant support for early intervention services, such as those administered by the Department of Health and Human Services.

11. Does the Clinton Administration have specific civil rights priorities for education? Will the Education Department's Office for Civil Rights be more aggressive? And does the administration believe the legacy of Brown vs. Board of Education is being served?

- o Our civil rights agenda in education is dedicated to ensuring equal access to high quality, high standards education. We intend to accomplish this through high priority policy development, targeted technical assistance and high impact compliance reviews.
- o OCR will be more aggressive in pursuing excellence and fairness in education. The Department of Education has made a commitment to a more balanced enforcement approach: 80% of proactive resources will be dedicated to remedying problems in five key areas. These areas are:
 - 1) over-representation of minorities in special education;
 - 2) under-representation of women, girls and minorities in math and science;
 - 3) under-representation of Limited-English proficient students in federal education programs;
 - 4) discriminatory use of testing for admissions and placement.
 - 5) discrimination in admissions
- o This is not to suggest that OCR's compliance program has been or will be inactive in other areas. OCR has recently reached settlements with the Chicago public schools to remedy years of neglect of learning disabled and severely disabled students. In California, the vocational rehabilitation system state-wide will be required to address on an equal basis the needs of language minority clients as a result of OCR intervention. These are two of many examples of OCR's re-commitment to equal educational opportunity.
- o OCR's handling of complaints is also dramatically changing. The new approach focuses more on achieving effective change, less on the production of documents.
- o Yes we firmly believe that we are enforcing the mandate in Brown. All of the steps described above will help us in attaining our goal of providing equal access to excellence.

Question 12: In his speech before the American Council on Education this week, President Clinton recognized the problem of violence in schools. He said the federal government could offer local leadership "supporting tools" for an ultimatum on weapons in schools. What tools? What level of support?

There are a lot of tools or support we--the Federal government--can offer schools in their efforts to eradicate violence and remove weapons from schools. Further, we anticipate that within a very short period we will, with passage of some important pieces of legislation, have even more tools available.

Among the tools currently available are:

--National School Safety Center: The NSSC provides training and technical assistance to state education agencies and local school districts in how to reduce and prevent school violence. Just this week representatives from the NSSC assisted officials from Columbia, South Carolina in identifying ways they could make their schools safer. They were invited to Columbia after a student was shot.

--Program SMART (School Management Resource Teams): This is an effort jointly sponsored by the Departments of Justice and Education. Program SMART is a management tool designed to enable schools resolve violations of law and policy through data collection, assessment, planning, and activity monitoring. The Norfolk School system states that SMART has resulted in a reduction in discipline, crime, and drug problems.

--Safe Havens: The Departments of Education, Health and Human Services, and Justice have provided support for 20 safe havens. These are schools or community centers that stay open after school and provide youth with a safe place to play, learn, and receive a variety of services. Schools have found that having these types of programs help reduce the overall amount of violence in schools and communities.

--Training in various violence prevention areas: The Department of Justice offers training--primarily for teams of individuals, including school officials--in several areas. They offer training in child abuse and sexual exploitation, crime prevention through environmental design, managing juvenile operations, and Safe School Planning and Operation. The Departments of Education and Justice just worked out a plan to offer these training programs to staff of the D.C. public schools.

In addition to the above we (ED, HHS, Justice) support

various research and evaluation efforts. The results of these programs will result in the development of more effective violence prevention programs at the local level.

Efforts such as Empowerment Zones and the National Service Initiative will provide resources to communities to develop programs that will reduce violence.

Finally, there are several bills currently pending before Congress which will provide local school districts and communities with additional resources for prevention efforts. They include the Safe Schools Bill, the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Act, the Crime Bill, and Goals 2000: Educate America Act.

