

Public Education Reform, Governance and the Daunting Task of Leaving No Child Behind: School Vouchers as a Remedy for the U.S. Public School System?

by Jutta Kern

In 2001, after only three days in office, President George W. Bush announced that education policy would be "the cornerstone" of his Administration. One year later, on January 8, 2002, hoping to tackle the public school system's reform head-on, the President signed the "No Child Left Behind" (NCLB) Act of 2001 into law (<http://www.nochildleftbehind.gov>). The NCLB Act mainly assumes to close what is referred to as the "achievement gap" in mandatory education for children in grades 1 through 12, also known as "K-12" education. Considering that K-12 public education is provided free-of-charge, the NCLB Act is aimed at enacting measures to promote equality in educational opportunities for all children regardless of their (financial, racial or other) backgrounds. The NCLB Act re-authorizes the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) of 1965, albeit with fundamental changes ("Overview of Programs and Changes Included in the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001" <http://www.ed.gov/offices/OESE/esea/progsum/>).

While Republicans and federal education officials praise a new era of education in the U.S., the Democratic support of this bipartisan bill is withering with its implementation. Opponents worry that the main pillars of the Bush Administration's education reform – the concepts of "accountability", "flexibility" and "choice" – are not as adequate as presented in the beginning to achieve the demanding goal of "leaving no child behind" in public education. Critics believe that rather than improving the existing public school system, the NCLB-Act steers federal money towards religious and private institutions, while substantially withdrawing federal responsibility from the public school system, thereby leaving the responsibility of selecting appropriate provision of basic education to parents but still assuming strong federal governance all the same.

One of the most touted benefits among all the federally financed measures under the NCLB Act is the expansion of choice options for parents. In the case that a public school fails to meet set performance criteria, parents are issued "school vouchers" that allow them to choose among different schools in which to enroll their children. School vouchers literally represent the amount of money in public per-district spending on education appropriated per pupil. If parents decide to exercise their right of school-choice, the public dollar, in the form of a voucher, goes to wherever the pupil chooses to enroll. This means that the money is directed away from the public school to which the pupil was originally assigned. Therefore, school vouchers can be seen as an instrument for allocating federal funds in a public education system that is predominantly financed by the states and local entities.

A school's performance is referred to, by the term of "accountability" under the NCLB Act of 2001. Every state is required by the new law to annually submit an accountability plan to the U.S. Department of Education that summarizes the performances of all students enrolled in public schools. The White House issued a presidential statement on June 11, 2003 on the progress of this far-reaching reform initiative for America's public education system. The statement conveyed to the public that all 50 states and the District of Columbia, as well as the commonwealth of Puerto Rico have now submitted their required accountability plans (President's Remarks: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/06/20030610-4.html>). Together with the new possibilities presented by a more flexible utilization of federal money across different U.S. government-authorized programs, vouchers play a pivotal part in the overall endeavor of reforming the U.S. public education system by making public schools accountable for their student's performances.

School Vouchers And The Freedom To Choose

Overall, about 89% of America's children attend public schools for their K-12 education. Enrollment in private schools remained stable at 9-11% between 1993 and 1999. Private schools have long been the only other choice parents have had in determining their offspring's basic education. Which school to attend is determined by the school district the family lives in. Apart from choosing to pay high tuition fees for private schooling, relocation to a different school district has been the only other option parents have to get children enrolled in a different public school. Considering that the U.S. public school system is to a large degree financed through property taxes, and to a lesser amount through income taxes, it is no surprise that high-performing public schools are mostly found in wealthier districts. The National Center of Educational Statistics' (NCES, <http://nces.ed.gov/>) report (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003031.pdf>), "Trends in the Use of School Choice 1993 to 1999," shows that the percentage of students enrolled in public schools they chose increased from 11% in 1993 to 14% in 1999, while the percentage of students enrolled in public schools to which they are assigned decreased from 80% to 76% during the same period. The trend of enrollment in chosen public schools was most evident in low-income families, which are characterized by an income below \$10,000. The link between poverty-ridden neighborhoods and low-performing schools is obvious.

Beginning in the late 1980s, public school choice began to spread as a reform movement across the U.S.. There are still suggestions lingering for the total de-regulation of the schooling system according to a free-market model based on vouchers. This model was conceived by economist Milton Friedman and suggests transferring all educational funding into vouchers to be issued to the individual; at the same time, institutions would no longer be funded directly at all.

