

Mike -
Per your
request -
CS

589
2930
127 72

**HEARINGS ON H.R. 1804—GOALS 2000:
EDUCATE AMERICA ACT**

HEARINGS
BEFORE THE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
OF THE
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED THIRD CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

HEARINGS HELD IN WASHINGTON, DC, APRIL 22, MAY 4, AND 18, 1993

Serial No. 103-17

Printed for the use of the Committee on Education and Labor



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

70-820 =

WASHINGTON : 1993

For sale by the U.S. Government Printing Office
Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office, Washington, DC 20402
ISBN 0-16-041289-7

CLINTON LIBRARY PHOTOCOPY

COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

WILLIAM D. FORD, Michigan, *Chairman*

WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY, Missouri
GEORGE MILLER, California
AUSTIN J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania
DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan
PAT WILLIAMS, Montana
MATTHEW G. MARTINEZ, California
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ROBERT E. ANDREWS, New Jersey
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
ROBERT C. SCOTT, Virginia
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO,
Puerto Rico
RON KLINK, Pennsylvania
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
RON DE LUGO, Virgin Islands
ENI F. H. FALEOMAVAEGA,
American Samoa
SCOTTY BAESLER, Kentucky
ROBERT A. UNDERWOOD, Guam

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
RICHARD K. ARMEY, Texas
HARRIS W. FAWELL, Illinois
PAUL B. HENRY, Michigan
CASS BALLENGER, North Carolina
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
BILL BARRETT, Nebraska
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
PETER HOEKSTRA, Michigan
HOWARD "BUCK" McKEON, California
DAN MILLER, Florida

PATRICIA F. RUSSLER, *Staff Director*
JAY EAGEN, *Minority Staff Director*

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

DALE E. KILDEE, Michigan, *Chairman*

GEORGE MILLER, California
THOMAS C. SAWYER, Ohio
MAJOR R. OWENS, New York
JOLENE UNSOELD, Washington
JACK REED, Rhode Island
TIM ROEMER, Indiana
PATSY T. MINK, Hawaii
ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
XAVIER BECERRA, California
GENE GREEN, Texas
LYNN C. WOOLSEY, California
KARAN ENGLISH, Arizona
TED STRICKLAND, Ohio
DONALD M. PAYNE, New Jersey
CARLOS A. ROMERO-BARCELO,
Puerto Rico

WILLIAM F. GOODLING, Pennsylvania
STEVE GUNDERSON, Wisconsin
HOWARD "BUCK" McKEON, California
THOMAS E. PETRI, Wisconsin
SUSAN MOLINARI, New York
RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM, California
DAN MILLER, Florida
MARGE ROUKEMA, New Jersey
JOHN A. BOEHNER, Ohio

CONTENTS

	Page
Hearings held in Washington, DC:	
April 22, 1993	1
May 4, 1993	43
May 18, 1993	137
Statement of:	
Fields-Tyler, Sheryl, American Electronics Association; Marc Tucker, President, National Center on Education and the Economy; Margaret Piesert, Director of the Health Care Workforce Project, Service Employees International Union; Raul Valdes-Pages, President and CEO, Denver Technical College; Mike Baroody, Senior Vice President for Policy and Communications, National Association of Manufacturers; and Paul R. Sackett, Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota	138
Hall, Robert, Vice President, Government Affairs Council, National Retail Federation, Washington, DC; Samuel J. Meisels, Associate Dean for Research and Professor, University of Michigan School of Business, Ann Arbor, MI; Janice Earle, Office of Systemic Reform, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC; and Linda G. Morra, Director, Education and Employment Issues, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC	77
Reich, Hon. Robert B., Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor	44
Riley, Hon. Richard, Secretary of Education; accompanied by Michael Cohen, Consultant, Office of the Secretary of Education	4
Prepared statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera:	
Baroody, Mike, Senior Vice President for Policy and Communications, National Association of Manufacturers, prepared statement of	194
Additional material submitted for the record	204
Earle, Janice, Office of Systemic Reform, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	90
Fields-Tyler, Sheryl, American Electronics Association, prepared statement of	143
Hall, Robert, Vice President, Government Affairs Council, National Retail Federation, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	79
Meisels, Samuel J., Associate Dean for Research and Professor, University of Michigan School of Business, Ann Arbor, MI, prepared statement of	83
Morra, Linda G., Director, Education and Employment Issues, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	119
O'Toole, Thomas J., EdD, President, The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association, Rockville, MD, prepared statement of	37
Piesert, Margaret, Director of the Health Care Workforce Project, Service Employees International Union, prepared statement of	171
Reich, Hon. Robert B., Secretary, U.S. Department of Labor, prepared statement of	51
Riley, Hon. Richard W., Secretary of Education, prepared statement of	39
Roemer, Hon. Tim, a Representative in Congress from the State of Indiana, prepared statement of	36
Sackett, Paul R., Industrial Relations Center, University of Minnesota, prepared statement of	228
The National Coalition for Advanced Manufacturing, Washington, DC, prepared statement of	38

statements, letters, supplemental materials, et cetera—Continued	
Mr. Marc, President, National Center on Education and the Econo-	
prepared statement of.....	156
Pages, Raul, President and CEO, Denver Technical College, pre-	
d statement of.....	175

HEARING ON GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT

THURSDAY, APRIL 22, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., Room 2175 Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dale Kildee, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Kildee, Ford, Sawyer, Roemer, Unsoeld, Reed, Miller of California, Becerra, English, Strickland, Owens, Romero-Barcelo, Green, Woolsey, Goodling, Petri, McKeon, Gunderson, and Roukema.

Staff present: Susan Wilhelm, staff director; Andy Hartman, education coordinator; Jack Jennings, education counsel; Jeff McFarland, subcommittee legislative counsel; Margaret Kajeckas, legislative associate; Diane Stark, legislative specialist; Tom Kelley, legislative associate; Lynn Selmsner, professional staff member; and Jane Baird, education counsel.

Chairman KILDEE. The subcommittee will come to order. We are meeting this morning to receive testimony on Goals 2000: Educate America Act, the administration's systemic reform bill. We have a single and very distinguished witness at this morning's hearing, the Honorable Richard Riley, Secretary of Education, former governor of South Carolina.

This is the Secretary's first appearance before the Committee on Education and Labor and I know all of us want to extend to him a very warm welcome.

This is my 17th year in the Congress and over that period of time I have worked with a number of Education secretaries and none came to their job with stronger qualifications, greater experience or reputation as an education leader than does Secretary Riley.

He is recognized nationally. We all know what he did in his own State of South Carolina to really put that straight on the reform path, and we all appreciate that because we live in a mobile society, and what happens in South Carolina affects the entire country. You certainly did a splendid job there, Governor.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Over the last 2 years this subcommittee has devoted substantial attention to education reform and we look forward to the Secretary's testimony.

Goals 2000: The Educate America Act will provide grants to States and local schools for comprehensive education reform. It would also promote the establishment of voluntary national education standards to assist States and local schools in their reform efforts.

A third component of the bill would establish a national board bringing together business, labor, and education to promote the development of voluntary occupational skills standards. These voluntary occupational skills standards would provide an important foundation for reforming the manner in which young people are prepared for the world of work.

Before we begin, I would like to recognize my good friend and ranking Republican member of this subcommittee and the full Education and Labor Committee, Bill Goodling, for any opening statements he may have and he will be followed by the Chairman of the full committee, Mr. Ford.

Mr. Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We too welcome you, Mr. Secretary. I know you have been up on my floor quite a few times over the last several weeks and it is good to have you now in the subcommittee.

Mr. Chairman, you and I started work on this school reform legislation almost 2 years ago when we initiated work on H.R. 3320, the Neighborhood Schools Improvement Act.

