S. HRG. 107–334

IMPACT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION BUDGET ON IOWA SCHOOLS

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

UNITED STATES SENATE

ONE HUNDRED SEVENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SPECIAL HEARING

APRIL 21, 2001—CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA
APRIL 21, 2001—CLEAR LAKE, IOWA

Printed for the use of the Committee on Appropriations

Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.access.gpo.gov/congress/senate

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

72–851 PDF WASHINGTON : 2002

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Internet: bookstore.gpo.gov Phone: toll free (866) 512–1800; DC area (202) 512–1800
Fax: (202) 512–2250 Mail: Stop SSOP, Washington, DC 20402–0001

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

TED STEVENS, Alaska, *Chairman*

THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania
PETE V. DOMENICI, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER S. BOND, Missouri
MITCH McCONNELL, Kentucky
CONRAD BURNS, Montana
RICHARD C. SHELBY, Alabama
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
ROBERT F. BENNETT, Utah
BEN NIGHTHORSE CAMPBELL, Colorado
LARRY CRAIG, Idaho
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
MIKE DEWINE, Ohio

ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
PATRICK J. LEAHY, Vermont
TOM HARKIN, Iowa
BARBARA A. MIKULSKI, Maryland
HARRY REID, Nevada
HERB KOHL, Wisconsin
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
BYRON L. DORGAN, North Dakota
DIANNE FEINSTEIN, California
RICHARD J. DURBIN, Illinois
TIM JOHNSON, South Dakota
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana

STEVEN J. CORTESE, *Staff Director*
LISA SUTHERLAND, *Deputy Staff Director*
JAMES H. ENGLISH, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEPARTMENTS OF LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES

ARLEN SPECTER, Pennsylvania, *Chairman*

THAD COCHRAN, Mississippi
JUDD GREGG, New Hampshire
LARRY CRAIG, Idaho
KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON, Texas
TED STEVENS, Alaska
MIKE DEWINE, Ohio

TOM HARKIN, Iowa
ERNEST F. HOLLINGS, South Carolina
DANIEL K. INOUYE, Hawaii
HARRY REID, Nevada
HERB KOHL, Wisconsin
PATTY MURRAY, Washington
MARY L. LANDRIEU, Louisiana
ROBERT C. BYRD, West Virginia
(Ex officio)

Professional Staff
BETTILOU TAYLOR
MARY DIETRICH
JIM SOURWINE
ELLEN MURRAY *(Minority)*

Administrative Support
CORREY DIVINEY
CAROLE GEAGLEY *(Minority)*

CONTENTS

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA

	Page
Opening statement of Senator Tom Harkin	1
Statement of Ted Stilwill, director, Iowa Department of Education	3
Prepared statement	6
Statement of Robert D. Koob, president, University of Northern Iowa	7
Prepared statement	10
Statement of Lois Mulbrook, director of financial aid, Mount Mercy College	16
Prepared statement	18
Statement of Swati Dandekar, board member, Linn-Mar Community School District and Iowa Association of School Boards	20
Prepared statement	22
Statement of Tammy Wetjen-Kesterson, vice president, Iowa Head Start Association	24
Prepared statement	25
Statement of Dan Stice	33
Statement of John Hieronymus	33
Statement of Wendy Vodenhofer	34
Statement of Jamie Knight	35
Statement of Nancy Porter	35
Statement of Mickey Dunn	36
Statement of Ron Fielder	37

CLEAR LAKE, IOWA

Opening statement of Senator Tom Harkin	41
Statement of Dr. David Buettner, president, North Iowa Area Community College	43
Prepared statement	46
Statement of Jolene Franken, president, Iowa State Education Association	49
Prepared statement	52
Statement of Dr. Lawrence J. McNabb, superintendent of schools, Osage Community School District, Osage, Ia	54
Prepared statement	56
Statement of Sherry Brown, vice president for legislation, Iowa PTA	58
Prepared statement	59
Statement of Derrick Palmer, student	61
Statement of Lynne Eckhart	67
Statement of Steve Lovik, vice president of admissions and financial aid, Waldorf College	69
Statement of Sally Frudden, member, Iowa State Board of Education	71
Statement of Chris Petersen, vice president, Iowa Farmers Union	72
Statement of Tammy Poppe	74
Statement of Jessica Putnam	75
Statement of Les Person	76
Statement of Lorna DiMarco	78

IMPACT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION BUDGET ON IOWA SCHOOLS

SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 2001

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Cedar Rapids, IA.

The subcommittee met at 9:05 a.m., in room 234, Cedar Hall, Kirkwood Community College, Cedar Rapids, IA, Senator Tom Harkin presiding.

Present: Senator Harkin.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOM HARKIN

Senator HARKIN. The Senate Subcommittee on Labor, Health, Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies will come to order. I would at the outset say to all of you that are here, and to our witnesses, that this is an official hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee, more specifically a subcommittee with the responsibility of funding the Departments of Labor, the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Education, and a number of related agencies. Perhaps one of the most important parts of this subcommittee is the funding for our education programs, everything from the Early Start program right to Pell grants for college students and everything in between. And as you may have been reading, we have been having some budget battles on this and we continue to have some battles as the year rolls along. And I thought it would be important to bring the subcommittee, of which I am the ranking member, to Iowa for public hearings, to get the input from local educators and leaders and also from the audience. It's my intent that after we have the official witnesses that I will open up the mike to the floor for any comments or suggestions of anyone that is here today. I would just ask if you do that, if you would state your name clearly, and if it's a very complicated name like Smith, please spell it so the reporter can get it correctly.

Having said that, we have our two interpreters here, Susan Terrell and Karen Gray, and in the interest of expediency, among other things, I will just ask, is there anyone here that needs interpreted services? Yes? No? I will ask the question one more time: Does anyone need interpreted services? If not, I will let the interpreters relax.

Thank you. I will just open with a quick statement and then we will go to our witnesses. Our country was founded on this ideal—

that no matter who you are, no matter where you're born, no matter how much money your parents have—if you're willing to study and learn and work hard, you can be a success. This is what we call the American dream. Unfortunately, it's slipping away because our classrooms are overcrowded, our schools are crumbling, and our students don't have the educational opportunities for a lifetime of learning from pre-school to college and beyond.

Now, for years we have been nibbling around the edges of solutions—we tweak a program here, adjust the funding there—but we haven't made a real dent in education reform in the 21st century. The fact is right now—and I always enjoy asking this question of people—of every Federal dollar that we appropriate, how much of that dollar goes for education? I get all kinds of different answers, but no one ever gets it right because it's only 2 cents on the dollar. Of every dollar that we appropriate in Washington DC, of your hard-earned tax dollar, only 2 cents goes directly to education. That simply is not enough.

We need to use our budget surpluses, I believe, to prepare for the future by doing two things; paying down the national debt and investing in education. Earlier this month the Senate adopted an amendment I offered, which I called the Leave No Child Behind amendment to increase the national investment in education by $250 billion over the next 10 years. This investment would make it possible to do many of the things we say that we want to do. Now, I know that $250 billion sounds like a lot of money, and it is. But keep in mind, relatively speaking, in terms of the tax bill, that $250 billion is only one-half of the amount of tax breaks that—if we adopt the tax bill that they are going to send down next month, it's only one-half of the tax breaks that would go to the richest 1 percent of Americans whose average incomes are over $900,000 a year. It's just half of that amount. Give us $250 billion for education and with that amount of money we could make sure that all children will start school ready to learn by fully funding the Head Start Program. We could reduce class size to no more than 18 students, and we could repair school buildings. We could fully fund special education—the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. We could help students that fall behind get the extra help they need by doubling funds for the Title I reading and math programs. We could make college more affordable by increasing funding for Pell Grants, and we could help workers get the skills they need by investing nearly $10 billion in job training. We could do all this and more if we invest in education.

Now, the President has said, well, leave no child behind, or words to that effect. However, his budget does not support that. His budget devotes $1.6 trillion of the surplus, the supposed surplus, to tax cuts, but a mere $21.3 billion for education. This is over 10 years.

So the proposed budget for the White House has tax cuts that are 76 times greater than the investment proposed for education over the next 10 years. Again, we have to ask ourselves, are these the right priorities?

Investments are important, but we also have to maintain fiscal discipline. That is why I believe that we also have to pay down the national debt so that our kids don't have a terrible debt to cover

in the future. So today we will be holding two hearings to examine the impact of the national education budget on Iowa children and Iowa schools. We will hear testimony from the real experts on education—students, parents, teachers, school administrators, school board members, student financial aid directors and college presidents. We will learn more about the important role that various Federal programs play in helping all Iowans. These are the individuals on the front lines, and I look forward to your testimony.

So again, I want to thank you all for coming to participate in this important hearing. As I said earlier, following the testimony of the panel, I will open the hearing up for comments from people in the audience. In addition, the hearing record will remain open for 1 week so individuals can submit written statements for the record, if they so desire.

And we were going to have five on our first panel, but the tables were too small, so we will do two and then three. Our first witnesses are Dr. Ted Stilwill, director of the Iowa Department of Education, and Dr. Robert Koob, president of the University of Northern Iowa. Dr. Stilwill has served as director of the Iowa Department of Education since his appointment in 1995. Prior to that time he headed the department's activities dealing with elementary and secondary education. Before coming to work in State government, Mr. Stilwill worked for 18 years as a teacher and administrator at the local level. He also chairs the school budget review committee and serves on several State boards and commissions.

Dr. Robert Koob is the president of the University of Northern Iowa. Prior to becoming president of UNI, Dr. Koob was senior vice president, vice president for academic affairs in California at Polytechnic University. Dr. Koob received his bachelors degree from UNI, his Ph.D. in chemistry at the Universitiy of Kansas. J Hawk. And we will forgive him.

And with that, we welcome our witnesses. We thank you for taking time on a Saturday and for being here and submitting testimony. And I would just ask that we try to limit it to 5 to 10 minutes, so we can move both panels. And with that, I will open by recognizing Dr. Stilwill, director of the Iowa Department of Education.

STATEMENT OF TED STILWILL, DIRECTOR, IOWA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Mr. STILWILL. Thank you very much, Senator. I have to tell you that I very much appreciate the invitation to be here to share some thoughts on the needs of education in Iowa. Probably one clarification I should make, only one of us on this panel happens to hold a doctorate, and I'm betting on the University President.

That aside, it's also, I think, pretty significant that you chose Kirkwood Community College to kick off these hearings. Because in the United States, I think we are realizing more clearly than ever before the relationship of education and the economy. And if we are going to prepare, not only children and young people, but adults to really succeed in that new economy, education is now incredibly important and it is in the national interest to become engaged in education. And I understand full well the need for the

Federal Government and the support we need from the Federal Government.

I can't think of anyone in Iowa's delegation in Washington—Senator Harkin, you have done a great job in advocating for education in Iowa at the Federal level. You have a long track record. I will just mention a couple of things and my prepared remarks provide more detail. Iowa is noted for its Iowa Communications Network Program. What a lot of people in Iowa don't fully understand is the Federal contribution, through legislation that you have sponsored and advocated, has provided $44 million so that individual school districts and community colleges and others have money at their site to build the local classrooms, and if necessary, access that network. That has been extremely helpful. Second is the first-in-the-nation Federal funding for school infrastructure. The State of Iowa has very old schools, as you well know. The Federal contribution which now amounts to $37 million, has allowed 257 school districts to meet life safety needs but also provide new construction. That's leveraged our ability in Iowa and perhaps raised the conscious of the Iowa legislature to also become involved in the infrastructure of our schools as well to a significant degree. That really does well for us.

But I'm sure what a lot of people understand less well is in the Title I legislation. You have been able to help Iowa assure that even though the Federal formula to fund Title I, a remedial reading and math program for kids in typically kindergarten through third grade, occasionally pre-school, Iowa would have received drastic reductions of Title I funding. So much so that it would have literally gone quite a ways in offsetting the gains we made in Federal and State funding for class size reductions. Senator Harkin has done effective work in safeguarding those funds for a number of years. But to look into the future and what you are proposing in terms of a much greater Federal commitment is certainly something that we welcome. The 2 cents on the dollar is simply not enough. Everyone in this room now is increasingly familiar with the dilemma of Iowa's economy. And incidently, Senator, if you need a good example of the fact that perhaps tax reduction doesn't automatically generate an economic stimulus, Iowa might be a good case in point.

Probably the many things that are proposed, the dramatic increase in support of special education funding will not only help guarantee services to children who have special needs, but will also have the effect of helping to relieve the pressure on property taxes. Because as you know, special education has been underfunded in Iowa. Districts have to rely on levying from local property taxes which creates an undue burden on those communities, and an unequal burden on those communities because some simply do not have the ability to levy for additional property tax.

The proposal you had to really quadruple funding for professional development is one that I particularly would like to recognize. Because the one thing we realize more clearly in Iowa than probably ever before in our history, is that if we are going to raise student achievement, if we are going to help students perform, if we are going to meet the challenges before us, the one thing that absolutely has to happen is quality teaching. And not only do we need

funding, and we are working on that in Iowa, to bring in the best and the brightest into teaching and make sure they stay there, but once they are there, ironically education has not done a very good job of helping to meet the skill development needs, the professional development needs of its own workers. You would think that folks in education would know better, but we have not done well. That funding would be very welcome and makes a great deal of sense.

So Senator, I guess I would like to, in the remainder of my remarks make a point to appreciate what you have done to ensure that the Federal legislation ensures flexibility in Iowa. It's one thing to receive funding, it's another thing to receive very prescriptive mandates to accompany that funding, and that is indeed problematic. I fully understand that there are some States in the United States, perhaps several States in the United States, where communities have abandoned their kids, where the State government and Federal Government probably needs to move in to protect those kids, and thus the equivalent of calling out the National Guard to run the education system in those communities. Perhaps sometimes in large cities it's perhaps necessary for the Federal Government to impose that kind of restriction on States. But as you know, that is not the case in Iowa. We have no need for an educational national guard. We do not have and I do not want to have teachers waking up in the morning and principals waking up in the morning thinking, "Boy, I need to comply with State and Federal regulations today. That's what's my motivational setting." I don't ever want that to happen in Iowa. And the more intrusive both State and particular Federal regulations become, the more their day will be taken up with meeting those requirements to a greater extent than meeting the needs of the kids.

There are some elements in the proposed legislation that and I will use testing as an example, where the Federal Government appears compelled to change current practice. In Iowa, the legislature and the Governor and the State board of education think our current practice is quite adequate, what we just started doing this year, for districts to report on the progress of their students in fourth, eighth and eleventh grade in three subjects and report on their success or potential success in succeeding in post-secondary education. For some reason or another at the Federal level it now seems that the U.S. Department of Education is going to want to have to know how kids are doing at second grade, third grade, fourth grade, fifth grade, sixth grade, at every grade level. It's not a question of whether testing every year is a good idea, it certainly is. Testing probably more often than every year is an excellent idea. Every teacher in Iowa certainly does that. Whether the Federal Government needs to know about the results of that when the Iowa legislature and the Iowa Department of Education doesn't feel the need to have that heavy hand in monitoring, much less prescribing not only when they are tested, but who they tested, how they are tested, what kind of tests are involved. We have a good testing system in Iowa. We have the Iowa testing program just down the road. We have 60 years of history and track record with that test. If the current legislation were implemented we would likely have to abandon that program at a cost of $10 to $20 million. It would take a lot more time, people require different kinds of

tests and because it would require more administration of that test the annual cost of administering that program would be somewhere between $3 to $6 million. And those are fairly conservative estimates, Senator. In this financial environment we do not have that kind of money to provide a testing program that we really don't need at this point. Every local school district in Iowa, and I talked with several of them yesterday at a conference, are working hard so that teachers in the district have their own assessment programs and plans put together. That is where it has the most need. That is where the hopes and dreams of kids in those communities ought to be formed. Probably not at the State and not at the Federal level. And that of course has been our policy in Iowa.

PREPARED STATEMENT

So it's that flexibility that you advocated for, your staff has been very helpful on those issues, but I would certainly appreciate the ability to continue that kind of flexibility. That concludes my remarks. Thank you again.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TED STILWILL

Senator Harkin, I appreciate the opportunity to offer my insight on Iowa's education needs in relation to the current conversations occurring in Washington, D.C.

I applaud your consistent efforts on behalf of Iowa school children. Thanks to you Iowa has received $44 million in Star schools funding to improve instruction using technology, significant additional funding for special education and $37 million for a first-in-the-nation pilot federal K–12 school infrastructure project. Senator Harkin, we also thank you for working overtime to keep Iowa's allocation of Title I early elementary reading and math assistance.

Looking ahead I see that you continue your progressive approach to helping Iowa school children succeed. The amendment you authored that was adopted by the United States Senate specifically addresses Iowa's critical need for early childhood funding, improved professional development for teachers and school infrastructure. I applaud the provision in your amendment that would fully fund implementation of federal IDEA special education regulation within 10 years.

The profile of Iowa's population has changed noticeably over the past 20 years. We have the highest percentage in the nation of two parent working families. Wages have not kept pace with regional or national averages. These contribute to the simple fact that Iowa's school children come to school less ready to learn than was the case a decade ago and certainly two decades ago. Federal Head Start funding is a centerpiece of Iowa's plan to provide three and four-year olds with quality developmental pre-school. Iowans know that every dollar invested in early childhood pays real dividends. Please continue your advocacy to expand Head Start programs.

In the past year I've personally been preaching to schools, state legislators, policy makers and business leaders about the irrefutable evidence that the quality of the teacher is the single greatest factor in student learning. I am not bashful in saying that Iowa has the best teachers in the nation. Our educators are devoted to kids and are clearly mission driven. Ongoing development of the skills of those classroom teachers who need to respond to an ever-changing profile of student learners is vastly overlooked as a key to improving student learning as well as teacher morale. Research based professional development is becoming available. Finding teacher time is not. The emphasis in your amendment on quadrupling federal funding for professional development responds directly to the needs of Iowa teachers as well as educators nationwide.

Iowa has 257 school districts that have received $28 million dollars in Harkin grant awards for K–12 school infrastructure repairs and construction. This first-in-the-nation initiative spurred the Iowa legislature to contribute over $50 million for school infrastructure over the next three years. The Harkin grant program served as the framework for our Vision Iowa school infrastructure program. Other states are learning from our experience. Iowa school districts continue their plea for federal, state and local assistance to this $3 billion need. Thank you for responding to

their call and the call of schools everywhere with the creation of a nationwide school infrastructure program.

Iowa special education costs have increased 100 percent over the past 10 years. While acknowledging the need for special education to be heavily federally regulated, states, including Iowa, are having trouble making ends meet when it comes to guaranteeing the necessary education opportunities for special education students. Fully funding the state implementation of the federal IDEA special education regulations will release a pressure valve for Iowa school districts struggling to levy local property taxes to fund these programs.

As you know, Senator Harkin, local control is the hallmark of K–12 education in Iowa. Annual school board elections and monthly local school board meetings offer an unparalleled opportunity for parents, teachers, administrators and other resident citizens to play a role in setting the education policy that governs the day-to-day education of the children in their community. My colleagues, the chief state school officers in other states, envy Iowa's local control doctrine and the remarkable levels of student achievement that result from local ownership of student learning. I would not trade Iowa's K–12 system for that of any other state in this nation.

While other states have spent tens of millions of dollars to develop state standardized tests, Iowa students have a 60 year history with the Iowa Testing Service. Iowa long ago decided that high stakes testing on one standardized test is not indicative of student learning. I simply cannot say this strongly enough. We are sincerely appreciative of your efforts to understand and represent Iowa's community driven education system. I ask that you advocate for flexibility in the use of federal dollars now being proposed to help state testing efforts in grades three through eight. In Iowa, we want the flexibility to use that new federal funding in the development of multiple measures to assess student learning. Iowa's school districts and area education agencies are in the process of developing district specific reliable multiple measures to round out the limited picture standardized tests give of a student's learning. Your advocacy on this issue would be much appreciated. I am also encouraged by conversations in Washington to improve federal assistance for reading initiatives. Achievement scores for Iowa's 4th graders and 8th graders have slipped ever so slightly over the past three years. In order to remain among the first in the nation, Iowa could greatly benefit from additional assistance. I close with the thought that as I have daily frontline interaction with state legislators on our Iowa state budget and on teacher compensation efforts, I am continually impressed with the collegiality that reflects the willingness and dedication of Iowa policy makers to put students first. I congratulate you on bringing that Iowa flavor to the U.S. Senate. I wish you continued success on behalf of Iowa's school children. Thank you.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much, Ted. I appreciate that. Next we go to Dr. Koob, president, University of Northern Iowa.

STATEMENT OF ROBERT D. KOOB, PRESIDENT, UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA

Dr. KOOB. Thank you, Senator. You won't be surprised to learn that many of my remarks echo things that Ted has said. But I want to start by thanking you for the active role that you have played. We think that it's appropriate that Iowa take a leadership role in education. We have been recognized as number one in education for some time and we are terribly proud that it's our Senator that has taken the lead in protecting education this last session. We are particularly proud of your Leave No Child Behind formula. That very closely echos what we have been saying is important for education for a long time. So you have our unqualified endorsement in this particular area.

It's no surprise to anyone that we are concerned with education. The rapid increase of complexity of the American society has raised the expectations on education enormously. So much so that today 90 percent of parents with children in school expect their children to complete college. I mean, I can recall in World War II, just as the GI bill was coming into play we had something less than 5 percent college completion of people. What were we going to do with all of those GIs that were going to go to college? As recently as

1990 the Department of Labor estimated that the United States could not gainfully employ more than 20 percent of its population as college graduates. And yet today here in Iowa we have 72 percent and lead the Nation in the number of high school graduates that go on to college—community colleges and 4-year schools, and we are unable to keep up with the demand. So to say that expectations have changed is actually to put it in rather an understated way. I think the difficulty and the reason that we call for reform in schools is that we have not realized that education is no longer 6 through 16. This might have been true in the first half of the 20th century. But right now we are talking about education that really begins at age zero. We understand that the greatest learning really occurs among our youngest children and goes on at least through college, as I tried to illustrate, and in fact, goes on throughout life. I can recall visiting with an executive of IBM when they were laying off employees in 1994 and asking why this company, which for many years had a policy of never laying off anyone, when forced to do it decided who they kept and who they let go. And they said that they kept those that had demonstrated that they knew how to learn a living. And I have never forgotten that statement. Because the fact is, in today's rapidly changing society, if we haven't learned how to learn, we are not going to be able to adapt to that change. I have five recommendations, and you will find that they support, I think, your Leave No Child Behind agenda quite closely. But I will just mention those five to you, and if there is time left—and I will check with your staff—I will talk about the specific programs at UNI.

And the first is to echo Ted's comments about testing: Don't confuse indicators with solutions. It's often easy to suggest, well, we will just test more and we will change the curriculum. But research has shown that that has absolutely no impact on this solution of needing to improve achievement. There is no relationship between the thermometer and what causes the temperature to change. The thermometer only indicates whether the temperature has changed or not. So don't get confused between indicators and solutions. We have solutions that I think are straight forward. And the four remaining do's after that one don't deal with that solution.

The second supports Ted's point about teacher education and teachers in general. First of all, recognize that the only really important elements in education are the teachers and the families of the parents—or the parents and families of those students. Make certain that we have professional development available for our teachers. Teachers stay in our schools for generations. I mean, they will see generations at schools. It's absolutely necessary to have professional development because the world changes and our teachers must be given the opportunity to change along with it. That isn't easy to do that. Whatever funding we provide ought to be contingent on the participation of the community in that school. Make certain that parents are drawn to the school in order to participate in the education of their child. If they are not brought into the school, research has shown again and again, no matter how good the teacher is, it's only the exceptional child that can advance without the support of their family. So do recognize that teachers and the parents are the core of their education.

Recognize also that access to college and completion of college is the single most important factor in the financial and social success of Americans today. There has been a very, very strong correlation demonstrated between the social economic status of the child and the child's family and their success in education. I'm sorry to say, and I'm sure that you knew this, that the gap is continuing to widen. The gap between those in the upper income quartile of our nation and the lower income quartile of our nation has increased by nearly a factor of 10 over the last 25 to 30 years. At the same time, the gap between the families, the students coming from that lower quartile and upper quartile has increased. So the lower end of that group has had less and less opportunity to experience quality higher education. So it's absolutely necessary—and I know again that you know this, that we provide smoothly graded and fully funded financial aid infrastructure that offsets the tremendous inherent disadvantage of the potential student's economic status. Unless we talk about affirmative action, the most important affirmative action is to offset that difference in economic status.

The fourth point, is to take leadership to broaden public responsibility for early childhood education. I don't believe there is a single more important thing that we can do in this Nation to improve on school success than to provide high quality early childhood education. That may sound funny coming from a college president, but I recognize the old song I heard when I was very, very young when they were using the twig on me, they were saying as the twig is bent, so grows the tree. And this in fact is still true. I'm sorry, but it's true. I don't advocate using twigs on people any longer, none of us do, but I do advocate recognizing that children are learning in a country where 80 percent of our parents are working, contributing to this great economic engine that we call the United States, that they are not home taking care of their children. I don't find fault with the parents, but I find fault with a society which has allowed that to happen without replacing the influence of the parent with a stimulating educational environment for their children. I think if I could pick one thing of all the things that we could do, that would be the single most important.