School-choice options, or voucher programs, were implemented for a variety of reasons among the 50 states. For example, Vermont implemented a voucher program to counteract the states' inability to provide public schools in every community due to its sparse population. Vermont's school vouchers provide about \$6,000 per child for education. Maine has instituted a similar kind of program while the city of Cleveland/ Ohio endorses vouchers for children in the amount of about \$2,500. In Milwaukee, Wisconsin, a full educational choice program is in place and school vouchers are issued to students at the amount of the state per-pupil expenditure.

Most of the voucher programs already implemented before the enactment of NCLB have been challenged in the courts for including religious schools in their school choice options. The First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution upholds a strict separation of church and state and thus usually is interpreted as a prohibition of federal funding for religious matters. Non-religious schools account for only 2% of the total enrollment in private schools. However, in June 2002, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that the school voucher program in Cleveland, Ohio does not infringe upon the constitutional separation of church and state. The NCLB Act of 2001 fully integrates religious and sectarian schools in the school-choice program.

The U.S. Education System: Decentralization and Governance as Cornerstones

Laws and regulations of the individual states and local districts predominantly are responsible for organizing education in the United States. The Tenth Amendment of the U.S. Constitution prohibits federal laws such as the "No Child Left Behind" Act of 2001 from prescribing curricula. Federal education policy provides, however, a framework to foster and enhance certain educational goals and endeavors. Despite having no authority to establish a national education system, the federal government must safeguard the right of every U.S. citizen to have equal access to, and equal opportunity for, education. To do so, federal money is assigned to special programs and the maintenance and improvement of educational quality. Beyond this requirement, the U.S. Department of Education defines the federal government's role as the one of an "emergency response system." The Department of Education currently oversees the attendance of about 53 million pupils nationwide in the U.S. of which 92,000 are enrolled in public schools, 27,000 are enrolled in private schools throughout nearly 15,000 school districts.

Despite this highly decentralized system, education in the 50 states and the District of Columbia is characterized by many similarities. National accreditation procedures and testing systems guarantee minimal shared standards in the provision of curricula and the educational goals that must be achieved. In most states, a State Board of Education, run under the leadership of a Chief State School Officer and the state-level Department of Education, determines the main education requirements. Additionally, schoolbook publishers have a strong interest in streamlining curricula, since the U.S. education market is characterized by a high concentration: As few as four states, namely California, Texas, New York and Illinois, represent almost 30% of the market. Moreover, certain cohesion is achieved through educational policy on the federal level. Congress mandates the conditions under which federal funds are assigned to local and state institutions and programs. The concept, by and large, is meant to exercise governance by setting financial incentives, and also by creating penalties. In NCLB Act-speak, this means encouraging improvement in under-achieving districts by using the NCLB Act of 2001. Within this new market-oriented approach, school vouchers bear strong leverage in the U.S. elementary and secondary public education system.

Financing K-12 Education: Property Assets, Pork Barrels And The States' Troubled Budgets

Since public education is a responsibility of state legislation, its funding comes predominantly out of the states' budgets. More than 90% of the estimated overall \$770 billion spent on education for the 2002/2003 school year came from State, local and private sources. The federal share in financing the U.S. education system is less than 7% of the overall expenditure. President Bush's 2004 Budget assigns \$53,137 million to be administered by the Department of Education (<http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/03feb20030900/www.gpo.gov/usbudget/fy2004/pdf/budget/education.pdf>). In 2003, the Department of Education's budget is about 2.9% out of the overall U.S. budget. Not included in the Department of Education's budget are programs run by other federal agencies, such as the Department of Agriculture's "School Lunch" program. In the Department of Education's budget, \$75 million are included for the new "Choice Incentive Fund" that finances the voucher program. Another \$25 million are reserved for "Voluntary Public School Choice" grants that encourage states and school districts to establish statewide and inter-district public school choice programs. A major part in the education reform is reserved for charter schools. Charter schools operate independently of the state school system, but do receive public funding. They are designed and operated by educators, parents, community leaders or educational entrepreneurs. Sponsored by designated local or state educational organizations, they are monitored in quality and effectiveness. The federal budget reserves \$320 million to support charter schools.