I continue to believe that there is a limited role for the Federal Government in encouraging and assisting States in undertaking major efforts to reorient school systems toward a focus on learning and achievement. It has been a long, rocky road since the first bipartisan effort.

Clearly, the bill Secretary Riley is here to present to us today is a new variation on that original approach. In some aspects the legislation improves on the original bill; in other areas I think it may have fallen short of the mark or erred from the target.

My understanding of what school reform was all about was a process by which the public and educators first formed a consensus about what the goals and outcomes of the educational process should be. From that starting point they would use their ingenuity and skills to fashion an educational process by which all students would be able to achieve those goals.

I have some concern that this legislation has turned some of these original ideas on their head. For example, the bill requires that States and districts ensure that schools provide an opportunity to learn but does not require that States and districts ensure that students actually learn any more.

It is this disconnection between results and opportunity that troubles me. How can we know if students have an opportunity to learn unless we first know what it is they should learn and whether or not they have truly learned it?

There are many positive things in this legislation and I hope that we can build on them and create a bill that I can support that can

pass the House and the Senate and be signed into law by the President.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Chairman.

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to revise and extend my remarks and first compliment you on the prompt way which you have responded to the administration on this legislation and worked with them to help develop the bill that is presented to us here today.

I spent some time discussing it with Mr. Goodling yesterday and I am optimistic that Goodling and Kildee and Ford will be back in business in a bipartisan way working on this bill very quickly, and we will do that as long as we can without getting anybody in trouble. We don't want to embarrass any of us by being seen in the wrong company, but we nevertheless will do our very best to work together.

Mr. Secretary, I want to say "I associate myself with the gentleman's remarks." That is the expression we use around here in the things that Mr. Kildee said about you. I have had the pleasure of meeting with you on numerous occasions in discussing not just this legislation but education from the perspective of the Federal Government in general and I have been mightily impressed from our first meeting and even more so in each meeting thereafter with the depth of your understanding of the fact that we have to change things.

Now your partner, the Secretary of Labor, has upset some educators by saying some of the things that Mr. Goodling and I have been saying here for a number of years about the same archaic vocational education in this country and about the fact that we are still targeting vocational skills for the turn of the century, and he is discovering that there are education traditions out there that reside mostly in the minds of people employed in education that are very hard to part with.

Now, I say that in spite of the fact that the Wall Street Journal said the other day that I was having difficulty with you about this bill because I was kowtowing to the NEA. After I read that editorial, I quickly asked my staff, who has been negotiating with your people and helping you, what has the NEA to do with this bill, and they tell me nothing. They tell me we have heard not suggestion number one about any changes in your proposal, nor have they asked me to support any particular change in your proposal.

And so for the public record, it ought to be made clear that any discussions we have had have been between Chairman Ford and Secretary Riley and not the NEA through Chairman Ford and Secretary Riley, and I don't say that by way of divorcing myself in any way from them.

They have been and I am proud to be their friend during all of my public career and I do rely on them very heavily for advice about what is happening and should happen in education. But I think that some of the outside interests in a way of looking for some sort of tension to make a newspaper story or make a newspaper point are searching very, very deep to find these kind of things that just don't exist.

I do not believe that I have ever seen a perfect piece of legislation introduced in the committee in the sense that everybody on the committee would suddenly look at it and say that's what I want to do and that is exactly the way I want to say it.

Before we are through with this legislation we will spend, I am willing to predict, maybe even hours arguing over semantics of a better way to say the same thing to get to the same place. It always happens on any legislation that does enough to be worthwhile.

And there will be people standing by the sidelines saying why don't you and he fight. Mr. Secretary, I detect no fight or tension between you, as the spokesperson for the administration, and the majority on this committee, and for that matter, the minority that I have talked to up until this point.

I think that we are going to be working together for some time but that we will have success with the legislation. You could not be in better hands than Chairman Kildee, who has an unblemished record in working for the future of education rather than the past of education, and I am looking forward to seeing how this legislation develops and I will be supporting you every step of the way.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Just to note that the only perfect legislation in the world was written on Mount Sinai and not on Capitol Hill.

Mr. FORD. That was an executive order.

Chairman KILDEE. Secretary Riley, you may begin your testimony.

STATEMENT OF HON. RICHARD RILEY, SECRETARY OF EDUCATION; ACCOMPANIED BY MICHAEL COHEN, CONSULTANT, OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF EDUCATION

Mr. RILEY. Thank you, Chairman Kildee, Chairman Ford, Congressman Goodling, members of the committee. I appreciate the kind remarks about both my involvement with education and my career.

My wife and I have just moved into a new apartment here and I couldn't get my shower to work this morning, my coffeemaker wouldn't work, and she put buttermilk on my cereal, so I feel appreciative of the little lift I got.

It is a real pleasure to be with each of you and to discuss the President's education reform bill, Goals 2000: Educate America Act. Like each of you, I am deeply concerned about the quality of elementary and secondary education in America.

We must improve our education system if we are to prosper as a democratic country and build a high-skill, high-wage economy. Education reform and improvement must be a high priority in all of our communities and States throughout this great country.

I ought to express my appreciation to all of you and to your staff members. You have given us a great deal of verbal and written advice and feedback, and we have attempted to deal with it and try to develop a balanced measure here for your consideration.

Unfortunately, too many of our students in America receive a watered-down curriculum and for far too many of our students we have low expectations. The other countries against which we com-

pete for jobs expect all of their students to take challenging course work in a variety of academic areas, including especially students headed for the workplace rather than a 4-year college.

As we approach the 21st century our prosperity and dreams hinge upon education as never before. The global economy is characterized by an information-rich world dependent upon technology and filled with high-skill, high-wage jobs.

In this world, workforces, businesses, communities and countries that are the smartest and that are the best educated will clearly do the best. We cannot afford to leave any student behind. Students must know well a variety of subjects from chemistry to foreign language, to geometry and the arts, from English and geography to history. Many more students must be competent in both academic and occupational areas as the world becomes smaller and more immediate.

A strong education system is, of course, good for its own sake for an individual, but now it is a social imperative in an ever-changing democracy, and an economic imperative in an international marketplace.

If we do not meet the challenges then we will face, as futurists say, an unacceptable future for many of today's children and their communities. The Goals 2000: Educate America Act is about taking this first step to an acceptable, brighter future for America's children and youth.

Robert Mosely, who is a civil rights activist, came to see me the other day to explain his algebra project. It was quite interesting. He started the algebra project to teach sixth and seventh grade pre-algebra and algebraic concepts because without algebra many occupations and postsecondary education are opportunities denied. Algebra is one of those gatekeeper courses.

He started his algebra project by using the subway system to teach the concept of positive and negative numbers. He now vividly demonstrates that poor and disadvantaged students, many African-American students, who previously may never have taken algebra in 12 years of schooling could learn the challenging content and learn it in junior high school.

A teacher in California, Jaime Escalante, had a movie made about his teaching experience which vividly demonstrated that Latino high school students could learn and perform well in advanced placement calculus. We tend to achieve what we aim for and what we aim for is too low for many of our students.

Two weeks ago we released the math results from the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress. While progress was made from 1990 to 1992, far too few students reached the higher performance levels and the gap in performance between student of different racial groups remains unacceptably large.

It did appear, however, that students who took more difficult courses, who did more homework, and who watched less television performed better on the NAEP exam. Early signs are that more challenging math standards and curriculum recommended by the Nation's math teachers will make a positive difference in student performance.

In a world in which what you can earn depends upon what you can learn, today's young people will be destined for a future (

lower pay unless we can help many more of them take and master more challenging subject matter.