I commend to your review the activities of the U.S. Army. They have a very active early childhood education program. They require certification and they have even come up with a funding formula that seems to work successfully. I urge you to review that and see if it would not be something we could use nationwide.

And finally, I would like you and the U.S. Congress to recognize that it's a changing society that has changed these expectations on the schools and we need to move away from finding fault with one sector or another for what is going on. Rather we need to encourage partnerships, we need to make certain that the State and Federal government work closely together, that the State and local government work closely together, that the parents and teachers work closely together and you make the list. But we need to join arms and work together to solve this problem because the challenge is enormous and the people who are in the field attempting to meet that challenge are goodwilled, and it's much better if we support them with partnerships than to blame them for what is going on at this time.

If I have time, I would like to point out just a couple of things with respect to financial aid and some programs, if that is acceptable? Thank you very much. To my point on providing a smoothly integrated financial aid for college students I would like to point out that the University of Northern Iowa which serves students from all over the State of Iowa, with perhaps, 95 percent of its undergraduate population from the State of Iowa, has 76 percent of its students requiring financial aid. If one had any idea—I had no idea when I came to Iowa that the need for financial aid would be that high. I did not realize that according to the strict guidelines that the government has set that we have that much need. Our financial aid needs totals $68 million, and Federal aid coincidentally makes up 68 percent of that assistance. Pell grants are around $5.5 million. For us, that serves only 23 percent of our undergraduate population. So less than a third of the students eligible for financial aid can get a Pell grant under the current program. We are concerned about the balance between loans and grants. Right now we are finding that our students are graduating with anywhere from $16,000 to $20,000 worth of debt upon graduation among those that receive financial aid. So we strongly support the $600 increase in the maximum Pell grant that was put in your Leave No Child Behind amendment. There is no question about our support. It will not keep up even at that rate with the rapid increase of tuition we expect with the declining tax base that we have in Iowa. We are going to see a sharp rise in tuition here in this State within the next 2 years and we are sorry to have to turn to the Federal Government to help mitigate that, but it seems to be our only choice.

PREPARED STATEMENT

I believe in the long term, over the next generation, the single most solution for meeting the rise in expectations of education is early childhood education. We still have a generation of students to deal with that are already in the schools today. The TRIO programs and GEARUP programs are examples of effective ways to deal with those students. I would hope to put those programs out of business over the next 18 years, beginning with children that are born today by making sure they all have a successful, safe, and stimulating educational opportunity throughout their educational career. But until we do that, those students who have not had the opportunity to receive that kind of early childhood support need to be rescued in every way that we can. So, thank you very much for supporting the TRIO and GEARUP programs. Thank you for the opportunity to visit with you today.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF ROBERT D. KOOB

Mr. Chairman, thank you for your past and continued support of our nation's students. Your tireless efforts on behalf of our nation's neediest students have not gone unnoticed in Iowa. We know you are truly one of the Senate's staunchest supporters on behalf of education funding and improving education throughout the pre-kindergarten, postsecondary and lifelong learning continuum. Your introduction and leadership of the "Leave No Child Behind" amendment to the Senate Budget Resolution is just one of many examples of how you turn rhetoric into action, and of this we are grateful.

Post World War II America has seen dramatic changes. Families with working parents are now the norm rather than the exception. More jobs are now associated

with using and processing information than with farming or manufacturing. Despite an overall rise in family income, the spread between upper and lower income distribution has grown by approximately an order of magnitude. On the average, the only individuals that have seen an increase in discretionary income in the last 30 years are those with four years of college or more.

Changes such as these, along with the general increase in the complexity of American society, have led to changing expectations for American schools. These changing expectations have led to many misdirected calls for reform such as one-size-fits-all standards, school vouchers, and "quickie" teacher certification programs. Spreading blame among those that should be working closely to adapt to these changes is even more damaging.

It is important to recognize that it is evolution rather than reform that is required to match these changing expectations. More than 90 percent of today's parents of school children expect their child to go on to college. Contrast this number with about 40 percent a few years ago—and today's leading college-going rate found here in Iowa of 72 percent—and one immediately realizes the enormity of the challenge.

America is still trying to meet the challenges of the 21st Century with the apparatus built in the early 20th Century. Our concept of public schools is still approximately for ages 6–16. We must broaden the public education model to include at least ages 0–22, and even lifelong learners.

Extensive research has shown that learning patterns are established at a very early age. Here in Iowa, 70 percent of families with children under the age of 6 have no parent at home during normal working hours. That number rises to over 80 percent after the age of 6. This means that there are large blocks of time in a child's day where we are uncertain of the learning opportunities for that child. Passive childcare is certainly not enough even if it provides a safe place. Stimulating developmental environments are required if each child is going to be able to cope with the increased educational expectations he or she will face later in life.

Schools can no longer be viewed as milk separators, sending the cream on to college while sending the rest into the workforce. The workplace is increasingly requiring post-high school education. The high expectation parents have for their children's education is a direct result of this changing workplace expectation.

America's colleges must increase their articulation with community colleges and high schools, and adopt attitudes that seek to help every student graduate. This must be done without lowering standards, but rather by adopting a more sophisticated understanding of how people learn and grow. This is fundamental if we are to leave no child behind.

In the 21st Century, the successful worker and the successful citizen will be the person that has learned how to learn. In a period of rapid change, learning is obviously the most important adaptive skill.

Schools across America are of highly variable quality. The correlation with economic status and school success is alarmingly high but notable exceptions exist. Iowa is a good example. Considered by some to be the home of the best educational enterprise in the nation, neither public nor private expenditures can account for the quality. At best, Iowa has midlevel per student tax appropriations and mid-to-low level tuition. What Iowa does have is high quality teachers and parental involvement. Local control has encouraged local involvement. This coupled with a culture valuing education has led to continued involvement of parents in their child's education.

The apparatus for early childhood education in the United States is so variable as to defy general characterization. Here in Iowa there are virtually no standards, and even less state support than federal support for early childhood education programs.

And how are we to pay for this expanded educational apparatus?

The Jeffersonian ideal of a free public education was adopted when that meant elementary school-level literacy, and both parents spent most of their time with their children. The concept of a free public education has taken a severe beating in the last quarter of the 20th Century.

Ironically, the strong correlation between education and financial success led to the conclusion that there was a personal benefit to being educated, as well as a public benefit expected in a democratic society requiring an informed citizenry. Public colleges particularly have seen a significant rise in the percent of per student cost covered by tuition. This in turn has led to a complex financial aid apparatus. This is a more costly solution overall than maintaining tax-supported education available to all, but the momentum of public opinion seems to favor moving even further in this direction.

I would like to suggest some principles to guide the role of the U.S. Congress in aiding the evolution of American education:

1. Don't confuse indicators with solutions. Standardized tests may be useful barometers of achievement, but they have no role in improving achievement.

2. Recognize that teachers and parents are the overwhelming influences in a school child's life. Provide support that encourages the education and continuous professional development of teachers. Provide support that encourages the involvement of parents in their child's education.

3. Recognize that access to college is the single most important indicator of future financial and social success of the rising generation of Americans. Failing full public support of the nation's public colleges, provide a smoothly graded and fully funded financial aid infrastructure that offsets the tremendous inherent disadvantage of the potential student's economic status.

4. Take leadership to broaden public responsibility for early childhood education. The U.S. Army has adopted a public private support structure for early childhood education that appears compatible with current public opinion and may serve as a good working model for the nation.

5. Realize that it is a changing society that has created our current educational needs. Rather than finding fault with any element of systems in place, enter into partnerships that encourage collaborations of many types. Just a few include federal-state, state-local, public-private, school-parent, college-school, and school-early childhood efforts.

I thank you for the opportunity to be heard on the vital issue of American education.

ADDENDUM

Answers to questions regarding the national education budget and its specific effect on University of Northern Iowa programs.

Question. How important is Federal aid to UNI students?

Answer. Very important. Approximately 76 percent of all UNI students receive some form of financial aid totaling more than $68 million. Federal aid makes up approximately 68 percent of that assistance. Pell grants are around $5.5 million for this current year, assisting more than 2,790 students—23 percent of our undergraduate population. One in five Pell Grant recipients receive no other aid.

The increase in Pell grants barely keeps up with the rising cost of tuition. Currently, a full Pell grant just covers tuition and fees with very little room to spare. In the past, Pell grants helped cover the costs of books, supplies, room and board, transportation and other expenses.

Other Federal programs such as work-study, SEOG and Perkins Loans have given students an opportunity to offset these high costs. At UNI, the Federal work-study program assists around 600 students a year for just under $1 million. The SEOG program assists around 600 UNI students for just over $500,000. The Perkins loan program assist approximately 800 students at $1.4 million. These programs assist very needy students who could not attend the University without this aid.

The balance of loans vs. grants is a concern. Loans currently account for 63 percent of aid received by our students. This is creating an incredible burden for students. The Iowa legislature is considering eliminating all state funds for work-study—more than $250,000. If that happens, 275 UNI students will need to look elsewhere for help. That means more loans and more debt.

Students need access to grants. As we look ahead to the 2002/03 academic year, we project 2,882 students will receive Pell grants, at an average award of $2,149 per student. The plan proposed by President Bush would increase Pell grants by less than $100 per student. We strongly support a $600 increase in the maximum Pell Grant award for fiscal year 2002 as was included in your "Leave no Child Behind" amendment to the Senate Budget Resolution that was passed by the Senate with bipartisan support.

It's important to put this in context. A recent survey indicated that 90 percent of today's parents expect their school-age children to attend college. Today's students can expect to walk out of a state university with $15,000 to $20,000 in debt (not including debt from credit cards and other sources) and an average starting salary of between $25,000 and $30,000. When we couple these facts, we see we're in danger of creating a society that can do little more than pay their school loans. Our economy will bear the consequences.

Question. How important are the TRIO and GEARUP programs to UNI students?

Answer. The TRIO programs have a great impact on UNI students by giving them experiential learning opportunities from early childhood education through continuing education programs. Because of TRIO grants, UNI is actively involved in enriching the lives of more than 4,000 low-income and special needs children and adults in the Cedar Valley each year. UNI is the only institution in the state to

house a comprehensive TRIO program. However, TRIO funding is available to less than 10 percent of the needy and eligible students who could potentially benefit.

UNI's GEAR UP program is now six months old and is targeted at Waterloo's Logan Middle School. Its goal is to prepare students for college. We use an integrated, holistic approach to addressing all the factors that influence student success.

The program is supported by a five-year, $1.26 million grant from the U.S. Department of Education and by matching funds and services from UNI, Waterloo Community Schools, Allen Hospital, Communities in Schools, Inc., and the community at large. The Bush budget proposal cuts this program by 23 percent.

During the past six months, the Logan library has been stocked with reference books and tutoring and mentoring programs have been established. The tutors are mostly UNI students and the mentors are from the partner institutions and the community. They've been warmly received. Reduced funding would threaten our ability to provide quality services to these students in the long term, rendering us unable to affect real change for at-risk children.

GEAR UP also supports professional development. Logan staff have attended diversity training and the UNI College of Education is planning customized learning opportunities for faculty, with the goal of spurring interested teachers to pursue masters degrees. Reduced funding may threaten this effort to provide permanent, positive change for Logan's staff. It also may eliminate a highly visible opportunity for community involvement.

Preparations are underway for a pilot summer school program—the first summer school program offered in Waterloo for a number of years. Targeting approximately 120 of Logan's most at-risk students, this six-week program will combine intensive academic work with creative recreational, cultural and enrichment opportunities. Reduced funding may force us to retreat from this innovative program. The City of Waterloo and its children will be the ultimate losers.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you, Dr. Koob and Ted Stilwell. Thank you both very much for excellent testimony. If I could, would both of you just again answer a couple of questions and maybe delve into it a little bit more on this testing issue. We are going to have the elementary and secondary education act bill up probably starting this week sometime. We don't know exactly when. I'm on the education committee and I will be involved in that debate. There is going to be a lot of discussion about this idea of testing and annual testing in grades three through eight.

Ted, you said that you estimated the cost in Iowa would be between $3 to $6 million a year if we had annual testing, did I get that right?

Mr. STILWILL. Yes, on an annual basis. First we would have to spend quite a bit more than that to develop a different kind of test than what we have today, because what is specified appears to be a criterion reference test, a different kind of test than the Iowa Test of Basic Skills.

Senator HARKIN. Is it your opinion that the Iowa Test of Basic Skills is a valid indicator then to see if a student is learning or progressing right now?

Mr. STILWILL. It clearly is. It's particularly for the purpose, as President Koob mentioned, if we need an indicator at the State level of the health of the system, with the help of education in the school district it's a very good indicator. I would have a great deal more confidence if I had a child in school, in the assessments that the teacher gives. You know, if you want to know whether your kid is reading okay or not, you put a lot more stock in the second grade teachers than you do in the test at the end of the year.

Senator HARKIN. I think a lot of concern a number of us have in Washington on the committee is that again, we are like any of you, annual testing is fine if it's for a purpose and if it's funded and if it leads to something. In other words, if it's just a test to see who

is making it and who is not, I don't know what that gives you if you don't have the support behind it to help those students. In other words, if we are not going to give the teachers the training and support, the educational material, technology and the nice buildings and things like that so that kids can do well on the tests, and all we are going to do is set up an annual test, it's like we are setting up the kids for failure because you are not giving them the materials and the kind of support that teachers need to do well. And the second thing, if they don't do well, what do you do? Well, it seems to me that it's an indication that we need to come in and support that school more and support the teachers. Maybe there's family support. There's all kinds of things that have to go along with that. And I'm not certain we are prepared to do that on a national basis. We may be prepared to test to find out how someone is doing, but I'm not certain we are prepared to do anything with it once we do that test. That is my concern.

Mr. STILWILL. Not at 2 cents on the dollar, Senator.

Senator HARKIN. Not at 2 cents on the dollar, right. So we would just be setting up a system that is going to fail. So again, I think people like to think about testing and most people say, yeah, we have a test, but I keep asking, what is the purpose of the test and what is it going to lead to and is this the best way? I think you just answered that question for me this morning, but we are going to have a lot of debate on that whole issue.

On the ability of kids to go to college, it's amazing how we see different patterns developing of kids going to college, Dr. Koob. We are getting to the point that it really is all market driven right now. Well, not all, but most of it is market driven right now. But how do you encourage students who want to go into fine arts or music or literature, things like that, to develop the basis of our concept of who we are and what we are about as humans when they had to go to college, but when they get out and they can't get paid anything. I mean, if you go out and become a computer engineer, you could probably pay off your college loans.

The second thing is, I just had a meeting with some medical researchers, another part of my obligations in the Senate, and we are finding now that a lot of young people are not going into medicine to pursue medical research because their debts are so high when they get out of school that it forces them to go into some other type of practice so they can at least make some money to pay off the loans, and they don't go into research like a lot of them would like to do. So we are losing some of our best minds to medical research because of that. I was just mentioning that to follow up on what you said about the need for more student assistance and a way to cut down on the amount of loans that they have.

When I went college at Iowa State in 1958, and I don't know the exact figure—but I know that loans as a part of our entire cost of going to school was a very small part. I think now it's probably the biggest part.

Dr. KOOB. It is. I think it's over 50 percent.

Senator HARKIN. I think it's skewing our whole system up.

Dr. KOOB. You are absolutely right, Senator. The fundamental cause of the shifts that you have described has been the loss of faith in what I call the social contract for higher education. The

country was founded on the assumption that we ought to have public education available to all of its citizens. As the number of people grew, the number of people going on to college grew, and we became less willing to pay for that and we began to raise tuitions to offset drops in tax support for schools, this created a costly financial aid system to be superimposed on top of that. So we actually get less for the dollar spent than if we raised tuition in the first place. It has also been driven, this approach to debt, which diminishes the freedom to pursue education of the students that are there, the examples that you used. So unfortunately, moving education instead of a social contract into a business contract has had a number of effects. The way this country has chosen to deal with that is through financial aid. The better choice would have been 30 years ago to have not started to raise the tuition for our colleges. But there seems to be no public sentiment in support of that analysis. And so the solutions, the ones that we have reached, that is we need to provide more and more financial aid in order to offset these differences. Unfortunately, the more State legislatures become aware of the availability of those kinds of dollars, the less willing they seem to be to spend money in terms of taxes on education.

Clearly we have to have a public debate about the public and private good of education and who has to pay for it. And that debate has not been joined as yet. So absent the ability to reverse the trend to shift more and more of the burden of higher education to individuals, financial aid appears to be the only solution to the problems that you provided.

Senator HARKIN. Doctor, I have a feeling that if today the U.S. Congress tried to pass the equivalent of what they did in the 1940's with the GI bill. I don't think it would go through. I don't think it would pass.

Dr. KOOB. I don't think the Lambrant Act would pass either. The Lambrant Act of 1962 was one of the most definitive acts in the entire history of the United States. I absolutely believe that the economic and military—whatever leadership this nation has, is because it made a commitment to educate each and every one of its citizens at whatever level was necessary. And the results speak for themselves. Why the demand and success is beyond me.

Senator HARKIN. We need that public debate and the public debate goes beyond doctors and testing.

Dr. KOOB. It certainly does.

Mr. STILWILL. Senator, it's particularly interesting in Iowa right now when we seem destined to be increasing the tuition at our regent universities markedly, destined to increase the tuition at our community colleges markedly in a State where 47 percent of the parents make less than $10 an hour. We are almost going to guarantee that the children of those parents are going to make less than $10 an hour.

Senator HARKIN. You are saying that 47 percent of students——

Mr. STILWILL. Wage earners in Iowa make $10 an hour or less. So when the hope for their children's future and the hope for a new economy in Iowa depends on their access to higher education, a 2-year or 4-year degree or apprenticeship at least, we are making it

increasingly difficult to provide that access. It doesn't seem like a smart move.

Senator HARKIN. No, not a smart move. Thank you both very much for being here. Let's hear it for both.

Now, I would like to call up Lois Mulbrook, financial aid director of Mount Mercy College in Cedar Rapids, Swati Dandekar, board member of Linn-Mar Community Schools in Marion, and Tammy Wetjen-Kesterson, vice president of the Iowa Head Start Association from Marengo.

First we will start with Lois Mulbrook. Lois Mulbrook is the director of financial aid at Mount Mercy College in Cedar Rapids and is president-elect of the Iowa Association of Student Financial Aid. Lois earned her bachelor's degree from Upper Iowa University and her MBA at the University of Iowa. She is a certified CPA with a background in public accounting.

Swati Dandekar has been a member of the Linn-Mar Community District School Board since 1996, and was appointed to the Vision Iowa Board by Governor Tom Vilsack. Swati was recently elected as the director of the Iowa Association of School Boards and is a graduate of Linn-Mar High School and Stanford University.

Tammy Wetjen-Kesterson is vice president of the Iowa Head Start Association and Chair of the Iowa River Valley Family Resource Center. She has extensive experience as a Head Start volunteer. Tammy is currently pursuing a degree in criminal justice and hopes to eventually practice law.

We welcome you here and thank you for coming on a Saturday morning. And you don't have to read your whole statement, but if you could just summarize it, I would appreciate it. And I would like to say that all of these written statements will be made available in their entirety so you don't have to go through the whole thing. So with that, I will turn first to Lois Mulbrook, director of financial aid at Mount Mercy College.

STATEMENT OF LOIS MULBROOK, DIRECTOR OF FINANCIAL AID, MOUNT MERCY COLLEGE

Ms. MULBROOK. Thank you, Senator Harkin. I appreciate this opportunity to give comment with regard to your recent amendment to the Congressional Budget Resolution.

Pell grants are the backbone of a financial aid package. I was very interested to hear statistics from UNI because at Mount Mercy only 23 percent of our students received a Pell grant during the current academic year. Because funding is so restricted in these areas, these Pell grant recipients still have unmet needs of over $2,600. This means that a family who has very limited financial resources must still obtain an average of $2,600 to contribute to a child's education. In order to do this they must obtain additional loans and/or work excessive hours at a part-time job.

An increase of $600 to the Pell grant award would be significant to our student body. Based on our current recipients and the typical Pell grant award, this increase would help reduce the debt load of our Pell grant recipients by over $100,000.

Senator, I know you understand the needs of students attending college and you realize that an increase in the Pell grant award is not enough. Even funding for the campus-based programs is not ac-

ceptable. The campus-based programs which consist of Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant, Work-Study Program and the Perkins Loan Program are very critical to financial aid packages.

Based on the current funding of the Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant Program, Mount Mercy is only able to fund 42 percent of our Pell grant recipients. Funding must be increased so more students are able to benefit from this program.

Our Perkins Loan Program has benefited from our dedicated, responsible students who are very conscientious in repaying their student loans. Without increased funding for this program we have no choice but to rely on repayment of these loans in order to fund our current students. We also encourage Congress to continue support of the cancelation fundings for these loans. Mount Mercy has strong programs in the nursing, education, criminal justice and social work areas. These are majors that can definitely benefit from the cancelation provisions. While they are a great help to our students, we are also providing capable, well-trained individuals to the work force for these shortage areas.

In my opinion, the Federal Work-Study program is one of the most useful programs funded by the Government. It gives students a chance to take responsibility for their education while gaining work experience. However, funding is critical to this area as well.

I do not want to give the impression that I expect the Federal Government to completely fund the students attending Mount Mercy College. We are committed to assisting students in obtaining the type of education that best fits their needs. Each year Mount Mercy College provides over $5 million of institutionally funded financial aid to help our students. Along with the other 29 independent colleges in Iowa, we feel that it's important that students be given a choice in the type of education that they receive. That is why independent colleges in Iowa provide institutional support to their students attending their schools and at the same time are determined to control costs and maintain the same high level of education. However, it's a fact that students must continue to borrow funds to help pay for their education. Efforts must be made to help reduce the debt load of students by increasing Pell grants and increasing the campus-based programs

I would like to give an example of one of our seniors that will be graduating in May. She has received a Pell grant all 4 years while attending Mount Mercy College. Her father is a farmer in Iowa and her mother also works to help support the family. Their adjusted gross income for 1999 was just over $23,000. She also works part-time while attending college, and her adjusted gross income for 1999 was almost $6,600. In addition to her off-campus work she also participates in the Work-Study program and tutors in the America Reads program. Her Pell grant for the 2000/2001 year was only $3,050. This is a typical Mount Mercy student. She will graduate with almost $19,000 in loans. Our students are willing to work off campus to help fund their education. They don't expect a free ride. However, another $600 in the Pell grant would have helped a lot to reduce her loans. She hopes to graduate and find a job teaching in Iowa making $23,000. She will begin her career already $19,000 in debt, almost her entire first year salary.

We must continue to provide funding to make sure students like her can still feel free to make choices regarding their education.

PREPARED STATEMENT

I want to express my thanks to Senator Harkin for allowing me to share my experiences and opinions. I also want to thank you for all of your past support for education, and this amendment proves that we can rely on you to protect the interests of higher education. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LOIS MULBROOK

I want to thank Senator Harkin for this opportunity to give comments concerning the Harkin Amendment to the Congressional Budget Resolution, H. Con. Res. 83 that was recently passed by the Senate.

Pell grants are the backbone of a financial aid package. However, only 23 percent of the students attending Mount Mercy College during the 2000–2001 academic year receive a Pell grant. The average Pell award for these students is $1,935 compared to the maximum award of $3,300. Only 15 percent of the Pell recipients were eligible for the maximum award. The Pell recipients have the greatest financial need, but because of funding restrictions these students at Mount Mercy College still have unmet need of over $2,600. This means that a family who has limited financial resources must obtain, on average, another $2,600 to contribute to their child's education to be able to attend Mount Mercy College. How does a family do this? Unfortunately, the answer is for the student to obtain additional student loans and/or for the student to work excessive hours at a part-time job. For this academic year, we had approximately 29 percent of our freshman class eligible for a Pell grant. Of this freshman class, 87 percent of the students had an average of $4,700 in student loans.

An increase of $600 to the Pell grant award would be significant to our student body. Even though only approximately 15 percent of our students will receive the full $600, it will greatly help all students who are eligible for a Pell grant. Based on our current recipients and the typical Pell award, it is estimated to increase the average Pell grant by $350. It will help reduce the debt load of the students receiving Pell grants at Mount Mercy College by over $100,000.

Senator Harkin understands the needs of the student attending college and realizes that an increase in the Pell award is not enough. President Bush has recommended that funding for campus based programs (Federal Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (FSEOG), Federal Work-Study Program, and the Federal Perkins Loan Program) remain level for the next academic year. Level funding is not acceptable as was noted in Senator Harkin's amendment. Increases in these programs are critical. Even though the majority of these funds go first to Pell recipients, other needy students also benefit.

Based on the current funding of the FSEOG program, Mount Mercy College is only able to fund this grant to 42 percent of the Pell recipients. Awarding these funds is one of the most difficult jobs a financial aid officer must perform. We have to determine the average FSEOG award and then balance it with the number of Pell recipients. It is never enough. Funding must be increased so more students are able to benefit from this program.