Funding systems across the states (Description of Funding Systems arranged by State: http://nces.ed.gov/edfin/state_finance/StateFinancing.asp) vary, although most of them operate with earmarked tax revenues. That means - bluntly stated - that taxes not earned cannot be redeemed by the education system. If K-12 education is not recognized as a fixed expenditure in the budget, but rather is financed through earmarked revenues, missing funds cannot be substituted with other financial sources out of the States' budgets. Thus, U.S. elementary and secondary public education highly depend on the overall development of the federal and state's economy.

The State of California, for example, has seen a substantial shift in financing away from the local level to the state level in the last 20 years. In the 1999/2000 school year, the state's share amounted to 60%. Additionally, California has a specific regulation ("Proposition 98" passed in 1988) that guarantees minimum state funding for K-12 education that amounted originally to about 40% of the overall general fund. In 1990, a new formula was invented to adjust the allocation to education in years when there were large changes in the state revenues. Out of the overall Californian education budget, 55% of funds are reserved for general purposes and 45% are earmarked for special programs or groups of students. The latter share has steadily increased over the past few years. On the local level, property taxes are the main source of financing. Generally, one fourth of the state and local revenues are generated by local property taxes. However, California exercises a system that bases taxation of

property mainly on the date of purchase. This serves the 6 million students currently attending public schools. School districts do not receive money garnered from income or sales taxes.

In 1999, California spent an overall amount of \$40.095 billion on the public K-12 school system. Weighed to the Average Daily Attendance (ADA), this amount appropriates \$5,752 to each of California's 5.44 million pupils. About \$120 in funding per pupil is generated through the California State Lottery, which is required to stipulate a minimum of 34% to education funds. Lottery revenues never exceeded 2% of the total school revenues.

In the State of Maryland, Governor Robert J. Ehrlich, the first Republican to hold that office in a long time, is trying to lure lawmakers into passing legislation that would legalize slot machines with the decoy of earmarking a portion of its revenues earned to the financially challenged public education system. Ever since Ehrlich took office in 2002, legalizing slot machines has been one of the centerpieces of his first legislative agenda. So far, Gov. Ehrlich has not yet succeeded in this endeavor. California numbers show that the funds possibly generated by such a measure could not really safeguard Maryland's educational system with its estimated 846,000 public school children.

The State of Texas, in turn, runs a financing system, which is predominantly based on property taxes. Texas does not at all impose personal or business income taxes. On the state level, the education budget is primarily financed through the General Revenue funds, which is supported by many different taxes and fees, such as motor fuel taxes, natural gas and oil taxes and "sin" taxes. However, 55% of the funds are provided through collected sales tax. Generally speaking, Texas' funding system is a multi-tiered system that defines state and local funding levels through a system of formulas known as the "Foundation School Program" (FSP). Forty-seven percent of the public education is funded on the local level. Texas is also one of the states that runs many charter schools. In 1999, there were 66 charter schools in operation, and by 2000, another 80 opened up. In the 2002/2003 school year, almost 185 charter schools are operating. Texas' public schools currently serve an estimated 4 million pupils.

As the home-state of President Bush, Texas has in many respects become a model state for education reform policy as picked up by the Bush Administration's "No Child Left Behind" initiative. Pro-school choice, charter schools, alternatives to affirmative action university admission policies and, of course, the voucher system were all implemented at an early stage. However, questionable conduct in the Lone Star State's charter school development was recently discussed by the New York Times (Re-educating the Voters about Texas' Schools, NY Times, June 3rd 2003, <http://www.nytimes.com/2003/06/03/opinion/03TUE3.html>): nepotistic staffing, false academic records and unchecked criminal backgrounds completed the portrait of educational reform in Texas with a charter school's principal leaving town in the middle of the night while taking the school's furniture with him. Pupils, suddenly without learning facilities, had to be accommodated back in the public school system. Under rigorous testing requirements imposed on schools under the NCLB Act, forty-six schools in Texas were classified for improvement. Significantly, about two thirds of those were charter schools, initially invented to improve the public school system.