Therefore, Mr. Chairman, we need to redouble our efforts, in my judgment, to meet the national education goals to help all children, regardless of their circumstances, meet these challenging standards. That is why putting goals and a bipartisan goals panel in formal national policy to report on progress is so important and is part of this Goals 2000: Educate America Act legislation.

To achieve these goals will require a fundamental overhaul of our education system and new relationships and partnerships between our schools and parents, educators, community groups, social and health agencies, business, higher education and early childhood services.

At the Federal level we can best help by supporting local and State reformers by motivating, leading, and providing information and seed money for State and local communities that are looking for ways to improve.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act is about change. It is designed to expand the use of challenging curricula, instruction, and assessments geared to world class standards and to do that for all students.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act will help to identify voluntary internationally competitive standards for what students should know and be able to do in each of the major subject areas and the occupational areas.

Students, teachers, parents, communities and States can use these voluntary standards developed by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council to judge their own performance.

Studies now report that American students do not do as well as students in other industrialized countries, yet currently we have no way to provide educators and parents, students or policymakers throughout our Nation with information about the content and the rigor that students in other countries study and to then match this information to our own American expectations for students. The Goals 2000 process will identify and make such information available throughout America.

Similarly, we do not have information available about what constitutes internationally competitive opportunity to learn standards. Through the Goals 2000 Act voluntary, exemplary opportunity to learn standards will be identified in essential areas related to teaching and learning, such as quality and the availability of curricula, materials and professional development of teachers, to deliver this higher content. The information will be made available by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council.

Again, how can we compete internationally if we don't know what we are competing against? Goals 2000 will give us that information. The existence of standards will not change our schools.

We need sustained broad-based grassroots efforts of parents, educators, business, labor and citizens to provide every student the opportunity to reach these standards.

The Goals 2000 legislation will challenge every State and every community to develop comprehensive education plans to overhaul their schools so that every student in every school can reach these

challenging standards. It will activate the forces of reform which must occur in classrooms and in schools and in school districts and colleges and local and State government.

These changes should not be just for the sake of change but to achieve greater levels of skills and learning for all students, levels that are internationally competitive in academic and occupational areas.

Students and schools will work harder and smarter if they are given the challenge and the opportunity. Goals 2000: Educate America Act builds upon lessons learned from local and State education reform efforts of the past 10 to 15 years.

Unfortunately, the reform efforts have been disconnected and often not sustained, but these efforts have taught us that education reforms are more likely to work if they are comprehensive and systemic, that the pieces fit together like a puzzle; if they focus on challenging curriculum and better instruction for all students to help many more students reach higher standards; if they provide teachers and principals with new professional development opportunities to deliver challenging content and work to diverse student populations; if they involve more educators and parents, communities and businesses with school improvement efforts; if they are long-term, phased in over 5 to 7 years; if they have State assistance to encourage bottom-up local classroom innovation and school site planning; if they have accountability based upon results; and if they provide greater flexibility to encourage innovation and new ways of organizing the school day and the school year.

The local and State improvement plans under Goals 2000 will begin to address changes that best meet each school's, community's and State's unique circumstances. About 94 percent of the funds under this Act in 1994, \$393 of the \$420 million, are dedicated to these purposes, going out to the States and to the school districts.

Goals 2000: Educate America is only a first step, but it is a critical step to start America down the road to renewal in education. We need major new investments in early childhood and infant and national health, as the President has proposed. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act and the Office of Education Research and Improvement need to be reauthorized.

We in the Department, like you, are reviewing and reevaluating every part of the ESEA and the OERI to revitalize these important programs to help disadvantaged schools reach challenging standards and serve other purposes.

We need to have a new school-to-work transition, a youth apprenticeship program building upon the early successes of Tech Prep and other similar initiatives.

In addition, this bill would establish a National Skill Standards Board. American workers, employers, training providers and educators must know what knowledge and skills are required, and this part of the bill encourages the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skills standards and certification.

The United States, unique among our competitors, lacks a formal system for developing and disseminating occupational skills standards. The challenge for us then is to lead and to act here in Washington, and that challenge is great. The challenge for educators

parents, students and the public all across America to revitalize and reinvent our schools, and that challenge is great.

It has been 10 years almost to the day since the report entitled, "A Nation at Risk" was released. We have learned a great deal about education reform since then and it is time to apply these new lessons across this land.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act, in my judgment, will do that. The President has sent the measure here for your consideration. Together I submit that we can be successful.

Goals 2000 starts us on the high road to success. It will take a lot of hard work from all Americans, but we must start with goals and standards and high expectations for all of our children and their futures. We must start with a plan, one that can energize Americans to reach for excellence and for quality.

We need your help and your support so this entire Nation can begin to work together to educate America. Thank you, sir. I would be happy to respond to questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. Mr. Secretary, while you were Governor of South Carolina your State pursued a very comprehensive systemic reform program, and I was down in your State right after the election and really felt a sense of excitement. I talked to some of the teachers down there and sensed a real commitment.

How are the lessons of that experience in South Carolina reflected in the Goals 2000 bill?

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I think it is so helpful. A lot of people have said what has come out of all the reform efforts of the 1980s and a lot of governors, a lot of southern governors, who got programs underway—Bill Clinton was one of those governors, Lamar Alexander was another, Bob Graham, and so forth—really got into this business of education reform.

I would say that lessons were learned, some of them that certain things did not work well. Certainly it did not work well to have a spurt of energy unsustained and then have it drop back off, and that happened in a number of cases.

But I think that one of the big lessons we learned in South Carolina is, one, that you have to have a results orientation to make long-term progress. You have to deal with goals, you have to deal with a place to reach for, and you have to do it in a comprehensive way and you have to be practical in terms of hunting for easy solutions. They are not there.

Every child is different, every classroom is different, every teacher is different. The world is changing. Knowledge is changing every day. It is an exciting world to deal and be involved in, but I will tell you it must be hard work. It has got to fall back on the teaching and learning quality and not the desire to hunt for easy silver-bullet solutions.

I think the comprehensiveness, the accountability feature, the results orientation, the involvement of all children—every single child should be involved in the process. Systemic is the word that is now used. I never have liked that word particularly but it does describe everything fitting together and I think that is an important part of it and I think that is some of the main lessons that we have learned in the 1980s.

Chairman KILDEE. There is no one definition of what systemic means either, I found out, as I travel throughout the country.

Mr. RILEY. However you want to take it, I guess.

Chairman KILDEE. How did you involve the business community, the labor community, the education community and various elements in society that really are concerned with education?

Mr. RILEY. Education, Mr. Chairman, in my view, is clearly the entire community, and if you attempt to divorce the schools from the community you really end up with a very limited approach to education.

My wife, Tunky, headed up what we call the Citizen Involvement Committee and it was a very, very active committee with corporate presidents and involvement from teachers and labor and citizens, parents, grandparents, all types of citizen representative groups, that then combed out and got involved in all of the communities in the State in many, many different ways.

Education should be part of everything and that is, again, part of the comprehensive nature of this. These action plans that are proposed in this bill then call for that and that is part of what would have to be the State plan, and the school district and the school plan would be how they plan to develop and go about getting people involved in the school system and in excellence in education.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much. I will pass on to Mr. Goodling now.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will try to get five quick questions in before he turns the lights on. The Chairman always starts the lights right after the Chairman finishes speaking.

Chairman KILDEE. I'll do my best.

Mr. FORD. No, that is me.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Ford. Oh, that is you. I see. Well, I sent you a list yesterday of interests and concerns that I have so I will just quickly go over five things.

Experience with the National Science Foundation's systemic reform initiative in math and science found that sometimes States need more than a year in order to come up with a decent, well-thought-out plan.