Mount Mercy College is very fortunate to have dedicated, responsible students. Our Perkins Loan Program has benefited from this because our students are very conscientious in repaying their Perkins Loans. We work hard to maintain a low default rate. Without an increase in funding to this program, we have no choice but to rely on repayment of loans so those funds are available for our current students. We loan almost $600,000 to students each year. While this helps them fund their education, it must be repaid. We encourage Congress to continue their support of the cancellation funding for these loans. Mount Mercy College has strong programs in Nursing, Education, Criminal Justice and Social Work. These are all areas that could benefit from the cancellation provision of the Perkins Loan Program. While it is a great help to our students, Mount Mercy College is also providing capable, well-trained individuals to the work force for these shortage areas.

In my opinion, the Federal Work-Study program is one of the most useful programs funded by the Federal Government. It gives students a chance to take responsibility for their education while gaining work experience. However, funding is

critical to this program. Currently we are able to offer only 16 percent of our student body the Federal Work-Study program. This includes the students who participate in the America Reads Program. Our Education Department works closely with the schools in the area to help provide tutors through this program. This is a wonderful way for the local elementary schools to provide additional help to students and at the same time provide our Mount Mercy College students with a valuable learning experience.

I do not want to give the impression that I expect the federal government to completely fund the students attending Mount Mercy College. Mount Mercy College is committed to assisting students in obtaining the type of education that best fits their needs. Each year Mount Mercy College provides over $5 millions of institutionally funded financial aid to help students attend. With Mount Mercy College, there are 29 other independent colleges in Iowa that feel that it is important that students be given a choice in the type of education they receive. These schools provide a wonderful opportunity to students, not only from Iowa, but also from across the nation. Mount Mercy College is not unique when we provide institutional assistance. The other independent schools in Iowa support the students attending their schools, as well. The independent colleges are also very fortunate in Iowa to have the Iowa Tuition Grant program. This program provides a $4,000 grant to students with a specific need level that are planning to attend an independent college in Iowa.

The independent schools in Iowa are also committed to controlling costs while at the same time providing the same high level of education. However, it is a fact that students must continue to borrow funds to help pay for their education. Preliminary numbers show that students attending independent colleges in Iowa during the 1999–2000 academic year borrowed over $557 million. At Mount Mercy College, the average loan indebtedness of students graduating in May 2000 was over $17,000. This includes all federal, state, Mount Mercy College, and private loan sources. This represents almost a 19 percent increase in the last five years. Assuming this amount was all federal loans (which it is not), a best case scenario would have a student paying over $230 a month in loan payments. Over the life of the loan, interest payments would be almost $8,900. This can be an almost unmanageable debt load for students graduating in the service areas such as teaching and human services. Efforts must be made to help reduce the debt load a student incurs by increasing Pell grants and campus-based programs and allowing for continued cancellations of federal loans for shortage areas.

I would like to give an example of one of our graduating seniors that has received a Pell grant all four years while attending Mount Mercy College. Her father is a farmer in Iowa and her mother also works to help support the family. Their adjusted gross income for 1999 was $23,646. The student also worked part-time while attending college. Her adjusted gross income for 1999 was $6,595. In addition to working an off-campus job, she also participated in the work-study program on campus and tutored in the America Reads program. Her Pell grant for the 2000–2001 year was only $3,050. She will graduate with almost $19,000 in loans. This is a typical Mount Mercy College student. Our students are willing to work off campus to help fund their education. They do not expect a "free ride". However, another $600 in a Pell grant award would have allowed this student to reduce her loans. She graduates hoping to find a job teaching in Iowa making $24,000. She will begin her career already $19,000 in debt, almost her entire first year salary. Four years later, would she still decide to attend Mount Mercy College? We know that the learning experiences she had while attending out-weigh the impact of the debt load, but we must continue to provide funding to make sure a student like her can still feel free to make choices.

Again, I would like to express my appreciation to Senator Harkin for allowing me to share my experiences, knowledge, opinions and financial aid statistics. I want to also thank Senator Harkin for all his past support for Education and this amendment proves that we can continue to rely on the Senator to protect the interests of higher education. Thank you for your time and consideration.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you, Lois, very much for your kind words and your testimony.

Next we will turn to Swati Dandekar, Board Member of the Linn-Mar Community School District and the Iowa Association of Schools.

STATEMENT OF SWATI DANDEKAR, BOARD MEMBER, LINN-MAR COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT AND IOWA ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL BOARDS

Ms. DANDEKAR. Senator, I want to clarify something, if I may. My son went to Linn-Mar school district school and then on to Stanford. I came to United States 28 years ago.

Senator HARKIN. Very good.

Ms. DANDEKAR. It looks nice.

Senator HARKIN. I'm glad you came to Iowa.

Ms. DANDEKAR. Yes, I came from India's midwest to Iowa's midwest—United States midwest. And this is my first time doing this so I'm really nervous.

Senator HARKIN. We're glad to have you here.

Ms. DANDEKAR. I always tell people in Iowa that I feel right at home because I came from one midwest to another. So we are farmers in India too.

Senator Harkin, thank you for the opportunity to present oral and written comments regarding Federal education policy. Also, and more importantly, thank you for your continued support of America's children and their education. Public education is the foundation of our democratic society and the key to successful futures for Iowa children. State and Federal policy makers must protect the future of our country by recognizing the importance of continued support of public education.

Today I'm representing Linn-Mar Community School District as well as the Iowa Association of School Boards. The Linn-Mar School District and IASB believe that every child can achieve.

Public education spending is an essential investment in Iowa's future. Employers want to build or relocate where the educational system provides a quality work force. Studies show that investment in public education pays off in long-term dividends for the local community, State, and country. According to U.S. Census Bureau, high school graduates can earn twice as much as dropouts. There is a higher correlation between dropout rates and incarceration than there is between smoking and lung cancer. High school graduates have the ability to seek higher education where their earning potential is even greater. People who earn more are giving more back to their community in spending power and tax returns.

More important, public education spending is an investment in our children's future. Public schools provide equality of opportunity for all children. Our public education system guarantees every child access to a quality education at a neighborhood public school, regardless of academic ability, socioeconomic status, family background, race, religion or needs. In addition to teaching academics, public schools are the primary institution for teaching common values, our country's history and commitment to democracy. Public education represents a transcending American interest in continuing our democratic culture, freedoms and providing every student the education needed for a successful, independent life.

Today Iowa public schools face many challenges: No. 1, raising academic standards; No. 2, ensuring all students receive an excellent education; No. 3, improving teacher quality through meaningful professional development programs; No. 4, helping the increasing number of children with special needs. These include students

with limited English-speaking ability, homeless students and students with physical, mental or behavioral disabilities.

Senator, I have changed my remarks. I hope it's okay.

Senator HARKIN. That's fine. Fine with me. It's okay.

Ms. DANDEKAR. No. 5, rebuilding old schools; No. 6, providing technology resources; and No. 7, attracting and retaining qualified teachers and administrators in light of Iowa's lower-than-average salaries and spiraling benefit costs.

State and Federal funding supports school districts in all these areas, but funding has not kept pace with the rising costs of meeting these challenges. Schools of today cannot continue to rely on the resources of yesterday. Many critical programs are significantly under funded, including early childhood education, special education and professional development for teachers.

Iowa State tax cuts that have been enacted for several years have resulted in State budget problems. These State budget problems will inevitably result in reduced education funding. Iowa public schools serve more than 92 percent of all Iowa school-age children. I'm right on that one, yes? The influx of Federal funding is welcomed as a new resource to meet the needs of Iowa's schools and students.

It is through your efforts, Senator Harkin, that Iowa schools now have more money to address life safety issues. It's also through your efforts that we are beginning to see the Federal Government meet its commitment to fully fund its share for special education costs. We are also seeing a strong commitment to early childhood education through class-size reduction dollars, and a commitment to fully fund Head Start so all eligible children are served.

Iowa policy makers must demonstrate primary support for Iowa public schools in order to maintain the respected quality of Iowa's education system nationwide. We urge you to: No. 1, continue to provide resources for school boards to meet all students' needs; No. 2, commit real, new and significant resources to improve education in Iowa; No. 3, ensure every child hits the ground running when he or she comes to kindergarten; and No. 4, continue funding life safety grants and construction grants for schools.

Senator Harkin, in conclusion—I'm not reading everything that I have. I wanted to make it shorter because if I read everything it could be 15 minutes long.

Senator Harkin, in conclusion, let me summarize: No. 1, public education represents a transcending American interest in continuing our democratic culture and freedoms and providing every citizen the education needed for a successful, independent life; No. 2, if our children don't succeed, our society won't succeed. All students have the right to the best quality education to allow them to become respectful, productive citizens. Public schools are the only entities that can and must meet the needs of all students; No. 3, education funding has not kept up with the increase in revenues nor has if kept pace with the changing face of society and its impact on education; No. 4, the time is to act now. We cannot leave any student behind. Education moves individuals dependent on society into individuals contributing to society; and No. 5, everyone talks about supporting public education, but reality has not

matched the rhetoric. We need to make funding public education a priority.

And Senator, I would talk to you as a first generation immigrant. I feel the reason America is a super power is because of our public education.

PREPARED STATEMENT

As a board member I tell people that we may not be perfect, but we are good public school systems, and we have to work hard to become excellent public school systems.

Senator Harkin, thank you for your time and your continued commitment to our children.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SWATI DANDEKAR

Thank you for the opportunity to present oral and written comments regarding federal education policy. Also, and more importantly, thank you for your continued support of America's children and their education. Public education is the foundation of our democratic society and the key to successful futures for Iowa children. State and federal policymakers must protect the future of our country by recognizing the importance of continued support of public education.

Here today, I am representing the Linn-Mar Community School District as well as the Iowa Association of School Boards. I am a board member for both organizations. The Linn-Mar Community School is a school district of approximately 4,500 students here in Linn County. The Iowa Association of School Boards is a statewide educational organization representing Iowa's 374 public school districts, 15 area education agencies and 15 community colleges. The mission of the IASB is to assist public school boards in achieving high and equitable student achievement. Both the Linn-Mar school board and district and IASB believe every child can achieve and the time to act is now.

Public education spending is an essential investment in Iowa's future. Employers want to build or relocate where the educational system provides a quality work force. Studies show that investment in public education pays off in long-term dividends for the local community, state and country. High school graduates can earn twice as much as dropouts. *U.S. Census Bureau, 1990 Survey of Income and Program Participation.* There is a greater connection between dropout rates and incarceration than there is between smoking and lung cancer. High school graduates have the ability to go to higher education where their earning potential is even greater. People who earn more are giving more back to their community in spending power and tax revenues.

More important, public education spending is an investment in our children's future. Public schools provide equality of opportunity for all children. Our public education system guarantees every child access to a quality education at a neighborhood public school, regardless of academic ability, socioeconomic status, family background, race, religion or needs. In addition to teaching academic subjects, our public schools are the primary institution for teaching common values, our country's history an commitment to democracy. Public education represents a transcending American interest in continuing our democratic culture and freedoms and providing every citizen the education needed for a successful, independent life.

Today, Iowa public schools face many challenges.

—Raising academic standards through school improvement plans and goals to ensure all students receive an excellent education.

—Improving teacher quality through meaningful professional development programs.

—Helping the increasing numbers of children with special needs, including students with limited English-speaking ability, homeless students and students with physical, mental or behavioral disabilities, including medically fragile students.

—Updating or rebuilding old or overcrowded schools and providing technology resources.

—Attracting and retaining qualified teachers and administrators in light of Iowa's lower-than-average salaries and spiraling benefit costs.

State and federal funding supports school districts in all these areas and others. But funding has not kept pace with the rising costs of meeting these challenges. Schools of today cannot continue to rely on the resources of yesterday. Many critical programs are significantly underfunded, including early childhood education, special education and professional development for teachers.

Ongoing state tax cuts have been enacted for several years resulting in state budget problems. These state budget problems will inevitably result in reduced education funding. Iowa public schools serve more than 92 percent of all Iowa school-age children. The influx of federal funding is welcomed as a new resource to meet the needs of Iowa's schools and students.

It's through your efforts that Iowa schools now have more money to address life safety issues in their schools—long before the state agreed to help local schools fund infrastructure issues. It is also through your efforts that we are beginning to see the federal government meet its commitment to fully fund its share of special education costs. We are also seeing a strong commitment to early childhood education through class-size reduction dollars and a commitment to fully fund Head Start so all children eligible are served.

Iowa's policymakers must demonstrate primary support for Iowa public schools in order to maintain the respected quality of Iowa's education system nationwide. We urge you to:

—*Continue to provide resources for school boards to meet all students' needs.*—School boards must have both the freedom and the financial resources to fulfill this responsibility. Full funding of the federal government's share of special education costs will significantly reduce our dependence on local property taxpayers to meet rising special education costs. Increased funding for Title I programs focusing on those students at-risk of failing, will give school districts the added resource needed to help level the playing field so a student's income will no longer be a determinant of how that student will succeed in school.

—*Commit real, new and significant resources to improve education in Iowa.*—The continued reallocation of existing resources within education is both insufficient and detrimental to Iowa students. Teacher pay cannot keep pace. Quality professional development for teachers, curriculum, textbook and library resources, and technology will all continue to fall behind. Federal funding to help teachers obtain the data-driven professional development needed to ensure all children achieve is welcomed. Time spent on professional development is time away from students but it is vital in order to ensure quality education occurs when students are in the classroom.

—*Ensure every child hits the ground running when he or she comes to kindergarten.*—By increasing the federal government's commitment to fully fund Head Start, we know those children at greatest risk of failing in school, those from low-income families—will have the same resources available to them to allow them to come to school ready and able to learn.

—*Continue funding life safety grants and construction grants for schools.*—Since we already struggle with funding for educational programming, infrastructure assistance is greatly needed. All children have the right to an education in a safe, secure facility—not just those who live in property tax or sales tax rich school districts. Spending time searching for infrastructure funding is time taken away from education. Having new sources of funding, frees up our time and resources to focus on student achievement.

Senator Harkin, in conclusion, let me summarize:

—Public education represents a transcending American interest in continuing our democratic culture and freedoms and providing every citizen the education needed for a successful, independent life.

—If all children don't succeed, our society won't succeed. All students have the right to the best quality education to allow them to become respectful, productive citizens. Public schools are the only entities that can and must meet the needs of all students.

—Education funding has not kept up with the increases in revenues nor has it kept pace with the changing face of society and its impact on education.

—The time to act is now—we cannot leave any student behind. Education moves individuals dependent on society into individuals contributing to society.

—Everyone talks about supporting public education, but reality has not matched the rhetoric. We need to make funding public education a priority.

Again, thank you for your time and your continued commitment to our children.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you. As a second generation immigrant—my mother came to this country—I really appreciate what

you had to say. You are just right on. That really is what made us super is public education.

Ms. DANDEKAR. And I truly believe in that, so please fight for all of us.

Senator HARKIN. I can tell that.

Thank you very much. And now we will turn to Tammy Wetjen-Kesterson, Vice President of the Iowa Head Start Association.

STATEMENT OF TAMMY WETJEN-KESTERSON, VICE PRESIDENT, IOWA HEAD START ASSOCIATION

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. On behalf of the Iowa Head Start Association, I'm pleased to testify in support of the fiscal year 2002 appropriation for the Head Start program. Also, Senator Harkin, I would like to thank you for being a champion for Head Start children and our families.

The Iowa Head Start Association is a private, non-for-profit membership organization representing more than 6,700 children and their families, upwards of 1,400 staff and 20 Head Start Programs and Delegates in all 99 counties. Early Head Start projects served 800 children under the age of 3 in fiscal year 2000.

The Iowa Head Start Association stands by the goal established by Congress to enroll 1 million children in the Head Start program by the end of the coming fiscal year and doubling the number of infants and toddlers and their families enrolled in Early Head Start. Iowa Head Start Association requests the subcommittee's favorable action on a fiscal year 2002 appropriation for Head Start of $7.2 billion—an increase of $1 billion over the last fiscal year.

In the State of Iowa there are 2,500 children that are left unserved by Head Start programs. And we are only serving 15 percent of the children who are currently eligible for Early Head Start. To serve these children there needs to be continued support for Head Start and Early Head Start expansion. Senator Harkin, now is the time to answer the needs of our children that has been placed on hold for too long. Now is the time to fill the gap for low income children and their families. No longer should we tolerate waiting lists for Head Start and quality early care and education programs. And no longer should we be forced to turn away children that will be Iowa's future.

Another issue of concern to Head Start programs in the State of Iowa is the need to extend services to full-day, full-year services in response to the needs of parents who are working full-time. Programs in the State of Iowa need the flexibility to use additional expansion to convert existing part-day, part-year operations into full-day, full-year classrooms.

In the 1998 reauthorization of Head Start, it called for marked improvements in the quality of professional development for the Head Start teaching staff, the quality of services provided to children and families, and working toward quantifiable goals—goals which recognize the primary importance of education at the forefront of the Head Start mission.

The Iowa Head Start Association supports the quality services that Head Start programs achieve. Our efforts have had a positive impact on early childhood education and child care. In Iowa, when our Head Start programs partner with child care or home visitation

programs we pass along the high standards of Head Start. Through these partnerships many children throughout the State receive high quality services without having to be enrolled in Head Start. To maintain this high quality requires a continued substantial investment in Head Start.

We have made good on the commitments and promises made in the 1998 reauthorization of our program. We have put quality over quantity, and we have put results over progress. But even an inflationary increase of $136 million over fiscal year 2001 funding level would force abandonment of a number of important plans in Head Start, including the scheduled expansion of the Early Head Start program and training for teachers.

Senator Harkin, this is not the time to retreat from our commitment to the full funding of Head Start—from the goal of providing every eligible low-income child access to the type of services which will give them the opportunity to gain access to the American dream. And this is not the time to remain stationary. If the nation does not rise to the occasion, investing our resources in our children, we will have failed ourselves as well as future generations.

The Iowa Head Start Association appreciates this opportunity to reinforce the critical national interest served by supporting expanded Head Start staff funding. With your assistance we can continue to make a difference in the lives of Iowa's children and families, especially those that are most vulnerable.

PREPARED STATEMENT

In summary, we request: A fiscal year 2002 appropriation of $7.2 billion; support the use of grant dollars for full-day, full-year services; and to continue to financially support professional development of Head Start staff and other Early Childhood providers which creates services for all of Iowa's children.

Thank you for allowing the Iowa Head Start Association to present issues of importance to the Head Start community before this committee.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF TAMMY WETJEN-KESTERSON

On behalf of the Iowa Head Start Association, I am pleased to testify in support of the fiscal year 2002 appropriation for the Head Start program, administered by the Department of Health and Human Services under the Subcommittee's Jurisdiction.

The Iowa Head Start Association (IHSA) is a private, non-profit membership organization representing more than 6,700 children and their families, upwards of 1,400 staff and 20 Head Start Programs and Delegates in all 99 counties. Early Head Start projects served 800 children under age three in fiscal year 2000.

In this the 36th year of Head Start, IHSA stands by the goal established by the Congress several years ago to enroll one million children in the Head Start program by the end of the coming fiscal year and doubling the number of infants and toddlers and their families enrolled in the Early Head Start initiative within that same time frame. At the same time, IHSA remains committed to keeping the promise made to low income children and families by Presidents George H.W. Bush and Bill Clinton and by both Democratic and Republican-controlled Congresses—namely, full funding of Head Start. Accordingly, IHSA requests the Subcommittee's favorable action on a fiscal year 2002 appropriation for Head Start of $7.2 billion—an increase of $1.0 billion over fiscal year 2001 program funding level.

In the State of Iowa there are 2,500 children that are left unserved by Head Start Programs. And we are only serving 15 percent of children eligible for Early Head Start. To serve these children there needs to be continued support for Head Start

and Early Head Start expansion. Now is the time to answer the needs of our children that has been placed on hold for too long. Now is the time to fill the gap for low-income children and families. No longer should we tolerate waiting lists for Head Start and quality early care and education programs. No longer should we be forced to turn away children that will be Iowa's future.

An additional unserved population of children exists in Iowa. These children's families are minimally over the income guidelines. Some families are less than $100 over the income guidelines. Due to Iowa's rural nature and our welfare reform program (the Family Investment Act), Head Start Programs are seeing a dramatic increase in the number of children that must remain unserved under current guidelines. These families still have at-risk factors for remaining in poverty such as illiteracy, limited or no job skills, little or no parenting skills, substance and/or spousal abuse, and other high risk factors.

The law permits the enrollment of a "reasonable number" of over-income families to accommodate the working poor and near poor who desperately need Head Start services to maintain employability and self sufficiency. During the last administration, Secretary Shalala interpreted "reasonable number" to permit over-income enrollment of up to ten percent of total program enrollment. IHSA would like to see this flexibility expanded to as much as 25 percent of enrollment. This would solve a major problem as it relates to welfare reform, especially in the rural Programs in our state. Under thus arrangement, the working poor would still be eligible for Head Start and would have more support to become self-sufficient.

Another issue of concern to Head Start Programs in the State of Iowa is the need to extend services to full-day, full-year services in response to the needs of parents who are working full-time as well as unconventional hours because of welfare reform. IHSA is extremely appreciative of the Head Start Bureau's efforts to address this need in their recent guidance for fiscal year 2001 expansion. However many of the Programs in the State of Iowa need the flexibility to use additional expansion to convert existing part-day, part-year operations into full-day, full-year classrooms.

The 1998 reauthorization of Head Start called for marked improvements in the quality of professional development for the Head Start teaching staff, the quality of services provided to children and families, and working toward quantifiable goals—goals which recognize the primary importance of education at the forefront of the Head Start mission.

The mission of the Iowa Head Start Association is to enhance the capacity of its members to promote and advocate for a wide range of quality services for all of Iowa's children and families.

The IHSA supports the quality services that Head Start Programs achieve. Our efforts have had a positive impact on early childhood education and childcare. In Iowa, when our Head Start Programs partner with Child Care or Home Visitation Programs we pass along the high standards of Head Start. Through these partnerships many children throughout the State receive the high quality services of Head Start without being enrolled. To provide these quality services to children both within our Programs and to touch the lives of other children in the State of Iowa requires a continued substantial investment in Head Start.

We have made good on the commitments and promises made in the 1998 reauthorization of the program: we have put quality over quantity; results over progress. We have improved the quality of our Programs, assisting those local projects in need of guidance. We have moved toward improving the training and professional competency of our classrooms and programs. Iowa Programs not only focus on professional development within our classrooms, but we work hard to promote educational standards for all early childhood educators.

Even an inflationary increase of $136 million over the fiscal year 2001 funding level would force abandonment of a number of important plans in Head Start—including the scheduled expansion of the Early Head Start program; training of teachers toward the goal of increasing credentials and college degrees such that at least one-half of all Head Start classrooms have a teacher with an Associate's, Bachelor's, or Master's degree by 2003; and bolstering our commitment to achieving education outcomes through the institution of research-based early childhood educational interventions.

This is not the time to retreat from our commitment to the full funding of Head Start—from the goal of providing every eligible low-income child access to the type of services which will give them the opportunity to gain access to the American dream. And, this is not a time to remain stationary. If the nation does not rise to the occasion, investing our resources in our children, we will have failed ourselves as well as future generations. Our richness lies in our people. It always has.

The Iowa Head Start Association appreciates this opportunity to reinforce the critical national interest served by supporting expanded Head Start funding. With your

assistance, we can continue to make a difference in lives of Iowa's children and families, especially those that are most vulnerable.

In summary, we request:

—A fiscal year 2002 appropriation of $7.2 billion—an increase of $1 billion over the fiscal year 2001 appropriation level;

—Enhanced flexibility to allow for the participation of a larger proportion of over-income children and families where needs exist and extending services to these families;

—Supporting the use of grant dollars for full-day, full-year services for currently enrolled children;

—Continue to financially support professional development of Head Start staff and other Early Childhood providers which creates quality services for all of Iowa's children.

Thank you for allowing IHSA to present issues of importance to the Head Start community before the committee.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much. Thank you all very much. Let me start with Head Start. Every study that we have seen, I think both Dr. Koob and several others referred to it also, talks about the importance of getting to the kids early. Forget about patching and fixing and mending later on, we have to get to the kids early, and that is the focus of Early Start and Head Start. One of the things that I keep hearing about is the status of Head Start teachers and how much they are compensated. Can you tell me what is the average salary of a Head Start teacher in the State of Iowa right now? Do you happen to know what that is, because I don't know.

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. I would say the average salary right now is in the range between $7 to $7.50.

Senator HARKIN. Per hour?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Per hour. And that would be for teacher associates. Teachers would typically make more. The majority of our staff are teacher associates.

Senator HARKIN. And what kind of training do they have to have?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Most of our teachers are required to have either a CDA or a——

Senator HARKIN. A what?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. A Child Development Associate.

Senator HARKIN. Okay.

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Or they are required to have an Associate of Arts degree or Bachelor's degree with an early childhood endorsement. But the qualification do vary from one program to another. In rural areas you are going to find programs that are unable to find staff that have the Master's and Bachelor's and Associate Arts degrees.

Senator HARKIN. Now, do most Head Start teachers work half a day?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. No, most Head Start teachers now are putting in full days because we are in the process of converting our classrooms to accommodate the parents who are on their track of welfare reform.

