# **ECenter for Education Reform**

### 2008 U.S. SENATE CANDIDATE SCORECARD

While education policy falls largely into the hands of state leaders to decide, the role of a U.S. Senator can be instrumental in advancing - or stopping reform in its tracks. Support for a program carries the federal imprimatur. Ironically, while most people eschew federal control they actually value the leadership which it implies.

When the Senate gets asked to vote on providing scholarship monies to poor children to attend a private school of their choice, or a charter school program or facilities support, the debate that ensues in Washington can push state leaders to do things they might normally fear will cause them the wrath of their national colleagues.

A speech by the president, his secretary of education or even a congressional colleague can confer "accepted" status on a reform that may have seen struggles. A few words may unlock the door to passage. That's the essence of the bully pulpit. In 1987, then Education Secretary Bill Bennett called Chicago schools the "worst in the country." While he angered local and state leaders (some of who still talk about it), he set into motion a civic response that created needed reform, which continues to this day.

So as you refer the *U.S. Senate Education Scorecard* on the thirty-five pending races for office, we admit that we're taking sides, but not on a partisan level. Rather, we're taking sides for individuals who are willing to cast the votes that not only help children but may in fact advance some policies along in a state, even from Washington.

# HOW REFORM-MINDED ARE THEY?

Assessing the reform prowess of a U.S. Senator is an exercise that requires counting up key votes by incumbents that suggest an interest in, or proclivity toward, reform. Interest in boosting charter schools can often - but not always -- be predicted by how one voted on a myriad of charter incentive programs that are part of education or other appropriations. Sometimes that vote may be a result of a variety of issues, but more often than not, a U.S. Senator willing to cast a vote for a bill that includes a choice program or funding for charters means they are positively predisposed.

For challengers, we've had to search their campaign literature, their comments in speeches or debates, and press coverage. Many of those running for U.S. Senate have voting records from state government. In each instance, we've been able to materialize at least one data point to provide us insights into how the challenger, if elected, might vote on important national education votes.

#### **METHODOLOGY**

The Scorecard was developed as follows:

D.C. School Choice - This 2003 vote was a watershed for school choice. While the program in question provided only a tiny amount of money in the big scheme of things for a program serving approximately 2,000 poor children from failing D.C. schools, the months long debate, negotiations and much controversy showed us where Senators were willing to stand on this important issue on a grand scale.

Charter School Incentive Funds - The Charter School Program (CSP) - is the major federal funding initiative which gives states money to provide start up grants to new charter schools. In addition, various incentive funds for facilities in the form of credit enhancement have been put to a vote, allowing for objective assessment of charter support.

NCLB - While many who once claimed to support the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB) now argue that they would only do so if there were significant changes (e.g. More money, less federal power, etc.). However, the basic premise of ensuring strong accountability for how districts spend federal funds is a challenge to the status quo.

In some cases a vote for or against an issue may have been for unrelated reasons. We sought additional validation of support or opposition in determining scores for charters and NCLB, in particular.

Each of these three voting areas garners three possible points. Three is a clear up or down vote with no hesitation or strong support. Two is a "yes" vote but one that came under much duress. For non-incumbents, a two is moderate support. A one means the individual either abstained in a vote or offers only weak support. A zero means opposition or a clear "no" vote. Candidates whose positions still remained unclear after numerous attempts to contact them and detailed research on their coverage of the issues were also given a zero.

An individual who scores a 7-9 is a real reformer. A score of 5-6 means the individual is a moderate supporter of some reform, but probably has little passion on the subject. A score of 4 and below - well, this individual is most likely a supporter of the status quo and anti-reform.

Jeanne Allen President

# 2008 U.S. SENATE CANDIDATE SCORECARD

Candi	idates for U.S. Senate	Party	D.C. School Choice	Charter School Incentive Funds	NCLB	EdReform Score
Alaba			55.5			333.5
※	Jeff Sessions	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Vivian Davis Figures	Democrat	0	0	0	0
Alask		Democrat	J	0	0	J
XIASK		Popublican	3	2	3	8
14	Ted Stevens	Republican				
A .	Mark Begich	Democrat	0	2	0	2
Arkar						_
1/2	Mark Pryor	Democrat	3	3	2	8
	Unopposed					
Color	rado					
	Mark Udall	Democrat	0	I	2	3
	Bob Schaffer	Republican	3	3	0	6
Delav	vare T	1 1				
	Joe Biden	Democrat	0	3	I	4
	Christine O'Donnell	Republican	0	0	0	0
Geor	gia					
茶	Saxby Chambliss	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Jim Martin	Democrat	0	0	0	0
Idaho						
	Jim Risch	Republican	3	3	0	6
	Larry LaRocco	Democrat	0	0	0	0
Illinoi		2 3. 3.	-	-		-
	Dick Durbin	Democrat	2	3	ı	6
**	Steve Sauerberg	Republican	3	3	3	9
-IS	I steve sauerberg	Nebanican	J	J	J	7

