

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

(AUTO)

THE FOLLOWING FILE(S) ERASED

FILE	FILE TYPE	OPTION
067	MEMORY TX	

TEL NO.

919163232596

PAGE RESULT

14/14 OK

1 DONE
BB

ERRORS

1) HANG UP OR LINE FAIL 2) BUSY 3) NO ANSWER 4) NO FACSIMILE CONNECTION

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: Rona HallahraORGANIZATION: Sen. Johnston's officePHONE NUMBER: 916 322-4815FAX NUMBER: 916 323-2596FROM: MICHAEL COHEN

202 401-3070

Call Vicki 401-3389

or Mike Kerst's office

for Fax #

PH ?
415-723-4412

Mike Kerst Fax

415 725-7412
FAX ~~##~~

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

(AUTO)

THE FOLLOWING FILE(S) ERASED

FILE	FILE TYPE	OPTION	TEL NO.	PAGE	RESULT
049	MEMORY TX		919163232596	25/25	OK

ERRORS

1) HANG UP OR LINE FAIL 2) BUSY 3) NO ANSWER 4) NO FACSIMILE CONNECTION



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTALTO: Rona HallabrinORGANIZATION: Sen. Johnston's officePHONE NUMBER: 916 322-4815FAX NUMBER: 916 323-2596FROM: MICHAEL COHENPHONE NUMBER: 202 401-3070

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

(AUTO)

THE FOLLOWING FILE(S) ERASED

FILE	FILE TYPE	OPTION
068	MEMORY TX	

TEL NO.

914157257412

PAGE RESULT

21/21 OK

ERRORS

1) HANG UP OR LINE FAIL 2) BUSY 3) NO ANSWER 4) NO FACSIMILE CONNECTION



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO:

Mike Kunt

ORGANIZATION:

Stanford

PHONE NUMBER:

415 723-4112

FAX NUMBER:

FROM: **MICHAEL COHEN**PHONE NUMBER: **202 401-3070**

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

(AUTO)

THE FOLLOWING FILE(S) ERASED

FILE	FILE TYPE	OPTION	TEL. NO.	PAGE	RESULT
071	MEMORY TX		914157257412	14/14	OK

ERRORS

1) HANG UP OR LINE FAIL 2) BUSY 3) NO ANSWER 4) NO FACSIMILE CONNECTION



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: Mike KurtORGANIZATION: StanfordPHONE NUMBER: 415 723-4412

FAX NUMBER: _____

FROM: MICHAEL COHENPHONE NUMBER: 202 401-3070



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: Rona Hallahin

ORGANIZATION: Sen. Johnston's office

PHONE NUMBER: 916 322-4815

FAX NUMBER: 916 323-2596

FROM: MICHAEL COHEN

PHONE NUMBER: 202 401-3070

MESSAGE: Here is the Clement Institute
Report

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

THIS TRANSMISSION IS INTENDED FOR AND RESTRICTED TO THE NAMED ADDRESSEE ONLY. IT MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU RECEIVE THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR. YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, COPYING, OR DISSEMINATING THE TRANSMISSION. PLEASE CALL 202-401-3000 TO ARRANGE FOR RETURN OF ANY TRANSMISSION SET IN ERROR. THANK YOU.

33 **PAGE(S) TO FOLLOW**



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: Mike Kirt

ORGANIZATION: Stanford

PHONE NUMBER: 415 723-4412

FAX NUMBER: _____

FROM: MICHAEL COHEN

PHONE NUMBER: 202 401-3070

MESSAGE: _____

CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE

THIS TRANSMISSION IS INTENDED FOR AND RESTRICTED TO THE NAMED ADDRESSEE ONLY. IT MAY CONTAIN CONFIDENTIAL AND/OR PRIVILEGED INFORMATION. IF YOU RECEIVE THIS TRANSMISSION IN ERROR. YOU ARE NOTIFIED THAT YOU ARE PROHIBITED FROM READING, COPYING, OR DISSEMINATING THE TRANSMISSION. PLEASE CALL 202-401-3000 TO ARRANGE FOR RETURN OF ANY TRANSMISSION SET IN ERROR. THANK YOU.

_____ PAGE(S) TO FOLLOW



THE CLAREMONT INSTITUTE

FOR THE STUDY OF STATESMANSHIP AND POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

Post-It® Fax Note	7671	Date	# of pages 33
To Michael Jackson	From Dana McLennan		
Co./Dept.	Co.		
Phone #	Phone #		
Fax #	Fax #		

DR ET

October 17, 1995

#19

Goals 2000 and California Education: Devolution in Retreat? -

By Lance T. Izumi and Natalie Williams*

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Few topics in recent years have inflamed parents and grassroots education advocates as the Clinton administration's Goals 2000: Educate America Act, passed in 1994. Although the law's supporters contend that Goals 2000 is merely a helpful attempt to increase academic standards in K-12 education, the authors of this study find that in any common sense reading of the law, power is transferred from state and local education authorities to the federal bureaucracy in Washington.

The law makes mandatory a wide variety of federal dictates, controls education course strings, requires national standards, issues federal "skill certificates," imposes new regulations, and manipulates state and local assessments. In so doing, Goals 2000 radically alters the education decisionmaking landscape by centralizing policymaking at the federal level, leaving the states and localities to carry out Washington's dictates.

The major findings of this study include:

- Drafters of the Goals 2000 law use the command "will" at least forty-five times in describing what the federal government expects states and local districts to do to accomplish the Act's eight national goals. The more permissive "should" is used only three times.

- Goals 2000 creates a wide variety of bureaucracies (e.g., the National Goals Panel, regional education laboratories, federal education research institutes, etc.) which are endowed with wide "advocacy" powers in order to get states and localities to implement the national goals and objectives contained in the Act.
- Once a state accepts federal Goals 2000 money, it must implement the national goals and objectives of Goals 2000. According to the Act, any state that applies for Goals 2000 funding must devise a state improvement plan that incorporates "strategies for achieving the National Education Goals."
- Through its control of the purse, the federal government will increase its influence over school curricula. Washington explicitly recommends that states include "gender, equitable and multicultural materials" in its improvement strategies.
- Goals 2000 tells states how to cut their education pie and in some cases even dictates the size of the pie (the level of spending) and mandates what social services schools are to provide on campus.
- Goals 2000 creates a National Skills Standards Board that will endorse a broad spectrum of skills standards to be considered by business and employers when hiring. The related School-to-Work law strongly encourages states to issue "skill certificates" to students who supposedly have met the skills standards promulgated by the National Skills Standards Board. Schools and students who refuse to participate in the skill-certificate program will be at a disadvantage in the job market.
- Even though compliance with Goals 2000 is "voluntary" for states, the law holds disadvantaged children hostage to its dictates. Goals 2000 requires states that receive federal money under the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA) to align state assessments, curriculum, and professional teacher development programs with the standards contained in the Goals 2000 law. California is slated to receive more than \$1 billion in IASA money in 1995-96; two-thirds of this money goes to "compensatory education."
- Goals 2000 may impose radical and untried ideas on most of the nation, but its objectives are already mirrored in California's subject frameworks and its statewide assessment (both the defunct CLAS test and the proposed new assessment). In other words, California has "been there, done that." Since student performance in California has continued to fall under these frameworks, we can expect no improvement if California decides to participate in Goals 2000.

INTRODUCTION

"We seek to support and encourage; we do not dictate or determine local or state policy."

*Richard Riley
U.S. Secretary of Education*

"In the future, because of Goals 2000 and its tight linkage to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act... federal regulation may extend much more directly into what is taught, how it is taught, the conditions in which it is taught, and how it is tested."

*Diane Ravitch
former Assistant Secretary of Education
U.S. Department of Education*

In 1989, the nation's governors met with President Bush and issued a list of six education goals that they wanted America to achieve by the year 2000. Then-governor of Arkansas Bill Clinton was a big proponent of this goal-setting process, which combined national leadership with state innovation and flexibility. There were no federal dollars involved, and no new federal bureaucracy was created to administer it. It was a state-centered program designed to broad national goals, with the key role of policy development left to the governors of the 50 states.

But once Clinton moved from the statehouse to the White House, he abandoned this state-centered program. Instead of a *national* program of statehouse leadership, it became a *federal government* initiative—a distinction that has been lost or forgotten by many of the governors who had joined the Bush initiative. The original six goals were expanded to eight by Clinton and his new Secretary of Education, Richard Riley, and the eight goals were tied to the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which channels billions of dollars to local school districts.

Why has Goals 2000 become controversial? After all, what could be wrong with wanting American students to be number one in the world in math and science? Or wanting every American adult to be literate? Or wanting to increase parental involvement?

The answer, of course, is that there is nothing wrong with desiring these and some of the other laudable goals contained in the Goals 2000 law. However, as with many worthwhile objectives, the means to the ends are just as important as the ends themselves. And in the case of Goals 2000, the means contained in the law's more than 150 pages of fine print should give great pause to anyone who takes seriously the notion of state and local control of education.

This paper, a joint publication of the Pacific Research Institute and the Claremont Institute, examines the fine print in Goals 2000 and focuses on how this law will affect California's public education system—and by inference, the public school systems in other states. Although the law has been seen by many as helpful at best and innocuous at worst, the authors of this study find that Goals 2000 threatens to dominate and control its subject area and concentrate decision-making power in a few unelected officials in Washington. For this reason, it is fair to call it "devolution in retreat," a step backward to greater centralization of authority, not forward to more state and local responsibility. As such, it is a piece of warmed-over 1970s legislation, not a progressive step into the 21st Century.

MECHANISMS OF FEDERAL CONTROL

Congress and the Clinton administration were well aware of the suspicion that had grown in many quarters regarding Goals 2000's potential for federal usurpation of educational decision-making authority. The Goals 2000 law, therefore, specifically cites past laws enacted by Congress that reserves responsibility for education to the states and local school systems. Section 319 of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act (hereafter "the Act") notes:

Public Law 96-88 specified that the establishment of the Department of Education shall not increase the authority of the Federal Government over education or diminish the responsibility for education which is reserved to the States and local school systems and other instrumentalities of the States.¹

This statement is more than a little disingenuous, however, since everyone knows that the vast array of federal programs that funnel federal tax dollars to the states all come with strings and conditions that increase Washington's control over what goes on at local levels. For example, many public schools in low-income areas must ensure that their actions conform to Washington's requirements if they are to receive the millions of federal dollars earmarked for disadvantaged children.

Still, the Act maintains that:

Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, or allocation of State or local resources or mandate a State or any subdivision thereof to spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under this Act.²

¹ "Goals 2000: Educate America Act," Public Law 103-227, March 31, 1994, Section 319, p. 187.

² Ibid., Section 318, p. 186.

Viewed in isolation, this provision seems to preclude the type of federal intrusion that has become all too familiar over the last thirty years. Unfortunately, the Act is laden with terminology, programs and incentives that clearly contradict this supposed respect for the autonomy of states and local jurisdictions.