Senator HARKIN. How many Head Start teachers do we have in the State of Iowa?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. We have approximately 1,400 staff, and that would include the teachers and teacher associates, our counselors and our directors.

Senator HARKIN. Okay. And do you have a presence in all 99 counties?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Yes, we do.

Senator HARKIN. And you serve 800 children under age 3 and 6,700 children in the 3 to 5?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Currently those are our numbers, but with last year's authorization there was $100,000 in expansion that was guaranteed to each grantee, so those numbers would be increasing as we expand our numbers. Senator Harkin, what we would like to see is the flexibility to use those expansion dollars, not only to add children, but also to convert our part-day, part-year classrooms into those full-day, full-year services that our parents desperately need. And one thing I did not mention was we do have another population in the State that we consider to be underserved. And they are parents we cannot serve because they are minimumly over the income guidelines. We have parents that are $50 to $100 over income guidelines. There is no way they could go anywhere and find a reasonable child care experience or quality preschool experience for $50 to $100.

Senator HARKIN. What is the income guideline?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. 100 percent of Federal poverty is the income guidelines, and we are currently allowed to accept 10 percent of over income children into the program. What we would like the administration to do is to increase that to 25 percent. It would give us the flexibility especially in our rural programs, and especially since Iowa is on the forefront of welfare reform. We have many, many families in the family investment program that simply need to have their children in a quality education program so they can work.

Senator HARKIN. Ellen was just saying that because of the FIP program they have gone back to work, but they are still poor, they are only making a few dollars over the income guidelines.

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Yes, they are the parents that are making less than $10 an hour that hope to send their children to college some day and they would like to see their children start off where they could go to kindergarten ready to learn.

Senator HARKIN. And again, I had hoped through my amendment, which was adopted, to fully fund the Head Start Program, and began to rachet up the Early Start Program, we just got the budget from the administration, the budget provides $6.325 billion. That represents an $125 million increase over last year. That compares to about a billion dollar increase last year. And I know the Head Start Program had been advocating at least $7.2 billion, which would be about another billion dollars over last year.

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Yes, essentially we received over $931 million.

Senator HARKIN. Is that what it was last year?

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Yes.

Senator HARKIN. The budget also eliminates funding for the Early Learning fund. This budget that was just sent down eliminates the money for that. So we have a battle on our hands just trying to get that money back in there.

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Well, I think what early reading research taught us was that 3- and 4-year-olds are almost too late

in the course. So we have to start when parents bring that child home from the hospital when it's born.

We have to start to do it when their brains are ready to be stimulated, and that is at birth, not at 3 or 4.

Senator HARKIN. I'm going to tell you the story that I keep telling. I've been telling it for 11 years, that's how old it is. In 1990 I was the Chair of this committee. In 1985 then President Reagan had commissioned a study of education about what do we need in education, and he didn't want a bunch of soft-headed social thinkers and stuff, he wanted hard-headed business people to get together the leaders of industry to decide what we needed to do about education in American. And the head of that was Jim Renier, who was then the CEO of Honeywell in Minneapolis. Well, this commission met and met and met, and met and then President Reagan left office and President Bush comes in. And they finally finished all of their hearings and their witnesses and their studies. And keep in mind these are the corporate leaders of America, not the soft-headed social thinkers.

And Mr. Renier walks into my office, I'd never met him before, walked into my office because I was now chairman of this committee, and he gave me this report. And the executive summary, the first part, the little executive summary part said the following: "We must understand that education begins at birth and the preparation for education begins before birth." And the whole study, 11 years old, was talking about how we need to make sure that we have a healthy start for kids, we have maternal child health care programs for mothers so they have healthy babies, that we have nutrition programs, at the earliest stages. This was corporate American saying this. And we still for some reason can't quite get it through our thick skulls that we have to put more emphasis on as you said, when they bring that child home from the hospital. And it would just save us so much later on down the road if we'd do that. Because we know—we know from all of the studies how much a child learns in those early years and what they can absorb and we just have not focused on that enough.

So I'm personally upset about what is happening in Head Start. I think we need better training and requirements for Head Start teachers. We need better support for the Early Start, and I'm talking about 0 to 3. Now, that is going to require an investment of money. But I think that we have to do it. Anyway, I didn't mean to get off on that, but I just hope we can overcome the budget requests that we have here and get more money in for this year.

Ms. WETJEN-KESTERSON. Those are also really good reasons for leaving Head Start within the Department of Health and Human Services, Senator Harkin. We believe if Head Start is left within the Department of Health and Human Services it will stay the holistic program that it is. It will not focus primarily on education. Education is only one piece of a child being ready for school. That child also has to be socially ready for school, the parents have to be ready to support that child entering school.

Senator HARKIN. Very true. Well, on student financial aid, Lois, again, the same thing that Dr. Koob was saying, we need to get our Pell grant funding up. Once in a while I hear the comment, "Why should we just give this money to them?" Well, you know, we gave

the money to the GI bill. I went to school with the GI bill, and so many of my co-workers went to school with the GI bill, and we never asked them to pay the money back because we knew it would be returned in tax returns. And later on we could just earn more money. And I think that is really the basis, and to allow these kids to go to college, close that social economic gap as you stated. So I thank you for your testimony on that.

Ms. DANDEKAR. Senator, may I ask you something?

Senator HARKIN. Yes.

Ms. DANDEKAR. I didn't talk about it but in regards to special education, we would like to have full funding from Federal Government because we see about 12 to 15 percent.

Senator HARKIN. It's about 17 percent right now.

Ms. DANDEKAR. Yeah, for special ed. And I thought we were supposed to get 40 percent.

Senator HARKIN. When the IDEA was passed in 1975 there was a commitment by the Federal Government that we would pay up to 40 percent of the average cost.

Ms. DANDEKAR. Right.

Senator HARKIN. And we are about 17 percent right now.

Ms. DANDEKAR. And right now, just when I look at Linn-Mar school, we have to fund $385,256 from property tax. And not all school districts can come up with that kind of money. And I'm sure that Cedar Rapids Community Schools must pay a lot more. I think it's millions for Cedar Rapids Community Schools.

Senator HARKIN. And that is why I offered this amendment to try to get our funding for special ed up to a 40 percent level. We will try it again this year. I was reading the paper this morning, the Cedar Rapids Gazette, there was an article that the chairman of the House Budget Committee was saying that we need to fully fund IDEA. Well, he is the Budget chairman. All he has to do is write it in there.

If they put it in there, school districts will get their money. That is all there is to it. Listen, thank you all very much for taking your time and thank you for your leadership in all of the aspects of our children's education here in the State of Iowa. Thank you.

I would like to now open it for any statements from the floor. If you have written ones we will accept those. If you want to make just a verbal statement, that would be fine too. And we have a microphone, and as I said, please identify yourself. I have here that Nancy Wright, Central College TRIO would like to make a statement. You can either sit at the table or stand at the mike, whatever you prefer. Is this Nancy Wright?

Ms. WRIGHT. Yes, it is. Hopefully my knees aren't shaking too much and I will be okay if I stand here.

Senator HARKIN. All right. Don't worry about it. Go right ahead.

Ms. WRIGHT. Good morning, Senator Harkin, I'm very happy to be here. And I'm the educational talent search director and GEARUP director at Central College and was very happy to hear Dr. Koob this morning talk about TRIO and GEARUP at University of Northern Iowa. They are also a great TRIO community up there. And as you know, Educational Talent Search is part of the TRIO umbrella which is funded under Title IV of Higher Education Act Programs like Upward Bound, Student Support Services, Edu-

cational Opportunities Program, McNear Programs, and so our programs are serving basically sixth grade students all the way through graduate students in higher education. So it's a large population. Currently there are over 2,400 TRIO programs across the Nation, and we are serving almost 750,000 students nationwide. Here in Iowa we have 44 TRIO programs.

Senator HARKIN. 44?

Ms. WRIGHT. Yes, 44 programs at 20 different institutions of higher education. And we are serving 14,230 students here in Iowa.

I was also interested to hear other comments from your other presenters this morning. The Head Start students that you were talking about, the 3- and 4-year-olds are exactly the same kids that we are talking with when they get to the sixth grade. And what we are doing is providing the services that those students need to be successful in middle school and high school and in college. And the financial aid piece that you heard about this morning is also very important because the low income students that we are serving, we are serving families at 150 percent of poverty level. And right now, nationwide, we are only serving 6 percent of eligible families. Only 6 percent nationwide.

Senator HARKIN. You are talking about in the TRIO program?

Ms. WRIGHT. In the TRIO program, exactly. And if you think about how that translates here in the State of Iowa with our students, if you take that 6 percent, we are basically not serving over 237,000 students, if we use that same percentage rate that are not receiving our services. Students that should be coming through the Head Start program or could be coming through other programs that aren't receiving the tutoring, the mentoring, the supportive services, academical and personal counseling and those kinds of things so that they can be successful and receive the financial aid to go on to college and then continue to be successful academically there. So the things that we are providing are essential pieces of all the things that we have already heard about this morning.

I want to tell you a real quick story about one of our students that we are serving with our program. Her name is Amy and she is from Albia High School. She is a senior this year and we are very happy that we have been able to work with her because she was on the cheerleading squad and in 1999 she had an accident and suffered severe head trauma. She was not able to even go back to school the next semester of her sophomore year. She had to be at home. Her mother is a single parent, probably one of these families that is making less than $10 an hour and wasn't able to cover the hospital bills as well as being worried about her academically and keeping up with her classes and that type of thing. And fortunately, Amy was part of our talent search program. So with the help of the guidance counselor at Albia High School we set up a tutoring program at home where talent search was provided for her to keep up with her classes. And this May she will be graduating with her classmates and then going on to Northwest Missouri State to study education. And so it's stories like that over and over again, where we have all of these students that we are working with who have the American dream that we have all been talking about this morning and helping to make that possible for these kids. And that is what our TRIO programs are all about.

Personally, I grew up maybe 5 miles from here and attended Cedar Rapids Prairie High School and grew up in a low income, first generation family. I was lucky enough to have very supportive parents who told me I didn't have a choice, I had to go to college. Actually, they are here this morning and they are very wonderful people. But my senior year of high school I was in track and field as a student and I won the 400 meters at a track meet. And I think of TRIO in the sense of we are running this race to meet the needs of students. And when I was running I would never stop and look back and say, "Wow, look at how far I've come. I'm doing a great job." I was always looking toward the finish line, looking toward winning this race. And I think what we are trying to do with this Leave No Child Behind, we are trying to fully fund these programs and win this race and make the American Dream possible for all of these low income families here in Iowa and across the Nation. And TRIO needs to be a part of that. So we would appreciate your help in helping fund TRIO at an increase of $150 million for this next year so that we can serve a few more students so that we can help these kids go on to college.

Senator HARKIN. Well said. Thank you very, very much.

All right. I'm just told, Nancy, that in the present budget there is an increase of $50 million for the TRIO program, and you were saying that we need at least $150 million?

Ms. WRIGHT. Exactly.

Senator HARKIN. Well, we will try to get it up. I was told Joanne Lane, Child Care Resource and Referral from Waterloo. Joanne? Hello, Joanne. How are you?

Ms. LANE. I'm fine. I am Joanne Lane from Waterloo. And speaking as the director of Child Care Resource and Referral for a service area that is 20 counties of northeast Iowa. We thank you for your support and for the opportunity to speak to you this morning. But every day our Child Care Resource and Referral counselors are talking to parents who are seeking safe and reliable child care. Over half of those parents are seeking care for an infant or a toddler. And increasingly they are seeking care because they are working weekends and second or third shift. Presently in Iowa we project that the supply of child care that is regulated, either center or home, meet—and is available full-day, full-year, meets about half of the projected need. We heard of our family income levels. We know that an additional 20 percent of that 48 percent is at $7 an hour or less. Thanks to your leadership we have made great strides in meeting these needs through the Child Care Development Block Grant and the quality set aside that is included in that and through our Head Start and Early Head Start. We truly do support your amendment. It should have been at $350 billion—and urge that you include in the legislative assurances for funding for Child Care Resource and Referral programs that are assisting parents in their responsibility to locate and select the best child care possible.

I have prepared these remarks before I read the press release regarding the recent child care study. And if I could share some insight based upon 7 years as a director of a large care center, but also 24 years as the director of a Child Care and Referral Resource agency, and say that I think those results are showing that; No.

1, we have not adequately invested in the quality of early care and education. And child care is early education whether it's quality or not; and No. 2, that we need to do more in parent consumer education, because we know that parents, when they don't know the choices are available to them, will make hasty decisions that will result in frequent changes of the caregiver leading to an inconsistency for the child that leads to the instability of the behavior problems that manifest themselves, and truly when they hit kindergarten are not ready to succeed. Thank you very much.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much, Joanne. I appreciate it very much.

We are going to put some more money into the Child Care Development Block Grant. How much, I don't know. The budget includes $400 million for a new after school program. They put $400 million in there and then cut $200 million of the funds that are available for younger kids. Is that right?

UNKNOWN AUDIENCE MEMBER. It was kind of an even trade? No.

Senator HARKIN. Any other statements that somebody might want to make? Take the mike and identify yourself for the reporter.

STATEMENT OF DAN STICE

Mr. STICE. My name is Dan Stice.

Senator HARKIN. Will you spell that last name?

Mr. STICE. S-t-i-c-e. Like slice with a T.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you, Dan.

Mr. STICE. I don't want to detract from these other people, these people that are prepared, but I don't see how I could argue with anything that has been said, but I want to make one comment. We are looking at the trees. Where is the forest? The forest is good jobs. That is what gets jobs above $10. And very few people create those good jobs. There is a man here in Cedar Rapids that did a lot, Collins. He is gone now. Rockwell didn't do a thing. You have to go to Oshkosh, Wisconsin to claim where Rockwell started. You need very few, and college is not the answer. Bill Gates didn't graduate from college. What the answer is, somebody starts something and it does something and it grows. And as a businessman, Iowa makes some very poor business decisions because we spend all of this money that you are talking about and want to spend more, and what are we doing it for? The benefit of everybody else around us because we are exporting our talent, particularly the ones like Collins.

Senator HARKIN. I just might add that even—I guess Bill Gates didn't graduate from college; is that right? He didn't graduate from college, but I can tell you that the people he hires that makes his money for him are all of the most brilliant students in America that graduated with the highest grades from our schools. So, I mean, it's one thing to be an entrepreneur, it's another thing to understand, as one of my early mentors said, "To be a success in life, never be afraid to hire people smarter than yourself." And that is what Bill Gates had done.

STATEMENT OF JOHN HIERONYMUS

Mr. HIERONYMUS. My name is John Hieronymus. H-i-e-r-o-n-y-m-u-s. I am a high school math teacher in Iowa City and I'm currently vice president of the Iowa State Education Association.

I just want to commend you on what it is you are trying to do. I think that the list that you have of Federal programs indicates the very best programs that have been achieved in education. They represent things that we know work. And the only thing that has been short in those programs has been funding. And what you are going to do with this amendment provides at least a large uplift in the kind of funding that we need for education from early childhood on through college.

I think what is important to understand is that this does not represent additional Federal intrusion in any way in our schools. Those are programs that already exist, we know they work, and what you are proposing is to actually give them the funding that they need in order to advance. I want to talk about a couple in particular, IDEA, we did a lot of studying of IDEA after the last set of amendments passed and we did what we could to educate our professionals in the State of Iowa about those changes. The only thing that we are lacking at this point is really getting those guidelines implemented is the professional development. And from this amendment that you are proposing, I expect a lot of that professional development would go towards helping our professionals understand better how to deal with students that are the recipients of IDEA.

Class size reduction, when I had talked to you a few years ago and the class size reduction bill came through, I told you that Iowa too added to that, that we have had a class size reduction program. We have increased funding for it. Unfortunately, this year they are now talking about reducing that program by $30 million. Very unfortunate. It's going to make a negative impact in our schools. But hopefully what you are trying to do with the Federal program will help bolster that.

Since I have such limited time, I would like to point out one other thing and that is, bills cross all of these programs. I'm constantly reminded as I read the newspaper about some of the programs and what politicians are saying about we will get there eventually, is that they don't seem to understand that the children that we have right now will only be children for a brief period of time. As they talk about putting programs in eventually, those children are already gone. They are lost to the programs, they haven't been able to take advantage of it. So I guess that is why I would emphasize the immediancy of this. The sooner we can act on these programs and bolstering them the better for the children that are in need right now. Thank you very much.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you, John, very much.

Just identify yourself for the reporter.

STATEMENT OF WENDY VODENHOFER

Ms. VODENHOFER. My name is Wendy Vodenhofer. V-o-d-e-n-h-o-f-e-r. I'm from Oxford Junction.

Senator Harkin, I would like to start by thanking you for your commitment to education. I just want to share with you today some

of the benefits that I have had through funding at Kirkwood. I get the Federal Pell Grant, the Work Study, the SEOG Grant, and without it it would have been impossible for me to go to Kirkwood. I also have $10,000 in student loans.

Senator HARKIN. What year are you in now?

Ms. VODENHOFER. Pardon?

Senator HARKIN. What year are you in school?

Ms. VODENHOFER. I will graduate after this summer with ASN, legal office administration. I'm also a past Head Start student and I have a son in Head Start, so I'm an example of how all of this funding can really benefit somebody. I feel that I'm going to give it back to the community in the future. So it's worth it.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much.

Have you met Tammy? Do you two know each other?

STATEMENT OF JAMIE KNIGHT

Ms. KNIGHT. Senator Harkin, my name is Jamie Knight. K-n-i-g-h-t. I just wanted to take this opportunity to share with you what Head Start has done for me. And it's actually Early Head Start. I'm the parent of an Early Head Start child, and I'm currently working towards a degree in chiropractic. I was using Child Care Resource and Referral to find quality day care for my daughter and thought I had found what was a good place for her and later found out about Early Head Start and was lucky enough to get one of the spots with the brand new expansion that was happening down in Davenport, Iowa.

The first day that I went to pick up my child she didn't want to come home. She was so happy and so stimulated by that environment that it made me cry. It made me sad that I hadn't been able to find that kind of quality before that. And for the funding to go down and not support what is already in place, let alone not support any expansion, would be sad. And so I really feel great that you are working further to get the funding that is needed to continue with a very quality and wonderful program.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you for that brief point in person.

STATEMENT OF NANCY PORTER

Ms. PORTER. Senator Harkin, my name is Nancy Porter, I'm a—P-o-r-t-e-r. I'm a Title I teacher from the Iowa City Community School District. And I want to thank all of the previous speakers for their points and remarks and Dr. Koob with his reiteration that Iowa remains number one in education, and this room full of people is an example. We have the resources, we have the intelligence, we have the background and training because of our educational system. And Mr. Stilwell, your comments too on reinforcing Senator Harkin's wonderful job in the Senate and fighting for education. I appreciate it and all of the students that I have had through the years appreciate it, they just don't always know it.

I could comment on a lot of things because I have had experience in just about every area that has been spoken to this morning. But I would like to mention two things: Every once in a while there seems to be those people out there that don't understand what our educational system does for us. And they attack some of the programs that are working so well. And as a Title I teacher in the Iowa City Community School District, I'm also a Reading Recovery

trained teacher, so two of the items I would like to speak on is; No. 1, professional development; and No. 2, the, "replacement of the family unit," via the school system.

No. 1, as a Reading Recovery, Title I teacher I have had extensive training in the strategy for teaching reading and I have worked with students for years. But nothing satisfies the self esteem need, the ability to move ahead like learning to read in first grade. And that is what I'm able to do. I'm able to teach those students how to read in first grade with the help of their parents and the classroom teacher we all team together. This is one area of professional development that teachers often are slighted. They don't have the time to interact with each other, we don't have the time to look at the programs that work, and we need that interaction, we need that time and we need to look at the strategies and programs that work. And they are there and they are here in Iowa, and we are working in Iowa City with many of them. So feel free to call on us and we will show you how it works.

No. 2, I'm also fortunate to work in a building where our building is part of the community, even though it's part of the Iowa City Community School District. It's a small school 8 miles south of Iowa City. It's Hills Elementary. And our building is open early in the morning with a wrap around program, preschool as well as daycare for students whose parents work early hours, we are open from 7 a.m. to approximately 6 p.m. Our building has two programs after school from the 2001 grant monies. We have an after school tutoring program, we have an after school program that just concentrates on reading, we have a family resource center that is open every Tuesday night where parents come in and enjoy the space of the building and are often taking part in learning programs presented by staff members while their children are involved in activities in the building. Every Wednesday night the building is open just for adolescents allowing them to come to the building unsupervised by their parents but supervised by staff members so they have a place to congregate and interact with each other. So we try our best.

Senator HARKIN. Is your building hooked up to the ICN?

Ms. PORTER. No, it's not. But there is always room for improvements; right? But regardless, we do have a lot of things going on in our public schools that are positive and reflect the needs of our community. And thank you, Senator Harkin, for maintaining those funds.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much. I appreciate your statement. My time has run out. The last two statement here.

STATEMENT OF MICKEY DUNN

Ms. DUNN. I will make them brief. I'm Mickey Dunn, I'm from Center Point. D-u-n-n. I teach too at Center Point and I'm also Reading Recovery and all that stuff. My story is an older story about how the Department of Human Services and how funding for kids can really, really, really make a different in our economy. I married too young, I had a child too young. I qualified for him to go to Head Start. I was able to go on ADC and go back to school and get my BA in reading. And I taught for 5 years and I went back and got my master's degree. And when my son was 19, he was

a freshman in school at Kirkwood, and he was injured and is quadriplegic and is now on SSA and has a trust fund in place and has just graduated a year and a half ago from the University of Iowa with a BA in psychology. He is currently working. Those programs, that funding is making an impact in taxes. Because I now have a master's degree, I'm fully employed, I have done adjunct teaching at UNI. If I had not had the scholarships and grants that I got to go back to school, if I had not been funded through ADC to get back to school, I would still be working for $2 and—what, it's probably more than that. It was $2.10 then. I would probably be working for $10 an hour.

Senator HARKIN. Great story.

That's the kind of personal stories that more and more policy makers need to hear. These are not obtuse kinds of things that we are talking about. I know we always talk about program this, a program is a program, but these manifest themselves in real peoples' lives and how people live, what we are able to do. Yes?

STATEMENT OF RON FIELDER

Mr. FIELDER. I will try to be brief, Senator. Thank you for being the Nation's premier champion for students with disabilities.

Thank you for your recent——

Senator HARKIN. For the record, please——

Mr. FIELDER. Yes. Ron Fielder, administrator of Grantwood Area Education Agency. That's F-i-e-l-d-e-r, as in left, right or center.

Thank you for your recent efforts to increase IDEA funding. And rumor has it that you and your staff have been your typical, effective and tenacious advocates in the last month on the full funding provisions also, so we thank you for that.

Public education is in serious trouble in Iowa, primarily because of the effects of 5 years of—5 straight years of tax cuts that are literally taking $800 million out of our budget. As of last week, students with disabilities began to be targeted for some of those cuts in this State. I would just ask that as you deal with the policy issues around the pending IDEA legislation that you make sure that the supplanting issues are appropriate to prevent us from—this State and other States from replacing State dollars with Federal dollars, which I hope you are targeting to help us expand capacity and to reduce the local district tax burden and budgets. And I would say probably in States other than this, that is a danger if those supplanting policy aspects are not included in legislation.

Senator HARKIN. You are right, Ron. You are absolutely right on that. And we are going to make sure that that does not happen. What Ron is talking about is as we put more money in then the State takes money out. So you are sort of left without the increases that we need in helping students with disabilities. We have come a long way—Well, I want to thank everyone for being here. I want to thank the witnesses who were scheduled and those of you who gave personal testimony this morning here.

I want to wrap up the hearing by saying that it's a matter of priorities. We really have to think about our priorities. When you say two cents out of every Federal dollar goes towards education, that says something about our priorities.

Now, I know that education for most of the history in this country has been local and State funded. I have for many years been going around talking about education in this way: I keep asking people, where does it say in the Constitution of the United States that education is to be funded by property taxes? You won't find it anywhere. But that is basically the system that grew up, is that we fund education on the basis of property taxes. And the reason for that is when we first as a Nation committed ourselves to a more general public education, which in the beginning was white males, but then got more inclusive later on, we did not have an income tax system and all we had was property taxes and tariffs. So we used that as the basis of funding the public education system in America. And that is just how it grew up. The first Federal involvement in education was the Morrell Act in 1852. And that was quite a giant step. And that began the focus of the Federal effort toward higher education. So for probably over 100 years the sole focus of the Federal involvement in education was in higher education. The GI bill, land grants, research institutions, things like that, all focused toward higher education. Then later with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act in 1965, the Federal Government began to be involved more in supporting elementary and secondary education.

The genius, I think, in the American education system has been in its local control and the sort of local and State involvement in experimentation in education. I have been to a lot of different countries where they have this top down education system that does not provide for much innovation and experimentation. And it's kind of a stifling system. In America we have had spurting of new ideas and experimentation at the local and State levels. That has been the genius, I think, for American education. The failure of American education has been the lack of proper funding for education.