My question would be would you support allowing the States a more flexible period of time to complete their reform plans but not allowing any implementation funds going to them until they have completed the plan and it has been approved? I think they can get implementation funds now the way the bill is written even though the plan may not have been completed and may not have been approved.

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Goodling, that is a very reasonable approach to an issue. I think it is important for all of these things to be going on at the same time. The main thing is that the plan would involve part of what you say; in other words, if it is going to take more than a year to arrive at that then the plan would say that and why it would take more than a year.

If you see, the first year we just think it is so important to have all of the State leadership thinking those kinds of things out and so they do have their own plan so I think that is a very reasonable approach so long as they—

Mr. GOODLING. I agree with your comments. I just want to keep their feet to the fire and I don't want them getting implementation money until you say the plan is good and it is completed and is proved.

As I mentioned to you before, currently we do not have any way knowing whether we are making any progress toward goal number one and I had hoped that that would be included. Perhaps we can get it in to some kind of legislation so that we can find out where we are in relationship to goal number one. We do not have that kind of information. We need to get that kind of information otherwise, we do not know how to proceed in making sure we get to goal number one.

So my hope would be that somewhere along the line in the very near future that we can get something involved there so that we know where they are in relationship to their readiness to learn when they come to a formal setting.

Mr. RILEY. Well, my sentiment and the President's sentiment is exactly with you on the early childhood concept of development. I do not know that this bill is the place to get into that, but my sentiment is certainly with you.

I do think this: We make a very clear statement here and if this Congress passes this that every child be ready to learn when they get to school, start school, that is a very strong, powerful national statement, which then certainly should follow, Congressman, with efforts to see that then we can try to help see that that is done, so I strongly support your entire sentiment of your early childhood measures.

Mr. GOODLING. My third one deals with the role of national standards, both content and opportunity to learn. As we put them together it was all supposed to be models. I am not sure whether the legislation, by requiring NESIC to only certify them if they are consistent or comparable to the national standards, I am not sure that that is consistent with the whole concept of these are models. I am not sure they are models when you state it that way.

Mr. RILEY. Well, of course, I guess you can have more than one model to be consistent with national content standards. The content standards, as I observe this, would drive the entire process and they are arrived at of course, as you know, with a national consensus-building process which is very healthy in itself. It is uplifting to Americans who know math out there are talking about what a high grader should know in math.

When to have those content standards in place really is the goal, the direction for everything to move toward and I guess you could see several models which would all be consistent with reaching these high content standards.

Mr. GOODLING. I guess my concern was the whole bottom-up concept that you talked about in your testimony making sure that maybe the State and the local agencies have a greater opportunity to determine, help determine, those standards so that you get the bottom-up kind of concept that you were talking about.

Mr. RILEY. Absolutely. And, of course, the certification process is primary, as you well know. But, yes, you should have significant movement upward from the States and that is really how it begins to use in the beginning of the action plans, of course, which is

completely separate from this process, the State must develop its own content standards, opportunity to learn standards, and assessment process and so forth.

Mr. GOODLING. I will lump the last two together. A State must in its plan establish a timetable for ensuring that every school in the State achieves the State's opportunity to learn standards. I have talked to you about that.

As a former governor, how would you go about doing this? How would you, as a former governor, ensure that all of the school districts are meeting these "opportunity to learn standards?"

Mr. RILEY. Well, I guess the first place would be to identify what are the standards that are necessary for any student in this State to have the kind of teaching and learning opportunity to meet the high content standards.

That would, of course, involve anything from teacher education to teacher development to a curriculum that is consistent with high standards, not some watered-down curriculum that doesn't expect this child to really be dealing with difficult issues, and education policy would be changed accordingly.

The State then, I think, could do that and would do it, identifying those things. It is not like what we used to think of as counting things as much as it is looking at the real opportunity to learn, what it takes for a young person, a disabled young person, a person who has limited English proficiency, a brilliant young person, all young people, to have the opportunity to learn and to improve and to reach high standards.

Mr. GOODLING. I guess my question, Mr. Secretary, was how do you ensure that. How do you ensure that all these school districts have met these ready-to-learn—not ready-to-learn, we used to call them—delivery standards?

Mr. RILEY. Well, of course, your original measure is a plan for that and development of it, but the State has the responsibility of accountability.

For example, in our State in our education reform measure we have a number of ways to ensure accountability by measuring through assessment and through other measures whether things are being done. That is a State responsibility and I think most States are very familiar with that and work with that now, so I would say it is an accountability characteristic that the State would have to develop.

Mr. GOODLING. As you know, I expressed my concern that they all would be doing these things now if they had the money to do it and if they do not have the money to do it they will not be doing it now after we pass this legislation but it will, I believe, preclude them then from participating in any reform movement and they may be the people that need to participate the most.

That is a concern I have expressed because if they cannot meet these delivery standards, and I think they would meet them now if they could do it, if they cannot meet those delivery standards then they cannot seek a grant, as I read your initial legislation, for reform.

Mr. RILEY. Congressman, that is not exactly right, as I understand it. They would have to have plans for moving towards meeting them.

Mr. GOODLING. But they would not have to be there?

Mr. RILEY. They would not have to. You know, again, that is probably a changing goal. It would be certainly prioritizing, we hope, the thinking to be moving towards teaching and learning.

In some situations that I ran into in my State it was not just a money problem. You can have all kinds of school problems. People are off onto the wrong priorities, disorganized or whatever. We had several school districts and under our provision in South Carolina that we could—the State decision to declare them bankrupt. The children simply were not getting an education. It was not bankrupt in terms of money; it was bankrupt in terms of education. And we had procedures to come in and the people welcomed that.

But, again, that is a State involvement to see that the kind of assessment measures and so forth showed that progress was being made for all children. And most of those were districts that were relatively poor but their funds were not managed well, they were not handled well, and, again, the communities themselves welcomed the State coming in and helping them get straightened out.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Ford.

Mr. FORD. Mr. Chairman, I took time for an opening statement so I will yield at this time to the other members of the committee.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Petri.

Mr. PETRI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like first to associate myself with the remarks of the Chairman of the full committee and the others in their opening remarks and say how much I am impressed by your debut on the national scene and the leadership you are providing in the education area. I look forward myself, and I know that others do on both sides of the aisle, to working with you in a real cooperative effort to do the best job we can for our students and young people in our country.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you.

Mr. PETRI. I have one or two questions I would just like to mention. I think from everything I have heard, you are sensitive to and share these concerns, but I think I should mention them.

One concern is that however good and well thought out a national program we might have of goals for education and helping education, there is the law of unintended consequences around this town and sometimes the result of having a brilliant plan or a well thought out program at the national level and then asking local people to discuss it and go to conferences and fill out forms to comply with it and so on is to shift the focus from the student and the classroom to paperwork and meetings and bureaucracy.

Therefore, I just hope that you and people in the National Education Department are sensitive to that sort of unintended consequence that can occur. It certainly has occurred with many smaller education programs where at the end of the day a medium-size school district gets \$50,000 or \$30,000 and to fill out the forms to get that money costs them as much or more than they actually benefit so they end up adding to their overhead and really not having many resources available.

We are diverting resources by putting in Federal funds rather than actually multiplying them where the rubber hits the road in the classroom and with the teacher and student and their parents.

Are you sensitive to that and are you going to try to avoid a shifting of that focus and having that unintended consequence from our activity here at the national level, however well-intentioned and well thought out it might be?

Mr. RILEY. Well, absolutely, Congressman. That is an excellent question because you have to be careful. When you create accountability you really are dealing with more paperwork, in most cases, and you have to draw a balance between all that. That is really kind of a State problem. We do not want to cause them to have more of a problem, because of what we are doing, than they should have.