Added to Question #12

Pending Safe Schools Proposals

Safe Schools Act of 1993

Summary: Introduced by the Administration in June, 1993 as an emergency response to the growing level of violence in schools, this proposal authorizes the Department of Education to make direct grants to local educational agencies (LEAs). The legislation would permit Chapter 1 concentration grant eligible LEAs facing high rates of crime, violence, and disciplinary problems to compete for Federal assistance. The bill authorizes a wide range of activities, including initial problem assessments and reviews, planning activities, community education programs about school violence prevention, coordination of activities with law enforcement and other agencies, and instructional strategies, such as conflict resolution and peer mediation that are designed to reduce school violence. It also authorizes LEAs to purchase metal detectors and other security devices and hire security personnel; these types of expenditures could not exceed 33% of the total grant award. Limited funding (5% of total appropriation) for national leadership activities, including program evaluation, data collection, and information dissemination is also authorized. This bill authorizes \$75 million for FY 94, and \$100 million in FY 95. ED's FY 94 enacted appropriation includes \$20 million for Safe Schools, contingent upon enactment of authorizing legislation; if an authorizing statute is not completed by April 1, 1994 those funds will be used to help cover the Pell Grant shortfall.

Status: Passed the House under suspension of the rules on 2/22. Passed the Senate as part of Goals 2000 legislation.

Political Considerations: This bill should be viewed as supplement to the Safe and Drug-Free Schools proposal discussed later; it is not duplicative. If the bill becomes law before April 1, ED will be able to use \$20 million appropriated part of its FY 94 appropriation to begin to provide support for prevention programs strategies in some of the schools most affected by violence. Safe and Drug-Free Schools dollars will not be available for this purpose until FY 95, at the earliest.

There is some also difference of opinion about the relative merits of various possible program interventions (metal detectors, increased security, conflict resolution or other instructional methods, etc.) among interested representatives and senators. Any Safe Schools bill should authorize a comprehensive array of program activities and not impose such stringent "set-aside" requirements that school districts are denied the necessary flexibility to develop responses that address their local needs and concerns.

Safe Schools Act of 1993 (Crime Bill)

Summary: The Senate-passed Crime Bill also includes provisions identified as the Safe Schools Act of 1993. This provisions authorize the Director of the Bureau of Justice Assistance (Department of Justice) to make grants to local educational agencies. The provisions authorize anti-crime and safety measures, crime education and prevention programs, counseling for victims of crime within schools, gang prevention initiatives, education programs to teach students about the criminal justice system, and crime prevention equipment including metal detectors. (No cap on equipment purchases is established in the bill.) Appropriations authority is established at \$100 million for Fiscal Years 94, 95, and 96.

Status: Included in Senate-passed Crime Bill. Not able to verify if similar provisions are part of the five crime bills pending on the House side.

Political Considerations: See discussion of Safe Schools Act above.

Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act

Summary: Part of the Improving America's Schools Act (ESEA reauthorization) this proposal expands the scope of the current Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act to authorize programs and activities designed to prevent violence. The proposal provides a comprehensive response to drug and violence prevention problems by authorizing:

- o a State formula grant program (funding for State and local educational agencies and Governors) that will support a wide range of grantee activities, including instructional strategies, training, and counseling services. Metal detectors or the hiring of security personnel is also authorized, but expenditures are capped at 33%. (SEA and LEA grants will serve students; Governors' grants will reach out-of-school youth and help support community-based prevention initiatives.)
- o discretionary grant programs for direct services, demonstrations, research, evaluation, training, and information development and dissemination that will encourage innovation and program improvement;
- o a grant program to support drug and violence prevention programs for students at institutions of higher education; and
- o formula grant application requirements that include measurable goals and objectives and a national evaluation system designed to improve accountability and program outcomes.

(More than 90% of LEAs currently participate in the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act program. This combination of formula and discretionary funding will help the Department supply direct support for thousands of school programs and encourage innovation and improvement in drug and violence prevention programming.)

Status: Scheduled for consideration by the House as part of the Improving America's Schools Act legislation beginning 2/24. No action on Senate side to date.

Political Considerations: The current incarnation of this program (the Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act) took a significant budget cut in the FY 94 appropriations process -- (about one-third of dollars for the formula program were cut). Although this Administration FY 95 budget request contains a significant increase for the reauthorized program, the FY 94 action may reflect some concern about the program's effectiveness.

Some key members of the House strongly oppose the portion of the Administration's proposal that authorizes the Governor's portion of the program [Ford (Michigan), Kildee (Michigan), Owens (NY)]. Reasons for the opposition are based to a large extent on personal experience with the Governor's portion of the program -- Congressmen Ford and Kildee oppose the way the program is being administered in Michigan; Mr. Owens has expressed concern about the amount of dollars flowing into his district from the program, as well as about the recipients of grants that were made. Generally, they also appear to feel that the dollars are "education" dollars and should go to schools.