So I'm hopeful that we can understand that. With the movement of Americans from job to job and from State to State, that a child who is ill-educated in one State won't be just a burden in only that State, but that child could be a burden in some other State. We are one Nation and we have to look upon this as a national effort. And in no way do I mean to take away the genius of American education which has been the local experimentation and implementation of different methods and methodologies of teaching. But I do believe it needs better financial support from us as a Nation. And that is why I push hard for things like IDEA. As the author of the Americans with Disabilities Act and as one who has been involved in IDEA since I first came to Congress in 1975, we have come a long way in our thinking about the education of people with disabilities, and we have become a better country for it. But then again, to put all of that burden on a local school district, and to put that burden on a teacher in a classroom is unfair. Because the teacher may not have the requisite of skills. The teacher is dealing with 20—hopefully 18 students—more likely 25 students, and then you add one or two with special needs and with disabilities and the teacher all of a sudden gets on overload. So that teacher needs more help in the classroom to handle and to deal with these special needs students. And that is again where the Federal Government comes in. And lastly, the Federal Government should be coming in

with funds to rebuild and renovate and build our schools all over America and to bring them into the 21st century.

So again, I must say that as a U.S. Senator I do have a national obligation. My obligation is nationwide in terms of education. But I'm also a U.S. Senator from the State of Iowa and my first obligation is to my constituents in this State. And I'm very concerned about what is happening in Iowa in education. I'm concerned that we in this State may be on a downward spiral of accepting ever lower and lower standards of what is the best. We always pride ourselves on being the best in Iowa. For a long time we were. But if we look in the mirror and are really honest with ourselves, we are no longer there. We can say we are, but we are not. And we can't just accept that and say, "Well, we are okay." And then next year it will be down a little more and we will say, "Well, that's okay." And that is what I'm afraid of happening. And I know Ted is very concerned about that too, about accepting ever and ever lower levels of what we accept as the best in the State of Iowa.

And lastly, a couple of people mentioned this, aside from all of the other aspects of education, if we just want to get down to hardheaded, hard-nosed economics, if we want to really promote economic development in the State of Iowa, let's focus on education. We should make Iowa sort of the mecca of educational development in the United States. I have often said, we don't have beaches, we don't have mountains, and we don't go skiing—well, not really in Iowa—and we don't have all those kinds of things that attract people or industries to this State, but if we have, and I mean really have the best educational system in American, I mean everywhere from preschool, elementary, secondary, with the best support for every student who wants to go to college in this State and with the grants that they need to go to college, if we have the underpinning of all these things like TRIO and others, people will come here. People will want to live here. They will give up the beaches, they'll give up the mountains to make sure that their kids have the best possible education in America.

I'm hopeful that my State representative and my State senator that represents me in the legislature think that way, think about looking upon this as investing in economic development in the State of Iowa. I mean, in the past we have thought about, oh, give tax breaks to businesses that want to come into Iowa. Okay. As far as that goes. But I don't know that that has really panned out that well. I think that, again, businesses will come here, as I said—based on what I said before. And I think we have to be looking upon education aside from the social aspects of it, just look upon it as hardheaded economics. If we want to grow in the State of Iowa, that is the way to do it.

Well, I will get off my soap box here. I just want to thank Kirkwood and I want to thank Steve Ovel for helping us arrange this hearing this morning. We will now recess and move on to Clear Lake. So again, I thank you for being here, and please continue to e-mail me or write any thoughts, suggestions, advice, consultations you have on education matters. My door is always open. And I do not have a closed mind on this. I'm always looking for new ideas and suggestions on ways to improve education.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Thank you very much, that concludes the hearing. The subcommittee will stand in recess until 3:30 p.m., Saturday, April 21, when we will meet in the E.B. Stillman auditorium, Clear Lake Middle School, Clear Lake, IA.

[Whereupon, at 10:30 a.m., Saturday, April 21, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 3:30 p.m., the same day.]

IMPACT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION BUDGET ON IOWA SCHOOLS

SATURDAY, APRIL 21, 2001

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR, HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES, AND EDUCATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Clear Lake, IA.

The subcommittee met at 3:30 p.m., at E.B. Stillman Auditorium, Clear Lake Middle School, Clear Lake, IA, Senator Tom Harkin presiding.

Present: Senator Harkin.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR TOM HARKIN

Senator HARKIN. The hearing of the Appropriations Committee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education will come to order in Clear Lake, IA.

For the benefit of the audience who is here, and others, our witnesses, this is an official hearing of the Senate Appropriations Committee, more specifically, of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies.

The purpose of this hearing, and the one we had this morning in Cedar Rapids, and this one here this afternoon, is to gain some testimony from our witnesses regarding their views and information and suggestions on the state of education and the balance between the budget and what we are doing on the budget in Washington and how that is going to affect education here in the State of Iowa.

I am also going to ask, is there anyone here in the audience who needs interpretive services?

I will ask it once more. Is there anyone here—please raise your hand if you need an interpreter.

Ms. FOWLER. I do not see anyone.

Senator HARKIN. Well, if not, then we will let Donna Fowler relax.

Ms. FOWLER. Thank you.

Senator HARKIN. Let me, first of all, thank our Clear Lake school officials: Mike Teigland, the superintendent; Bob Mondt, the principal of our Clear Lake Middle School; and Nick DiMarco, a teacher at Clear Lake Middle School, for all their help in helping set this up.

I am told we have—I cannot see too well. I am told we have one county official here, the Cerro Gordo County treasurer, Mike Grandon.

Where is Mike?

Ms. MURRAY. Right there.

Senator HARKIN. Where is he?

Ms. MURRAY. Right there.

Senator HARKIN. I cannot see anything. Yes.

Hi, Mike.

Mr. GRANDON. Hi.

Senator HARKIN. You are sitting in the dark back there. Hi, Mike.

And we will have the testimony of the witnesses. And then when we finish, I have a mike, I think, a roving mike someplace that I will ask for any statements or comments from members of the audience.

I only ask that when you give a statement, or whatever, that you, for the benefit of our recorder, that you give your name and spell it. If it is more difficult than Jones, please spell it out for the reporter.

Before I get to our witnesses, I will just make a short opening statement.

Our country was founded on an ideal that no matter who you are or what the circumstances of your birth, that if you are willing to study and learn and work hard, you could be a success.

That is the American dream. But unfortunately for too many, it is slipping away. With overcrowded classrooms, our students—and because of a lack of educational opportunities, a lot of kids do not have the opportunities that we once had.

Now, for a long time we have been nibbling around the edges on this. We have tweaked a program or two here, we adjust a little funding here and there, but we have not made a real dent in real education reform for the 21st century.

I always like—every time I have speaking engagements, I talk a lot about education. I always ask people if they can tell me how much of every Federal dollar is spent on education. Because, you see, budgets talk about priorities.

What are your priorities? You have got so much money to spend. How you spend it says a lot about what our priorities are.

So for every dollar that the Federal Government spends of your hard-earned tax money, I always ask people if they know how much goes to education. And I always get various answers.

I hear 7 cents and 10 cents. The correct answer is 2 cents. Two cents of every Federal tax dollar goes for education. That just simply is not enough.

Earlier this month we had a debate on our budget in the Senate. And my view on this was that we should use our proposed surpluses, which we do not really have yet, but we should use our surpluses to do two things: Pay down the debt and invest in education.

I offered an amendment to that effect. I called it the Leave No Child Behind amendment, which would have invested $250 billion of the proposed tax cut in education over the next 10 years.

That $250 billion, I know, sounds like a lot of money. It is. But keep in mind, it is only one-half of the amount of the tax benefits

that would go to the top 1 percent of the richest Americans. Only one-half of that would be able to give us the $250 billion.

Well, that means that we could fully fund the Head Start program. We could continue to reduce class sizes down to no more than 18 in grades one through three. We could repair and rebuild our school buildings.

We could fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. We could double the funding for Title I reading and math. We could increase the funding for Pell Grants, and have more skilled workers by investing $10 billion in job training.

The President said that we want to leave no child behind. I agree with that philosophy. But we have to work, again, with the budget.

The budget has a $1.6 trillion tax cut, but only $21.3 billion for education. So the tax cuts are 76 times greater than the investment that we would have for education. So again, we have to ask the question of whether or not these are the right priorities.

So again, today we are holding two hearings in Iowa to examine the impact of the national education budget on Iowa children and schools.

Again, we have heard testimony this morning and we will hear testimony this afternoon from the real experts: Students, parents, teachers, school administrators, school board members, financial aid directors, and college presidents.

We'll learn more about the important role that various Federal programs play in helping all Iowans. So I want to thank you all for coming and participating in this important hearing.

As I said, at the conclusion of the panel, I will open it up for questions and statements from the audience.

Our panel of witnesses this afternoon, we will start first, again, with Dr. David Buettner, the president of the North Iowa Area Community College. He has served as president since July of 1981. Dr. Buettner graduated from Southern Illinois University, got his master's degree from the University of Illinois, and his Ph.D. from Ohio State University.

Dr. Buettner served as campus president at Southeast Community College in Lincoln, Nebraska, before coming to North Iowa Area Community College.

And, Dr. Buettner, welcome.

And for all of the witnesses, your prepared statements will be made a part of the record. I would ask that you just summarize those statements and make the major points.

Dr. Buettner.

STATEMENT OF DR. DAVID BUETTNER, PRESIDENT, NORTH IOWA AREA COMMUNITY COLLEGE

Dr. BUETTNER. Thank you, Senator Harkin. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the impact of the national budget on our college and our students and our constituents.

As you know, NIACC enrolls about 2,800 credit students each year in a wide array of transfer and career preparation programs. And I know that you know quite a bit about our extensive involvement in secondary education in the region.

A lot of people do not realize that NIACC and the school districts of North Iowa partner to provide vocational education and early college opportunities in a widening array of subjects.

Just this semester, 625 students are involved in tech prep or early college opportunity programs while still in high school. Working with almost every employer in the region, we also deliver an enormous amount of training and retraining for workers.

We have a new partnership with the Iowa Workforce Development Department, of which we are very proud. We feel that we have had tremendous success in helping people move off the welfare rolls and regain employment.

The National Education Budget does affect—does support all of these endeavors and promises to affect each of them.

I'd like to just take each one, if I could, for a moment.

Senator HARKIN. Absolutely.

Dr. BUETTNER. In the vocational education area, tech prep funding through the Perkins legislation is the primary resource that we have used to create the partnerships throughout North Iowa.

We have made significant gains. We have programs in about two-thirds of the school districts throughout the region. And we have covered about 75 percent of the occupational areas we'd like to cover at some point.

Unfortunately, President Bush's budget calls for no new money for Perkins block grants and proposes zeroing out the demonstration grant for tech prep. And, of course, we're particularly concerned about that.

As popular as our tech prep and our early college programs are, they are probably among the most precariously funded and supported programs we offer. Over 90 percent of the students in those programs eventually wind up in college programs on campus for a second year of study.

We have talked so much about the need to lower the cost of higher education and reform higher education, without claiming that we envisioned all of this from the beginning, we now realize that our tech prep program and our early college opportunity program does, in fact, shorten the time period required and significantly lower the cost to families for the higher education.

People can now—young people can now enroll in vocational education programs and early college programs while still in high school and essentially complete up to the first full year, with the support of college and the local school districts, using, to a great extent, Federal funds Perkins and tech prep which we pool with the local schools.

So when a young person shows up at NIACC's doorstep as a high school graduate, first of all, they have completed a full year of college, in some cases, and second, the college and the school district and the State of Iowa, the Federal Government have paid for that first year.

So we have, in fact, figured out a way to lower the cost and the time required to complete a baccalaureate degree or vocational education program. I really believe these programs are absolutely key to helping young people thrive in the decades ahead.

Just in my lifetime I have witnessed almost a complete erosion of means for a person without exceptional skills to earn a good liv-

ing. I am not sure I am saying that very well. But there was a time when a person could find a good wage earning job that provided the avenue to a comfortable lifestyle.

Today that is not the case. The only real avenue to a comfortable lifestyle today is high skills. And these programs are really instrumental.

Let me move on and talk just a bit about workforce development. They have always told me not to take all the bolts out of the rudder at once. But we have practically done that with the workforce development system in Iowa.

We have completely disassembled it and reassembled it. The Workforce Investment Act is a complete overhaul of a system that needed a complete overhaul. And I am really proud of the progress we have been able to make.

We now have a One Stop Center that we operate in partnership with the Iowa Workforce Development Department. And that center is, in fact, serving the needs of clients with multiple problems, multiple agency needs. And it is working.

In the past, people would sometimes find their way through that maze. In many cases they would not. I am really proud of what we have been able to do there. We do have some growing pains there. And I am hopeful that somewhere in the upcoming session that we could find a way to do some refining of the system.

The Training Provider Certification has been a bit of a burden for all of us. We are so scrutinized and we spend so much time proving to everyone that the programs that we offer are effective and successful that sometimes I think we could skip one of those steps and probably not put anyone at great risk.

Also, some of the funding commitments for spending under the WIA, Workforce Investment Act, is low at this time. And I am concerned that that might indicate or hint at an opportunity for some cutback in support.

I think that probably would be a mistake because, frankly, it is taken us a while to bring these programs up to speed and really get them rolling. And we are making commitments to clients to support them.

And while those funds have not yet been expended, those commitments are there. And I am concerned that we do not blink at this point. I think we have a good system. And I'd like to see it improved.

The Workforce Investment Act requires people to use the Pell Grant money to pay tuition and does not allow the Workforce Investment Act funds to do that.

Under the old program, the JTPA program, people would use JTPA funds to pay tuition, and the Pell Grant was used to help pay living expenses. It was a more workable system for people who needed complete support.

I encourage you to go back and take a look at some of those strategies and see if we could make some refinements in the Workforce Investment Act.

I'd like to comment a little bit about financial aid. You commented on the American dream a minute ago. I remember, when I first went to college, my first quarter tuition for a full-time student at Southern Illinois University was $28.

I think it was $44 shortly thereafter. So it was a terrible increase in price. I know NIACC sends bills to students every semester now in the neighborhood of $1,200 to $1,300.

That is quite a difference. Consider, if you would, the contrast between my era where I watched people benefit from the GI bill where we provided them a free education and encouraged them to do good.

Today we have young people graduating from college with loan deficits, loan balances of $15,000, $20,000 and even $30,000. Recent improvements in the Pell Grant have enabled us to reverse the trend of increased loan debt.

NIACC has actually made some progress now in lowering the average loan debt in the last year or so. And for this coming fall, we have a great improvement in Pell Grant support. And we're really excited about that.

I am a little bit concerned that the campaign promises surrounding the Pell Grant might be at risk or a thing of the past.

There was talk of a $5,100 maximum Pell Grant and front loading to help students their first year or two. Those are great ideas and I really hope that we can somehow protect them.

And finally, let me just comment, NIACC is really like a lot of employers, organizations, really, frankly, like all of us, struggling with technology. Our special problem is that it is our job to help people learn about technology. So we really have to try to stay at the cutting edge.

We have to have faculty development programs. We have to somehow keep up with the trends. In the technology area, the equipment needs are just staggering.

The Federal Education Budget includes one program that has the flexibility and the capability to really help schools like ours, and that is the Title III program. This is a terrific program. And it has done terrific things for our college.

In the mid-1980s, we had two Title III grants that were just a phenomenal success. We're competing for new Title III monies as we speak. But I would urge you to try to protect the level of funding, perhaps the future funding for Title III, because it does have the promise to really help schools like ours in the future.

PREPARED STATEMENT

Again, I really appreciate the opportunity to comment, Senator. I'd be more than happy to try to clarify any of this, if I can. My formal comments have been submitted. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF DAVID BUETTNER

INTRODUCTION

Thank you for the opportunity comment on the impact of the National Education Budget on Iowa children and schools. Senator, as you know, NIACC enrolls about 2800 credit students each year in a wide array of college transfer and career preparation programs. And, you know quite a bit about our extensive involvement in secondary education in the region. Many people do not realize that NIACC and the school districts of North Iowa, including Clear Lake, partner to provide vocational education and early college opportunities in a widening array of subjects. Just this semester, 625 high school students are enrolled in Tech Prep or early college courses while still in high school. NIACC is also heavily involved in a wide array of work-

force development endeavors. Working with almost every employer in the region, we deliver an enormous amount of training and retraining throughout the area. And, relatively few people know about our new partnership with the Iowa Workforce Development Department, through which we work with other agencies to help people, who might otherwise languish on the unemployment and welfare rolls, gain or regain work. The National Education Budget affects all of these endeavors and more.

VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Let me begin with Vocational Education and Tech Prep, over which we worry most. NIACC, in cooperation with surrounding schools, offers Tech Prep opportunities on its main campus, at hub sites, and at various local schools. All of the cooperating schools, including the college pool resources to operate these programs. The College, working with the Area Education Agency, provides much of the leadership and logistical support for the program with the aid of Perkins (vocational education) and Tech Prep demonstration funds. This program is very successful and could grow significantly in the years ahead.

Unfortunately, President Bush's budget calls for no new money for Perkins block grants or Tech Prep, which is used by high schools and community colleges to provide vocational/technical training. Let me reiterate, our region, as a result of Perkins and Tech Prep funding, has made significant gains in developing vocational programs which link NIACC's vocational programs to virtually all high schools in our service area. We are especially disheartened to learn that the new Tech Prep budget eliminates funding for "Tech Prep Demonstration Sites" at a Community College. Over 90 percent of our students who participate in a Tech Prep Program while in high school continue with postsecondary education. These are effective and quality programs, requiring continued investments if we are to advance the quality of life of individuals in the state and achieve our workforce and economic development goals.

WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT

The Workforce Investment Act has enabled us to expand and strengthen our partnership with the Iowa Workforce Development Department. Working together, we have created the North Iowa Workforce Development Partnership, combining the former Job Service, local JTPA operation, College Placement, and College economic development promotion efforts under one umbrella. Together, we have created a "One Stop Workforce Development Center" located on South Pierce Avenue in Mason City where we are joined by other agencies, including Vocational Rehabilitation, as we extend our services to clients in a convenient and effective manner. Satellite operations boost the One Stop Center's reach and are located at the College, Forest City, and Charles City.

These efforts are working smoothly and efficiently. Today, clients, who, before, had to find their way literally from one office to the next (and who sometimes did not do so) find closely coordinated services available under one roof. More importantly, services are refined and more effective in addressing clients with multiple needs and issues.

It is important to understand the magnitude of the change that has been engaged. We have essentially redesigned the entire system from the ground up. While we are proud of our progress, it may be too early to judge overall results and too early to project current figures for operation at full scale. In fact, we worry that low expenditures in some aspects of the program may appear to be opportunities to scale back support. In reality, we are likely to see these expenditures move up steadily as we continue to refine and hone our workforce development operations.

SOME GROWING PAINS

I have polled our staff in preparation for this opportunity and have found only a few areas of concern. First, the requirement to have Training Provider Certification has backfired. The good intent to give the client a choice of providers has actually cut down the number of providers because some institutions do not think it worth the data collection and paper work that is needed to have the certification. Participants end up with less choice. And, the training providers are often scrutinized and accredited by other agencies, making the certification process somewhat redundant.

Second, cutting back the funding for WIA is short-sighted. Expenditures are low now, but participants have had funds obligated in order to complete their programs. Participants come on board, and we need a stable funding stream to serve them and to be able to add new clients. The lower funding levels will result in lower enrollments. The program needs time to get off the ground.

Another concern is that, unlike the Job Training Partnership Act, the Workforce Investment Act requires participants to use the Pell Grant for tuition and books. Under JTPA, if a participant showed "financial need," JTPA funds would pay for tuition and books, thus allowing the student to use Pell Grant money for living expenses. Many students need far more financial help than just tuition and books. Most are only able to work part time while attending college and find it a real hardship to pay monthly bills, to say nothing of unforeseen expenses such as car repairs, medical, or pharmacy bills. This impacts our ability to subsidize training for the Adult Program. To qualify, persons must be economically disadvantaged, and, in most cases, they will receive a Pell Grant. Consequently, WIA funds would only be used for child care and/or transportation costs if applicable. Many individuals who need and want retraining are unable to pursue these opportunities because the Pell Grant alone is not enough.

I'm under the impression that it is more difficult to place a client into meaningful training today than it was a few years ago. Efforts to lower costs, score well on simplistic outcome measures, or to excessively scrutinize client or provider qualifications have conspired to reduce the number of participants getting more than the most superficial of services.

I want to continue to argue for a support system which distinguishes between quick fixes and those which may survive the first economic downturn. I know that the College's two-year vocational-technical programs have that kind of power and potential.

FINANCIAL AID

Strong financial aid is what keeps the "American Dream" alive. People still can make something significant of themselves in America even without a substantial financial starting place. That is possible because of the nearly universal access to postsecondary education made possible by community colleges and federal financial aid.

For example, costs to attend NIACC and other higher education institutions this fall are increasing by an unusually large amount, due primarily to the state's budget troubles. But for students who have qualified for a Pell Grant (currently 28 percent of the student body), those costs are manageable. When one considers all financial aid, over 47 percent of our students participate with financial help of some kind.

Next year, that would not be the case if President Bush abandons his Pell Grant campaign pledge, as is rumored. As harmless as annual tuition increases appear to be, they have an insidious effect in the long run. I can't help but note the generational shift that has played out in my lifetime in education. Recall the strategic effect of the GI Bill. Following the GI Bill era, tuitions were low, and the advent of community colleges sustained low-cost access to higher education through the next decades. Through the 80s and 90s, tuitions began to increase substantially, but aid programs grew, too. And, the lion's share of that aid was comprised of grants and scholarships. Today, tuitions are generally high and getting higher. And today, the lion's share of aid is comprised of loans. What a shift in public policy—from the GI Bill to a time where many students graduate with loan balances in excess of $15,000, $20,000 or even $30,000.

Recent increases in support for the Pell Grant Program have promised to reverse this worrisome trend. NIACC, for example, has been able to reduce the average loan balance of its graduates who borrow under the federal financial aid loan program to under $5,000. Without a strong Pell Grant Program, this improvement would not be possible.

Urge the President and the Congress to uphold the campaign pledge of a $5,100 maximum Pell Grant concentrated in the early college years.

STRENGTHENING INSTITUTIONS/TECHNOLOGY

The Title III Program is the backbone of significant innovation at many community colleges. NIACC has benefited greatly from Title III support in the past and is presently competing in the current funding cycle. Today, most institutions are struggling to fulfill their missions related to technology education.

Numerous studies now demonstrate the strong connection between technology, workforce productivity, and overall economic growth.[1] [2] For example, although IT industries still account for a relatively small share of the economy's total output—an

[1] Andrew Whinston, Anitesh Barua, Jay Shutter, Brant Wilson, and Jon Pinnell. *Measuring the Internet Economy.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas, January 2001.

[2] Andrew Whinston, Anitesh Barua, Jay Shutter, Brant Wilson, and Jon Pinnell. *Measuring the Internet Economy.* Austin, Texas: University of Texas, June 6, 2000.

estimated 8.3 percent in 2000—they contributed nearly a third of real U.S. economic growth between 1995 and 1999.[3]

High skill levels are vital in a technology-based and knowledge-intensive economy. Changes associated with rapid technological advances in industry have made continual upgrading of professional and vocational skills an economic necessity. It is exceedingly difficult, but vitally important, for community colleges to keep up with rapid-pace technological advances in business and industry. Yet, if are to meet workforce expectations, adequate instructional equipment, curricula, and staff development must be made available to achieve our goals.

The Title III Program offers the flexibility and resources to address these needs. I urge you to protect and improve this important program.

Thank you, again for the opportunity to offer our views.

Senator HARKIN. Dr. Buettner, thank you very much. And I will get back with some questions for all the panel when we—when we get through the full panel.

Next I would like to introduce Jolene Franken, who is president of the Iowa State Education Association. Jolene has taught elementary school for 30 years, beginning in Sutherland, Spencer, and most recently Denison.

Most of her early elementary experience was in first grade, though the last 5 years she's been involved in the program for talented and gifted students in grades K through 5.

Jolene earned her bachelor's degree from Greenville College in Greenville, Illinois, and her master's degree in elementary education at Northwest Missouri State University.

Jolene, it is good to see you. And thank you for being here today.

STATEMENT OF JOLENE FRANKEN, PRESIDENT, IOWA STATE EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

Ms. FRANKEN. Thank you, Senator. Welcome to the State that educates on the cheap. That is just my own cheap shot.

Recently, I read an editorial in the Omaha World Herald about "temporizing teachers." When discussing the current proposals on teacher pay, the statement is made: "It is not the best plan that could be drafted, but it'll help."

That is happening all too often in Iowa as well. When it comes to funding education, we are just trying to do whatever is doable instead of what really needs to be done. We are not really demanding that issues be faced and that problems be defined and solutions crafted. We expect—accept partial remedies because they are doable.

That kind of an attitude will only lead us into a state of educational mediocrity, not the high-quality education our students deserve and that the students have benefited from for so many years.

I have to say that these statements also describe Federal funding for education, Senator, that is until you started talking about your "Moonshot for Education," which I think is just great. That is the kind of bold initiative we need if we're going to solve the problems facing education today.

Our students deserve no less than the kind of resources and support that was committed to the space race in the early sixties if they are to receive the finest education possible.