In Title I, which lays out the eight national education goals and the thirty-five objectives listed under the goals, there is a troubling pattern of word usage that indicates a greater willingness by the federal government to impose its will than it would have the public believe.³ Although the Clinton administration emphasizes the voluntary nature of the goals, the Act uses the command word "will" at least forty-five times in describing what the federal government expects states, localities, and individuals to do to accomplish the various goals.

Thus, one finds dictates such as:

All children will have access to high-quality and developmentally appropriate preschool programs. . . .

Parents will have access to the training and support parents need.

Children will receive the nutrition, physical activity, experiences, and health care needed to arrive at school with healthy minds and bodies. . . .

All students will be knowledgeable about the diverse cultural heritage of this Nation. . .

All teachers will have access to preservice teacher education and continuing professional development activities. . . .

States and school districts will create integrated strategies to attract, recruit, prepare, retrain, and support the continued professional development of teachers, administrators, and other educators. . . .

Schools, in implementing comprehensive parent involvement programs, will offer more adult literacy, parent training and life-long learning opportunities. . . .

Every local educational agency will develop a sequential, comprehensive kindergarten through twelfth grade drug and alcohol prevention education program. . . .⁴ (Emphases added.)

³ Ibid., Section 102. See the Appendix at the end of this paper for a listing and analysis of the eight national goals contained in the Act.

⁴ Ibid., Section 102, pp. 130-133.

What are the meanings of phrases such as "will have access to," "will offer," "will develop," and "will create"? Do they not mean that states and local school districts have an obligation to create a plethora of new programs to fulfill the imperatives of the Act?

It is obvious that the use of the command word "will" was deliberate. In Title I, the permissive word "should" is used as well, but only three times. Thus, for example:

Community-based teams should be organized to provide students and teachers with needed support.

Every school should work to eliminate sexual harassment.⁵ (Emphases added.)

Why the difference? One expert on legal drafting observes that the word "will" not only expresses a future contingency, but also, "when the relationship is a delicate one, expresses both parties' obligations."⁶ Under such a definition of "will," the states could find themselves forced to implement the goals' many objectives (especially if, as will be discussed later, the states decide to accept the federal funding attached to the Act).

A principal problem that arises from such word usage is judicial interpretation in future court cases. Recent judicial history is replete with examples of courts making critical changes in public policy through loose interpretations of the words in laws. The word "will" is not permissive; it is a mandate to do a specific thing, and federal courts will likely interpret it that way.

New Bureaucracies

Another concern is the various federal entities that are created under the Act. For instance, the National Education Goals Panel is empowered to report progress that the states and the nation are making toward achieving the goals of the Act. Among the Goals Panel's duties is to "identify actions that should be taken by Federal, State, and local governments to enhance progress toward achieving the National Education Goals and to provide all students with a fair opportunity to learn."⁷ Although states and local jurisdictions may decide to ignore the identified actions, as we discuss in the following section on the federal "purse," resisting federal "advice" will not be as easy as it may seem.

The Goals Panel is also charged with an advocacy mission:

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Bryan A. Garner, *Advanced Legal Drafting* (Dallas, TX: Law Prose, Inc. 1994), p. 13.

⁷ "Goals 2000," Section 203, p. 136.

The Goals panel shall help build a nationwide, bipartisan consensus for the reforms necessary to achieve the National Education Goals.⁸

Statements by Colorado Governor Roy Romer, an active supporter of Goals 2000, demonstrate what type of advocacy one can expect from the Goals Panel and its bureaucratic subgroups. According to Romer, Goals 2000 is in trouble because "parents and voters oppose the scheme." In view of this skepticism on the part of the public, Romer is encouraging the Goals Panel's subgroups to work with business executives and state legislators who have been resistant to Goals 2000. In other words, if local leaders aren't showing the proper enthusiasm, they must be educated and propagandized until they come around. The federal goal will drive local reforms, not the other way around.

The Act also creates Resource and Technical Planning Groups on School Readiness. A primary duty of these Groups is to "create clear guidelines regarding the nature, functions, and uses of early childhood assessments, including assessment formats that are appropriate for use in culturally and linguistically diverse communities, based on model elements of school readiness."⁹ What is the force of these guidelines? Will the federal government determine the validity of assessments in areas such as bilingualism? Even though the Planning Groups are supposed to operate in an advisory capacity, in California their guidelines could have a disproportionate impact on the state's assessment programs. The assessment debate in California continues to rage after last year's California Learning Assessment System (CLAS) debacle, leaving an open field for federal influence.

A major body created by the Act, the National Education Standards and Improvement Council (NESIC), which is charged with overseeing the creation of the voluntary national content and student performance standards, is currently the target of defunding moves in Congress. Although still not officially dead, the NESIC will not be a factor for some time, if at all (at present, no nominations have been put forward for any Council member positions). It should be remembered, however, that the NESIC's possible demise does not eliminate the national standards themselves, or the fact that states receiving federal funds will have to meet those standards.

The Act also creates a number of federal research institutes. The problem with these institutes is that the mission outlined for them in the Act contains provisions that would turn them into advocacy organizations. For example, the National Institute on Student Achievement, Curriculum and Assessment (NISACA) is charged with, among other things, identifying:

⁸ Ibid., Section 203(6), p. 136.

⁹ Ibid., Section 207, p. 138.

- (viii) the impact and effectiveness of Federal, State, and local efforts to provide gender-fair educational opportunities to elementary and secondary students;
- (ix) programs, policies, and approaches which promote gender equity in elementary and secondary education.¹⁰

Given this charter, what would the Institute have to say about recent efforts by African-American parents to create single-sex schools, which have been shown to improve the achievement and discipline of children, especially male children, in that community? It is hard to imagine that such innovations would be able to receive a fair hearing and analysis.

Another group of bureaucracies created by the Act, which have so far received little attention, are the "regional educational laboratories." Under Section 941(h) of the Act, the United States would be divided up into regions each having a regional educational laboratory. States participating in Goals 2000 must give their consent to the formation of these laboratories through their chief state school officials and their state boards of education. The mission of the labs is to promote reform efforts. The labs are supposed to be, among other things, a resource for schools within the region.

Although the regional labs may prove to be innocuous, they are simply another layer of bureaucracy that have the potential to impose their will on local schools. The regional labs will be governed by an unelected, appointed board made up of various state officials and special interest representatives. Among its main duties, the board:

Directs the regional educational laboratory to carry out the laboratory's duties in a manner as will make progress toward achieving the National Education Goals and reforming schools and education systems.¹¹

Like the Goals Panel and the research institutes, the board and the labs are given an advocacy mission.

Potentially more damaging to local control of schools is the labs' stated duty to:

Facilitate school restructuring at the individual school level, including technical assistance for adapting model demonstration grant programs to each school.¹²

¹⁰ Ibid., Section 931(d)(2)(A), p. 232.

¹¹ Ibid., Section 941(h)(6)(A)(v), p. 253.

¹² Ibid., Section 941(h)(3)(D), p. 251.

This duty is much more interventionist than simply supplying educational research to state and local school agencies. Furthermore, "restructuring" has become a buzz word in many education circles for changing school curricula and school governance and for promoting the controversial principles of outcome-based education. The fact that unelected bureaucratic entities such as the regional educational labs have, as a primary duty, the facilitation of this controversial concept at the school site level is an open invitation to unwanted federally-sponsored meddling into local decision-making.

Federal Requirements Come with the Money

Perhaps the most pernicious instrument of federal control of state and local education policy is the additional federal funding that is made available by the Goals 2000 Act. Under Title III of the Act, \$400 million was authorized for fiscal year 1994-95 for the purpose of allowing the federal government to make allotments to the states. In order for states to receive this funding they must, unsurprisingly, meet a number of requirements contained in the Act.

What are those requirements? According to Section 306 of the Act, "any State educational agency that wishes to receive an allotment under [Title III] after its first year of participation shall develop and implement a State improvement plan for the improvement of elementary and secondary education in the State."¹³ In turn, the required state improvement plan must itself meet an important requirement:

Each State educational agency, with broad-based classroom teacher input, shall establish and include in its State improvement plan strategies for meeting the National Education Goals by improving teaching and learning and students' mastery of basic and advanced skills. . . .¹⁴

In order for the states to get the Goals 2000 money, they must adhere to the goals, objectives and standards laid out by the Act. The minute any state decides to accept any part of the Goals 2000 largesse, the supposedly "voluntary" goals become mandatory.

But this is not all. The Act not only requires that states abide by its goals, it also lists the strategies that they must follow in order to meet the goals. Alarming, these required strategies open the door to radical policy-meddling by federal officials. For example, a state strategy must include:

A process for aligning State or local curricula, instructional materials, and State assessments with the State content standards and State student performance standards.¹⁵

¹³ Ibid., Section 306, p. 160.

¹⁴ Ibid., Section 306(c), p. 162.

¹⁵ Ibid., Section 306(c)(1)(C), p. 163.

The trouble is that under Goals 2000, state content and student performance standards are heavily influenced by the federal government. (This influence is explained in detail below.) The federal government will therefore have a heavy influence on the curricula, books and tests of local schools.

What kinds of books and materials does the federal government wish to promote? Again, the Act explicitly recommends that state strategies include:

A process for developing, selecting, or recommending instructional materials, including gender equitable and multicultural materials, and technology to support and assist local educational agencies and schools to provide all students the opportunity to meet State content standards and State student performance standards.¹⁶

Gender-equity and multiculturalist textbooks and materials have caused extreme controversy and division among parents and state and local school officials. Many of these works are infused with anti-male and anti-Western biases, and often rely more on polemics than on objective scholarship. Yet this is the type of instructional material that Washington singles out for inclusion in state strategies.

Further, the Act seeks to affect the exact ways in which states divide their education budget pie. The Act recommends that strategies include:

Assessing the effectiveness and equity of the school finance program of the State to identify disparities in the resources available to each local educational agency and school in such State and how such disparities affect the ability of the State educational agency and local educational agencies to develop and implement plans under [Title III].¹⁷

In view of provisions such as this, the Act's pretense of not directing how a state or locality allocates its resources is no more than empty rhetoric.

A good example of the gap between a good goal and bad means can be found in the Act's standards regarding parental and community involvement. On the positive side, the Act requires that:

Each State improvement plan shall describe strategies for how the State educational agency will involve parents and other community representatives in planning, designing, and implementing the State improvement plan. . . .¹⁸

¹⁶ Ibid., Section 306(c)(2)(C), p. 163.

¹⁷ Ibid., Section 306(c)(2)(B), p. 163.

¹⁸ Ibid., Section 306(f), p. 164.