The State of Florida is a good example to show that funding for public education received from the state fluctuates annually depending on revenues earned and the state's expenditures. Nonetheless, in the 1999/ 2000 school year, Florida's public education was financed almost at 50% through state funds. The system is based on the Florida Education Finance Program (FEFP) of 1973/74, which allocates funds, by and large, on the basis of the number of pupils participating in a particular educational program multiplied by cost-factors. On the level of school districts, which are congruent with counties boundaries, revenues for the school system are almost exclusively based on property taxes. On the state level, Florida also utilizes 38% of the gross income of its lottery for the Educational Enhancement Trust Fund. In 1999, legislation set the base student allocation (BSA) at \$3,223. The concept of this system already takes the per-pupil cost ratio into account, which is necessary to exercise a school-choice system on the basis of vouchers. Florida currently has 2.3 million children enrolled in its public schools.

Interestingly, Florida's Gov. Jeb Bush, brother of President Bush, was the first one to base the choice-program on a rating system for schools in 1999. Students of under-performing schools were eligible to attend higher-rated schools on the basis of vouchers and "over-performing" educational institutions received financial incentives of about \$100 per pupil.

With funding based on earmarked tax revenues, the public school system is immediately affected in case a state's budget falls short. This can be observed all over the U.S. in the current fiscal year. The outlook for the upcoming year is not rosy either. Schools either had to shut down earlier than usual this year or impose furloughs so that at least basic programs could be maintained until the end of the school year. California's education system had to deal with severe shortfalls in the state's budget. Gov. Gray Davis (D) proposed to cut about \$1.6 billion in direct financing for the state's 1,000 school districts. The massive shortfall is attributed to the high-technology crisis and the overall sluggish economy in the U.S.. In April 2003, an estimated 25,000 teachers received pink slips, as required by state law if school districts are considering letting teachers go. Since most districts have not yet settled on their upcoming budgets, it is unclear how many of those teachers will actually lose their jobs. Some annual teacher's recruitment fairs in California's school districts have been canceled.

President Bush's federal budget proposal for 2004 went along with a massive tax cut that according to critics favors the wealthy. The child tax credit, saving a poor family \$1,000 per child per year, was eliminated at the last moment from the bill by the Republicans and could only after major partisan arguments be passed by Congress. However, most of the financial pressure seems to rest on the middle-class. Taxes will decline for all income groups, except for those earning more than \$28,000 and less than \$337,000. The "middle-income" groups falling within these income brackets will end up paying an even greater share of taxes than they did before. In addition, already troubled state budgets have to make up for the federal cuts.

An analysis by the "Chronicle of Higher Education" projects that "even if states experience normal economic growth over the next eight years, all but a handful of states will find it impossible, given their existing tax policies, to continue funding their current level of public services" (State Shortfalls Projected Throughout the Decade, http://www.highereducation.org/pa_0203/index.html).

The Specific Case of the U.S. Capital Washington, D.C.: Taxation Without Representation

When members of the educational community wish to express the problematic sides of the public school system in the U.S., they usually sum up the array of challenges in one phrase: inner-city schools. Whether it be low performance, poverty-ridden or unsafe schools, or drug-abuse, these factors seem to be ever-present in the struggle of inner-city schools' administrative and academic lives. The case of the capital's inner city schools is particularly interesting. Washington, D.C. is neither a state nor part of one. Because of this specific designation as a political district and not a state, D.C. does not send a congressperson with actual voting rights to the U.S. House of Representatives or a Senator to the U.S. Senate. D.C. lately added the slogan "taxation without representation" to its license plates to express this political under-representation in spite of full taxation. Additionally, the District's tax base is impacted by the presence of the federal government which creates tax exemptions such as the one on federal real estate buildings that cut down the effective levies on property tax by 42%. The District is partly offset by the federal government for this loss. In education, the teacher retirement fund is financed federally.

Washington, D.C. collects income and sales taxes, but in contrast to other financing systems, no specific D.C. tax revenues are earmarked for schools. Instead, D.C. operates with a "D.C. Public Schools" (DCPS) budget that is subject by law to a public hearing before it is placed into effect. The annual appropriations are made from the general fund to DCPS, public charter schools, teacher retirement funds and school transportation.

In his second term, Mayor Anthony Williams (D) even caught his own staff off-guard when he agreed in May 2003 to adopt the voucher program for the District of Columbia's public schools (DCPC). Parents of an estimated 5,000 to 10,000 of 77,000 children in D.C.'s public

schools will be eligible to receive school vouchers. Senior officials of the Board of Education confronted Williams with opposition to this move and accused him of selling-out home rule with the goal of receiving additional funding from the federal government for the city's budget.