---

[3] Patricia Buckley, Sandra Cooke, Donald Dalton, Jesus Dumagan, Gurmukh Gill, David Henry, Susan LaPorte, Sabrina Montes, Dennis Pastore, and Lee Price. *Digital Economy 2000.* Washington, D.C.: Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, June 2000.

And, Senator, your proposal, as I understand it, would bring an additional $244 million in Federal IDEA funding over 5 years in Iowa. That would be greatly appreciated.

A full funding of that act, the Individuals with Disability Education, was only slated to be at 40 percent. That was called full funding, 40 percent, when it was originally drafted. And only recently have we gotten out of single figures of funding it at the Federal level, which is inexcusable.

We need to increase funding for Title I programs and Head Start preschool programs. And these are programs that provide funding for low-income schools and for students.

And everyone knows that children who have a high-quality preschool Title I program perform better when they get to school for their formal education. It is kind of like the farm team prior to the big leagues.

We need to triple the current Federal funding as you've proposed and provide resources for teacher professional development.

Research indicates over and over again, the number one determinant of student achievement and student learning is the quality of the teacher in the classroom. And if we do not do more to help our teachers handle the kinds of situations they have in the classrooms today, we are not going to have high-quality education.

Teachers need high-quality professional development to meet those changing needs for our workforce and our community.

Maintaining the class size reduction program and keeping it on track to recruit the total of 100,000 new teachers is very essential to Iowa.

There is case after case that proves class size is essential to the learning of students. And anyone who's taught 30 students in a classroom versus 20 students in a classroom knows how right I am. You do not get to do very individual types of instruction and you do not get to do hands-on experiential learning that is so important to help children learn.

In order for teachers to do their best, they must know their students' learning needs, their styles, their strengths and their weaknesses. And these things are impossible in a large classroom.

Teachers are being expected to do more and more, be more and more accountable for things they have absolutely no control over. We cannot work miracles in 7 hours a day when students go home to another 17 hours of environment that negates everything we have tried to do during the day.

You may be familiar what the legislature's contemplating doing this year, of cutting our class size legislation here in the State as well as our technology money. So the Federal money will be even more important.

There is no precedent for the violence, drugs, broken homes, child abuse and crime in today's America. Public education did not create these problems, but we have to deal with them every single day.

For millions of kids, the hug they get from a teacher is the only hug they get that day, because America is living through some of the worst parenting in history, through no fault of their own. Some of them are having to work two, three and four jobs just to make a living. They have less time to spend with their children at home.

A Michigan principal moved me to tears with the story of her attempt to rescue a badly abused little boy who doted on a stuffed animal on her desk. The ribbon on it said, "I love you." He said he'd never been told that at home. That breaks my heart.

The constant in today's society is 2 million unwanted, unloved and abused children in public schools. And we're the only institution that takes them all in.

Let me share just a few statistics from the School Nurses Association. Thirty one percent of Iowa's sixth through 11th grade students have experimented with tobacco products. Fourty six percent have experimented with alcohol. Thirty eight percent have experimented with drugs such as marijuana, amphetamines, inhalants, cocaine, and steroids.

These are the reasons why we need to double the current funding for after-school programs. Being an elementary teacher for over 30 years, I know what happens to kids when they leave the school. And it is not all positive. I had two first graders one year set a shed on fire after school. So I know what's going on.

There is a teacher shortage in Iowa and it is very, very serious. We are at a crisis situation right now. Nationwide we need to hire 2.2 million teachers just to replace who's there. That doesn't account for increasing enrollment. It doesn't account for class size reduction legislation. That is just to replace who's there.

Iowa is losing almost double the national rate of teachers after their first year of teaching, 17 percent. After 3 years, we're losing 28 percent.

Those are staggering figures. But when you compound those with a 40 percent retirement rate in the next 6 to 7 years we are really in serious trouble. And to coin a phrase, you might say "Houston, we have a problem."

These happen to be K–12 numbers. And I know our community college friends are also in danger of losing a lot of instructors and are having a hard time finding replacements.

Back in the old days when I became a teacher, I only had two choices of a profession, to be a nurse or be a teacher.

That is not the case today. Women have many, many more opportunities. And it is not just school we're competing with or the school down the road. It is the other fields of occupation, the other professions and the other States. So we have serious problems here. And I want to emphasize that to you.

We appreciate very much the work that you've done on school modernization. With $28 million coming to Iowa in the first 3 years of your Harkin Grant, that has generated $311 million in construction. That is big for Iowa. We have to do things to jump-start our economy and get things going. That kind of thing helps.

I want to just share a couple of other things with you. And one of them is a quote from the wonderful African-American historical figure, Harriet Tubman. "Within our reach lies every path we ever dream of taking. And within our power lies every step we ever dream of making. Every great dream begins with a dream for the stars, to change the world."

Senator Harkin, your Moonshot for Education is that dream. We need to make it a reality. Our students deserve no less than an all-out effort to keep education a top priority and to fund it like it is

the No. 1 priority, not just give it political rhetoric in a campaign season.

Everyone holds teachers and administrators accountable for student learning. But where is the accountability for politicians who do not vote the funding that they say they want to give? We have experienced enough of that in Iowa.

PREPARED STATEMENT

It is the bottom of the ninth inning and the bases are loaded. We need our lawmakers at every level of government to rally around our children and around public education.

It is about respect. It is about priorities. And it is about time.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF JOLENE FRANKEN

Recently, I read an editorial in the Omaha World Herald about "temporizing teachers" When discussing the current proposals on teacher pay, the statement is made: "It's not the best plan that could be drafted but it'll help".

That's what is always said in Iowa, too, when it comes to funding education. "All too often, we as a state aren't demanding that issues be faced, problems be defined and solutions crafted. We accept partial remedies because they are doable." That kind of attitude will only lead us into a state of educational mediocrity, not the high quality education our students deserve and have benefited from for so many years!

I have to say these statements describe federal funding for education, as well until Senator Harkin started promoting his "Moonshot for Education". That's the kind of bold initiative we need if we are to SOLVE the problems facing education today! Our students deserve no less than the kind of resources and support that was committed to the space race in the early 60's, if they are to receive the finest education possible. The Senator's proposal would bring an additional 244 million federal dollars in IDEA over 5 years to Iowa.

What are the keys to high quality education?

—full funding of Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) even this as originally drafted only called for federal funding at the 40 percent level but it has only recently gotten above single digits. (Next year Iowa will receive $70.4 million.)

—increased funding for Title 1 programs and head start preschool programs, provide funding to low-income schools and students everyone knows that children who have been through a quality pre-school/title 1 program performs better in classroom formal instruction. It's like the farm team prior to the big leagues! (Next year Iowa will receive $55.4 million in Title I.)

—triple the current federal funding provided for teacher professional development Research indicates over and over, the number one determinant of student achievement is the quality of the teacher in the classroom. Today's schools do not have the students of the 50s, nor do they operate like the schools of the 50s. But folks in the governing/law making bodies, only have that model/concept of education in their minds. Teachers need high quality professional development to meet the changing needs of students, workforce needs, and communities.

—maintaining the class size reduction program, keeping it on track to recruit a total of 100,000 new teachers. There is case after case that proves class size is essential in the learning of students. Try teaching 30 students vs 20 students and see how much individual help you can give to students; how much hands on experiential learning you can do; classroom management/discipline is a nightmare with 30 vs 20. In order for teachers to do their best, they must know their students needs, learning styles, strengths and weaknesses these things are impossible with large class sizes. Teachers are being expected to do more and more be more and more accountable for things they have absolutely no control over. We cannot work miracles in 7 hours a day when students go home to another 17 hours of environment that negates everything we try to do. (Next year Iowa will receive $12.8 million in class size reduction federal money.)

There is no precedent for the violence, drugs, broken homes, child abuse, and crime in today's America. Public education didn't create these problems but deals with them everyday. For millions of kids, the hug they get from a teacher is the

only hug they will get that day because America is living through the worst parenting in history.

A Michigan principal moved me to tears with the story of her attempt to rescue a badly abused little boy who doted on a stuffed animal on her desk. The ribbon on it said, "I love you!" He said he'd never been told that at home.

The constant in today's society is two million unwanted, unloved, abused children in public schools, the only institution that takes them all in. Let me share some statistics with you from the School Nurse Association:

—31 percent of Iowa's 6th–11th grade students have experimented with tobacco products

—46 percent have experimented with alcohol

—38 percent have experimented with other drugs such as marijuana, amphetamines, inhalants, cocaine, and steroids.

—These are all reasons for why we need to double the current funding for after school programs. Being an elementary teacher for over 30 years, I know what happens to kids when they leave school. If no one is at home, they FIND things to do not all are lawful or positive. One year I had 2 first graders go home and start a shed on fire. That might be only the beginning for more serious behavior activities!

Then there is the teacher shortage that Iowa and other states are facing. During this decade we need to hire 2.2 million teachers in America just the replace the ones who are currently teaching. That does nothing to address the needs of lowering class sizes and increasing populations. In Iowa, we lose 17 percent of our first year teachers, 28 percent leave after 3 years. Compound that with a 40 percent retirement rate of current high quality veteran teachers and "Houston, we've got a problem". These happen to be K–12 numbers but the Community college numbers are very similar, I think.

Back in the old days, I only had 2 choices for a profession be a nurse or be a teacher. Isn't it interesting that these are 2 shortage areas today and both are female dominated? Today, women have numerous professional choices. So schools are competing not only with other schools and other states but with other professions. The University of Northern Iowa recently completed a study of the shortage numbers. If everything stays the same as today, by 2006 we will be short at least 1200 teachers. Administrators ranks will be depleted by half.

—Senator Harkin's work on school modernization has been wonderful for schools all across America. In Iowa alone, $28 million came to Iowa in the first 3 years. That $28 million in Harkin Grants generated $311 million in construction and renovation projects for 161 school districts to address fire code violations and subsidize the cost of construction. This provides jobs which help our state's economy. Local school districts matched this federal money. Until this year, there had never been any state money provided for infrastructure.

—I have pretty much talked about K–12 but I must mention the need to increase Pell grants for our higher education students. Iowa's community college students are paying and will be paying some hefty increases in student tuition. Our community colleges are the key to retraining our workers who have been laid off in downsizing. If we don't retrain them and keep them in Iowa, they too will join the brain drain from Iowa to anywhere else! More than 85 percent of community college graduates stay in Iowa. We cannot afford to lose anyone!

I just want to close with a few meaningful quotes: Marian Wright Edelman, founder of the children's Defense Fund: "If you don't like the way the world is, you change it. You have an obligation to change it. You just do it one step at a time."

Lucinda Adams, President of the American Alliance of Physical Education, Recreation and Dance said, "Individually, we can make a difference while collectively we can make changes. We have the knowledge, skills, professional talents, and passion to make important changes in the lives of those we teach and serve."

Harriet Tubman: "Within our reach lies every path we ever dream of taking, within our power lies every step we ever dream of making. Every great dream begins with a dream for the stars, to change the world!" Senator Harkin, your Moonshot for Education is that dream. We need to help make it a reality. Our students deserve no less than an all out effort to keep education a top priority and fund it like it is the number 1 priority not just give it political rhetoric in a campaign season. Everyone holds teachers and administrators accountable for student learning, but where is the accountability for politicians who don't vote to fund what they SAY. We have experienced enough of that!

It's the bottom of the ninth inning and the bases are loaded. We need our lawmakers (at all levels of government) to rally around children and public education.

It's about respect. It's about priorities. It's about time!

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very, very much. That was great. I like that. Thank you very much, Jolene. That was great.

And now we will turn to Dr. Lawrence McNabb.

Dr. McNabb is the superintendent of schools of the Osage Community School District. He previously served as the superintendent for the Gladbrook and Reinbeck Community School districts.

Prior to his 10 years as an Iowa school superintendent, Dr. McNabb spent 8 years as a high school principal and 12 years as a social studies teacher and athletic coach.

Dr. McNabb earned both his bachelor's and master's degrees from the University of Iowa.

Thank you very much for being here, Dr. McNabb.

STATEMENT OF DR. LAWRENCE J. McNABB, SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, OSAGE COMMUNITY SCHOOL DISTRICT, OSAGE, IA

Dr. MCNABB. Thank you.

First of all, Senator, I'd like to thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of Iowa's public school children. I have long appreciated your outstanding support of education throughout your career.

I speak today on behalf of nearly 2,000 members of the School Administrators of Iowa—principals, central office administrators, and superintendents.

We have a slogan here in North Iowa that we use to remind us of our commitment. And it says very simply, "Kids Matter Most." That is what we're about. And yet Iowa's schools face serious difficulty. And only a major influx of new resources can save our children.

Iowa's schools are funded in the State level on a per pupil basis. And most Iowa school districts are experiencing declining enrollment.

Thirty percent of Iowa's school districts last year received no increase in funding at the State level. Yet despite limited resources, the challenge has continued to multiply.

Numbers of children come to us each year unprepared for the formal learning that takes place in schools. They have not had the experiences or the support that they needed at home to enable them to meet the challenges we provide.

The range of ability among entering students widens each year. Expanding Head Start services is essential to leveling the playing field for those students.

Poverty may be less visible in rural Iowa, but it is just as real as it is in the cities. Our district is considered a fairly affluent one. Yet one-fourth of my children would qualify for free and reduced-priced lunches.

If not for what Meredith Wilson characterizes as "Iowa stubbornness"—I prefer to think of it as fierce independence—even more of my families could and would qualify for free and reduced lunch.

This past year our district received $17,000 from the Federal Government for class size reduction. That is not enough to hire a single teacher. But yet by putting that money together with monies from other sources, we have been able to make our kindergarten an all-day, everyday program. And we think that is essential for our kids.

But finding money to continue that kind of commitment is going to be difficult for us. Our transportation costs are up 20 percent this year. Within the last 3 weeks the price of gasoline has gone up 20 cents a gallon in my school district. Our energy costs for natural gas and electricity are up 63 percent over the previous year.

Choices are not easy. Our district is looking at 60 students entering our kindergarten program next fall. Do we provide three sections or four? That is a $35,000 question for us. The temptation to choose larger sections and have the money for other purposes is great.

I commend our school district for making the choice for kids. We'll have four sections next fall. Many districts wanting smaller class sizes lack the space to house them. It is not merely a matter of funding teachers, but it is an infrastructure issue as well.

Communities are already financially strapped. They would find it difficult to pass bond issues or even find funds to maintain their existing facilities.

Our district is not immune. Our fourth and fifth graders are educated in a facility that was built in 1916. We have spent a great deal of money on that building to keep it a usable facility, including making it handicapped accessible. But it is still an 85-year-old building.

It is hard for people to understand that our high school lacks adequate space. We educate one-third fewer students than we did at our peak enrollment.

By taking classrooms for special education, for talented and gifted programs, creating computer rooms, all of that has led to a shortage of available space for our regular program.

We have had to turn a former storage area into a classroom. We have been forced to locate a class on a daily basis in our ICN room.

In our aging community, the likelihood of being able to pass a bond issue is slim. Many of our people are on fixed incomes. Despite positive feelings for students and for our school, they would not and could not support a bond issue. Without help, our infrastructure needs will go unmet.

Districts are facing more and more difficulty in finding qualified teachers. In recent years we have had only one or two applicants many times for teaching positions. Forty percent of the teachers in my district are going to retire within the next 10 years. Class size decisions will not matter much if I cannot find qualified staff to fill those needs.

Six years ago, Federal dollars paid the entire cost of my Title I program. Now those dollars fail to pay even the cost of the instructors. I cannot overemphasize the importance of that program.

Dr. Connie Juel, of the University of Virginia, says that 88 percent of the students who cannot read on grade level by the end of first grade will never catch up.

Many Iowa districts incur deficit spending in special education. In the mid-1970s, the Federal Government made a commitment to fund 40 percent of the excess costs of special education. At present, they're only funding about 15 or 16 percent.

Fully funding programs would ensure that students with special needs would have the programming they require without taking resources from other programs and other students.

Skills in the use of technology are important for life in the 21st century. Developing those skills requires students to have access to the latest technology. Right now the Federal Government's commitment to technology in my district is $5 per student. That is not enough to keep my kids in computer disks, certainly not anything that would help with software or hardware needs.

Four out of every five Osage graduates goes on to some form of continuing education. The cost of continuing that education increases every year. It is essential that the Federal Government strengthen its commitment to help those students.

Our working families struggle with that cost. Often young people leave college with staggering debt loads. Something needs to be done for them.

I strongly support your suggestions. I think a financial commitment to the nation's children by the Federal Government is badly needed. Leave No Child Behind should become a rallying cry for all the cared-about children in this country. And that commitment should include the full $250 billion that you suggested.

PREPARED STATEMENT

A few years ago people were fond of saying that it takes a whole village to raise a child. Perhaps in the 21st century we have gone beyond that. It may take resources from an entire nation to provide our children with the opportunities they need to solidify their future and ours.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF LAWRENCE J. MCNABB

First of all, I would like to thank the Senator for the opportunity to come and offer testimony on behalf of Iowa's public school students. We appreciate the Senator's outstanding record in support of education. I offer testimony today, not just as the superintendent of the Osage Community School District, but also on behalf of the nearly 2,000 members of the School Administrators of Iowa.

We have had a slogan that we have used here in North Iowa for the past few years. It is on banners, coffee cups and shirts to remind us of our commitment to the state's youth. That slogan says simply, "Kids matter most." It is what we are about here in North Iowa and throughout the state. That sentiment is not much different than "Leave no child behind."

I am here today to speak specifically about the needs of the Osage Community School District. I think that I can do that with some authority, after six years as the superintendent in that district. But in a larger sense, I know that we are typical of most of North Iowa and probably not much different than the rest of the districts in the state. "Leave no child behind" is a very appropriate title for the hearing that is being conducted today. The fact is that unless something is done, some children will get left behind. Iowa's school face serious difficulties and only a major influx of new resources can save our children. The long-term result of children being left behind is that they will become adults who get left behind. Senator Harkin's amendment would go far in providing those additional needed resources.

Numbers of children come to our school each year unprepared for formal learning. They have not had the experiences and the support that would have enabled them to meet the challenges that school provides. The range of abilities among entering students seems to widen each year. Head Start certainly helps to ameliorate that situation. Expanding the scope of that program can only increase student performance and help level the playing field.

Poverty is a very real problem in Iowa's school districts. Unfortunately, the more rural our districts, the less visible the problem becomes. Rural poverty is not concentrated in neighborhoods or located along well-traveled roads. Our district is a fairly affluent rural district and yet over one-fourth of our students qualify for free

or reduced lunch prices. If not for what Meredith Willson characterizes as "Iowa stubbornness", really fierce independence, many more families would qualify.

Federal class size reduction funding has been an important factor in allowing our school board to make a commitment to smaller classes. This past year our district received $17,000 from the federal government. That is not enough to hire an additional teacher, but combined with other monies from state and local sources, it has allowed us to make our kindergarten an all day/everyday program.

Finding enough money to continue that commitment will be difficult. Iowa schools are funded on a per pupil basis and most Iowa districts are experiencing declining enrollment. Last year 115 of Iowa's school districts, over thirty percent, lost enrollment to the extent that they received no increase in funding for this school year. The Osage district, like many others, must work hard to keep our budget balanced.

When confronted with a budget that does not grow, and faced with increasing costs, districts are in a real dilemma. Often, we must approach situations, not from a "what is best for students" perspective, but from a "what can we afford" viewpoint. While we know that smaller class sizes improve student learning, staff cuts may be the only way to balance our budgets.

Transportation costs have escalated. Those costs are completely beyond our control. We must get students to school to provide them with an education. Our transportation costs are already 20 percent over budget for the year and we still have one quarter of the school year to complete. Gasoline prices in our community have gone up by .20 per gallon in the past three weeks.

The combination of a severe winter and rising fuel prices has run our costs for natural gas and electricity far beyond what anyone could have imagined a year ago. Through March our district's energy costs are up 63 percent over the previous year. That difference would more than pay for a teacher's services in a classroom for a year. However, those are costs that districts cannot avoid. Students must be transported and buildings must have light and heat.

The choices are not easy. Our district anticipates sixty students entering our kindergarten next fall. Do we have four sections of fifteen or three sections of 20? That is a $35,000 decision. With only a small increase in funding for next year, it is even more difficult. The temptation to choose larger sections and have the money available for other cost increases is great. I commend the Osage school board for choosing four sections of kindergarten for next fall.

For some districts, the choice is not that simple. Many lack the space to house additional class sections. It is not merely a matter of funding teachers, but an infrastructure issue as well. Communities that are already financially strapped find it difficult to pass bond issues to construct facilities or even to find funds to maintain current facilities.

Our district is not immune from these problems. Our fourth and fifth graders are educated in a facility that was built in 1916. We certainly educate children differently today than we did in 1916. We have spent a great deal of money on the building to keep it a useable facility by today's standards, including making it handicapped accessible. However, it is still an 85-year-old building.

It is hard for people to understand that our high school lacks adequate space for our current program. We educate one third fewer students than we did at our peak enrollment. Taking classrooms for special education, talented and gifted programs and computer rooms has drastically cut the space available for other classes.

We have had to turn a former storage area into a classroom so that we have a place to teach our Principles of Technology courses. We have also had to locate a special education class in our ICN room when it is available. There were no other spaces available in our building for those classes to meet.

In our community, and many others in Iowa, the likelihood of passing a bond issue to deal with the problem is slim. Ours is an aging community. Many are on fixed incomes and despite having positive feelings for our students and the school, they would not or could not support a bond issue. Without help, our infrastructure needs will go unmet.

It is not just a matter of class size and building needs. Our districts are facing more and more difficulty in finding qualified teachers. Often in my six years at Osage, we have had only one or two qualified applicants for teaching positions. Fortunately, we have always had at least one quality candidate. The day will come when there will be none.

Unless we can raise teaching salaries appreciably, there will be fewer and fewer young people entering the profession. That spells disaster. Forty percent of the teachers in my district will retire during the next ten years. Class size won't matter if quality teachers are unavailable to staff those classrooms.

The dollars that have been available for Title One have failed to keep pace with the needs in our district. A program that was once supported in total with federal

dollars, now fails to pay even the cost of the instructors. Our district has chosen to subsidize the program with funds from other sources rather than cut services to students. That is becoming more and more difficult to do. I cannot overemphasize the importance of that program. Dr. Connie Juel, of the University of Virginia, says that 88 percent of the students who cannot read at grade level by the end of the first grade, never will read at grade level.

The situation in special education is not much different. While our district has been able to operate in the black the past few years, many districts find themselves operating at a deficit in special education annually. In the mid-seventies, when Public Law 94–142 was passed, the federal government made a commitment to fund 40 percent of the excess costs for special education. That commitment has never been met. At present, only about 15 or 16 percent of those costs are being funded from the federal level. Fully funding programs would ensure that students with special needs could have the programming they require without taking resources from other programs.

Skill in the use of technology is as important for life in the twenty-first century as reading and math skills were in the last century. Developing those skills in students requires that districts keep pace with changes in hardware and software. That's nearly impossible for districts to do. Right now the federal government's contribution to technology in my district is $5 per student. That is barely enough to keep students in computer disks, let alone help with software or hardware.

Gordon Moore, one of the co-founders of Intel, formulated a law back in 1965 that has basically held true ever since. Moore's Law says that computers will double in speed and halve in price each 18 months. We can currently replace our computers only every five or six years. That makes it difficult for us to send students off to college or the work place with the technology skills they need.

Right now, about four out of every five Osage students go on to some sort of continuing education. The cost of continuing their education is increasing every year. It is essential that the federal government strengthen its commitment to assist those students. Too often, I see young teachers come to us with huge debt loads from completing their degrees. Something needs to be done to assist them.

I strongly support the Harkin Amendment. A financial commitment to the nation's children by the federal government is badly needed. "Leave no child behind" should become a rallying cry for all who care about children in our Nation.

A few years ago people were fond of saying that it takes a whole village to raise a child. Perhaps in the twenty-first century we have gone beyond that. It may take resources from the entire country to provide our children with the opportunities they need to solidify their future and ours.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much. That was wonderful. Thank you very much.

And now we will turn to Sherry Brown.

Sherry has been an active member of the PTA for 13 years, both in Alaska and here in Iowa. She is currently vice president for legislation of the Iowa PTA. Sherry is also active in both the Boy and Girl Scouts in Cedar Falls.

Sherry Brown, thank you very much for being with us today.

STATEMENT OF SHERRY BROWN, VICE PRESIDENT FOR LEGISLATION, IOWA PTA

Ms. BROWN. Thank you.

I think the idea to double our Federal investment in education is exciting. I think it is something that we desperately need.

As you know, Iowans have always been proud of their schools, but certainly we have areas of concern.

We have urban schools and we have rural schools. We have high-income areas and we have low-income areas. We have times when State revenues are up and we have times when State revenues are down. And those differences leave us with issues involving equity and consistency in education that I think the Federal Government could help us with.

As you mentioned yourself, Head Start is underfunded. And it is a very successful program. But success is limited when there is not enough funding to reach every child who would benefit from it.

One of the things that we like about Head Start is that it has a parent involvement component. And that brings families into their kid's education right from preschool.