The strategy described by the Act as a way to achieve parental and community involvement raises very serious questions. The Act envisions a strategy which will result in:

Increasing the access of all students to social services, health care, nutrition, related services, and child care services, and locating such services in schools, cooperating service agencies, community-based centers, or other convenient sites designed to provide "one-stop shopping" for parents and students.¹⁹

To what social services must the state and local jurisdictions provide "access" to? What types of health care services? Perhaps those "reproductive services" advocated by former Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders? And what types of child care services? And how appropriate is it to locate these services on school campuses? Is this not another example of schools taking on new roles that divert it from its primary mission—to teach?

Carrots and Sticks: Federal Approval of State Plans and Strategies

Although Goals 2000 advocates in California downplay the mandatory nature of the state improvement plans and the strategies required to implement them, there is no getting around the fact that under Section 307 of the Act, it is the federal Secretary of Education who has approval power over a state's application for funding under the Act. More important, after the first year of funding, the Secretary will approve further funding only if he has approved the state improvement plan and has determined "that the State has made substantial progress in developing its State improvement plan and will implement such plan not later than the end of the second year of participation."²⁰

This process raises important questions, such as:

- Does the state's improvement plan and accompanying strategies include gender equitable and multicultural textbooks?
- Does it include an "equitable" distribution (at least in Washington's eyes) of state education budget dollars?
- Are large numbers of social services, including perhaps even reproductive services, available to the state's children?
- Has the state included in its plan and strategies ways to implement the thirty-five objectives listed under the eight national goals?

¹⁹ Ibid., Section 306(f)(2), p. 164.

²⁰ Ibid., Section 307(b)(1)(B), p. 167.

The answers to such questions could determine whether the federal Secretary decides to bestow a Goals 2000 grant on a state. In other words, the federal Secretary has significant discretionary power to accept or reject a state's application based on the state's adherence to Washington's policies. Given that states have historically accepted federal dictates that translate to more dollars in their budgets, there will be powerful and irresistible pressure on states to conform to federal education policies.

It is not just the Secretary's power to approve a state's improvement plan that gives his agency carrot-and-stick leverage. According to Section 317 of the Act, the Secretary of Education can award technology grants to states that, as part of their state improvement plans, include:

[A] systemic statewide plan to increase the use of state-of-the-art technologies that enhance elementary and secondary student learning and staff development in support of the National Education Goals and State content standards and State student performance standards.²¹

Again, behind the promise of money is the requirement that the federal goals be promoted. It is also instructive to note that the Act dictates how the states allocate the funds they receive under its auspices. After the first year of funding, at least ninety percent of a state's allotment must be used either to fund the state improvement plan at the local level or "to improve educator preservice programs and for professional development activities that are consistent with the State improvement plan."²² The remaining ten percent or less can be used for state activities such as promoting public magnet and charter schools; supporting contracting with private management organizations to reform schools; and supporting violence-reduction programs in schools. In essence, teachers are given access to the vast majority of the Act's funds, but supporters of cutting-edge reforms such as charter schools and private contracting have access to only a tiny fraction of these funds.

Even supporters of Goals 2000 admit that there are potential control problems if states decide to take the Act's funding. California's state Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), which supports California's participation in the Act, nevertheless warns that "Taking advantage of the federal framework is not risk-free. . . ." The LAO realizes that the voluntary nature of the Act is more illusion than reality:

The state would always be able to opt out of Goals 2000 if it appeared federal policy making was interfering with state or local authority. (Of course, California would also

²¹ Ibid., Section 317(b)(1), p. 184.

²² Ibid., Section 308(b)(1)(B), p. 168.

have to relinquish the federal funds provided under Goals 2000, which would not be easy.)²³

The amount of money California has received under the Act has been modest thus far. In 1994-1995, California was allocated \$10 million. For 1995-1996, however, California is to receive \$42 million. After that, the amount increases even more dramatically. How long will it be for the state to withdraw after local districts become dependent on this money? And remember, only the state has this option; California's 1,002 districts will have no such option.

GOALS 2000 AND THE FEDERAL SCHOOL-TO-WORK LAW

Usurping local decision-making power is just one troubling aspect of the Goals 2000 Act. Equally disturbing is the Act's intrusion into the private labor market. Under the Act, a National Skill Standards Board is established, the purpose of which is:

... to serve as a catalyst in stimulating the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and of assessment and certification of attainment of skill standards.²⁴

Why the need for "skill standards"? According to the Act, the standards, assessment, and certification are to be used:

- (A) by the Nation, to ensure the development of a high skills, high quality, high performance workforce, including the most skilled front-line workforce in the world;
- (B) by industries, as a vehicle for informing training providers and prospective employees of skills necessary for employment;
- (C) by employers, to assist in evaluating the skill levels of prospective employees and to assist in the training of current employees;
- (D) by labor organizations, to enhance the employment security of workers by providing portable credentials and skills;
- (E) by workers, to—
 - (i) obtain certifications of their skills to protect against dislocation;
 - (ii) pursue career advancement; and

²³ Legislative Analyst's Office, "Implementing New Federal Education Legislation," Sacramento, CA, February 1995, p. 7.

²⁴ "Goals 2000," Section 502, p. 191.

(iii) enhance their ability to reenter the workforce;

(F) by students and entry level workers, to determine the skill levels and competencies needed to be obtained in order to compete effectively for high wage jobs;

(G) by training providers and educators, to determine appropriate training services to offer.²⁵

In other words, *everybody* should be using these skill standards.

As with the Act's national goals, skill standards may, at first, seem like a good idea, especially in view of employer complaints about the quality of new workers coming out of the public schools. Unfortunately, the envisioned skill standards, like the national goals, are a Pandora's box of federal entanglement in local education and the private sector job market.

The National Skills Standards Board will, after conferring with representatives of business, labor, education, and various other organizations, adopt skill standards for a broad spectrum of private industries (the Act refers to "broad clusters of major occupations"²⁶). These standards must take into account, among other things, standards used in other countries, requirements of work organizations, and, perhaps most importantly, "content and performance standards" certified by the National Education Goals Panel.²⁷ Thus, the education standards created by the National Education Goals Panel will be incorporated into the national skills standards that Washington wants employers to use. It is apparent that the Clinton administration wants the business community to pressure local schools to use the education standards contained in the Act so that students will be able (supposedly) to meet the new skill standards.

Goals 2000 supporters will undoubtedly point out that, like other provisions in the Act, the skills standards will be voluntary. However, like these other "voluntary" provisions, closer scrutiny shows that there is less "voluntariness" here than meets the eye.

To judge fully just how "voluntary" the skills standards are, it is necessary to look at the federal School-To-Work Opportunities Act of 1994 (referred to below as STW), which is a companion law to the Goals 2000 Act. According to its stated purpose, STW establishes:

... a national framework within which all States can create statewide School-to-Work Opportunities systems that—

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Ibid., Section 504(a), p. 195.

²⁷ Ibid., Section 505(d)(1)(B)(III), p. 197.

(A) are part of comprehensive education reform;

(B) are integrated with the systems developed under Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the National Skill Standards Act of 1994; and

(C) offer opportunities for all students to participate in a performance-based education training program. . . .²⁸

In addition, STW explicitly states that another of its purposes is:

... to further the National Education Goals set forth in Title I of the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.²⁹

STW, therefore, exists in large part simply to further the reach of Goals 2000.

One of the principal tools used by STW to ensure that the ideology of Goals 2000 becomes part of both school and workplace is the creation of a "skill certificate." According to STW, a skills certificate is:

... a portable, industry-recognized credential issued by a School-to-Work Opportunities program under an approved State plan, that certifies that a student has mastered skills at levels that are at least as challenging as skill standards endorsed by the National Skill Standards Board established under the National Skill Standards Act of 1994, except that until such skill standards are developed, the term "skill certificate" means a credential issued under a process described in the approved State plan.³⁰

Why is this skill certificate so critical? If the government is handing out skill certificates to select students, then these students will, at least initially, have an advantage

over those students who do not have a certificate when it comes to getting a job or perhaps getting into college. The problem then becomes two-fold. First, those states and local jurisdictions that want to resist participation in Goals 2000 will feel pressure to reverse their position because students from states and localities participating in Goals 2000/STW will be receiving skill certificates which will, as a consequence, place the students from non-participating jurisdictions at an initial competitive disadvantage. Second, those students without a certificate will not just be those youngsters who have failed to study hard and perform, but will also include many students who attend private schools and home schools that oppose participation in Goals 2000/STW because of fear of government control.

²⁸ "School-To-Work Opportunities Act of 1994," Public Law 103-239, May 4, 1994, Section 3(a). The National Skills Standards Act of 1994 is that part of the Goals 2000 Act that established the National Skills Standards Board.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Ibid., Section 4(22).

If states, localities and private schools decide to participate in the offering of skill certificates, the inevitable result will be teaching to the certificate: curricula will be shaped to improve the chances of students to obtain these certificates. This is important since, as has been noted, the skills certificates issued under any state plan must meet the skill levels and standards endorsed by the National Skills Standards Board. It will be this federal Board, therefore, that will set the broad criteria for getting a skill certificate, not the states or localities. This power will give the federal government strong influence over what is being taught in the classroom.

Further, STW also increases federal power by requiring that a state or local School-to-Work Opportunities program that awards skill certificates include:

... a program of study designed to meet the same academic content standards the State has established for all students, including, where applicable, standards established under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act. . . .³¹

Thus, all those supposedly voluntary standards contained in the Goals 2000 Act suddenly become mandatory if a state or local jurisdiction wants to award skill certificates under STW. Federal education priorities, not local ones, will, therefore, become dominant.

As with the Goals 2000 Act, the federal government also increases its education policy-making power through the disbursement of federal dollars. Under STW, states can apply for grants to develop a School-to-Work Opportunities system. Not surprisingly, there is a big condition that must be met if states are to get their federal money:

The Secretaries [of Education and Labor] may approve an application submitted by a State under section 203 only if the State demonstrates in such application that the activities proposed to be undertaken by the State to develop a statewide School-to-Work Opportunities system are consistent with the State improvement plan for the State, if any, under the Goals 2000: Educate America Act.³²

Furthermore, in the grant application the state's School-to-Work Opportunities plan must:

... describe how the State will adopt, develop, or assist local partnerships to adopt or develop model curricula and innovative instructional methodologies, to be used in the secondary, and where possible, the elementary grades, that integrate academic and vocational learning and promote career awareness, and that are consistent with academic and skill standards established pursuant to the Goals 2000: Educate America Act and the National Skill Standards Act of 1994.³³

³¹ Ibid., Section 102(3).

³² Ibid., Section 204.

³³ Ibid., Section 213(d)(8).