Every effort here is toward getting the dollars for systemic reform down to the school level, as you know, and the push is down and the push is for things like professional development and not a whole lot of busywork, and I will be very sensitive to that and I appreciate your comment.

You do have to have a certain amount of accountability if you are going to have a massive school system work, but you sure need to always be sensitive about unnecessary, duplicative paperwork that takes away from the product of education.

Mr. PETRI. One other concern that I constantly hear in my office from employers in the area I represent is that there tends to be a focus which they feel is harmful to young people they are seeking to employ on credentials as opposed to ability to perform. And they find that if we are not careful in education we focus kids on being in school for a certain period of time to get a piece of paper but at the end of the day they can't do the job and they, therefore, are very interested in sort of outcome-based education and kids' ability to think and to react and operate in real time and change as they have to confront changing circumstances in the workplace, rather than just sort of meet a time requirement or some other requirement to get a paper credential.

I hope that as we go to national certification and so on we are not driving things toward more credentialism in our society at the cost of helping people actually be prepared to perform in the real world. I just express that concern.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you, and I am sympathetic to that view, sir.

Chairman KILDEE. I think we are going in the order that I observed people arriving, so I will call on Mr. Roemer next, and then Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mr. Secretary. It is great to have you here and it is great to have somebody that in the past has not only been successful in building coalitions that set these goals for students but providing the resources to achieve these goals and achieve reform. So I am very anxious to hear your ideas today and over the next 2 years and work very closely with you and with the President in such an important area.

I have two questions. The first one revolves around the idea of this change in concept of education. If we had three Rs in the 1960s we all know what those three Rs were. Today, the three Rs are probably renew, reinvent and revitalize our education system and so much of that kind of revolves around change in curricula, as you pointed out, and instruction and in assessments.

Each one of those areas is intimately connected to our teachers having the ability to get new training and development skills.

Could you, as you did give me some ideas in your opening statement about Robert Moses, could you give me some ideas as to how we decentralize this to our schools so that teachers of the year that are teaching in our schools where I have a teacher of the year that has never been able to meet with other teachers in that school or have teachers come into her classroom to share why and what methods have helped her achieve that award.

The first thing cut in State budgets are oftentimes this development and training and if we are going to get change, this is a critical area.

The second question is in terms of reorganizing the school day and the school year. Having just visited inner city schools in Chicago, sometimes the schoolplace is the safest place and the most productive place for some of these students.

What ideas might you have on that concept as well?

Mr. RILEY. The first thing we would start to do, Congressman, is start the kind of conversation that you and I are having about that very subject. We will discuss these action improvement plans that will energize bottom-up and statewide school reform and statewide shared information that creates free-moving involvement in education. Education is not locked into one little place here. It is part of everything.

We have some provision in here for national leadership activities that would then enable us to do that from a regional standpoint. It is not a big piece of this but some funds that are provided for in the bill that would enable us to develop consortia among different regions to come up with better ideas to then disseminate technical assistance to help people put them in place and so forth. So we are dealing with that in those ways.

The other issue on safety, the fact is that is an issue that shows up in the schools oftentimes. It is not necessarily a school-caused problem; it is a community problem usually.

However, we all know that if you do not have a safe school you do not have a good school. If you do not have a safe anything is it no good. We, as Americans, especially for our children and especially in a learning context, must insist on that. We are all going to have to develop better ways of dealing with that over the months ahead and I would be very anxious to work with all of us on that.

This does elevate education's standard and interest and involvement and it gives us the opportunity to have these kinds of plans and movement and electricity going on that we hope would be beneficial and move to those kinds of responses.

Mr. ROEMER. Are you considering expanding the schoolday and the school year?

Mr. RILEY. This bill, in and of itself, would set in motion all kinds of things like that on the State level. As far as that is concerned, every State, I think, must look at it.

I know we have a study on time and learning coming down here very soon, and a lot of interesting work that is going on in that area. In South Carolina we did expand, I think, from 180 to 186 days and we expanded the day over a half hour a day.

So I think all the States will be working on that. We will be certainly looking at that in these action plans as one of the issues.

Mr. ROEMER. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Secretary, for being here and for, frankly, being a leader on this issue. I am deeply hopeful that you can accomplish something we have not been able to accomplish in this town, and that is a bipartisan commitment to educational reform. If you can do that, hats off and I look forward to working with you in that regard.

I have a series of technical questions, and not to bore the audience but I think it helps us understand what we are trying to deal with here and probably Mike can help you out as I try to go through the draft that you have provided to us.

On page 61 you talk about the plans which would have to include a comprehensive local plan for districtwide educational improvement, but in that same section on page 63 you talk about the fact that at least 50 percent of the funds made available by a local education agency to individual schools under this section must be made available to schools with, frankly, chapter one criteria.

I am confused. Which is it? Do we mean districtwide reform at the LEA level qualifies for a plan or is it our intent that it only be school-based within each LEA based on the Chapter One criteria?

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Cohen gives me his analysis of that as the district focuses on the whole district.

Mr. GUNDERSON. If he wants, there are two mikes there. Mike, take the mike.

Mr. COHEN. The way this is designed, the district would be expected to develop a plan that would ultimately affect and involve every school in the district, but the funds that we provide are initially targeted to those schools that are in greatest need. Over time that could expand and over time the district may have to use some of its own resources to bring additional schools on.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I would hope you would work with us as, in particular, in rural areas this is impossible to comply with because you are going to have probably two, for example, elementary schools within a rural LEA. You do not have the data to figure out which one of those qualifies under Chapter One standards and which one does not. We are going to need some flexibility in that area.

The second question I have is: When does voluntary become mandatory? I think this is a difficult issue, but on page 48 on line three you literally say, "ensuring that every school in the State achieves the State's opportunity to learn standards."

Now, you recall that in a different section of the bill you say that the national council will certify State standards and opportunity to learn if they are comparable with the Federal standards, but then you go on here and you require that they ensure that every school in the State achieves the States' voluntary—no longer voluntary if you are ensuring that they must meet those opportunity to learn standards.

Mr. RILEY. This, of course, Congressman, deals with the strategy and timetable for the State plan and the strategy and timetable

would have to deal with that issue. Of course, the certification is a separate process.

If a State asks for certification on the national level, then that would bring into play what the national opportunity to learn standards are as they are developed through this consortia plan worked with NESIC.

Mr. GUNDERSON. So do you mean ensure or do you mean promote and encourage?

Mr. RILEY. Well, I mean ensure that a strategy and timetable is developed. They have to do that. They have to have a strategy for moving towards quality teaching and learning.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Statewide strategy is very different than ensuring that every school meets these "opportunity to learn standards." See, that is what I am trying to get out there.

Let's go to this next part that you brought up because on page 23 you talk about the council may certify content and student performance standards presented on a voluntary basis by States if such States are comparable in rigor and quality to the voluntary national.

What do you mean here by certification? I mean what does that mean? If you certify them do you say, well, it's a nice try or do you say, okay, we have approved it and your State may now apply for a reform grant? What does certification mean?

Mr. RILEY. It is not connected with the action improvement plan. It would simply, as we have said, be like a Good Housekeeping stamp of approval and that would be voluntary, as I said, and they would come in a voluntary way to ask for that certification. If it was applicable then it would be certified.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Before time runs out I want to ask one more question. In the composition of your NESIC council, if I read the criteria, there must be five professional educators, there must be five people who are either postsecondary educators or business people, one of which must be a businessperson, so you assume four could be postsecondary educators. You then have five public advocates, which could include school boards or State educational policymakers, and then you have five education experts.