And there are also programs that bridge the transition into the public schools that I think are necessary because they also help to bring the parents along and make them a part of their child's education. Those parent involvement components I think are very important in the Federal programs.

When the kids get into the elementary school, then the small class sizes become very important. And I think that the studies are real clear that they have a tremendous impact on academic achievement if we have small class sizes.

Also, if there are small class sizes and there are fewer students, then there are fewer parents for the teacher to interact with, which means they can get to each of the parents more often.

So I think that small class sizes also lead very much to improved parent communication and parent involvement. Many schools in Iowa have K through three classes significantly larger than the 18 or less that we'd like to have.

Title I is extremely important. We have an issue now relating to immigration. We have students who need to learn English and get up to speed as quickly as possible so they do not fall behind on their other classes. And I think the Title I and bilingual programs, all of those are really important there as well.

Safe and modern schools are very important. I think that Ms. Franken and Mr. McNabb have already mentioned how much we need. We need better facilities and technology.

Also, we have, in Iowa, as you know, an extremely large number of families with both parents working. That gives us a critical need for before and after-school programs because—and the problem with those nationally, I think, is that before and after-school programs tend to be scarce in rural areas and rare for middle school children. And we need them in rural areas. We need them all the way through the middle schools. They need to be of high quality, affordable, and based in the public schools.

PREPARED STATEMENT

I think that renewed and enhanced Federal programs working with the State to fulfill its education priorities will result in equity and consistency in public education and allow us to reach every child.

Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SHERRY BROWN

The national education budget has a significant impact on Iowa children and schools, and adequate funding for federal programs is critical to providing every child a quality education leading to a bright future. Since we concur that full funding for public education should be a national priority, the Iowa PTA strongly supports doubling the investment in federal education programs.

Effective initiatives such as Head Start are now seriously under-funded. Communities in Iowa have created early childhood education centers to provide Head Start

along with other government and community services. Unfortunately, success is limited when funding is not adequate to serve all of the children who would benefit from the programs. There must also be full funding for programs that bridge the transition from Head Start to the public schools. A positive transition is essential for student success and, as important, for continued parent involvement. The emphasis on parent communication that is a part of Head Start must be promoted as children enter the public schools. Given the proven, positive effect of parent involvement on student success, let's make sure that we "leave no parent behind."

The advantages of small class-sizes in the early grades on overall academic achievement are well documented, but the advantages also include improved parent involvement. When teachers have fewer students, they have fewer parents with which to communicate and are able to confer with them more frequently. Many schools in Iowa have K–3 class sizes significantly larger than the eighteen or less that is considered desirable.

In addition to needed funding to reduce class sizes, there must be increased resources for Title I to support disadvantaged and low-achieving students. Iowa is not immune from issues related to immigration. While immigrant families establish themselves in the community and struggle to learn English, the children require a great deal of assistance with reading and language skills.

Iowa's need for safe and modern public schools for all students, including barrier-free access for individuals with disabilities, continues to grow. Increased funding for education technology is necessary to ensure equity of access to academic tools by both rural and urban schools and by students from both high-income and low-income families.

In order to provide students with the best education possible, we must continually develop and adapt programs to meet the changing needs of Iowa's families. For example, Iowa now has a critical need for before- and after-school programs because we have so many families with both parents working. These programs provide learning opportunities in safe and drug-free environments. They can also provide a more comfortable, non-threatening atmosphere for parents to visit the school. Before- and after-school programs tend to be scarce in rural areas and rare for middle school children. Some programs are also prohibitively expensive for many families. Before- and after-school programs must be of high quality, affordable, and based in the public schools.

A good education begins with parents as the first teachers and continues with early childhood programs and quality public schools. There should also be funding for programs that provide job training and encourage higher education, leading to responsible citizens who continue to be life-long learners. Iowa is facing revenue shortfalls and state funding for education programs is in jeopardy. On the other hand, the federal government has a tax surplus. Funding for national programs will have a tremendous impact on the quality of education we are able to provide for the children of Iowa. Renewed and enhanced federal programs, working to help the state fulfill its education priorities, will result in equity and consistency in public education, and will allow us to reach every child and leave none behind.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you very much, Sherry, for giving your testimony and being here today.

Now we turn to the most important participant, a student.

Derrick Palmer is a senior at Mason City High School. Derrick was enrolled in the special education early childhood program at the age of three and has benefited from special education throughout his school years.

Derrick will soon graduate from Mason City. And I want to ask him what he plans to do.

Derrick is joined by a number of classmates today here. I will introduce them.

Jeremy Beavers, where are you? Well, I thought he was here. I cannot see in the back.

Is Eric Eichenbaugh here? Well, I had these names here.

Is Trenton Anderson here?

SPEAKER. Yeah. Trenton's here.

Senator HARKIN. Somebody is back there.

AUDIENCE MEMBER. Yeah. Trenton is back in the back there.

Senator HARKIN. Oh. That is because the lights are off. I cannot see anybody there.

Derrick said he did not have any prepared testimony.

Derrick, if you do not mind, I will just ask you some questions.

Tell me about your schooling and how special education might have helped you in school.

Tell us how it might have helped.

STATEMENT OF DERRICK PALMER, STUDENT

Mr. PALMER. Well, thank you, Senator.

The way I see education helped me, is if it wasn't for special education, I wouldn't have gotten this far through a senior in high school.

Senator HARKIN. Great. And you are going to graduate soon?

Mr. PALMER. Right.

Senator HARKIN. What, next month, maybe?

Mr. PALMER. Next month. May the 26, I believe.

Senator HARKIN. He knows the day, the hour, the minute. I remember it that way.

Tell me what you—what are you planning—what are you looking ahead at, Derrick?

Mr. PALMER. Working at NIVC after high school——

Senator HARKIN. Yeah.

Mr. PALMER [continuing]. And building pallets for businesses.

Senator HARKIN. Working at where?

Mr. PALMER. North Iowa Vocational Center.

Senator HARKIN. Oh. Is that right?

Mr. PALMER. Uh-huh.

Senator HARKIN. Good for you. Good for you, Derrick.

And do my notes tell me, do you have a part-time job right now?

Mr. PALMER. Yes. I work at Kraft General Food on Monday through Friday, 2 to 4, making pudding.

Senator HARKIN. Really?

Mr. PALMER. Yes.

Senator HARKIN. I probably had some of your pudding.

Mr. PALMER. It is good stuff. The best that money can buy.

Senator HARKIN. I suppose the best stuff I ate was what you made. I understand. Yeah.

Tell me, Derrick, are your—are your folks here?

Mr. PALMER. My mom is.

Senator HARKIN. Your mom is here.

Hi, mom.

Is that your mom?

As you have probably heard from these other people sitting here, that we are looking at trying to get more funding for special education all through the years.

But I would say you are a great example of what investment in special education can mean. Now, you have obviously done well in school. You are going to graduate and go on and be a great productive member of our society and a good citizen.

How old are you now, Derrick?

Mr. PALMER. 19.

Senator HARKIN. All right. Registered to vote?

Mr. PALMER. Right.

Senator HARKIN. Okay. Not that I am trying to influence you. You are going to work.

Are you going to take a little time off this summer?

Mr. PALMER. To go to Camp Sunnyside, yeah, basically.

Senator HARKIN. Well, good for you. Great.

Well, anything else, Derrick, you can think that we ought to know about your education, about school?

Let me ask you this. Here is a good question, maybe. I hope it is, anyway.

If you could have seen anything, you know, maybe something to be done differently in school, something you thought you might have missed or you wished you would have had in school, is there anything that comes to mind that may be something you might have wanted differently in school.

Mr. PALMER. Well, supposedly there was going to be a school shooting, but the way I see it is, they need tighter security. And lots of people threatening people, like younger classmen and special ed kids, because the way I see it, some people do not take it seriously. And they think it is a hoax. And when it turns out to be like Columbine School—and they just think it is a hoax. And when the person comes to school the next day with a gun, then they wonder why.

Senator HARKIN. Well, I think that is one of the things that we all should be cognizant of.

And I think that—I know that our teachers, Jolene, and our PTA people and our superintendents are all quite aware of instilling in our classroom supervisors—our teachers, teaching assistants and others—to be on the lookout for kids who may be picking on younger classmen and special ed students and stuff like that.

So I hope we are becoming more aware of that and more sensitized to that. Because I think what you just said is very true, that a lot of times people may pick on someone, if they are not stopped and if they are not made aware of what they are doing, it could lead to tragic circumstances later on. So I think that is a point well-taken. Point well-taken.

Well, thank you very much, Derrick.

Mr. PALMER. Thank you, Senator.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you for being here and testifying today.

Let me—I just had some notes here that I took. I want to go back.

And, Derrick, just stay right there. I want to ask you a couple questions. I may have some things I might want to ask you about more here.

And, Dr. Buettner, tell me a little bit about this. There are no tech prep demo sites at the community colleges in the new budget.

Tell me what the effect of that is going to be or how that affects us.

Dr. BUETTNER. Well, our college, NIACC, has really been the leader in Iowa and in the nation, frankly, in implementing tech prep programs, and we have done so through hook and crook. I mean, we have really taken dollars from nooks and crannies, from the Perkins legislation and the tech prep legislation, and we have made remarkable progress here.

There has been a lot of discussion about formal tech prep demonstration sites, formal funding through the Federal Government to literally fund sites like ours, I would hope, where we really have a successful demonstration underway so that other schools, not just in Iowa but throughout the country, could see a successful tech prep program implementation.

It is a very complicated business. I know Larry, one of our superintendents in the area, and a lot of these superintendents and college people working on it said that they wouldn't work.

And it seems to me that these programs would have such promise. And the need is so great that a well-conceived network of demonstration projects across the country could pay enormous dividends.

I envision a day—I am not sure I could predict when and if this will happen—where tech prep programs are commonplace and a part of the fabric of the secondary and 12-, 13-, 14-year public education across the whole United States.

Senator HARKIN. So you really urge us to take a look at that demonstration program.

Dr. BUETTNER. I really do. As your staff knows, I am not exactly the most objective person when it comes to tech prep. But I honestly believe that it is a very, very important program. It is a very effective program that young people need desperately.

It really promises to be the key to a successful, comfortable standard of living for many, many, many young people. Not everyone is going to go away to a 4-year college, graduate and earn a comfortable, professional living. That is just not going to happen for everyone.

Senator HARKIN. Right.

Dr. BUETTNER. And the tech prep program shows a clear path for many, many other people to earn similar incomes. The data's there. The results are there. What we have to do now is get behind it and take it to scale. We have to take it out and deploy it across the country.

Senator HARKIN. Well, I will do what I can to help on that.

Dr. BUETTNER. May I just add one thing, Senator?

Senator HARKIN. Yes.

Dr. BUETTNER. I appreciated Derrick's concern and comments about safety.

Senator HARKIN. Right.

Dr. BUETTNER. I started life as a high school vocational education teacher. And one of the contributions that I felt vocational education was making in the schools at that time, decades ago, it was enlisting young people who could very easily be disenfranchised from the school system.

And occasionally I had the opportunity to really get ahold of a youngster and really turn them on and keep them turned on. And some of those youngsters went on to very successful careers. And I believe that that is the promise of the tech prep program.

Senator HARKIN. Yes. Exactly. Exactly. Very good.

Sherry, one of the most perplexing issues for me as a public policymaker in looking at education concerns parental involvement. We know from studies that the more parents are involved, the better the kids do. That is irrefutable. We know that.

The question is, is getting parents involved. As you point out, parents are working. Sometimes both parents are working two, three jobs at a time trying to make ends meet.

I just wonder if you have any examples of any programs that you've seen that are successful at drawing parents into the children's schools.

And, if there are, do you have any ideas or suggestions to try to get parents more involved?

I am looking for answers here.

Ms. BROWN. I think there is. And I think that the answer is getting them involved at a very early age. And I do not think that necessarily bringing them into the schools is the answer. I think that might be what's holding us back.

I think maybe the schools reaching out to them is where the answer is going to have to lie, and showing their parents how they can be involved and make a difference from home, and still getting them into the schools whenever possible.

But that it is everyday, day-to-day in their child's life where they really need to be involved. And that is the level of involvement that is going to make the difference.

The number of times that they come in the school to help in the classroom or in the library is, I do not think, going to make the difference between success and failure. It is that day-to-day involvement at home.

And I think e-mail is changing things tremendously, and having phones in every classroom, so that teachers can easily contact the parents that they need to contact. That has helped in our school.

It used to be, you know, there was one telephone in every wing, or something. And now they have them in every classroom. And that does help.

But constant contact with parents when things are good as well as when there are problems is just as important. The frequency of contact is much more important than the amount of time, I think, that you spend. So I do not know.

I wish I had the magic answer, Senator.

Senator HARKIN. I know there is no magic silver bullet. We are just looking for different types of suggestions and thoughts.

Jolene, you had something?

Ms. FRANKEN. Just a couple things. One, there are some States that are doing some things with combining government agencies' efforts instead of fighting each other, by getting into people's homes much earlier when the children are very, very small, and working with them on developmental activities that they should be doing with the students before they ever get to school.

That is one of the things that we see.

Another thing that would be very helpful is trying to get some kind of a way to allow jobs to release their workers for a half an hour, even for a parent/teacher conference of 15, 20 minutes would be helpful.

Some school districts are having parent nights in the elementary school where the parents come in and they sit at the student's desk and they go through some of the activities that the students are doing so that they have a better idea of what the student is actually doing in school. Building that relationship is essential.

You know, 50 percent of the jobs in Iowa pay less than $10 an hour. That is what we're looking at here.

Senator HARKIN. That is not a very big income.

Ms. FRANKEN. No. And Dr. McNabb and I were both sitting here saying, telephones in a classroom, what's that? A lot of us do not even have a telephone in the wing, let alone in our classroom.

Senator HARKIN. Wow.

Ms. FRANKEN. And that is getting to be a very difficult situation, also, with the safety factor.

Senator HARKIN. So what percentage of classrooms, do you think, in Iowa—I am talking in elementary and secondary—would have phones where a teacher would have actual services?

Less than half?

Dr. MCNABB. Maybe 25 percent, maybe.

Senator HARKIN. 25?

Dr. MCNABB. Probably.

Senator HARKIN. Yeah.

One out of four, maybe?

Ms. FRANKEN. That could be high. I do not know.

Senator HARKIN. Yeah. But it is your experience that it is not very high.

Dr. MCNABB. No.

Ms. FRANKEN. I do not think so. There's some teachers out there that can maybe answer that question.

Senator HARKIN. Yeah. Well, I am going to turn to the audience in a little bit.

Dr. McNabb, you said that in the Osage school district you had 60 new kindergarten students coming in this year. I do not know if you meant next year or this last year.

Dr. MCNABB. It is been about the same for the last 2 years, Senator, so either one.

Senator HARKIN. But they chose four sections of 15 rather than the——

Dr. MCNABB. Three sections of 20.

Senator HARKIN. Wow.

Dr. MCNABB. We think that is an important decision.

Senator HARKIN. Give them my congratulations. That is good for them. That is good.

Dr. MCNABB. Thank you.

Senator HARKIN. You mentioned that Title I has not kept up. And I was just asking my staff about that. But I thought we kept the Title I hold harmless for Iowa, and worked very hard on that now.

So tell me more about this.

Dr. MCNABB. You have, Senator. You've held the funding exactly where it has been. But times have changed and salaries have gone up and materials cost more.

And so what used to be a self-sufficient program, now doesn't pay the salaries of my staff anymore.

Senator HARKIN. I see what you are saying.

Dr. MCNABB. And we have chosen to subsidize that from other funds rather than to cut services for kids. But it is getting tougher.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you. I just wanted a clarification on that.

Derrick, did you ever think about this tech prep? Did you ever get into any of that tech prep stuff in school at all when you were in high school?

Mr. PALMER. Can you be more specific, please?

Senator HARKIN. Well, I was wondering if you might have participated in the tech prep program.

Dr. BUETTNER. Actually, Derrick will very likely encounter some of the NIACC tech prep partnership at NIVC. When you begin there, you will undergo some training and you'll be helped to learn some of the procedures.

And NIACC has a partnership with employers all across North Iowa that help new employees do certain things. So you actually will encounter us from that point.

Senator HARKIN. Oh. So when he goes, he will get some training through tech prep.

Dr. BUETTNER. Very likely.

Senator HARKIN. Folded in with some of the other training.

Dr. BUETTNER. I am not suggesting we do all the training with NIVC. We do not.

Senator HARKIN. Yeah.

Dr. BUETTNER. But we do some there.

Senator HARKIN. Uh-huh.

Dr. BUETTNER. And it is possible that we are actually going to be involved with Derrick when he arrives.

Senator HARKIN. Well, it is something that his mother and Derrick ought to be aware of.

Mom. Derrick.

Because it seems to me that this would be a perfect match here for this. I do not know—Derrick, I do not know what your interests are, I am not trying to push you one way or the other, but——

Mr. PALMER. Well, of course not. Do not worry about it.

Senator HARKIN. But you look like you might be interested in a lot of different things. And this would be a good way to find out what skills or different things you might want to do. So I encourage you to take a look at that.

Any other things from the panel before I open up the mike, at all?

Jolene, do you have anything else at all?

Oh. By the way, you did say one thing I did want to point out. And this really hit home. And that concerns accountability. Everyone wants the school to be accountable.

But you said, "Where's the accountability for politicians who do not vote to fund what they say." On my way here I was reading the morning paper and saw an interesting statement.

The chairman of the House Budget Committee said that it is time we fully fund IDEA. We should fully fund the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. Nice story in the paper.

My response to that he is chairman of the Budget Committee, if he wants it, he can put it in there. All he has to do is put it in the budget.

Ms. FRANKEN. That is right.

Senator HARKIN. That means you are going to take some money out of the tax cut.

Ms. FRANKEN. That is right.

Senator HARKIN. But that is the choice we have to make. So again, I am not chairman of the Budget Committee. I offered my amendment on the Senate floor to the budget.

Fortunately we won because we had some bipartisan support for it. But the budget chairman did not put it in there. And the House side, they did not put it in the House budget either. And they have already passed the House budget.

The funding for IDEA, you know, to fully fund it was not in that budget.

It was not in there. And here is the House budget chairman saying we ought to fully fund it.

And I had to ask, why am I reading this when someone that has the power to put it in could have done that.

Well, anyway. So I took that to heart when you said that.

Ms. FRANKEN. Thank you.

Senator HARKIN. Now, with that, if there is nothing else from the panel, I am going to open it up for comments from the audience. There may be some questions for the panel.

Senator HARKIN. Oh, Derrick. Please proceed.

Mr. PALMER. Well, I thank you for your optimism about the school education, Senator.

Senator HARKIN. About what, Derrick?

Mr. PALMER. On your education plan and stuff, I think that is a good discussion, ought to be said to the representatives. I think that is a good idea.

Senator HARKIN. All right. Thank you very much. I am glad that you said that.

Let me open up the mike for the audience. Sonya has the mike. And all I ask, again, is you just state your name and spell it, perhaps, for the recorder.

STATEMENT OF LYNNE ECKHART

Ms. ECKHART. Okay. My name is——

Senator HARKIN. You have to turn it on. Sonya. Oh.

Ms. ECKHART. Low tech.

My name is Lynne Eckhart, E-c-k-h-a-r-t.

Senator HARKIN. I have heard that name before.

Ms. ECKHART. You have indeed. And we appreciate that.

I am a professional educator, again, at the high school level in Mason City community schools. I am a leader in the Mason City Education Association.

I have a daughter who is at UNI right now. She's an early childhood development major. Her first 3 years of college were at the community college level. And I am also an adjunct teacher at NIACC here in Mason City.

You might guess I have education issues that are just all over the place. But right today what strikes me is something that I do get to interact with at the high school level.

And that is the kid who comes in the class and says, "Yeah, I do not know why I am here. I am not going to be anything. I'll never get anything." And that kid, if you talk to them, you find out all of a sudden that they can untangle my computer faster than I can even mess it up. Or they can do PlayStation or other computer things that require mind-boggling coordination.

I have kids that I can mention something about my car, and they know how to fix it before I get the sentence finished. Or can bring me a bowl or a box that they have made in industrial technology that is unbelievable.

When those kids say there's nothing I can do, the partnership between Mason City High School and NIACC is something that I can say, that there is something you can do.

If you let me help you learn how to communicate—language arts is my field—then I know NIACC has a program that you can be in. In a year or a year and a half you will be trained to do a career. You can have a job that pays, with benefits.

The other thing I want to say is I teach ninth grade. Lots of kids who come into ninth grade are already so defeated in the school system that there's no way that they see any hope.

When I can say to them, if you hang in here, next year, or at the very latest your third year of high school, you can start a technical program. You do not have to sit here for 4 years in high school.

And, you know, truthfully, most of them are not going to stay. I mean, as soon as they're 16, they're going to be gone. But if you can say, you can start that tech program, you can have one whole year of college paid for by the high school even before you graduate, that is a bonanza for those kids.

My favorite phrase is, they all have to work. My social security depends on them working. And we cannot just leave them behind. We have to make it possible.

So I guess, again, my support is for that coordination between the high schools and the community colleges.

Senator HARKIN. Why do you think these students have such low self-esteem?

Ms. ECKHART. Defeat. I think the comment about if a kid doesn't learn to read by first grade is most of it. I mean, language arts, you meet a huge number of kids who cannot read at a high school or an adult level when they come into high school.

I just think the system wears them out. Just wears them out. And so by the time they're 14, they know 2 more years and they're out of there.

It is a hard thing. I mean, just think if you cannot read what you cannot do.

Senator HARKIN. Do we have to do more in early childhood education?

Ms. ECKHART. Well, I think so. But I think I am growing a nice early childhood educator too. But absolutely. I mean, they need to come—just like we have said, they need to come to school ready to learn. And they need to know what they need to know. And that will make all the difference in high school. You cannot turn around 9 years of education in 1 school year.

Senator HARKIN. Exactly. Exactly.

I believe the data, Lynne, is there. We have done the studies, but we just ignore it. And that is that we know that children have the most rapid learning process from ages of about 1 through 3, 4, 5, in that range.

And a lot of times if they have not learned to read and if they have not had rich learning experiences in their first years they are

not ready to learn by the time they enter school. They are behind. They just do not catch up. And I think that adds to their low self-esteem also.

So again, as much as I support education in all of its facets, I still must say the most important thing we can do is improve early childhood education. We have got to get to those kids early and in a better way than we have ever done in the past.

Ms. ECKHART. I would add one thing to that. I think what we need is more Senators like you who are willing to come out with these amendments and fight for education. And so I appreciate this opportunity.

Senator HARKIN. Well, thank you.

STATEMENT OF STEVE LOVIK, VICE PRESIDENT OF ADMISSIONS AND FINANCIAL AID, WALDORF COLLEGE

Mr. LOVIK. Hi. My name is Steve Lovik. That is L-o-v-i-k. And I am vice president of admissions and financial aid at Waldorf College up in Forest City.

When I started at Waldorf 24 years ago as an admissions counselor, our cost for room, board, tuition fees was approximately $3,000.

Senator HARKIN. Wait a minute. How many years ago?

Mr. LOVIK. 24.

Senator HARKIN. 24 years ago everything——

Mr. LOVIK. Was about $3,000.

Senator HARKIN. Yes.

Mr. LOVIK. And now for this coming fall, our costs for tuition fees, room and board will be $19,500. With the rising costs of technology, faculty salaries, building and maintaining campus facilities it costs a lot more. Thirty percent of our students receive a Federal Pell Grant. So that is a very important part of how they can afford their education. But they are willing to do their part. Seventy-five percent borrow money through the Federal student loan programs.

But they are also responsible borrowers. Last year our student default rate was 1.8 percent.

Senator HARKIN. That is good.

Mr. LOVIK. So our kids are doing a good job. Seventeen percent of our parents borrow money through the Federal parents plus loan.

So our kids and their parents want post-secondary education. They want a degree.

They are willing to do their share in paying for it. But they do need the assistance that the Pell Grant provides.

So I thank you, like everyone else has, for coming out and listening, and hope for your support with that increase.

Senator HARKIN. Well, thank you.

We have got to get that Pell Grant up. And again, I think the other thing we have got to do—and that is what I have heard here and I heard it earlier in Cedar Rapids, Des Moines, and now here—is that so many people in rural Iowa are just above the cutoff for Pell Grants, maybe even $100 or something like that, and then you are just out.

Mr. LOVIK. And so many of our Pell Grant recipients are first-time college attenders out of their families.

And so they're seeking a post-secondary education degree for the first time in their family. And they may not have that many resources available to them.

Senator HARKIN. I think we are going to have to take a hard look at raising the level for Pell. Not only rising the Pell Grant level for Pell Grants but raising the eligibility level.

Mr. LOVIK. Right.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you.

Dr. BUETTNER. Senator, may I comment?

Senator HARKIN. Oh, sure. Yeah. Hop in. Pitch in any time.

Dr. BUETTNER. Just one additional thought. During the course of the campaign there was a proposal to front-load the Pell Grant a considerable amount. And it may not be entirely apparent or readily apparent to a lot of people about why that is so wise. But I want to put the plug in for that, even though I feel it is slipping away.