Also, a state's grant application must:

... describe the process of the State for assessing the skills and knowledge required in career majors, and the process for awarding skill certificates that is, to the extent feasible, consistent with the skills standards certification system endorsed under the National Skill Standards Act of 1994.²⁴

In other words, unless a state can demonstrate that its School-to-Work Opportunities plan is following the national goals and standards contained in the Goals 2000 Act, and that its skills certification system is following the skills standards laid down by the Goals 2000 Act's National Skill Standards Board, a state will not be able to receive its grant. In view of these requirements, STW's Section 604, which purports to prohibit STW from imposing federal mandates, direction, and control, becomes just so much ineffectual boilerplate. The reality is that states will be forced to bend to the federal will because that is what the federal funding strings require.

Is this too harsh an assessment of what faces California and other states? The evidence to date, unfortunately, indicates that this assessment is all too accurate. In June 1994, Governor Wilson created a School-to-Career Task Force. A preliminary report of that task force endorsed the skill certificate concept (the task force proposed so-called "certificates of mastery").

In addition, this year several school-to-work bills were introduced in the State Legislature. One bill, AB 1835 by Assemblywoman Liz Figueroa (D-Fremont), would have created "certificates of mastery" that would have been coordinated and integrated with the Goals 2000 Act and STW. These certificates would be awarded based on "performance-based" assessments of pupils. It should be pointed out that performance-

based assessments are not synonymous with *skill-based* assessments. In today's testing and assessment environment, they often involve putting emphasis on what a child feels rather than what the child knows about the subject. It was this deficiency that led to the cancellation of the CLAS test last year.

Although none of the school-to-work legislation passed, bills such as AB 1835 give Californians an insight into what could lie ahead in their education future under STW. It seems odd that California, which is one of the leaders in the charter school movement—a movement based on empowering parents, teachers, and principals at the school site—could also be on the

²⁴ Ibid., Section 213(d)(16). Local jurisdictions may also apply directly for federal grants under STW. They are subject to the same requirements as states. See Section 303(c)(3).

verge of taking a bite out of the STW apple and transferring key powers to federal bureaucrats in Washington. Indeed, it is chilling to read that under STW:

... the Secretaries [of Education and Labor] shall jointly provide for, and shall exercise final authority over, the administration of this Act, and shall have final authority to jointly issue whatever procedures, guidelines, and regulations, in accordance with section 553 of title 5, United States Code, the Secretaries consider necessary and appropriate to administer and enforce the provisions of this Act.³⁵

Is this not an opening for greatly expanded federal regulation of education? A commonsensical reading of Goals 2000 and STW would make it hard not to feel uncomfortable when answering this question.

HOLDING CHILDREN HOSTAGE: THE IMPROVING AMERICA'S SCHOOLS ACT (IASA)

In addition to School-to-Work schemes, another federal program is guided by Goals 2000 and involves vastly greater sums of federal dollars—the Improving America's Schools Act of 1994 (IASA). The IASA reauthorized the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), and allocated approximately \$12 billion to thirty-two separate federal funding programs. In 1994-1995, California received \$900 million in ESEA money, and will receive more than \$1 billion in 1995-1996. More than two-thirds of this money goes to "compensatory education," i.e., money for services to disadvantaged children.

In a critical analysis titled, "Goals 2000 and a Reauthorized ESEA: National Standards and Accompanying Controversies," authors Michael W. Kirst and James W. Guthrie note that Goals 2000 will alter the Chapter One element from its long-standing regulatory and fiscal role to a "powerfully administrative instrument for fundamentally changing America's public schools." Goals 2000 in effect achieves a marriage between the financial

clout of the reauthorized ESEA/IASA—nearly \$1 billion in California—and the administrative authority of a planning process aimed at comprehensive goals for all schools.

It should come as no surprise that in order to receive its ESEA/IASA money, California must use the Goals 2000 standards. In summarizing the state responsibilities under ESEA/IASA, the LAO notes:

Title 1—Compensatory Education

- * Develop content and performance standards and assessments to evaluate school performance in mathematics and reading. States are required to use

³⁵ Ibid., Section 5(a)(1).

the standards and assessments developed under Goals 2000 if they are participating in that act.

Title 2—Professional Development

- * Develop a plan to provide teachers and administrators the skills to help students meet Goals 2000 performance standards. . . .
- * Align teacher training and licensing with Goals 2000 curriculum and performance standards.³⁶

Local education agencies, according to the LAO, must also adhere to the Goals 2000 agenda:

Title 2—Professional Development

- * Apply to the state for Title 2 grants. Local applications must be focused on the training needed to meet Goals 2000 standards. . . .

Title 6—Innovative Education Strategies

- * Develop a plan for the use of funds that helps the district meet the Goals 2000 standards. . . .³⁷

Further, under ESEA Title V, which is designed to promote equity of magnet school assistance, priority funding is given to magnet schools that propose to implement approaches that are consistent with Title III of the Goals 2000 Act (recall that this was the part of the Act dealing with state and local improvement plans).

In testimony before Congress, former Secretaries of Education William Bennett and Lamar Alexander observed that the legislation reauthorizing ESEA "mandates the kinds of

federally-approved 'standards' that Goals 2000 said would be voluntary." However, said the two former Secretaries, "Only with those approved 'content' and 'student performance' standards in place can a state or community get its federal aid." Finally, Bennett and Alexander warn:

[The IASA/ESEA] bill takes a giant step toward reviving the legitimacy—and federal supervision—of criteria that judge schools by their spending levels, pupil-teacher ratios, and suchlike, instead of their effectiveness. And since Goals 2000 authorized the Education Department to develop national "opportunity to learn" standards, we can expect that these will soon exist—and be used.³⁸

³⁶ "Implementing New Federal Education Legislation," p.24.

³⁷ Ibid., p. 26.

³⁸ Empower America press release, September 30, 1994, p. 2.

Bennett's and Alexander's fears are more than justified. The Legislative Analyst Office, for example, recommends that:

Local ESEA plans should be required to address the standards set out in the state's Goals 2000 plan.³⁹

If the state follows such recommendations, federal control of state and local education will have been accomplished by the states and localities themselves. As Diane Ravitch, former Assistant Secretary of Education in the Bush administration and a highly respected education writer, observed:

What bears watching in Goals 2000 is the precedent it establishes for federal legislation that influences the kinds of textbooks, teaching materials, teacher training methods, and research findings that must be used in every school to receive federal funds. For many years, the federal government exercised great restraint by respecting state and local control of education. In the future, because of Goals 2000 and its tight linkage to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act . . . federal regulation may extend much more directly into what is taught, how it is taught, the conditions in which it is taught, and how it is tested.⁴⁰

GOALS 2000 AND CALIFORNIA'S DECLINING STANDARDS

Given that Goals 2000 and its related laws will increase federal control over education decision-making, it is fair to ask what effect the Act will have on education standards in California. Most Americans would agree that any standard adopted by policymakers should

be clearly measurable and based on academics. Ravitch says that "A standard is both a goal (what should be done) and a measure of progress toward that goal (how well it was done)."

The Act gives us a clue to the type of standards it will endorse when it says that one of its purposes is "to improve learning and teaching by providing a national framework for education reform."⁴¹ Those involved in recent debates on tests and standards will recognize the term "frameworks." It is the buzz word for California's troubled experiment with outcome-based education. As one California report noted:

Outcome-based education, or whatever it is called by the various school districts, is not yet specifically defined at the state level, though the frameworks suggest learning

³⁹ "Implementing New Federal Education Legislation," p. 51.

⁴⁰ Diane Ravitch, *National Standards in American Education: A Citizen's Guide* (Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution, 1995).

⁴¹ "Goals 2000: Educate America Act," Public Law 103-227, March 31, 1994, p. 125.

outcomes. Each district will be required to conform to standards of achievement based on an implied understanding of what reform documents actually mean.⁴²

Goals 2000, therefore, will have a great impact on how the state and local districts understand what standards they should adhere to.

The existing California Subject Matter Frameworks are designed to be a guide for what is taught in California schools. However, methods promoted in the Mathematics and English/Language Arts Frameworks have resulted in the de-emphasis of basic math skills and phonics. As a result of growing pressure from the public, valid criticisms are surfacing. The following is a brief discussion of the current state of "frameworks," standards, and basic skills in California.

California Math Standards

Under California's current "Math Frameworks," the emphasis is on problem solving rather than on basic skills or rote memorization (e.g., multiplication tables). Critics charge, however, that without a good working knowledge of basic skills, it is hard to expect students to come up with academically rigorous responses to word problems. In a recent critique of the California Math Framework, Dr. Wayne Bishop, who teaches mathematics at California State University at Los Angeles, finds that there is little commitment to teaching deepening levels of mathematical competence and sophistication as students progress through the curriculum:

There are to be no assumptions of, let alone mandates of, minimal computational and conceptual competence at progressively higher grade levels. Since there is no data to support the contention that this current practice is aiding students at either end of the performance spectrum, and massive evidence is that it is hindering progress of students overall, this philosophy must be critically challenged instead of embraced.⁴³

Indeed, with the development of the California Learning Assessment System assessment test (which downplays the importance of correct computational answers in favor of answers based on feelings and sincerity), the state, according to Dr. Bishop, has taken steps to eliminate heretofore well-understood statewide assessment.

Reading Skills in California

⁴² "Outcome Based Education," Focus Committee of the California Federation of Republican Women (Northern Division), 1995, p. 29.

⁴³ Wayne Bishop, *A Critique of the 1992 Mathematics Framework for California Schools*, January 8, 1995.

At a time when even teachers union publications are admitting that phonics is the superior English reading instructional technique, many schools in California are still de-emphasizing phonics. " Through its English/Language Arts Frameworks, California has been a leader in adopting the "whole language" approach to reading which calls for teachers to spend more time reading stories to children than on specific skills such as spelling, the sounds of letters or syllables.

Other states have caught on where California has not. In Ohio, a law was passed which requires the teaching of systematic, intensive phonics in the primary grades. Teachers are now receiving phonics in-service programs. The National Right To Read Foundation indicates that there are currently nine states working on phonics legislation: Texas, Michigan, Ohio, Alabama, South Carolina, Wisconsin, Missouri, New York, and Illinois.

Goals 2000 and the CLAS Fiasco: The Untold Story

What is the connection between these state Math and English frameworks and the Goals 2000 debate over measuring standards? The answer to that question lies with the California Learning Assessment System (CLAS), the assessment test that was developed by the State Department of Education. The link is that the CLAS test was designed to measure the effectiveness of education reforms envisioned under Goals 2000 programs. Indeed, since CLAS is "performance-based" (i.e., it attempts to measure a child's thought processes rather than simply totaling up right and wrong answers), *it is exactly the type of test envisioned and preferred by Goals 2000 and its supporters.*

News media reports on the 1994 CLAS scores showed students unable to read critically or apply math to real-world problems, but virtually no mention was given to the fact that the English portion of the CLAS exam did not test for incorrect spelling or incorrect grammar, or that the Math portion did not emphasize basic skills. The unwritten story, therefore, is that even the low scores reported on the CLAS exam were still artificially high.