If I read that, we could easily end up with 19 educators and one businessperson on this council. Do you think we ought not put in a little bit more of a balanced criteria to get diversity in that council?

Mr. RILEY. Well, Congressman, of course, those names would come in those categories from the bipartisan goals panel and then the President would pick the names from those submitted and I think the President and the goals panel would have the same kind of interest that you propose would be a process you would go through if you were sitting there making those decisions.

We can take a look at that but I do believe that would be covered.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much. Mr. Sawyer.

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to join my colleague from Wisconsin in associating myself with the remarks of the Chairman of the subcommittee and the Chairman of the full

committee, not only because of the substance of what they said but because I am told it is always a good idea to associate yourself.

Let me also add that I think all of us appreciate the collaborative effort that has been made over the time since you have been in office both to recognize the work that has gone on among the States in bringing us to this juncture and the work that has gone on in previous years on this topic within this committee and to meld them together into a whole that represents an extraordinarily fine beginning in that process.

It may be so, as Mr. Ford says, that no introduction is ever perfect. He told me a couple of sessions ago that, in fact, he had a bill that was very, very close to perfect. We won't go into that.

I am particularly interested in the efforts to define systemic reform. I know that in my State and a number of others, the governance structure for education is grounded deeply in the north-west ordinance. A great deal of diversity arises among school districts as a result of that kind of governance structure. We have some 16,000 different school districts, and we wind up trying to tailor, as my other friend from Wisconsin mentioned, grant standards formulas and funding formulas that take into account all of that diversity.

I am not suggesting that we ought to try to reach into the governance structures of the several States, but it seems to me that one of the ways in which we might encourage collaboration across jurisdictional lines is to build financial advantage both in terms of grant competitions and funding formulas so that you have the kind of collaborative effort from the ground up among disciplines not only over time, but over space, so that those small districts where Federal funds are often dribbled away because they simply don't have enough volume to do the job are encouraged to come together and operate in consortia.

We have been working on doing that bill by bill in a number of different opportunities as they have presented themselves, including math and science through the Eisenhower formula and the work that we have done in literacy funding.

But it seems to me that this is one of those elements of systemic reform that would be wise to speak to in this kind of measure, not to be specific but to encourage ourselves in future enactments and to provide advantage to the States that, with their own grant and formula funding, make sure that those districts and local education agencies that can work together do work together in order to magnify the power of the dollars that we distribute to them.

Could you comment on that?

Mr. RILEY. Yes. I would say that the intent of the proposals coming from the State and then the school districts and the schools would certainly—very clearly that would be encouraged and welcomed.

And then, as I indicated earlier, we do have some funds dealing with consortia to deal with regions from the Department's standpoint, and I think that is an excellent point and if we are going to get the most out of systemic reform we are just going to have to do that and I would certainly carry that belief with me also.

Mr. SAWYER. Just as a closing comment, Mr. Chairman, I fully appreciate the importance of consortia regionally among States and I think the same principle can apply well.

Mr. RILEY. It can.

Mr. SAWYER. I want to emphasize, as those of us who come from States like mine have, that I would not urge forced consolidation on anybody. I recognize that those district lines were drawn shortly after the Deluge and we would have to go back to Mount Sinai to get rid of some of those local high school mascots. I do not suggest that, but I do think some of those mascots can coexist and to their mutual benefit.

Thank you, sir.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you very much.

Chairman KILDEE. Mrs. Roukema.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary. I welcome you here today and we had a very fruitful discussion the other day, although you were not able to allay my concerns and fears. And at the risk of repeating things to you, I do want the committee to know of my concerns.

And I must confess to this audience today I find myself in a difficult and uncomfortable position being a person who all my life has been a strong friend of public education, I do not like to be sitting here critically and obdurately saying, Mr. Secretary, I do not think you are going to win me over on this.

But let me explain to you my problem here. I have been a teacher of public schools, I have been an elected member of a school board and I have served on this committee for 12 years, and I also suffer the luxury of coming from a State like New Jersey where we had a wonderful education governor whom I think you know, Tom Keane, and he is a nationally renowned authority on improving accountability in education. He did that for New Jersey and I think that is what you are trying to do for the country.

But let me tell you my problem. I certainly support the block grant and incentive program, but it seems to me the more I hear both in response to the questions of my ranking member, Mr. Goodling, when he pointed out quite candidly, and I think correctly, that if these communities had the money to do these things they would probably do them, including his references to the opportunity to learn standards.

Mr. Sawyer expressed some of our own divisions in thinking here when he spoke about consortium regionalization, but not my State.

Let me be direct and I want you to answer, if you will. I am absolutely convinced, although it is not your intention, but I am absolutely convinced that the so-called voluntary national system of skills standards combined with the opportunity to learn standards will inevitably, like night follows day, lead to a national curricula, to which I am unalterably opposed and, even more directly, to funding standards, national funding standards that have all kinds of implications, not just budgetary implications, but equalization implications.

I have a problem with this. I want to improve our schools. I want to set higher standards. I would like to think that we can go the traditional block grant incentive approach without this massive overlay that may or may not be bureaucratic but, more important-

ly, may be a straightjacket for school systems and negate the historic State relationship that we have to education.

Mr. RILEY. I thank you very much and, as you and I discussed some of these issues the other day, I understand your concerns. Though the voluntary nature of the connection is very pronounced all through this, I understand that you are saying that at some point in time that might change.

Of course, my argument to that is that there is no way for us to be able to reach for world class standards for a school district in your State unless they had the wherewithal to do major, massive things like figuring out what content standards should be in terms of math for the eighth grade. That kind of thing.

I really think—I don't care how far you go in support of the State role—that there is a very clear national role of determining what these kinds of world-class standards should be for content, for performance, and for the opportunity to learn and occupational standards. I just think that, and that is what this really does is develop that information and then from that you have the other forces out there that build to that information.

Yes, you can have leadership, you can have help, you can have facilitation, but I do not think that we should absolve ourselves from taking that major role to try to build an educational attention nationally in light of that.

Mrs. ROUKEMA. Well, I hear the reference to voluntary but a national skills standards board by definition, I believe, goes far beyond setting voluntary standards.

But we will have to—we will not resolve this here today. Maybe we will never resolve it, but I would like to keep the conversation going.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you very much.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Reed.

Mr. REED. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too want to join in the uniform chorus of praise to the Secretary who brings to this endeavor great experience and wisdom. He has been most helpful and cooperative in dealing with this issue to date. We have had some discussions on the legislation and I suspect we will have some more.

I have just one general question, Mr. Secretary, and that is as we embark on this process which includes a lot of emphasis on statewide planning for educational reform, does the department have a recent up-to-date assessment of local efforts to date with respect to educational planning and educational reform?

This approach might be a welcome addition to State efforts, but if significant efforts have already been undertaken at that State level for these comprehensive plans, if they have a sense of where they are going, where they want to go, then perhaps we can think of other Federal roles in this great debate about educational reform.

Mr. RILEY. Well, I think, Congressman, if you analyzed what is out there now you would see every State is different in terms of what they have done and where they are. In every school district and every school, and I am sure there is an awful lot of State information about those kinds of issues but nothing like the kinds of

stimulation that we think this kind of attention would give to those issues.

And by having decisionmakers on the local level deal with teaching and learning, deal with all children, we think that that kind of energy will be very helpful.

As you might point out, you can find a school district here that might have done 50 percent of this kind of analysis in trying to respond to it. You might find one 95 percent and some hardly any.

So I think that the main thing is that we energize the whole system and really make it kind of a national interest for every State to be involved in better teaching, better learning.

Mr. REED. Mr. Secretary, if you could summarize whatever information you have available on State efforts and would forward it to me, I would greatly appreciate it.