If a person is going to make a success in their college experience, if they're going to persist and if they're going to graduate and go on to achieve the kind of employment that they had in mind when they began, the Pell Grant and the loan programs are all excellent investments. They all are excellent investments.

I have little fear for a student leaving college with a significant loan balance if they have achieved their objectives while in school and if they have, in fact, a career in mind and in their grasp that can enable them to repay those loans.

And we usually know whether that is all going to work or not very quickly. Sometime during that first year or so in a student's college experience I'd be willing to put pretty good odds on which students are going to make it and which ones are not.

And by front-loading the Pell Grant, we have enabled more people to find out whether they can really prevail or not, whether they can persist and achieve—whether or not the investment is really a good one, in what they learn.

And if we can take that small number of people, 10, 20 percent of all students entering higher education in the United States, and we help those that are not going to succeed discover that without saddling them with a significant loan debt, we have done them a favor and we have done ourselves a favor.

Senator HARKIN. Now, when you say—by front-loading, do you mean letting a person have what they might qualify for the next year or something put into the front year?

Dr. BUETTNER. The proposal—there were several. But the primary proposal was to simply raise the maximum amount of the Pell Grant for a fully qualified person during their first year.

Senator HARKIN. During their first year.

Dr. BUETTNER. Actually the first 2 years. But early in their college experience. And the reason was that if they stop there, they would probably find themselves employment that paid less well than if they persisted.

And the problem is that we had people coming to proprietary schools, community colleges, some students beginning anywhere, including private colleges and regents schools, that do not go on and do not succeed in college.

And if they quit after that first year or so and they're already saddled with $5,000, $8,000, or $10,000 of loan debt, that is a considerable burden on them.

It is a considerable burden on us.

Not just—I do not mean NIACC, but all of us. Because somebody has to repay that loan. And the front-loading idea, I think, was an excellent economic refinement to the student Pell Grant program.

Senator HARKIN. I will take a look at that. I am not all that familiar with it.

STATEMENT OF SALLY FRUDDEN, MEMBER, IOWA STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION

Ms. FRUDDEN. I am Sally Frudden, F-r-u-d-d-e-n. I sit on the Iowa State Board of Education.

But I also sit on a private nonprofit organization called TLC, The Learning Center.

And TLC, The Learning Center, is a community—a child care center that we're organizing in our small town.

And I want to revisit early childhood. I am picking up that you know the brain research and you know that the 1990s was the decade of brain.

And we know that the first 3 years are the years where the brain grows 80 percent and all these wonderful things happen.

However, what is happening in Iowa is that there is no system in place to take care of 0 to 3, other than in private hands. And when I complained about this to the Governor, he just simply said, Sally, there is no system.

So it is up to the communities, the will of the people to take care of those prime years when the brain is developing who's doing it.

Well, the Governor put together a task force on early childhood. And what they found was rather astonishing. Early childhood in Iowa is pretty much unregulated. And 59 percent of the youngsters in child care are in unregulated child care.

They brought in a consultant from the Children's Defense Fund. And she said, "I know you're proud of your Iowa education, but," she said, "however, you have the seventh worst child care in the country."

Now, I find that deplorable. And it is embarrassing. And it is simply the fact that we lack the political will and we lack the will of communities to step forward and say we will take care of these youngest of our population and do the things that would really prevent instead of have to remediate.

And I would urge you to look at what we could do for that 0 to 3 population. In what I have read, Head Start is wonderful. But it starts too late.

Senator HARKIN. Last year we started this early learning opportunities program, which is 0 to 3. And we just got it off the ground last year with $20 million.

Zeroed out of the President's budget this year.

Ms. FRUDDEN. Boy.

Senator HARKIN. We just got it started. After working on it and getting it developed the President eliminates the money. So, again, we are going to fight that battle again this year to try to keep it going and get some more resources into that 0 to 3 program.

Ms. FRUDDEN. Well, what we're doing is we're fund-raising, we're begging, we're scraping. We're doing all we can.

And seated to my right is the woman that is going to be our director. She's been interviewing people to be teachers. And the kind of salaries that we can offer for a 12-month position, for a center that will be open from 5:30 in the morning until 6:30 at night.

What we're asking people to do—and at the price that we're paying, we're not honoring our children. And we're not honoring our pledge to what you have up there as your No. 1 item, all children will start school ready to learn.

We're not doing it.

Senator HARKIN. In 1989, former President Bush and a number of Governors, including our Governor, Branstad at that time, met in Charlottesville, Virginia. And they all hammered out six goals for education. And it had strong bipartisan support. Everyone supported it.

The first goal was that by the year 2000 every child will be ready and able to learn by the time that child enters school. That was the year 2000. That was last year.

Ms. FRUDDEN. That was Goals 2000.

Senator HARKIN. That is right. Goals 2000. And that was last year. And we are not even close to it. And again, I do not think we ought to give up on it. We have just got to redouble our efforts and remind ourselves that this is something that time and again we have recognized. Our Governors recognized it. Former President Bush recognized it. Congress recognized it. Yet here we are 11 years later and we are making some headway. But not even remotely close to meeting that first goal. Not even remotely close.

Ms. FRUDDEN. Well, we will just keep kicking the tires.

And we appreciate your effort.

Senator HARKIN. And we are going to keep pushing.

Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF CHRIS PETERSEN, VICE PRESIDENT, IOWA FARMERS UNION

Mr. PETERSEN. Hi, Senator Harkin. I am Chris Petersen, vice president of Iowa Farmers Union.

Senator HARKIN. Hi, Chris.

Mr. PETERSEN. And welcome to my hometown. And thank you for fighting for family farmers in rural America. It is greatly appreciated.

And I basically want to say that rural America is being depopulated because of Federal farm policy and a lack of enforcement of environmental and antitrust laws to spend the concentration of agriculture in the corporate control.

And this affects all society, especially education. The less people we have, the less kids we have, the less money that can be generated for education in rural areas.

Cut taxes. And combine this with the political agenda going on right now to cut budgets and give the money to the wealthy. We have major problems.

And this has kind of cooled off a little bit right now, but I'd like to talk about vouchers for a minute. And I am not for them.

In a public school system all the Federal money, all the State money comes into the system and is spent. And it is decided by a school board who is voted on by every single person in the community. This is democracy at its best.

With a voucher system it is not true, you know. They're taking Federal money and educating our kids. And basically you end up with a two-tiered education system.

One funded by the public for the wealthy and one less funded for the rest of us.

This is not right. This is America. This is equality for all.

And I hope you go back to D.C. and you say that time and time and time again.

Senator HARKIN. All right. I can assure you that I mirror your feelings on vouchers. If people want to have that kind of choice, do what we do in Iowa.

If they want to, parents can send their child to another school district in Iowa; right?

Mr. PETERSEN. Open enrollment.

Senator HARKIN. Yeah. Fine. I do not mind that if they want to do that. But the vouchers—90 percent—correct me if I am wrong. Ninty percent of our kids go to public school.

Ninty two percent in Iowa. So it seems to me that, you know, that is where we have to focus our attention.

Anyway, thank you.

Mr. PETERSEN. And one more thing. I wear all kinds of hats. I am a family farmer. I work on family farm issues.

Senator HARKIN. I know.

Mr. PETERSEN. I have two and three and four jobs trying to make my budget work. And one of them is being a bus driver for this district right here.

And I can tell you how transportation costs have gone up and how we are trying to find tax money to buy school buses. We retired two of them last week. I think one was a 1985 model, 167,000 miles on it. And these buses were getting so they barely passed inspection without major work every time they showed up.

So I thank you for coming.

Senator HARKIN. Well, thank you, Chris. Thank you.

Now, you know, Dr. McNabb, you mentioned that your transportation costs have gone up 20 percent?

Dr. MCNABB. Yes.

Senator HARKIN. And your energy costs have gone up 63 percent, is that what you said?

Dr. MCNABB. That is correct.

Senator HARKIN. That is daunting.

Dr. MCNABB. Yes. That is probably the cost of two teachers that I could put in classrooms. Just the increase.

Senator HARKIN. Wow.

Ms. FRANKEN. Senator——

Senator HARKIN. And again, I had a couple meetings earlier on this year in various parts of Iowa on the high energy costs, about the impact on Iowans, especially elderly people because of the heating costs. But I got to thinking now, how about schools. I mean, schools must have been hit pretty hard with that too.

Ms. FRANKEN. I know. It is been awful.

Referring to Chris talking about rural schools. You know, there are a lot of people that think that all of our problems would be solved by consolidating rural schools.

We need to just get rid of the small schools. We'll make them bigger. The complication to that is the transportation problem.

And all you need to do is go up to western Dubuque or Bloomfield, go down to Davis County where they have one school in the county, and ask them how their transportation costs have gone up this year.

It is phenomenal. So when you do something that appears to be a simple solution to the problem, it tweaks something over here that you forgot to think about.

And until we do something about changing that funding mechanism for transportation, it will continue to hurt.

Senator HARKIN. Not to mention the fact that a kid in, well, high school, riding 2 hours a day, 1 hour to and from school, is not right.

It is just not right.

Ms. FRANKEN. Absolutely not.

Senator HARKIN. Okay. Anything else?

STATEMENT OF TAMMY POPPE

Ms. POPPE. My name's Tammy Poppe. That is P-o-p-p-e. And I am very proud to say that my husband is one of Dr. Buettner's tech prep teachers. He teaches the NIACC automotive technology program here at Clear Lake.

And as his proud wife, I am going to tell you the comments that we hear from the parents of these children. And I have been fortunate enough to hear quite a few of them.

Parents tell my husband that they are so grateful for his program for two reasons. It allows their child to make sure that this is what he or she wants to go into without expending hard-earned family dollars in their first year of post-secondary education.

A lot of kids that he has had, their parents were afraid that they were going to be falling through the cracks because they did not fit the traditional 4-year college education. They were the hands-on type of student.

And with Mark's program and others like it offered by NIACC, that it has offered their children a chance to succeed where they were afraid that they would fail.

So besides having personal interests in having these programs cut, I also think it would be very poor for the State.

We moved here from Wisconsin, where my husband could have earned substantially more as a teacher, because of the types of technical education programs that the State was looking into offering.

It is more important to him to teach these programs because he was one of those children in his schools that did not fit in anywhere because of his hands-on—his gearhead mentality. And we have $30,000 in student loans that we're paying off now to be here in this State.

I also have a background as an early childhood elementary teacher from Wisconsin. It is considered birth through third grade. And my suggestion on involving parents in their children's schooling is to promote literacy.

And literacy doesn't necessarily mean having to take 15 minutes to sit down and read, although that would be ideal. But I know a lot of parents that simply do not have the time to sit down and read.

But literacy can be as simple as singing songs to your children while you're driving down the road. It can be as simple as doing a finger play or pointing out signs.

You know, children learn to read by reading symbols. When your 2-year-old notices that that is the McDonald's sign and that is the Target sign, that is learning. That is learning at its finest. And those are teachable opportunities for parents.

We do not have to have our parents come into the schools to help promote literacy. But we have to let them know that what they're doing, by singing Mary Had A Little Lamb and things like that, can help their children just as much.

So thank you for your time.

Senator HARKIN. Well, thank you very much. Excellent statement.

Over here. And then back there.

STATEMENT OF JESSICA PUTNAM

Ms. PUTNAM. Well, Senator, thank you for being here.

My name is Jessica Putnam, P-u-t-n-a-m. And I live in North Iowa. And I am employed at North Iowa Area Community College through one of the student support services grants from the Federal Government, one of the TRIO programs.

And to kind of mirror one of the comments from Dr. McNabb, TRIO services students nationwide, but sometimes it is thought of as an urban program.

But we have 80 percent of the students that attend NIACC that are eligible by way of either being low income, first generation, or having a disability that could be certified in this program.

So it exists here also. And we appreciate that it is here. The services—The intensity of the services that we're allowed to provide, I am convinced, really make a difference for the students that we serve. That the tutoring, the one-on-one counseling, study skills, opportunities to learn how to negotiate their educational travel through the systems and on to transfer once they discover they have the potential to do that, I think are remarkable and are something we'd like to be able to expand beyond the 6 percent that are served by these programs at this time in the Nation.

And I appreciate that you've included them in the Leave No Children Behind legislation.

And that through my experience, it is my feeling that a lot of these people would not find their way without this type of support.

Thank you.

Senator HARKIN. TRIO programs are very important.

Ms. PUTNAM. I believe so.

Senator HARKIN. Very important programs. Talent Search, Upward Bound. Student Support Services and so on.

Support services.

Ms. PUTNAM. It started out as three, thus the TRIO. But it is beyond three programs at this time.

Senator HARKIN. You know, I do not know how many students we serve in Iowa with the TRIO program, but it is substantial. I do not know.

Dr. BUETTNER. At our college we have a program that allows us to serve 200 students.

The data on those students is phenomenal. They're in the program because—they meet certain criteria that suggests they might be at risk to not persist.

And the completion data is just astounding.

The ability to go in there and pay special attention to those people and give them support, absolutely works.

Senator HARKIN. Yeah. Fantastic.

In the back here.

STATEMENT OF LES PERSON

Mr. PERSON. Senator, my name is Les Person. And just spell it the way it sounds.

Senator HARKIN. All right, Les.

Mr. PERSON. I do not see very many people here that lived in the last depression. I am one of them. I am 80 years old. I remember that my dad had trouble on the farm.

In 5 years I went to five different schools. So you can see what was happening to him. He was losing out. So far you do not hear that going on now, because farms are bigger. So there are not those small farms there anymore.

But, I think that the main thing is just lack of money. Are we in a depression? The way I remember it back then, we were having all kinds of troubles then with money. And I think this is what we're going into now.

They are talking about this big money, but I don't think you can look that far ahead.

I think that the first thing that the President has to look at and has to forget is all of this money he's going to give away to a relatively few people. I think this is where that money should go, is into education.

I am sorry I am not standing up, but I have diabetes, so——

Senator HARKIN. That is all right.

Mr. PERSON. But I can remember going, as I said, to five different schools, high schools. And it was just rough back in those days.

Senator HARKIN. Well, I think your point is well-taken, heard on a couple of things.

First of all, regarding whether or not all that money is going to be there or not. In 1995, the Congressional Budget Office, with all of their computers and all their whizbang economists and all the resources they had handed to them estimated that in 2000 and—in the year 2000 we would have had a $236 billion deficit. That is what they were projected.

Last year we had an almost $280 billion surplus. So in 5 years they were only off a half a trillion dollars. I mean, think about this.

You see now, based on that, we are going to be looking at 10 years. And so we are going to have all this money. And so we are going to give all this tax cut right now.

And the problem is I think we all know too well—someone referred to it here in Iowa—you cut that and cut that and then when you hit the rough spot in the road, what happens?

That is why I feel that we have to be very cautious about this tax cut. And that if we have surpluses, which we do, we had surpluses last year, we are going to have surpluses this year, and more than likely we will have some surpluses next year.

It seems to me that the two things that we should do is, as you say, begin to invest and to really do what we said 11 years ago, make sure that all children start school ready to learn. We have said that before, but now we actually have the resources in which to start making that happen.

And second, it seems to me that if you want to give people a tax cut, it seems to me maybe we ought to give our kids a tax cut.

Right now every child born in America today—a kid born today will pay $750 every year of his or her life until they pass away 85 years from now if they live that long. That is the interest on the national debt.

In other words, we're paying this year a little over $220 billion on interest on the national debt. Now, if we got rid of the national debt, that is $220 billion we could use for education and a lot of other things.

So I am just saying that since we have the surplus, it seems to me we ought to invest in education and pay off the debt.

Mr. STECKMAN. Didn't that debt occur during the last tax cut?

Senator HARKIN. Say it again now.

Mr. STECKMAN. Didn't that debt occur during the last tax cut? Didn't that debt occur during the last tax cut?

Senator HARKIN. Oh. That is when the debt went up—in the 1980s.

Mr. STECKMAN. Yeah.

Senator HARKIN. That is when the debt ballooned, in the 1980s.

Mr. STECKMAN. Yeah. Yeah. That we're all suffering on.

Senator HARKIN. It all quadrupled.

And that is what happened.

Mr. STECKMAN. So——

Senator HARKIN. Your point is well-taken about whether or not there is actually going to be that money there. We do not know. We know we have it this year. we had it last year. So I think we ought to make very cautious choices right now.

Mr. PERSON. Here in the Midwest there's an old saying that as the farmer goes, so goes the rest of the State of Iowa and the Midwest. My dad got 10 cents a bushel for corn.

Do you know what, it is much better off here today now. But even then, they're complaining. They're complaining about they do not have the money. Consequently, Des Moines is not getting the money.

Senator HARKIN. I will take one more comment. I saw a hand there. It is so dark back there, I can hardly see. Go ahead. This will be it.

STATEMENT OF LORNA DiMARCO

Ms. DiMARCO. My name is Lorna DiMarco. D-i, capital, M-a-r-c-o. My husband Nick is a teacher here in Clear Lake. I am a teacher in Mason City.

We're both educators. We both returned to college. He was a funeral director and I was in home health care before we went to school.

We went to the University of Northern Iowa and left with about $30,000 of debt as well. And we have two young boys who are in school in Clear Lake.

I am a nationally certified teacher.

And my husband's one of those people that have about four jobs so that we can continue the lifestyle that we chose to go back to school for.

This morning he raked someone's yard. And today he's running lights and sound for you. You know, money's a very important thing to keep things operational. Sound business requires that we look at budgets.

When I went into teaching it was to help people learn, to really ensure a fine understanding of being a good citizen, the importance of understanding a democracy.

And I teach fifth grade. My husband teaches middle school. And I think those things can be instilled at a young age regardless of my personal benefit or gain or my school's budget.

But when I look at accountability and I talk about me being accountable to my students, my parents that I serve, the community that I represent, I need to think about accountability in testing as well.

And when we're looking at what President Bush is proposing and the success that his State has—there's some incredible statistics out there about how poorly his State is academically doing in Texas. And the reading teacher has a very fine article, a very excellent summary as far as his qualifications for accountability in testing.

And I have seen curriculums change now. And the focus of learning has stepped aside to the focus of test scores. And neatly tucked away in the Des Moines Register, this week in the Metro Iowa section was an article, a very small article stating that Iowa received this top ranking in the nation out of 100 categories.

What we're doing is phenomenal in this State. And we should encourage other States to recognize that. And to see curriculum in Iowa bow down to test scores and bow down to standardized testing. And forget about the voc-tech students. And forget about the people that are not able to perform academically in a testing situation like an ACT or an SAT test.

We forget that we're here to educate citizens. We forget that we're here to educate people to run a democracy. And then the budget becomes secondary, in my opinion, and integrity is really what comes into play.

So I please encourage you. Yeah, we need the money. Yeah, I wish my husband did not have to work extra jobs. You know, becoming a nationally certified teacher was a labor-intensive experience for me. All of those things, to me, are part of a lifestyle that I have chosen.

But we really are not serving our communities, our people, our students and our children if we forget about why we're here and what learning really is all about.

That is all I have to say.

And thank you very much.

Senator HARKIN. Thank you. Thank you for that statement.

Anything else from the panel?

Any other comments?

Ms. FRANKEN. I would just like to echo the same thoughts as Ms. DiMarco. I have an article here about test obsession which I am going to share with you after the session today.

But it is not even just the testing. It is the obsession with it. And then it is the punishments that Mr. Bush is following up with after those test results. Who is to say that his test is the best test or what the score should be. There are so many questions regarding testing.

Testing does not measure student learning. It should not be used as a sledgehammer which gets at kids' attitudes about school. It should be used as a diagnostic stethoscope to help us know what students can and cannot do so that we can adjust the curriculum to meet their needs.

It is not a sledgehammer.

Mr. PALMER. Well, the way I see it is it is like teaching a kid that, hey, testing's okay when they have got to study that night and then get ready for it the next morning. That is what Ms. Franken's trying to say.

Senator HARKIN. You just study for the test.

Mr. PALMER. Right.

Ms. FRANKEN. And when do you need to teach real curriculum?

And when do you need to teach creative thinking and problem solving and teamwork, the things that Iowa's education is based on? If you're continually teaching to what's on the test—because that is what will happen—we will lose our curriculum. Our testing will be running the curriculum instead of the curriculum running the testing.

Senator HARKIN. Well said. With that, I am going to—I am going—yes.

Ms. STECKMAN. I have one sentence to add to what Jolene said. I heard this from the Department of Education.

Sharon Steckman, educator, also in Mason City. To add to this. It is kind of an analogy. You cannot fatten the cow by weighing it all the time.

You cannot make a smarter kid by test, test, test, test, test. You need to teach. You need to feed the cow and teach the kid.

Ms. ECKHART. It is a bumper sticker.

Ms. STECKMAN. It is a bumper sticker.

Senator HARKIN. That is good. I like that. I could use that.

Well, listen, this has been very productive and very informative. And it has been a good exchange. I just appreciate all of your involvement in education.

I encourage you to continue to be involved and to let your State legislators and your national legislators know how you feel.

Make us accountable. If we say we are for something, make us accountable. Do not just buy it, just because I say I do it. Look at

me and see what we do. And judge us not by what we say but by what we do.

And I think I might say just one last thing here. As a fourth-generation Iowan, I went to schools here in Iowa, and graduated from Iowa State. I am concerned about the state of education in my State of Iowa. I am concerned because we have always prided ourselves in Iowa on education.

We have the best education system. But I think if we really looked in the mirror and we are honest about it, we are not the best anymore. We can fool ourselves. But what I am thinking is we are fooling ourselves.

And by fooling ourselves, we are in danger of accepting an ever lower and lower standard of what is the best. I call it the dumbing down process. And that is what really concerns me.

Well, okay. So maybe we are not there. But we are fine where we are. Well, then the next year or two, well, then we go down. Well, we are fine there too. And pretty soon, little bit by little bit we find that we have really come down a long way in education in the State of Iowa. And I sure do not want to see that happen.

I think that both the State—but I also think the Federal Government has an obligation. And I think 2 cents on the dollar is not the right priority for the Federal Government to be involved in education.

We have had a genius—I think the genius of American education has been that it is been diversified, that it has local control, local input all over this great expansive Nation. That is, in innovation, experimentation, some competition.

It has meant new learning kinds of things that have come up all over. And we have not had this top down you have-got-to-do-it-this-way type of thing.

I have been in many countries in the world in looking at education. And, to me, that has been the real genius of the American educational system.

The failure of the American educational system, I think, is that we have not seen that the funding of education should also be national in scope and that our country has an obligation. In other words, a child who is ill-educated in one State will not just be a burden in that State. That child can move around and be a burden in another State. So it is a national responsibility.

So I think that we have to reassess our national commitment to the underpinings of education in terms of helping with resources. You might say that money is not everything. But it takes money to fix a leaky roof. It takes money to pay for those transportation costs.

And if we are going to make teaching a good career where teachers can look ahead to career development and higher salaries, it takes money to do that. And so I think that we have got to understand that we want to keep the genius of the American system of education. But we have to fix what I think is the worst aspect of it. And that is the way it has been funded.

I challenge anyone to show me where it says in the Constitution of the United States that elementary and secondary education is to be funded by property taxes. You will look in vain and you will not find it.

Now, how did that happen? Well, it happened because in our early years when we decided to have a free public education for all citizens—actually, it was all white males in the beginning—but for all citizens, we did not have income taxes or anything else. All we had were tariffs and property taxes. So that is sort of the way it built up.

The first involvement of the Federal Government in education was in 1862, the Morrill Act, to set up the land grant colleges.

And for 100 years thereafter the only involvement of the Federal Government in education was in higher education: The land grant colleges, research, some medical school. Nothing down below that until 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. And then we began to do things like Title I.

So we have a very short history of the Federal involvement in funding of education. And that is why I think that we need to really take a hard look at it and get that 2 cents up.

The Committee on Education Funding, which is a consortium of different education groups, has a button that they have been passing around Washington. It says, "Five cents makes sense." In other words, they are trying to get the Federal share up at least 5 cents on the dollar.

The amendment I offered will not even get it up to 4 cents. And they thought that was too much. So, I think we have got a long way to go.

But I just wanted to kind of close on that note, to say that we really have to help some of our States out. Because you cannot base it on property taxes alone.

Someone said here earlier—one of the panel said we have an aging population in Iowa. We have a lot of elderly people. You cannot put the burden just on them because they have a house and property.

And we have to understand that we are all in this pool together. And that those who have benefitted the most from our society, maybe those are the ones that we ought to ask to give back a little bit more for the funding of education.

So with—one last little thing. I do not know why I just thought of this. Someone at the earlier meeting said, well, you know, it is not all that necessary for higher education. After all, Bill Gates did not finish college. I said, yeah, he may not have finished college, but look who he hires.

The people that make him the richest man in the world today are all the brightest students in computer engineering and computer science and everything else.

So he follows the old adage that one of my mentors gave me when I was young and starting out my career. He said, "The secret to success is never be afraid to hire people smarter than yourself." And I have always thought those are good words to live by.

CONCLUSION OF HEARINGS

Thank you all very much for being here, that concludes our hearing. The subcommittee will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

[Whereupon, at 6 p.m., Saturday, April 21, the hearings were concluded, and the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene subject to the call of the Chair.]

○