How can California's parents and policymakers judge the effectiveness of the new state frameworks if the state's measuring tool bases its scoring on *non-academic* benchmarks? Thus, although Superintendent Eastin has assigned task forces to examine the state Frameworks, it is disturbing to note the all-out support Ms. Eastin has given for a performance-based successor to the now defunct CLAS test. The ultimate problem of testing based on non-academic benchmarks is that even if scores rise, the public has no assurance that this is the result of improved student learning of academic subject matter.

A Case Study: How One California School District Uses Goals 2000 Funding

⁴⁴ It should be noted, however, that in a letter dated March 17, 1995, the California School Boards Association asked State Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin to re-introduce phonics-first programs.

How will districts use Goals 2000 money? The linkage between Goals 2000 and the IASA permits the philosophy behind Goals 2000 to permeate the more than 30 programs authorized under IASA. Poway Unified School District in San Diego County provides a revealing example. The district plans to use Goals 2000 money for elementary school counselors to assist in meeting the supposed emotional and social needs of district children.

As part of these counseling services, Poway has issued so-called "wellness" manuals. These manuals, used without parents' knowledge or permission, contain questions and techniques to get children to reveal private feelings about their family. Questions and techniques include "Do you feel that no one at home loves you and cares about you? Yes or No?" and "As bonding and trust evolve, the [counseling] group becomes a safe place where youngsters talk openly about their lives, sometimes sharing secrets they've never talked about before."⁴⁵

Poway will also use Goals 2000 money to promote an array of "core values": all students learning; parents as partners; competent and caring staff; staff participation in decision-making; safe, orderly, and attractive environment; and effective management of resources. All these goals may sound worthwhile, but notice that the focus is not on academics. The interaction of the Goals 2000 triad (Goals 2000, IASA, and STW) will mean a significant expansion in these "soft" areas of school management and school environment, with no assurance as to improved student performance or a higher quality of classroom instruction.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

California should just say "no" to Goals 2000 and School-to-Work dollars.

- Although the funding amounts are not huge at present, there is a clear expansion of federal control underway. At a time when there is a national consensus that decisionmaking power should be returned to the state and local level, Goals 2000 is a throwback to the discredited "Washington-knows-best" solutions of the Great Society.
- California does not need to look to Washington for ways to improve education. Charter schools, privatization, radical decentralization of school finance, streamlining of categorical programs, alternative teacher certification, tenure reform, and other innovations can radically turn around education in our state without any need for approval from a federal bureaucrat. Goals 2000 is a muddy detour on the road to reform, a detour California can't afford to take.

⁴⁵ Information regarding these manuals was provided to Assemblyman Steve Baldwin (R-Lemon Grove), vice chairman of the Assembly Education Committee, by a parent from the Poway Unified School District.

- Goals 2000 will discourage and hinder the development of rigorous standards for California's public schools. At a time when parents and others at the grassroots are demanding that students be made to demonstrate what objective knowledge they possess, Goals 2000 will do nothing to satisfy these demands—and in fact, will impede real reform.
- Rigorous academic standards will only be established by involving the public in a broad-based deliberation on the subject, thereby building a genuine and informed consensus. Goals 2000 obfuscates and delays that public debate by purveying the myth that new federal goals, standards, and strategies are meeting these needs. That is demonstrably not the case. Goals 2000 is, in reality, a gigantic hoax played on the public by the education bureaucrats and the teachers unions, both in Washington and Sacramento. Given what is at stake, the rescue of our failing schools, politicians who contribute to this hoax should face ridicule for the misuse of taxpayers funds.
- Rejecting Goals 2000 funding is only a starting point. Local control must be given more than lip service, and education standards must mean more than testing for "self-esteem." Financial incentives and disguised mandates from the federal level to use any particular type of learning strategy or curriculum program should be rejected.

For too long local schools have opted to rely on supposed "experts" in state and federal bureaucracies to dictate standards and curricula. Goals 2000 merely encourages this dependency, which carries over to other areas, such as textbook adoptions. This whole

process relies heavily on State Department of Education staff, who are generally more committed to the latest curriculum fads than to rigorous academic standards.

What is lost in this fevered quest for federal dollars is local control in any meaningful sense. Local school boards do not understand and therefore cannot influence this process; they become mere observers and cheerleaders for the local superintendent and his team. Federal dollars and state bureaucrats drive both curriculum choices and budget decisions in this system. The current system is bad enough without adding another State Plan to the mix.

***THE AUTHORS**

Lance T. Izumi, JD is Senior Fellow in California Studies and Co-Director of the Center for Innovation in Education at the Pacific Research Institute for Public Policy. Mr. Izumi is a regular commentator for KQED-FM, the National Public Radio affiliate in San Francisco. He holds a masters degree in political science from the University of California at Davis, a juris doctorate from the University of Southern California Law Center, and a bachelors degree in economics and history from the University of California at Los Angeles.

Natalie Williams, JD is Director of Education Affairs at the Claremont Institute's Golden State Center for Policy Studies in Sacramento. She speaks and writes widely on education matters. Prior to joining the Claremont Institute she was a senior policy analyst with the Capitol Resource Institute and a staff attorney with State Farm Insurance in Los Angeles. She received her juris doctorate from Pepperdine University School of Law and her bachelors degree in political science from California Lutheran University.

Appendix: The National Education Goals of Goals 2000

It is widely recognized that California's academic standards are deficient and that the basic skills of the state's students are at a woeful level. The paramount question for Goals 2000 is, therefore, will Goals 2000 improve learning or will the attempt to achieve the national goals, not all of which are academic, further dilute academics in the average school day? An examination of the National Educational Goals gives thoughtful citizens cause for concern. Presented below are the eight goals and a brief commentary on each.

1. SCHOOL READINESS

"By the year 2000, all children in America will start school ready to learn."

Analysis: This goal opens the door for government intrusion into family life under the guise of assuring that all children are ready to learn. In an attempt to cure the ills of a few children who may not be well cared for, all families, good and bad, are subject to the government playing nanny. The entire social service agenda of the Clinton administration can be imposed on schools through this goal. A National Education Goals Panel Report states: "Readiness to learn necessarily begins long before school, even before birth itself, and we conclude that 'school readiness' relates to the child's health, to the home environment, and to preschool education." The federal government will be in a position to determine what is and what is not an appropriate home environment through the implementation of Goal #1.

2. SCHOOL COMPLETION

"By the year 2000, the high school graduation rate will increase to at least ninety percent."

Analysis: Creates an incentive for schools to lower the requirements for graduation in order to boost the percentage rates of students who are graduating.⁴⁶ Does not contain an incentive to hold students to rigorous academic standards, but rather gives incentive to teach down to the lowest common denominator. Students are not allowed to choose from a wide array of curriculum and program options; therefore, this goal could homogenize all students and discourage healthy diversity.

3. STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT AND CITIZENSHIP

"By the year 2000, all students will leave grades 4, 8, and 12 having demonstrated competency over challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, foreign languages, civics and government, economics, arts, history and geography, and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our nation's modern economy."

⁴⁶ See "Cooking the Books on Dropout Rates," *Education Week*, February 22, 1995. According to the authors, state and local education officials have become very adept at misrepresenting the true dropout rate to deceive elected leaders and the public.

Analysis: In response to this goal of "responsible citizenship," many schools are beginning to mandate community service as a graduation requirement. This is problematic because of the vagueness of what qualifies as community service. Is it really a good use of students' valuable school time to coerce them into community service programs when many are graduating from high schools without basic reading, writing, and computational skills? Is it hypocritical to teach voluntarism by mandating it?

4. TEACHER EDUCATION AND PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT

"By the year 2000, the nation's teaching force will have access to programs for the continued improvement of their professional skills and the opportunity to acquire the knowledge and skills needed to instruct and prepare all American students for the next century."

Analysis: This is one of the goals added to the original six by the Clinton administration. Throughout the Goals 2000 Act, teacher education and training is a recurrent theme. This is not surprising since the National Education Association and other teacher unions view increased funding for teacher training as one of their top objectives and President Clinton has received key support from the teachers' unions. Unfortunately, the underlying premise of this goal is wrong. The unions feel that the only thing that is needed to turn bad teachers into good ones is a little more training. Yet the real reason for poor teacher performance is union-imposed collective bargaining agreements that protect incompetent teachers. Teacher advancement and pay scales are based on seniority rather than merit.

This goal does not address the serious problem of barriers to non-traditional teachers, whereby many highly skilled individuals such as engineers, chemists and others with professional degrees are not allowed to teach in a public school classroom simply because they lack an irrelevant teaching certificate. As written, this goal serves only the interests of the teacher unions, and it obstructs efforts to open the teaching profession to retirees and others who have much to offer our children.

5. MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE

"By the year 2000, United States students will be first in the world in mathematics and science achievement."

Analysis: In view of the current Mathematics Framework and the increasing numbers of students enrolled in remedial math at the university level, it is difficult to see how this goal will be reached without an increased focus on academics in California. Further, Californians should take little comfort in this year's publicized bump upward in SAT scores. A key reason why SAT math scores rose is because students were allowed, for the first time, to take calculators into the exam.

6. ADULT LITERACY AND LIFELONG LEARNING

"By the year 2000, every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of citizenship."

Analysis: Given that an estimated twenty-seven million adults are "functionally illiterate," is the Clinton administration advocating an entirely new public schooling system for those adults who did not learn to read in 12 years of public education? If so, how much would this cost? Is it logical to entrust this task to the public school system, which often graduates eighteen-year-olds without even eighth-grade reading skills?

7. SAFE, DISCIPLINED, AND ALCOHOL AND DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS

"By the year 2000, every school in the United States will be free of drugs, violence, and the unauthorized presence of firearms and alcohol and will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning."

Analysis: It is difficult to see the Clinton administration making much headway on this goal. Lackadaisical enforcement efforts, poor leadership, and outright endorsement of drug use (e.g., the pronouncements of former Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders) have characterized the Clinton administration's poor record on curbing illegal drug use. It is no wonder that drug use in California (as in many other states) has risen in the years following the Reagan administration's concerted anti-drug campaigns. According to one recent report, "Since 1989, drug use among seventh, ninth, and eleventh graders in California has revealed a disturbing trend of increased use."⁴⁷

Controlling juvenile violence will be just as difficult. Although a recent study showed that juvenile crime rises by seventeen percent for every ten percent increase in the number of children living in single-parent homes, the Clinton administration has done little to address the problem of rising illegitimate births or to break the connection between illegitimacy and high welfare payments (both of which contribute to juvenile crime).⁴⁸ The reality is that violent juvenile crime will increase dramatically because of demographic trends. From 1983 to 1992, juvenile arrests for violent crime (homicide, forcible rape, robbery, assault and kidnapping) increased from 12,321 to 21,549, a 74.8 percent increase.⁴⁹ Between 1995 and the year 2004, California's 11 to 17-year-old population (the ages responsible for 99 percent of juvenile crimes) will increase thirty-three percent, growing from approximately three million to nearly

⁴⁷ Lance T. Izumi, "California Family Wellness Index," Capitol Resource Institute, April 1995, p. 16. Citing statistics from the *Fifth Biennial California Substance Use Survey of 1993-94*, this report finds that, "Use of 'any illicit drug' at least once in the past six months was reported by 18.9 percent of 7th graders in 1989-90, 20.2 percent in 1991-92, and 24.6 percent in 1993-94; by 27.0 percent of 9th graders in 1989-90, 29.3 percent in 1991-92, and 41.6 percent in 1993-94; and by 35.6 percent of 11th graders in 1989-90, 37.7 percent in 1991-92, and 46.5 percent in 1993-94."