Arguments opposing the voucher system included that Washington already has enough school-choice options with its growing charter school movement. In the District of Columbia, more than 14,000 students are currently enrolled in charter schools. The voucher system gives parents the right to choose for their children not only among charter schools, but also among religious and parochial schools. Private schools in Washington, D.C. usually charge five-figure annual tuition rates. The new school vouchers to be endorsed to parents will be far from covering those costs. Consequently, observers expect that the biggest beneficiaries will most likely be those who want to attend Catholic schools, which typically ask lower tuition fees. Currently, in Washington, D.C., 7,924 of the 67,500 students are enrolled in Catholic schools. According to a Washington Post report (Washington Post, May 2, 2003; Page A01), the Archdiocese of Washington can offer another 1,200 slots in those schools.

However, in presenting the city's 2004 \$5.6 billion budget request to a U.S. House Appropriations Panel on June 5th – one month after welcoming vouchers to his city – Mayor Williams warned that the city's fiscal future is in jeopardy. The District has cut services and capital spending and has rolled back tax cuts to close a budget gap of approximately \$457 million for fiscal year 2003. Even if the economy improves, the District will need federal financial aid of several hundred million dollars. During the hearing, Mayor Williams explicitly demanded that any money the District receives through the Bush Administration's school voucher initiative should be in addition to, and not in place of, other federal aid. How large D.C.'s share of the \$75 million financing for the school voucher pilot initiative will be is still uncertain. Opponents to the mayor's voucher decision earlier this year clearly see the trade-off taking shape on the city's financial horizon. Federally-funded school vouchers for the District had already been approved by the Republican-controlled House years ago, but were vetoed by then-President Bill Clinton.

Despite all the different methods to allocate funds for public education across the U.S., property taxes remain the predominant source of funding. If revenues are collected and distributed on the local school district level and are not subject to re-allocation on a county or state administrative level, then educational provisions would correlate with the geographical distribution of wealth. Such a system creates largely homogenized school districts in terms of the available funding for schools. As a consequence, low funding creates magnets for poverty-ridden educational institutions not capable of providing sufficient, quality education. According to the No Child Left Behind Act, this is exactly the eligible target group for school enhancement and school voucher programs.

Education Reform With NCLB: Closing In On The Achievement Gap With Flexibility and Accountability

The interdependence among poverty-ridden districts and students' poor performances was already recognized by the "Elementary and Secondary Education Act" (ESEA) of 1965, NCLB's predecessor with provisions under "Title 1." This legislation is now referred to as "the foundation of the NCLB reforms" in the education budget proposal for 2004 and requests funds of \$12.4 billion. Being ESEA's and now NCLB's largest program, Title 1 grants federal money to local school districts based on their enrollment of poor students. Title 1 is especially popular because it allocates federal funds to almost every Congressional district. However, studies showed that in some cases, Title 1 funds defeated their purpose because they were used to supplant, instead of supplementing, local funds. The NCLB Act of 2001 bases the entire school-choice program, and therefore its voucher system, on the definition of low-performing schools and poor students.

American education relies throughout the system on standardized testing instruments to assess performance. One of those instruments for K-12 education is the National Education Assessment Program. Its results showed in 2001 that only 32% of American fourth-graders could read proficiently or better, whereas 63% of African-American fourth-graders, 58% of Hispanics, 60% of children in poverty and 47% in inner-city schools have tested "below basic"

in reading comprehension. Results like those lead many policy-makers to assume that the school system has not improved a lot since the famous "A Nation at Risk" report of 1983. Critics of this much-debated report complained in the aftermath of its release that increasing tests would make schools rather tougher than better.

Gerald Holton, Professor Emeritus at Harvard University and one of the accomplished authors of "A Nation at Risk," reminded readers of the Chronicle of Higher Education that it was then-President Ronald Reagan who, during his first year of the Presidency, made the political mission for the report-to-be clear to the authors at the inaugural meeting: "Bring God back into the classroom. Encourage tuition tax credits for families using private schools. Support vouchers. Leave the primary responsibility for education to parents." (An Insider's View of 'A Nation at Risk' and Why It Still Matters, <http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i33/33b01301.htm>). With its 20th anniversary, the concussive report "A Nation at Risk", which was based on two years of research across schools throughout the United States, bears witness to the fact that priorities in Republican education policy apparently have remained unchanged since President Reagan's time in the White House.