Mr. RILEY. I will do that. I surely will. Thank you.

Mr. REED. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here and thank you for all of your help and your work and your time spent with members of this committee on this legislation.

After spending 10 years working with you on children and family issues, I really believe that your service in this position is really one of the great contributions of the Clinton administration to national policy. I think you are going to be a tremendous, tremendous Secretary.

The questions that were asked by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if you will, are in a sense the same questions I have, but I come at them from the other side of the issue.

I think you have done a very, very credible job in integrating the opportunity to learn standards into this legislation; however, I must tell you I still continue to be concerned about them.

We have learned in our studies of children over the last 10 or 15 years that they are capable of much more than we ask of them. From infants to adolescents throughout entire youth experience, children have tremendous capabilities. The question is do we always extract the best in our handling of them and our nurturing of those children.

By the same token, as we seek to send every child to school ready to learn, I am terribly concerned about the issue whether we have every school ready to teach. I do not understand the hostility on the other side of the aisle to this issue.

We know that people make decisions about buying their houses, about changing jobs, and about the communities that they will live in based upon the education they think their children may receive. Houses are assessed differently and patterns in communities change because of schools. It is, I think, the first or second criteria that people use in a decision to make that investment to locate, to put down their roots.

I just think there is, if you will, a consumer right to know about the effort that the State and the local districts are making. I think you raise that issue and I think Mr. Gunderson asked you that question. You ask for a timetable, you ferret it out, and I commend you for that because I think that is an important part.

We are continuously asking ourselves not only in this legislation but also in the discussion of education reform about the effort that our children will make. There is very little evidence that children will not make the effort if the challenge is put to them and the resources are made available. We see it time and again in every pilot program and individual effort at looking at children.

I think the children have a right to ask what is the effort that their community is prepared to make on their behalf.

Because I must tell you—we all know this, and I guess I am entering that age bracket where you say it more often than not—the resources that are available to young children today in most schools are not comparable to what my parents and grandparents were prepared to make available to me.

There is a generational slighting here of our young children. I think that while we cannot steer this ship of public education because our control and our funding is so small, and although I think you and President Clinton represent a view of governors who are stronger advocates than we have had for a long time, we do have an obligation to ask the question of what is the effort that this Nation is really, in fact, prepared to make on behalf of educating the Nation's children.

You led the Southern Governors group. We have got to ask that question because it is not fair to this generation of children. I tour schools in my district where the rain is coming through the ceiling, where teachers are not certified, trained or credentialed in the subjects in which they are teaching, where modern technology is not available, where textbooks talk about a world that no longer exists, whether it is geography or mathematics or space travel or job occupations.

We have got to address that. I think this legislation starts to make people accountable. But I can no longer sit here and listen to leader after leader, especially at the State level and in the legislatures, talk about the importance of education and then continue to cut the resources to education. Let us believe that we are going to have a world class education system, especially on your terms, which are most important: that every child has the capability of achieving those goals and achieving that knowledge to make them productive and participants in this democratic society.

I just do not want to leave the notion that this is not an important part of the debate. I commend you. You have come a long way and I appreciate the controversy in this debate. But parents and children have a right to know the effort that we are prepared to make or are not making, so that they can make those decisions about their children's education.

Every parent wants those goals. Every parent wants to see that their child passes the assessments and is achieving those goals. That is what we want for our children. But we have got to know whether or not we have put them into a system that can deliver that.

It is the fundamental issue here. I really want to commend you and thank you for not only this effort but for what you have done on behalf of children and families and families at risk in your entire public service to this country.

Mr. RILEY. Well, I thank you so much, Congressman, and I thank you for your years of service for children and children's health and education and other issues. I go to bed every night concerned about the very things you talk about and I think all of us are interested in trying to bring about a condition of education where all children have the best opportunity possible.

We are in this situation here, obviously, where Constitutionally and legally and from a process standpoint the States really share the chief responsibility. I believe that is a good system. I believe it brings out lots of creative, innovative energy out there that really is capable of working.

I do think we can play a major role. It is my judgment, and I have worked with the President and with the administration people in the White House to try to develop a balance in this measure, that we can best impact that system within the structure of how education is handled in this country.

And I understand the debate from the two sides and I am here in the middle, but I tell you the debate is healthy, and it is good that we as policymakers and decisionmakers in this country are gathered here in this free speech arena to say what we feel and think about education and how we can best serve the children of this country.

Chairman KILDEE. I thank you very much. Mrs. Unsoeld.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I would like to align myself with the remarks that have been made today, Secretary Riley, about our appreciation of the cooperation and the working together that is taking place between your Department and our committee.

I would like to follow up on the question that Congressman Reed asked. In Washington State, we have gone a fair distance in establishing student learning goals and in working on the establishment of a performance-based assessment system.

How is this and what other States have already done going to mesh with what you are attempting to do?

Mr. RILEY. That is the interesting thing about the way that Goals 2000 would deal with the varying conditions and situations throughout the country, and you do have certain States that have gone great distances and really have very outstanding efforts in certain areas and they would be picked up where they are. They might have weaknesses in other areas that need to be implemented, but the systemic approach looks at everything. I mean it looks at curriculum and it looks at textbooks and it looks at teacher training and so forth, as we have talked about.

And if a State is further along, then it would pick it up right there and keep moving—there is no stopping place for anybody, any State. I do not care how far they have gone or how far they have not gone, there are miles to go.

And so we have attempted to devise this to then get into this conversation with the States, a partnership which I think is very exciting. We are going to be involved in stimulating this kind of energy, picking it up where it is and moving it forward.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Mr. Secretary, I would like to ask about what part, what role, parents can play in school reform, and how we can get them more involved.

How is this treated in Goals 2000, and what should we do to go beyond getting the cooperation of parents? Can get them more involved? What about those children who have parents that just don't care?

Mr. RILEY. Well, you know President Clinton has talked over the last months about an ethic of learning and I have heard him say that if there was some way that we could have in poor parents this ethic of learning where they simply imparted to their children how very, very important it is for them to get a good education if they are to escape a condition of poverty which, as you know, presses down on health and education and everything else.

This measure puts all of that on the table. It causes States and school districts and schools to deal with the issue of parents and parent involvement in every school that is out there and, as you know, in some places a lot is going on and other places very little.

It is part of this in terms of the plans and the development of where they are going in the various schools. It is specified as being part of it, and will get things moving to where other poor parents are seeing what is accomplished by their counterparts in other sections of the country, where they are coming together and meeting in the school and working with teachers and interested in all of the community problems such as drugs or violence or poverty.

I think this could play a great role in bringing out that kind of involvement across this country.

Mrs. UNSOELD. My time is just about up but given that the first national education goal focuses on preschool children, what effect is your bill going to have on early childhood education?

Mr. RILEY. It is also, of course, part of the plan for the State and the local district to deal with and for them to come up with their ideas and concepts of it. As you know, Head Start and WIC and many of those things that impact early childhood education are in HHS or Agriculture or other departments.

We are working very closely with those other departments to see that those lines are blurred in terms of how we handle young children in preparing them for school. There is language in here also that encourages coordination between agencies that deal with students and their problems and their preschool and postschool problems.

So that also, in a look at what we are going to do in a particular school district, that would be an issue that we would look at.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much. I want to point out that not for any personal reasons or philosophical reasons, but because of a scheduling reason, the Republicans have left for a prior scheduled meeting and they will return.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you, sir. I am glad you pointed that out, Mr. Chairman. I didn't know if I was doing well or poorly with them.

Chairman KILDEE. Ms. English.

Ms. ENGLISH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary, thanks very much for being here today. I have two questions and I will ask them both and then let you use the allotted time to answer them.