⁴⁸ See Patrick Fagan, "The Real Root Causes of Violent Crime: The Breakdown of Marriage, Family, and Community," *Heritage Foundation Background*, March 17, 1995.

⁴⁹ Little Hoover Commission, "The Juvenile Crime Challenge: Making Prevention A Priority," September 1994, p. 14.

four million. Even if the arrest rate stays the same, the state Legislative Analyst's Office says that the number of juvenile arrests for violent crimes will rise by 62 percent over 1993's total.⁵⁰

8. PARENTAL PARTICIPATION

"By the year 2000, every school will promote partnerships that will increase parental involvement and participation in promoting the social, emotional and academic growth of children."

Analysis: Parent participation often translates into parenting skills classes and mandatory compliance with government programs. All schools that receive funds under this Act are required to have a plan to achieve Goal #8:

Section 2 (8). The purpose of this Act is to provide a framework for meeting the National Education Goals established by Title I of this Act by . . . assisting every elementary and secondary school that receives funds under this Act to actively involve parents and families in supporting the academic work of their children at home and in providing parents with skills to advocate for their children at school.

Under Title IV of the Act, states and non-profit agencies can apply for federal grants to fund parent information centers. Groups applying for grants must include as part of their grant application an assurance that part of the funds they receive will be directed to "Parents as Teachers" (PAT) programs and are required to use the Missouri program as a model.⁵¹

The "certified parent educators" are trained to identify certain "risk factors" that exist in the child's home. Risk factors documented under PAT programs include "inability of parent to relate to or connect with child, overindulgence, undue spoiling on part of parent, low functioning parent (due to limited ability or illness), low weight gain, poor appetite, frequent illness, other." (Missouri Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, PAT National Center) Thus, the laudable goal of involving parents becomes in practice a device for government agencies to intrude into the personal lives of individuals. Parents have the greatest interest in the quality of education that their children receive. The practical effect of Goals 2000 will be to undercut parental rights and parental empowerment, as schools become counseling centers for parents and parents are co-opted into being just one more client of an expanding bureaucracy.

⁵⁰ Legislative Analyst's Office, "Juvenile Crime," May 1995, p. 22.

⁵¹ Section 402 (J) of the Act says: "Each application submitted . . . shall at a minimum, include assurances that a grantee will . . . use part of the funds received . . . to establish, expand, or operate Parents as Teachers programs." Section 405 (B) states that, "The term 'Parents as Teachers programs' means a voluntary early childhood parent education program that . . . is based on the Missouri 'Parents as Teachers' model . . . and provides regularly scheduled personal visits with families by certified parent educators."

EXCEPTS FROM THE CLAREMONT INSTITUTE'S Goals 2000 and California Education: Devolution in Retrospect

ON GOALS 2000 "MANDATES"

The law makes mandatory a wide variety of federal dictates, controls education's purse strings, requires national standards, issues federal "skill certificates," imposes new regulations, and manipulates state and local assessments. In so doing, Goals 2000 radically alters the education decision making landscape by centralizing policy making at the federal level, leaving the states and localities to carry out Washington's dictates.

Drafters of the Goals 2000 law use the command "will" at least forty-five times in describing what the federal government expects states and local districts to do to accomplish the Act's eight national goals. The more permissive "should" is used only three times.... One expert on legal drafting observes that the word "will" not only expresses a future contingency, but also, "when the relationship is a delicate one, expresses both parties' obligations." Under such definition of "will," the states could find themselves forced to implement the goals' many objectives (especially if, as will be discussed later, the states decide to accept the federal funding attached to the Act).

The Act is laden with terminology, programs and incentives that clearly contradict this supposed respect for the autonomy of states and local jurisdictions

Is this not an opening for greatly expanded federal regulation of education? A common sensical reading of Goals 2000 and STW would make it hard not to feel uncomfortable when answering this question.

In testimony before Congress, former Secretaries of Education William Bennett and Lamar Alexander observed that the legislation reauthorizing ESEA "mandates the kinds of federally-approved 'standards' that Goals 2000 said would be voluntary." However, said the two former Secretaries, "Only with those approved 'content' and 'student performance' standards in place can a state or community get its federal aid." Finally, Bennett and Alexander warn: "What bears watching in Goals 2000 is the precedent it establishes for federal legislation that influences the kinds of textbooks, teaching materials, teaching training methods, and research findings that must be used in every school to receive federal funds. For many years, the federal government exercised great restraint by respecting state and local control of education. In the future, because of Goals 2000 and its tight linkage to the Elementary and Secondary Education Act . . . federal regulation may extend much more directly into what is taught, the conditions in which it is taught, and how it is tested."

ON GOALS 2000 "BUREAUCRACY"

Goals 2000 creates a wide variety of bureaucracies (e.g., the National Goals Panel, regional education laboratories, federal education research institutes, etc.).

ON GOALS 2000 FUNDING

Through its control of the purse, the federal government will increase its influence over school curricula.

Even supporters of Goals 2000 admit that there are potential control problems if states decide to take the Act's funding. California's state Legislative Analyst's Office (LAO), which supports California's participation in the Act, nevertheless warns that "Taking advantage of the federal framework is not risk-free..." The LAO realizes that the voluntary nature of the Act is more illusion than reality.

The state would always be able to opt out of Goals 2000 if it appeared federal policy making was interfering with state or local authority. (Of course, California would also have to relinquish the federal funds provided under the Goals 2000, which would not be easy.)

Goals 2000 tells states how to cut their education pie and in some cases even dictates the size of the pie (the level of spending) and mandates what social services schools are to provide on campus.

ON GOALS 2000 CURRICULUM, MATERIALS, SOCIALS SERVICES, ETC.

Gender-equity and multiculturalist textbooks and materials have caused extreme controversy and division among parents and state and local school officials. Many of these works are infused with anti-male and anti-Western biases, and often rely more on polemics than on objective scholarship. Yet this is the type of instructional material that Washington singles out for inclusion in state strategies.

To what social services must the state and local jurisdictions provide "access" to? What types of health care services? Perhaps those "reproductive services" advocated by former Surgeon General Joycelyn Elders? And what types of child care services? And how appropriate is it to locate these services on school campuses? Is this not another example of schools taking on new roles that divert it from its primary missions—to teach?

ON GOALS 2000 SKILLS CERTIFICATES

Why is this skill certificate so critical? If the government is handling the skill certificates to select students, then these students will, at least initially, have an advantage over those students who do not have a certificate when it comes to getting a job or perhaps getting into college. The problem then becomes two-fold. First, those state and local jurisdictions that want to resist participation in Goals 2000 will feel pressure to reverse their position because students from state and localities participating in Goals 2000/STW will be receiving skill certificates which will, as a consequence, place the students from non-participating jurisdictions at an initial competitive disadvantage. Second, those students without a certificate will not just be those youngsters who have failed to study hard and perform, but will also include many students who attend private schools and home schools that oppose participation in Goals 2000/STW because of government control.

If states, localities and private schools decide to participate in the offering of skill certificates, the inevitable result will be teaching to the certificate: curriculum will be shaped to improve the chances of students to obtain these certificates. This is important since, as had been noted, the skills certificates issued under any state plan must meet the skill levels and standards endorsed by the national Skills Standards Board. It will be this federal Board, therefore, that will set the broad criteria for getting a skill certificate, not the state or localities. This power will give the federal government strong influence over what is being taught in the classroom.

In other words, unless a state can demonstrate that its School-to-Work Opportunities plan is following the national goals and standards contained in Goals 2000 Act, and that its skills certification system is following the skills standards laid down by the Goals 2000 Act's National Skill Board, a state will not be able to receive its grant. In view of these requirements, STW's Section 604, which purports to prohibit STW from imposing federal mandates, direction, and control, becomes just so much ineffectual boilerplate. The reality is that states will be forced to bend to the federal will because that is what the federal funding strings require.

ON GOALS 2000 CURRENT PROGRAMS

Poway will also use Goals 2000 money to promote an array of "core values": all students learning; parents as partners; competent and caring staff, staff participation in decision-making; safe, orderly, and attractive environment; and effective management of resources. All these goals may sound worthwhile, but notice that the focus is not on academics. The interaction of the Goals 2000 triad (Goals 2000, IASA, and STW) will mean a significant expansion in these "soft" areas of school management and school environment, with no assurance as to improved student performance or a higher quality of classroom instruction.

REPORT'S CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

California should just say "no" to Goals 2000 and School-to-Work dollars.

- Although the funding amounts are not huge at present, there is a clear expansion of federal control underway. At a time when there is a national consensus that decisionmaking power should be returned to the state and local levels, Goals 2000 is a throwback to the discredited "Washington-knows-best" solutions of the Great Society.
- California does not need to look to Washington for ways to improve education. Charter schools, privatization, radical decentralization of school finance, streamlining of categorical programs, alternative teacher certification, tenure reform, and other innovations can radically turn around education in our state without any need for approval from a federal bureaucrat. Goals 2000 is a muddy detour on the road to reform, a detour California can't afford to take.
- Goals 2000 will discourage and hinder the development of rigorous standards for California's public schools. At a time when parents and others at the grassroots are demanding that students be made to demonstrate what objective knowledge they possess, Goals 2000 will do nothing to satisfy these demands—and in fact, will impede real reform.
- Rigorous academic standards will only be established by involving the public in a broad-based deliberation on the subject, thereby building a genuine and informed consensus. Goals 2000 obfuscates and delays that public debate by purveying the myth that new federal goals, standards, and strategies are meeting these needs. That is demonstrably not the case. Goals 2000 is, in reality, a gigantic hoax played on the public by the decoction bureaucrats and the teachers unions, both in Washington and Sacramento. Given what is at stake, the rescue of our failing schools, politicians who contribute to this hoax should face ridicule for the misuse of taxpayers funds.
- Rejecting Goals 2000 funding is only a starting point. Local control must be given more than lip service, and education standards must mean more than testing for "self-esteem." Financial incentives and disguised mandates from the federal level to use any particular type of learning strategy or curriculum program should be rejected.