# 2008 U.S. SENATE CANDIDATE SCORECARD, continued

Iowa						
	Tom Harkin	Democrat	1	3	I	5
	Christopher Reed	Republican	0	0	0	0
Kansa	ns					
茶	Pat Roberts	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Jim Slattery	Democrat	0	2	0	2
Kentı	icky					
茶	Mitch McConnell	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Bruce Lunsford	Democrat	0	0	0	0
Louisi	jana					
茶	Mary Landrieu	Democrat	3	3	I	7
	John Kennedy	Republican	1	3	I	5
Maine						
	Susan Collins	Republican	2	2	2	6
	Tom Allen	Democrat	0	0	I	I
Massa	achusetts					
	John Kerry	Democrat	0	3	I	4
	Jeff Beatty	Republican	3	3	0	6
Michi	gan					
	Carl Levin	Democrat	0	3	0	3
	Jack Hoogendyk	Republican	3	3	0	6
Minne	esota					
兴	Norm Coleman	Republican	3	3	2	8
	Al Franken	Democrat	0	0	0	0

Missis	sippi					
茶	Thad Cochran	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Erik Fleming	Democrat	I	I	I	3
Missis	sippi Special Election					
茶	Roger Wicker	Republican	3	1	3	7
	Ronnie Musgrove	Democrat	0	0	I	ı
Mont	ana					
茶	Max Baucus	Democrat	0	3	2	5
	Bob Kelleher	Republican	3	2	2	7
Nebr	aska					
	Scott Kleeb	Democrat	0	0	0	0
	Mike Johanns	Republican	3	2	0	5
New	Hampshire					
兴	John Sununu	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Jeanne Shaheen	Democrat	0	0	I	I
New	Jersey					
	Frank Lautenberg	Democrat	0	2	I	3
茶	Dick Zimmer	Republican	3	3	3	9
New	Mexico					
	Tom Udall	Democrat	0	0	-	I
	Steve Pearce	Republican	3	2	I	6
Nortl	n Carolina					
茶	Elizabeth Dole	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Kay Hagan	Democrat	0	0	0	0

Oklah	noma I	T				
茶	Jim Inhofe	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Andrew Rice	Democrat	0	0	0	0
Oreg	on					
茶	Gordon Smith	Republican	3	2	3	8
,	Jeff Merkley	Democrat	0	I	0	I
Rhod	e Island					
	Jack Reed	Democrat	0	3	3	6
	Robert Tingle	Republican	3	3	0	6
South	Carolina					
茶	Lindsey Graham	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Bob Conley	Democrat	0	0	0	0
South	Dakota					
	Tim Johnson	Democrat	0	3	I	4
	Joel Dykstra	Republican	I	1	3	5
Tenne	essee					
**	Lamar Alexander	Republican	3	3	3	9
	Bob Tuke	Democrat	0	0	0	0
Texas	5					
**	John Comyn	Republican	3	3	I	7
	Rick Noriega	Democrat	0	0	0	0
Virgin	nia					
	Mark Warner	Democrat	0	2	2	4
₹ <u>`</u>	Jim Gilmore	Republican	3	3	3	9

# 2008 U.S. SENATE CANDIDATE SCORECARD, continued

West	Virginia					
	Jay Rockefeller	Democrat	0	2	2	4
	Jay Wolfe	Republican	3	3	0	6
Wyor	ming					
***	Mike Enzi	Republican	2	3	3	8
<i>\</i>	Chris Rothfuss	Democrat	0	3	I	4
Wyor	Wyoming Special Election					
	John Barrasso	Republican	0	0	0	0
	Nick Carter	Democrat	0	0	0	0

U.S. Senate Candidate Scorecard Key
Italics indicate incumbent.
Score 7-9: Supports education reform fully.
Score 5-6: Moderate to weak support.
Score 4 and helow: Most likely to defend status-guo and he anti-reform