

1996

## Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996): Correspondence 11

David Evans

Kevin Wilson

Follow this and additional works at: [http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_I\\_37](http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_37)

---

### Recommended Citation

Evans, David and Wilson, Kevin, "Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996): Correspondence 11" (1996). *Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996)*. Paper 8.  
[http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell\\_neh\\_I\\_37/8](http://digitalcommons.uri.edu/pell_neh_I_37/8)

This Correspondence is brought to you for free and open access by the Education: National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, Subject Files I (1973-1996) at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Institute of Museum and Library Services Act (1996) by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact [digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu](mailto:digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu).

June 18, 1996

To: Senator  
From: DE and KW  
Re: Workforce Development Conference

---

You are to meet at 2:30 this afternoon with Senator Daschle and other Democratic Senate leaders in regard to the Workforce Development bill now in Conference. Our understanding is that Leon Panetta and House Minority Leader Gephardt will be there. It will probably be a "members only" meeting. As we understand it, the purpose of the meeting will be to solidify the Democratic Senate position on the bill. The Administration has submitted a list of 8 items it believes it "must" have if the President is to sign the bill. A copy of that list accompanies this memo.

The meeting could put you in somewhat of a box. As you recall, you were the only Democrat in Committee to support the bill. Also, in terms of education, we have gotten over 80% of what we sought out to achieve. **However, one of the major outstanding issues is the formula. You are pushing for an 80% Title I and 20% population distribution within the state for vocational education, and you are also pushing for required spending for corrections education. It appears that we may not be able to achieve this, something that would certainly enable you to oppose the bill.**

It is also important that you know that the Kassebaum staff believes that it may be impossible for us to get a bill out of Conference. They tend to believe that the House Republicans are not bargaining in good faith and really do not want a bill. They (the House Republicans) could use the formula disagreement and a few other issues to prevent reaching agreement in Conference.

At tomorrow's meeting, you might want to emphasize that your major concern in the formula, and that you will not be able to support the Conference Report if the formula is not a good one. This is something you have already told Senator Kassebaum, and it is something I have shared at staff meetings

In terms of the Administration's "must" list, you could also emphasize that you strongly support their position on Education and continued support for the School To Work Program.

Generally, we would urge you not to commit to opposing the bill, at least not at this point. You could indicate that you are leaning against supporting the bill unless we get a good, strong formula, but that you want to reserve final judgment until the Conference is over and the decisions made.

## **ADMINISTRATION OFFER TO CONFEREES ON WORKFORCE AND CAREER DEVELOPMENT ACT**

This offer is to be considered as a whole; it is not divisible into component parts.

**1. Offer on authorization of appropriations:** Accept the such sums authorization with the following trigger for the flex account:

- o Funds appropriated under the Act would be subject to the following percent splits: 45% for adult training; 28% for in-school youth; 20% for at-risk youth; and 7% for adult education.
- o No funds would go to a flex account until the level of funding for the States reached \$3.85 billion (FY 1996 appropriation for the total Federal grants to the States for programs consolidated in this legislation).
- o All funds above FY 1996 appropriation level would be available for flex account until 125% of FY 1996 level is reached.
- o The amounts in excess of 125% would be allocated as follows: 25% flex account; 35% adult training; 15% out-of-school youth; 20% in-school youth; and 5% adult education with a hold harmless from the flex account.

**2. Offer on dislocated worker funding:** Earmark \$1.3 billion of adult employment and training resources for assistance to dislocated workers (of which \$1.03 billion is for State grants).

**3. Offer on skill grants for dislocated workers:** Training for dislocated workers must be provided through a skill grant system (House bill, but limited to dislocated workers). This requirement would include the limited exceptions in the House bill to address rural areas and other special circumstances. However, it would also include a 5-year phase-in for this requirement (similar to the House bill's 3-year phase-in), with authority to the Secretaries to use incentive funds to encourage earlier implementation.

**4. Offer on School-to-Work:** (a) Strike the repealer from the bill, allowing the appropriations process to determine the future of School-to-Work; or (b) move up sunset date for School-to-Work from September 30, 2001 to September 30, 2000.

**5. Offer on accountability:** Package to include:

- o **Plan approval and levels of performance:** Substantive State plan approval authority for the Secretaries (Senate bill with amendment); and Secretaries and States to negotiate expected levels of performance to be basis for sanctions and separate challenging levels to be basis for incentives (Senate bill with amendment).

- o **Performance information and resources:** Uniform technical definitions of benchmarks (House); consumer information to be provided by all nondegree training programs with certain information required (House bill with modifications); uniform MIS guidelines that include demographic information (House bill with modification); reporting of both local and Statewide performance results to the Secretaries (House); and adequate human resources for oversight and other responsibilities to be determined through annual budget and appropriations process. (House)

**6. Offer on control of education by State and local education system:** Senate language ensuring that education funds will go to State and local education agencies and that the education portion of the plan will be developed by the State education agency.

**7. Offer on local role:** Local board negotiates with the State on employment and training benchmarks for the area as a whole, and local board in coordination with LEO, negotiates with the State the process for designation of One-Stops. Remainder of responsibilities reserved for local board in partnership with LEO; these responsibilities include developing local budgets, oversight over local programs, developing local plan, and designating local fiscal agent. (House bill with modification)

**8. Offer on targeting resources to youth:** Modify Senate language to clearly require a Summer Youth Program in each local area. Require an equitable substate allocation formula for at-risk youth.