San Francisco Chronicle
October 19, 1995**LETTERS TO THE EDITOR****The Governor, Schools and Goals 2000**

Editor — Your October 6 article titled, "Wilson Spurns \$42 Million Federal Grant for Schools," does not properly present the governor's position on Goals 2000.

The governor has made very clear his belief that education is the responsibility of state and local governments, and that the federal government has no role in micro-managing our schools. That's why the governor has stated his belief that we should "proceed with caution" in accepting second-year Goals 2000 dollars.

He believes that educators and parents must be assured that these dollars will, in fact, not be tied to federal mandates that limit local decision-making on how to use the money either now or in the future.

All too often the pattern of federal programs is to offer funds that are then followed by the intervention of controlling regulations and bureaucratic meddling.

A further complication is that the House has removed funding for next year's Goals 2000 budget, and the Senate Appropriations Committee has reduced Goals 2000 by nearly two-thirds below the president's January budget request.

With the future of Goals 2000 funding uncertain, for local school districts to program funds for multiyear projects, which will require the redirection of funds from other worthy projects, if and when the federal dollars are eliminated or diminished, would be counterproductive and imprudent.

We need only look to the broken IRCA and SLIAG commitments to remember that the federal government has promised money before and reneged on that promise.

Very simply put, the governor — with experience as the teacher — is being admirably cautious in refusing to accept these funds until all the details are ironed out. Local school districts will do well by being equally as cautious and not expending funds that are not already in the bank. Writing checks on an empty account is never a good idea.

The bottom line: If the Goals 2000 program is in fact structured to be free of federal strings and fully funded, and the governor believes that the reforms being funded are good for our students, his concerns will be satisfied.

MAUREEN DIMARCO
Cabinet Secretary
Governor's Office
of Child Development
and Education
Sacramento

OPTIONAL FORM 99 (7-90)

FAX TRANSMITTAL

To <i>Kerri/Kay</i>	From	# of pages ▶
Dept./Agency	Phone #	
Fax #	Fax #	

NSN 7540-01-2417-7268

5089-101

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION

OFFICE OF SECRETARY

(AUTO)

THE FOLLOWING FILE(S) ERASED

FILE	FILE TYPE	OPTION
042	MEMORY TX	

TEL NO.
919163232596

PAGE	RESULT
03/03	OK

ERRORS

1) HANG UP OR LINE FAIL 2) BUSY 3) NO ANSWER 4) NO FACSIMILE CONNECTION



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

FAX TRANSMITTAL

TO: Rona HadadkinORGANIZATION: Sen. Johnston's officePHONE NUMBER: 916 323-4815FAX NUMBER: 916 323-2596FROM: MICHAEL COHENPHONE NUMBER: 202 401-3070

VA info

Frank
Mile
Terry

Mary Anderson

- Col RTBLE

Gen. McAdam

Van Skille

→ Am 1 Col RTBLE -
S. I

415 772-0991

Deanna Hut - Council

mo's e-cis 101K

help claud, musical

Ang a 30th

Jake Maria Col Bdr
Clarett Trubli

Ohio - Bob Welling
MD - Ch. Cn
WA - Ra. Rch
Mich. Sarah Vell

TO <u>MIKE</u>		TELEPHONED	PLEASE CALL	
DATE <u>10/20</u> TIME <u>5:35</u>		CALLED TO SEE YOU	RETURNED CALL	
PHONE CALLS		WILL CALL AGAIN	URGENT	
"WHILE OUT" RECORD		MESSAGE <u>RTA Sec.</u>		
M. <u>Donnie Hancock</u>		<u>Riley Temp Press</u>		
OF _____		<u>Interviewed</u>		
PHONE <u>415556-4920</u>		TAKEN BY: <u>BTR</u>		
AREA CODE NUMBER EXTENSION				

MEMORANDUM
OF CALL

Previous editions usable

TO:

Mike C.

☒ YOU WERE CALLED BY— ☐ YOU WERE VISITED BY—

Rona Hallabrin

OF (Organization)

Sen. Patrick Johnston, CA

☒ PLEASE PHONE ☐ DSN

(Enter area code, if necessary)

916-322-4815

☐ WILL CALL AGAIN ☐ IS WAITING TO SEE YOU

☐ RETURNED YOUR CALL ☐ WISHES AN APPOINTMENT

MESSAGE

Re: She is calling per
Cindy Cisneros's
request - see Cindy's
E-mail

RECEIVED BY

CJ

DATE

10/19

TIME

4:30

NSN 7540-00-634-4018
50363-112

OPTIONAL FORM 363 (Rev. 7-94)
General Services Administration

★ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1995-385-890

Fax 916 322-2596
GU. L. White
Clat

California

④ Call Maxine Ammon

⑤ Call Frank Tel 619 293-8234 ✓

⑥ Call Mike Knut

Dele Cony L.

SF Chronicle 10/19

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

The Governor, Schools and Goals 2000

Editor — Your October 6 article titled, "Wilson Spurns \$42 Million Federal Grant for Schools," does not properly present the governor's position on Goals 2000.

The governor has made very clear his belief that education is the responsibility of state and local governments, and that the federal government has no role in micro-managing our schools. That's why the governor has stated his belief that we should "proceed with caution" in accepting second-year Goals 2000 dollars.

He believes that educators and parents must be assured that these dollars will, in fact, not be tied to federal mandates that limit local decision-making on how to use the money either now or in the future.

All too often the pattern of federal programs is to offer funds that are then followed by the intervention of controlling regulations and bureaucratic meddling.

A further complication is that the House has removed funding for next year's Goals 2000 budget, and the Senate Appropriations Committee has reduced Goals 2000 by nearly two-thirds below the president's January budget request.

With the future of Goals 2000 funding uncertain, for local school districts to program funds for multiyear projects, which will require the redirection of funds from other worthy projects, if and when the federal dollars are eliminated or diminished, would be counterproductive and imprudent.

We need only look to the broken IRCA and SLIAG commitments to remember that the federal government has promised money before and reneged on that promise.

Very simply put, the governor — with experience as the teacher — is being admirably cautious in refusing to accept these funds until all the details are ironed out. Local school districts will do well by being equally as cautious and not expending funds that are not already in the bank. Writing checks on an empty account is never a good idea.

The bottom line: If the Goals 2000 program is in fact structured to be free of federal strings and fully funded, and the governor believes that the reforms being funded are good for our students, his concerns will be satisfied.

MAUREEN DIMARCO
Cabinet Secretary
Governor's Office
of Child Development
and Education
Sacramento

TITLE: VENTURA; Wilson Feels Heat to Accept School Funds
COLUMN: WEST VENTURA COUNTY FOCUS
BYLINE: CATHERINE SAILLANT
EST. PAGES: 1
DATE: 10/13/95
DOCID: LATM95094161
SOURCE: Los Angeles Times; LATM
EDITION: Ventura County Edition; SECTION: Metro; PART-B; No Desk; PAGE: 3
CATEGORY: Column; Brief
(Copyright, The Times Mirror Company; Los Angeles Times 1995
all Rights reserved)

A group of Ventura PTA activists will decide next week whether to launch a letter-writing campaign urging Gov. Pete Wilson to accept federal school-improvement funds.

Lorna Clifton, president of the Ventura Council PTA, which represents 18 Parent-Teacher Assns. in the Ventura Unified School District, said she will bring the issue up at the next joint meeting.

"It is the kind of thing that we do get involved in," she said. "We want what is best for our kids and if this is good for kids, we want it."

Wilson announced earlier this year that he may refuse to accept \$42 million in federal Goals 2000 money already designated for California. In Ventura County, about \$900,000 is in jeopardy, including \$54,800 promised to Ventura Unified.

The governor said he is concerned there are too many federal mandates attached to the money. But many California educators, including state Supt. of Instruction Delaine Eastin, have said they see fewer strings attached to the Goals 2000 funds than other federal programs and are urging Wilson to change his mind.

Ventura schools Supt. Joseph Spirito said he is pleased that Ventura parents may begin the campaign. About 3,600 parents are

actively involved in the 18 PTA groups.

"Anything we can do to get Wilson to move will help," he said.

REGION: US; UNITED STATES
OTHER TERMS: SEQN-56593; 95094161

TITLE: WILSON REFUSES \$42 MILLION GRANT FOR CALIF. SCHOOLS
BYLINE: San Francisco Chronicle
EST. PAGES: 1
DATE: 10/06/95
DOCID: PHX52790123
SOURCE: The Arizona Republic; PHX
EDITION: State; SECTION: Front; PAGE: A8
ORIGIN: WASHINGTON
(Copyright 1995 Phoenix Newspapers, Inc.)

In a move that has dismayed state education officials, California Gov. Pete Wilson is refusing to accept a \$42 million federal education grant, claiming the money comes with too many strings attached.

Despite Wilson's threat not to spend the money, U.S. Education Secretary Richard Riley on Thursday sent the funds to California, saying that they came with "no regulations" and that the state has "unprecedented flexibility" in how to spend them.

The flap, just the latest controversy between Wilson and the Clinton administration, involves grants under the Goals 2000 program to 1,600 schools for programs ranging from a parent resource center in Santa Clara to a reading program in San Diego.

Wilson informed federal and state officials over the summer, while he was still a contender for the Republican nomination for president, that he would not spend the funds as currently authorized.

A Wilson spokesman said Thursday that he still intends to make good on his threat unless Congress moves to relieve what he called "federal micromanagement" of California schools.

Schools Superintendent Delaine Eastin on Thursday called the governor "misinformed" and labeled as "ironic" his intention to return taxpayer money to Washington after insisting that California is not receiving its fair share of federal tax dollars.

Under the law, any funds not spent by one state can be reclaimed by the federal government for other purposes. Federal officials said Thursday that California must spend the funds sometime over the next two years.

Sen. Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., sent a letter to Wilson last week, saying she was "shocked that you intend" to reject the funds.

First conceived by then-President Bush and adopted by governors from every state in 1989, **Goals 2000** was intended to help schools achieve long-term goals such as reducing dropout rates and improving curricula.

However, since President Clinton began promoting the program as a pet project, it has become the target of criticism by conservative groups who see it as an attempt by the federal government to control what children are taught, and to impose liberal or secular values in the schools.

REGION: NME CA PRM; NORTH AMERICA; CALIFORNIA; PACIFIC RIM
OTHER TERMS: EDUCATION; FINANCE; CALIFORNIA; GOVERNMENT

TITLE: Wilson's Illogic
COLUMN: EDITORIALS
EST. PAGES: 1
DATE: 10/09/95
DOCID: SFC2322229
SOURCE: The San Francisco Chronicle; SFC
EDITION: FINAL; SECTION: EDITORIAL; PAGE: A18
(Copyright 1995)

ANY HOPE that Governor Wilson's withdrawal from the presidential race might restore the moderation, fairness and empathy that marked the early years of his political career appear dashed with his threat to refuse to accept school improvement money from the federal government.