The NCLB Act requires statewide "accountability systems" covering all students and public schools. It rates schools' performances using the annual standardized test results of students in grades 3 through 8 in reading and mathematics (in the future, also science). The standards are based on annual statewide progress objectives set to ensure that all pupils reach proficiency in the tested areas within 12 years of public education. Schools and school districts that fail to meet those objectives will be subject to improvement, corrective action and also restructuring. The law requires every state to release a list of its schools classified for improvement before the start of the school year. A school remains on this list for two years. Since schools are held accountable for their performances, parents of children enrolled in under-achieving schools are eligible to choose a different school within the same district. If the school fails to make "adequate yearly progress" (AYP) as determined by annual testing performances, parents are given enlarged choice options through school vouchers and supplemental teaching programs. The school district will be responsible for providing transportation to that new school. Twenty-five million dollars are assigned for 'Voluntary Public School Choice' grants to build new intra- and inter-school district choice options within states. Moreover, the NCLB Act explicitly encourages the founding of charter schools by reserving an additional \$320 million for that purpose alone.

In the school year 2002/2003, almost 2,700 charter schools are operating in 36 states, including the District of Columbia, and about 685,000 students are enrolled in them. A recent study titled "Impact of Charter Schools on School Districts" (<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/chartimpact/>) analyzed the challenges and opportunities of this system. The results showed that charter schools forced public schools to become more competitive in the services they offer. However, it seems interesting that the opening of charter schools mainly had a positive impact on public schools in districts that already showed a decent performance in their school system. Conversely, school districts that were already troubled by declining enrollment, increasing class-sizes, lay-offs, school closings and having to downsize their central offices reported that charter schools had a very negative impact on their budgets. Charter schools in these challenged districts are meant to supplant public schools rather than enlarge the options parents have to send their children to better performing schools, as promised by the No Child Left Behind Act.

Voucher options are complemented by additional incentives through "State-Flex" and "Local-Flex" mechanisms that allow States, local educational agencies and schools to consolidate federal funds. This new flexibility allows federal funds that were originally dedicated to specific programs to be used for other authorized purposes in exchange for a broader commitment to improving student achievements. Additional flexibility in the use of federal money is granted through the new "transferability" provisions, which allow the use of up to half of the amount received through different programs or under Title 1 provisions.

With the NCLB Act, the Bush Administration takes a highly individualistic and market-driven approach towards tackling the education systems' weaknesses and challenges. In his educational reform, George W. Bush chose to bring the leverage to bear on the general concept of

how to federally finance public education. Rather than creating sustainable and reliable base financing systems to prevent the immediate reflection of a state's economy on the public school system and integrating measures of equalizing local disadvantages, NCLB takes the approach of holding individual schools accountable and parents responsible. Vouchers, and the increase in choice by substantially promoting charter schools, are key elements of President Bush's education reform. One concern about this putative freedom of choice for families who come from disadvantaged backgrounds still remains: How will these families be adequately provided with sufficient information on their choices, and how will they be brought to make suitable decisions about their children's educational future when federal policy indicates it will take on less responsibility for public education?

Eugene W. Hickok (<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/hickok.html>), Under-Secretary of Education, who recently announced his resignation, called the No Child Left Behind Act a non-regulatory guidance in his statement of witness to the House Subcommittee on Education. However, it substantially de-regulates, privatizes and de-institutionalizes the U.S. public education system by setting massive financial incentives. In doing so – as contradictory as it may sound – the NCLB Act and, therefore, the federal government assumes strong governance for K-12 education, despite the Bush Administration's narrow reading of the Tenth Amendment.

Political observers predict education policy will remain on top of the political agenda in the President's 2004 election campaign. It also seems that in 2004 President George W. Bush will most likely begin work at reshaping what follows K-12: it will be the year when the Higher Education Act comes up for re-authorization.

