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WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT ACT
CONFERENCE

HOUSE CONFEREES:

Bill Goodling (R-PA)
Steve Gunderson (R-WI)
Duke Cunningham (R-CA)
Buck McKeon (R-CA)
Frank Riggs (R-CA)
Lindsey Graham (R-SC)
Mark Souder (R-IN)

William Clay (D-MO)
Pat Williams (D-MT)
Dale Kildee (D-MI)
Tom Sawyer (D-OH)
Gene Green (D-TX)
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3. Vouchers (Kennedy)
4. School-to-Work
5. Federal Role (Will?)
   Minimum Allocation
7. Drug Testing
8. Loan Guarantee Program
9. Labor Issues
   & Grievance & Remedies
10. Vocational Education Formula
11. State Apportionment
12. Sallie Mae
13. 85/15 Rule
14. Adult Education Hold-Harmless (Simon)
15. Local Boards (Simon or Williams)
16. Accountability
17. At-Risk Youth
18. Plans/Priority
    (Dislocated Workers/
     Single Parents)

H.R. 1617
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May 21, 1996
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Select Chair — will be NR

Opening Statement — Deputy staff agreement

Issue 1 on hold

Can set aside certain issues until member familiar with issues

Republicans do not want a welfare plan for members
CAREERS CONFERENCE SUMMARY
Tuesday May 20, 1996

1. AUTHORIZATION LEVEL
   - Staff tentatively agreed to $6 Billion before Republican members met and rejected it.
   - This overall authorization must be high enough to protect current education funds because of the large proposed flex account of 25%.
   - Democrats should offer $7 Billion authorization level.
   - Such sums should be rejected because there would be no idea what programs would get—it’s the authorizing committee’s responsibility to design this new system and tell appropriators what funding is needed. We shouldn’t feel bound by what appropriators did in 1996.

2. SINGLE BLOCK GRANT/PERCENTAGES
   - Current offer:
     - 35%--Employment and Training
     - 20%--Vocational Education
     - 15%--At risk youth
     - 5%--Adult Education and Literacy
     - 25%--Flex
   - Democratic offer:
     - 35%--Employment and Training
     - 25%--Vocational Education
     - 20%--At risk youth
     - 5%--Adult Education and Literacy
     - 15%--flex (adult ed hold-harmless to come from here)

3. VOUCHERS
   - Must have a mandatory Career Grant system for dislocated workers unable to be placed as a result of one-stop services.

4. SCHOOL TO WORK
   - Democrats have suggested to drop repeal of the program from the bill (and maintain separate authorization level)
   - The only other possible alternative would be to require the funding of the Implementation Grants from the flex account and allow national activities at the federal level.

5. FEDERAL ROLE
• Major accountability issue--Democrats want Secretarial authority to approve/disapprove the State plans. This would also include a review of the benchmarks to measure their appropriateness and quality.
• The Senate bill cuts the Departments of Labor and Education immediately upon date of enactment by 1/3. Further reductions of 40% over the next 5 years.

6. LIBRARIES
• Senate bill contains the reauthorization of the Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Program—Jeffords wants to keep this in the bill. The Arts and Artifacts Indemnity Act insures eligible art exhibitions against loss or damage. The FY96 authorization would be such sums as necessary to provide for functions of the Director of IMS and to pay claims.
• Republicans are insisting it get dropped because it doesn’t have anything to do with this bill and they think anything mentioning “the arts” is a killer on the House floor.
• Small state minimum allocation—House offer is $300,000. Jeffords wants $340,000

7. DRUG TESTING
• Democrats have offered changing the clause “States shall” to “States may” require these tests. Senate bill contains this provision—nothing similar in the House bill.

8. LOAN GUARANTEE PROGRAM

9. LABOR ISSUES
• Democrats have offered that the phrase “employees and labor organizations” to be inserted throughout the legislation where there is a reference to labor.

10. VOCATIONAL EDUCATION FORMULA
• Senate has offered their bill (current Perkins formula)—70% Title I/20% IDEA/10% population
• Alternate Democratic positions: 80% Title I/20% population OR 75% Title I/25% population
• House Republicans have offered 70% poverty/30% population

11. STATE APPORTIONMENT
• The Senate bill authorizes the Secretaries to make payments directly to the Governor for workforce employment activities and directly to the State Education Agency for Workforce Education activities.
• House republicans have offered that the State receive payment and then distribute funds to Governor and State Education agency—they don’t want to pre-empt States that have a sign off process by State legislature.

12. SALLIE MAE
• House bill contains a conditional privatization for Sallie Mae—it does not require it. It gives them the authority to, but also allows them to remain as a government sponsored entity as long as they wish.
• Connie Lee is also privatized in this bill—there is no contingency to it.
• Decision to privatize should be the government’s—not the stockholders of Sallie Mae.
• Democratic position is that this should not even be a part of this bill—reauthorization of the higher education act is up next year. This issue should be revisited then.

13. 85/15 RULE
• This rider was also added to the bill after it was reported out of committee and has nothing to do with this act.
• This provision clarifies the 1992 amendments to the Higher Education Act that require proprietary schools to receive at least 15% of their revenue from sources other than federal student financial aid programs in order for them to participate in federal student financial aid programs.
• The bill clarifies that when implementing this rule, the Education Department should consider an institution’s financial information only for a fiscal year that begins on or after April 30, 1994, which is the date that the final 85/15 regulation was published.
• In addition, the Department of Education has not allowed proprietary schools to count revenues earned from training contracts with business and industry toward the non-federal 15% of revenues. The House bill would allow such contracts --even those using Federal State and local government funds.

14. ADULT EDUCATION HOLD HARMLESS (5%)
• Democrats are proposing that the money to fund this hold harmless come out of the flex account because this is going to be one program that is very unlikely to be adequately funded at the State level, and will be overrun by changes to the welfare system.

15. LOCAL BOARDS
• Democrats are very concerned about maintaining accountability throughout this new system. The role and duties of the Local Elected Official must be significant.
• Oversight responsibilities of the Local Board must be spelled out in functions of the Board and include:
• Designation of the Fiscal Agent must be agreed upon by both the Governor and the Local Elected Official.
• Montana must maintain its rural CEP in order to avoid being a single state service delivery area which could result in the Governor using the collaborative state process as the local board for the puposes of the act.

16. ACCOUNTABILITY

17. AT-RISK YOUTH
• Senate Republicans have offered to split state and local funding to 50/50. Under this scenario, the summer youth program would not be funded. The Governor would control 50% of the at-risk youth money to spend as he wished.
Other 50% to be distributed by formula requiring a 1/3 weighting on each of the At-Risk youth definition factors:

- 1/3 number of youth (population)
- 1/3 number of disadvantaged youth (population)
- 1/3 on identifying factors such as low income, drop-out, offender, homeless, pregnant or requiring additional education to secure employment.

18. PLANS/PRIORITY—DISLOCATED WORKERS

- The Administration has requested an earmark of funds for dislocated workers. President’s Budget request is $1.3 billion for FY1997. FY1996 appropriations was $1.1 billion.