Apparently, Wilson is still in the campaign mode that holds that Republicans must use every opportunity to naysay the Clinton administration, even when such actions harm one's own.

By any measure of logic outside the strange ethos that dictates political behavior, Wilson's stubbornness is inexplicable and childish.

Despite the governor's vow to refuse the money unless changes are made to end "federal micromanagement" of schools, the Department of Education sent the Goals 2000 funds anyway -- \$42.1 million to be used toward a range of general goals in elementary and secondary schools, from creating more rigorous academic standards to improving teacher training.

Individual school districts came up with their own reform plans based on those broad aims.

Wilson, who had no qualms about accepting the money last year, now is complaining, along with some right-wing know-nothings, that the program contains "a myriad of federal dictates" that can usurp

local and state authority over education reform.

Such a complaint doesn't ring true, especially when the Goals 2000 program -- the brainchild, by the way, of the Bush administration -- comes with almost no strings and when districts developed programs that they determined would best meet local needs.

Wilson's threat to send the money back is certainly not endearing him to California educators. "It's crazy," said Robert Kessler, superintendent of San Ramon Valley Unified, whose district stands to receive \$184,000 in Goals 2000 money to promote student achievement through individualized learning plans.

We second Kessler's assessment.

REGION: CA NME PRM; NORTH AMERICA; CALIFORNIA; PACIFIC RIM

DESCRIPTORS: EDITORIAL; GRANTS; CA; GOVERNOR; EDUCATION; SCHOOLS; REPUBLICANS; ; EDUCATION; POLITICS

TITLE: Governor may reject \$42 million school aid
COLUMN: State Update
CREDIT: McClatchy News Service
EST. PAGES: 1
DATE: 10/06/95
DOCID: SDUN2836082
SOURCE: The San Diego Union-Tribune; SDU
EDITION: UNION-TRIBUNE; 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8; SECTION: NEWS; PAGE: A-3
CATEGORY: STATISTICS
ORIGIN: SACRAMENTO
(Copyright 1995)

SACRAMENTO -- The U.S. Department of Education yesterday announced it is sending California \$42.1 million in aid for schools, but Gov. Pete Wilson said he still hasn't decided whether to take it.

Wilson said in September that he might not accept the aid, offered under the federal Goals 2000 program, because of what he called the "myriad of federal dictates" attached to it and because Congress may decide not to continue the program next year.

Nevertheless, state Superintendent of Public Instruction Delaine Eastin applied for the funds anyway, and the U.S. Department of Education said yesterday that they have been released. But they can't be spent unless Wilson's Department of Finance authorizes it.

Cindy Katz, spokeswoman for the Wilson administration's Department of Child Development and Education, said yesterday the governor hasn't decided whether to distribute the money to 1,600 local schools or send it back.

"Until Congress decides what they're going to do with that program, the governor is not going to make a final decision," she said. Katz said the governor doesn't want local schools to become dependent on

the money, only to have it vanish later. She also said Wilson wants to know what strings will be attached to the **Goals 2000** money.

But federal and state education officials criticized the governor's stance, saying he is depriving schools of badly needed funds for little reason. Last year, California accepted about \$10 million in the program.

REGION: CA NME PRM US; CALIFORNIA; NORTH AMERICA; PACIFIC RIM; UNITED STATES
DESCRIPTORS: AID; CALIFORNIA; CONGRESS; CRITICISM; FINANCE; GOVERNMENT; LEADERS;
PREVENTION; SCHOOLS; USA; ; EDUCATION
INDUSTRY: BUSINESS & FINANCIAL NEWS

TITLE: Wilson Spurns \$42 Million Federal Grant for Schools
BYLINE: Louis Freedberg, Chronicle Washington Bureau
EST. PAGES: 2
DATE: 10/06/95
DOCID: SFC2321925
SOURCE: The San Francisco Chronicle; SFC
EDITION: FINAL; SECTION: NEWS; PAGE: A1
ORIGIN: Washington
(Copyright 1995)

In a move that has dismayed state education officials, Governor Wilson is refusing to accept a \$42 million federal education grant, claiming that the money comes with too many strings attached.

Despite Wilson's threat not to spend the money, U.S. Secretary of Education Richard Riley yesterday sent the money to California anyway, saying that it came with "no regulations" and that the state had "unprecedented flexibility" in how to spend it.

The flap, just the latest controversy between Wilson and the Clinton administration, involves grants under the Goals 2000 program to 1,600 schools for programs such as a parent resource center in Santa Clara and a model reading program in San Diego.

Wilson informed federal and state officials during the summer, when he was still a contender for the Republican nomination for president, that he would not spend the funds as currently authorized. A Wilson aide said yesterday that he still intended to make good on his threat unless Congress moved to relieve what he called "federal micromanagement" of California schools.

State schools superintendent Delaine Eastin yesterday called the governor "misinformed" and labeled as "ironic" his intention to return taxpayer money to Washington after insisting that California was not receiving its fair share of federal tax dollars.

"I don't think he would be so foolish as to send \$42 million back to Washington," she said. "It would seem quite ironic if we rejected \$42 million that would (otherwise) go to some other state or to Bosnia."

Under the law, any funds not spent by a state can be reclaimed by the federal government for other purposes. Federal officials said yesterday that California must spend the funds sometime in the next two years.

Senator Dianne Feinstein, D-Calif., sent a letter to Wilson last week, saying she was "shocked that you intend" to reject the funds. "I simply cannot understand why," she said. "The program contains only broad goals, chiefly to encourage greater participation of parents and local communities in the education of our children. Can anyone object to these goals?"

First conceived by President George Bush and adopted by governors from every state in 1989, Goals 2000 was intended to help schools achieve long-term goals such as reducing dropout rates and improving curricula by the turn of the century. But since President Clinton began promoting the program as a pet project, it has become the target of criticism by conservative groups that see it as an attempt by the federal government to control what children are taught and to impose liberal or secular values in the schools.

Federal officials expressed some bewilderment yesterday at the situation in California. They noted that the California Department of Education had requested the funds after screening detailed proposals from hundreds of schools.

"It would be nice if the state Department of Education and the governor got on the same wavelength," said Mike Cohen, a senior adviser to Education Secretary Riley.

He noted that Congress is considering trimming back or even eliminating the program for the 1996 school year and that the money

sent to California yesterday already had been approved by Congress and was intended for use during the current school year.

In a July letter to federal officials, Wilson said the Goals 2000 program, which he supported when it was first proposed during the Bush administration, had "deteriorated into a myriad of federal dictates."

However, officials said they had asked Wilson to bring them any complaints about excessive intrusion into the schools but had not received any.

Cindy Katz, an aide to the governor, hinted that there might be some room to maneuver, saying Wilson was "proceeding with caution" on the matter. "He is not saying no to the dollars; he wants to see how this is going to play out in Congress," she said.

The House has already voted to eliminate the program, despite a threat of a veto from Clinton. The Senate has approved drastic cuts in financing.

"The governor is saying we don't need another program coming out of Washington where they promise the money, but the next year there is no money, and we still have a problem," said Katz.

Eastin, however, noted that Wilson accepted \$6 million in Goals 2000 funds last year. "If the program was so flawed, why did the governor accept the money last year?" she asked. "If anything, the federal government has made it even easier to get the money since then."

REGION: CA NME PRM US; NORTH AMERICA; CALIFORNIA; UNITED STATES; PACIFIC RIM
DESCRIPTORS: CA; GOVERNOR; POLICY; EDUCATION; FINANCE; US; GOVERNMENT; GRANTS;
REACTION; ; EDUCATION
INDUSTRY: BUSINESS & FINANCIAL NEWS

TITLE: Wilson May Turn Down \$42 Million for Schools; Education: He opposes the program's 'federal dictates.' But U.S. officials say the money has no strings attached.

BYLINE: RICHARD LEE COLVIN

CREDIT: TIMES EDUCATION WRITER

EST. PAGES: 2

DATE: 10/06/95

DOCID: LATM95091891

SOURCE: Los Angeles Times; LATM

EDITION: Home Edition; SECTION: PART-A; Metro Desk; PAGE: 3

(Copyright, The Times Mirror Company; Los Angeles Times 1995
all Rights reserved)

Sitting in a bank account somewhere is \$42.1 million in federal money for California school districts to spend on such Mom-and-apple-pie goals as keeping children in school and helping them compete in math and science with their peers around the world.

But Gov. Pete Wilson, who with conservatives around the country has said that cashing a check from the federal government is akin to turning the keys of local schools over to Washington bureaucrats, has not decided whether to accept the largess or send it back.

The money--part of \$362 million to be made available in the second year of the national Goals 2000

0v0P program--is meant to help states and

school districts by giving them money to set challenging academic

federal regulations issued as {a} result of this new program," the letter said. If Wilson's concerns cannot be assuaged, however, the money cannot be spent and would be reallocated to other states.

"We'll worry about that step if and when we get to it," said Michael Cohen, a senior U.S. Education Department adviser. "Our aim here is not to take the money back, it's to get it to school districts."

At stake is a federal program that, contrary to the concerns of its critics, has almost no strings attached. The eight "goals" referred to in the law's title include having all American children come to kindergarten ready to learn, and promoting parental involvement. Schools are to be free of drugs, violence and guns and students are to meet high standards in academic subjects.

School districts were to come up with a plan that served those goals and, based on those plans, districts began receiving part of the money earlier this summer.

If the new money is accepted, Los Angeles County school districts will share about \$9 million over two years; Orange County schools would get about \$2 million, and Ventura County school districts would wind up with about \$900,000.

A consortium of seven school districts in the South Bay area of Los Angeles County plans to spend the money to integrate computer technology and the Internet into a new curriculum on the environment.

Beverly Rohrer, the school superintendent in Redondo Beach, said the federal money "would be an asset--definitely an asset."

But conservatives across the country worry that, rather than an asset, the seemingly innocuous program plants the seeds of a federal takeover of schools, which have traditionally been a state and local responsibility. The outcry has been so great that some states, including New Hampshire, Virginia, Montana and Alabama, have either refused to apply for the money or have sent it back to Washington without spending it.

Joan Wonsley, a Dana Point parent who is campaigning against **Goals 2000**, said the testing it promotes to measure whether students are achieving academic goals amounts to "social engineering" by tracking students into certain futures based on their performance.

Goals 2000 officials say the program does mention testing and establishes academic standards, but they are voluntary, not mandated.

making a final decision until after Congress and the Clinton Administration have decided on whether the program will be continued.

REGION: CA US NME PRM; UNITED STATES; CALIFORNIA; NORTH AMERICA; PACI
DESCRIPTORS: WILSON, PETE; EDUCATION REFORM; CALIFORNIA -- FEDERAL AID; SC
DISTRICTS -- FINANCES; CALIFORNIA -- SCHOOLS -- FINANCES ; EDUCATION
OTHER TERMS: SEQN-53939; 95091891