Resources:

- ❑ *President George W. Bush remarks on the progress in Education Reform* (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/news/releases/2003/06/20030610-4.html>)
- ❑ *In Focus – Education* (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/education/>)
- ❑ *Education Reform per State* (<http://www.whitehouse.gov/infocus/education/edmap.html>)
- ❑ *Department of Education (DOE): Office of Non Public Education* (<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OIIA/NonPublic/index.html>)
- ❑ *Department of Education (DOE): FAQ's for NCLB* (<http://www.nclb.gov/next/faqs/choice.html#1>)
- ❑ *Glossary Term Index at the Department of Education website* (<http://www.nclb.gov/start/glossary/index.html#13>)
- ❑ *President's 2004 Budget: State Fact Sheets* (<http://www.nclb.gov/next/states/>). These fact sheets highlight what President Bush's \$53.1 billion budget request for the Education Department in 2004 means for your state.
- ❑ *The State Education Office of the District of Columbia* (<http://seo.dc.gov/information/websites/index.shtml>)
- ❑ *The Consortium for Policy Research in Education (CPRE) provides an excellent source of studies and research papers ready to download* (http://www.cpre.org/index_js.htm)
- ❑ *Assessment and Accountability Systems: 50 State Profiles* (http://www.cpre.org/Publications/Publications_Accountability.htm)
- ❑ *The Federal Role in Education: Overview* (<http://www.ed.gov/offices/OUS/fedrole.html>)
- ❑ *Graph: the structure of education in the United States* (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Prog95/pt1_fig1.html)
- ❑ *Progress of Education in the United States of America: 1990 through 1994* (http://www.ed.gov/pubs/Prog95/pg_6toc.html)
- ❑ *Department of Education: Policy Overview* (<http://www.ed.gov/topics/topics.jsp?&top=Policy>)
- ❑ *Trends in the Use of School Choice: 1993 to 1999* (<http://nces.ed.gov/pubs2003/2003031.pdf>)
- ❑ *Description of Funding Systems arranged by State* (http://nces.ed.gov/edfin/state_finance/StateFinancing.asp)

- ❑ *Re-educating the Voters about Texas' Schools, NY Times, June 3rd 2003*
(<http://www.nytimes.com/2003/06/03/opinion/03TUE3.html>)
- ❑ *2004 education budget*
(<http://a257.g.akamaitech.net/7/257/2422/03feb20030900/www.gpo.gov/usbudget/fy2004/pdf/budget/education.pdf>)
- ❑ *Families See Two Sides to Tax Cuts: Oregon. 'How do we think it's OK to make our children second-class citizens...?'* (<http://www.latimes.com/news/education/la-na-taxore18may18,0,2460592.story?coll=la%2Dnews%2Dlearning>)
- ❑ *State Shortfalls Projected Throughout the Decade*
(http://www.highereducation.org/pa_0203/index.html)
- ❑ *Supreme Court affirms school voucher program. June 27, 2002* (<http://www.cnn.com>)
- ❑ *www.uscharterschools.org* (<http://www.uscharterschools.org>)
- ❑ *Challenge and Opportunity: The Impact of Charter Schools on School Districts*
(<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/chartimpact/>)
- ❑ *A Nation at Risk* (<http://www.ed.gov/pubs/NatAtRisk/>)
- ❑ *Middle Class Tax Share Set to Rise - Studies Say Burden Of Rich to Decline. Washington Post, June 4, 2003; Page A01* (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A10323-2003Jun3.html?referrer=email>)
- ❑ *Williams Pushes for Aid. City's Fiscal Future in Jeopardy, Mayor Tells House Panel. Washington Post, June 5, 2003; Page B01* (<http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A14978-2003Jun4.html?referrer=email>)
- ❑ *Mayor Endorses Vouchers in D.C.. Norton Criticizes Statement as 'Selling Out' Home Rule. Washington Post, May 2, 2003; Page A01.*
- ❑ *National Center for Educational Statistics: Revenues and Expenditures for Public Elementary and Secondary Education* (<http://nces.ed.gov/ccd/stfis.asp>)
- ❑ *Brown Center on Education Policy* (http://www.brook.edu/gs/brown/brown_hp.htm)
- ❑ *An Insider's View of 'A Nation at Risk' and Why It Still Matters*
(<http://chronicle.com/weekly/v49/i33/33b01301.htm>)

Jutta Kern is Senior Expert in residence with the Office of Science & Technology. She is responsible for OST's knowledge management and can be contacted at kern@ostina.org.

>><<

For further copyright information please contact:

Office of Science and Technology
Austrian Embassy
3524 International Court, NW
Washington, D.C., 20008-3027
United States of America

Phone (202) 895-6754
Fax (202) 895-6750
office@ostina.org