The first is in regard to the BIA Indian education program's involvement in the reform effort. I do appreciate the increased funding, but the bill does not really go into much detail as to how the BIA Indian education program will parallel the reform package that is being developed. Is it based only upon an agreement between yourself and Secretary Babbett?

How do you envision that agreement to be and do you think that there could be the potential for adding more work detailed language in the bill? The BIA program incorporates 182 schools and 44,000 students, and I think that is a significant number of students. They should be part of this education reform initiative.

My second question is what do you believe will happen to the States' commitments? As we continue down this road toward reform and the Federal Government increases our long overdue commitment, I think there will be temptations for States who do not have the same vision for education or financial commitments to education to decrease their own commitment, both financially and in accountability. These States will start pointing to the Federal Government as being responsible for the failure of education reform. If it fails they will say it was the Federal Government's problem.

How do we ensure that the States' commitments will correlate with and match the Federal Government's commitment to funding resources and education reform?

Mr. RILEY. Thank you very much. The bill provides, as you point out, that the Native American issue is handled through, of course, the Department of Interior and it is handled much like a particular State would be handled with separate funding provided and that then would have to be arrived at with some arrangement with the Department of Interior.

We felt like that with the federally operated school system, and it is sizable. It is something about which I have interest and concern and I have talked with Secretary Babbett some about that issue and we plan to talk a lot more.

But it is our feeling that would be, from a process standpoint, the best way to handle these federally operated school systems and we did give it special attention and special funding. I would welcome any ideas or suggestions that you might have along the way, but we will see that it is handled certainly equally with every other State as they are handled.

The other question dealing with whether or not this would in some way reduce a State, I guess, or local school district commitment or support for education accountability, I would hope would be just the opposite of the impact of this measure.

We will be elevating high standards and getting the American people in every State interested in improvement.

And it is my feeling that the calls for accountability and for the analysis of results will mean more attention to what is done in the States and the local school districts with those resources that are there.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Ms. Woolsey.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to join you and the rest of my colleagues in welcoming you back here, Secretary Riley.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you for being so generous with your time and your expertise. You make me thankful that I am on this very important committee. Your enthusiasm and your interest is very, very true and so helpful to us.

I know I am going to sound like a broken record because I am going to talk again about looking at coordinated services and the whole child, the entire student. It pleases me greatly that the Goals 2000 program includes language setting the stage for coordinating services because, as we all know, I have been talking about the need for every child going to school healthy, well-nourished, and ready to learn. Once that child is at school I would like to see support services made available to enable that child to become well-educated.

In other words, I believe we must begin to take the whole child into account, which means not only having bright, articulate, well-trained teachers, but also having students that are ready to learn.

So that leads me to my major question. Do you, Secretary Riley, believe that this program as we have laid it out now is considering the full student? Will it be promoting coordinated services as a priority and how will we encourage the States to prepare programs to cover the entire child, the entire student?

Mr. RILEY. Well, the answer is yes. In my judgment, the bill will certainly do that. It is intended to do that. I think that we on the Federal Government level can begin, as I have discussed earlier, not by looking at things in separate categories but by trying to look at how they all come together.

If you have a child that is impacted by certain Federal programs, and it might be two or three different programs with all the associated complications, we do have provisions in here that allow the school to request a waiver to handle that. It is a rather limited waiver process in some ways, but it is certainly new ground to enable a local school or local school district to come to us and request that the whole child be looked at and not just in categories.

Then when we go to the State and then the State to the school districts. With these action improvement plans we provide very clearly that one of the things that they have to show in the parental and community support involvement section is that they focus on public and private community resources, school resources, prevention, early intervention, the kinds of things that you have talked to me about before, that the students are holistically—needs are holistically attended to. Those things then the State is required to address in their action plans.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you. I have one more question and this follows up on a press conference that the Congressional Caucus for Womens Issues and our Chairman, Dale Kildee, had yesterday to support gender equity in schools.

I would like to know how these provisions fit into Goals 2000: Educate America Act, both in the classroom and on the goals panels and the councils. Are we looking at gender equity and diversity?

Mr. RILEY. Well, we certainly are and, of course, we strongly stress that we are talking about all children and we make it very clear that there is no difference between any child, and that we are

concerned about the education of all children equally and across the board.

All through here I think the whole tenor of this measure certainly makes the statement that we are interested in quality and equality.

Ms. WOOLSEY. I appreciate that. I think we might want to look at some language that talks about bridging the gaps that have—I mean there are different programs that are going to be needed that will bring young women and girls up to par in the first place.

Mr. RILEY. Fine. We will be happy to have those conversations.

Ms. WOOLSEY. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Green.

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, I appreciate the chance to be here. You can tell either I was late or I am one of the freshmen and I am far down the list.

During my many years as a State legislator, and a lot of us on the committee, particularly new members, have the background that you have in dealing with education on a State level.

The decision how to best educate our children is one that has been around for I know the many years I have been there. In fact, in Texas we were fighting equalization in the late 1940s.

I have seen lots of issues come up on educational reform and they are hot one year and then a few years later we see that they are not really that effective, and I hope that this bill in the willingness of the administration that I have seen in the last few weeks to work with us on the bill is a new course for education. It will not be just a hot idea for 1993 and we will forget about it in 1995.

The willingness of the administration to work with the committee, and even though I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bill, obviously we still have some disagreements and I think it is mainly we would like to see some improvement in it.

I think just like you said in your opening remarks this is a first step that we can deal with it, and with that I have some questions I would like to ask you.

The first one is that I noticed under the bill on page 40 you are using the current Chapter One formula. Is that because we have not rewritten the Chapter One formula? There is not an intent to actually use an old formula instead of whatever may come out of this committee and the full committee during this session of Congress?

Mr. RILEY. This will change when the formula changes.

Mr. GREEN. One of the other concerns I had was created in some of the members of the panel and on page 11, and I know this is probably discussed because we discussed it between members, that you have five members of the opposite political party on the goals panel.

Now, I have served with lots of governors in Texas: some good and some not so good and some who put education at a priority—I think we shared that at one earlier meeting—and some who just because they happen to be governor they did not care about education except they knew it cost too much.

My concern is by saying that putting five members as the non-Presidential party are we just filling slots or are we going to actually pick out? Now, there are governors, and being a Democrat

there are Republican governors who are far-thinking on education but there are some just like there are some Democratic governors and, hopefully and God forbid we don't lose control of the White House in 1996, that there are some Democratic governors who may not be as reflective of educational reform or educational initiatives.

I understand the bipartisanship and that is what we are aiming for but I also hope we are not setting ourselves up for failure by just filling slots with nonPresidential party governors.

Mr. RILEY. Well, you and I have had some discussion on that, Congressman. I understand the points you make about the goals panel and I think you fully realize that with the Constitutional responsibility of States and the feeling of all the governors coming together, with President Bush then coming in, and with Bill Clinton being in the middle of that, we sincerely felt, and the President does, that this is the proper way to proceed.

And that is to take basically the structure of the Goals Panel, which is bipartisan, and to take the basic goals, national goals which were a consensus of the 50 governors and the President, and, basically move that forward.

There is some slight adjustments to it. As you know, State legislators have been added and then we, of course, added foreign language and arts to the basic competencies in the goals themselves and listed the objectives also.

So I would hope that you would be sympathetic to the history of that and the fact that all of us, and I really think all of us, ought to work for bipartisanship in terms of education and I think that is important. We come from different political postures, obviously, but it is better for children if we can be bipartisan in that effort.

Sometimes you can try so hard to be bipartisan you get partisan about being bipartisan and I hope we avoid that. But I do think we inherit this structure and this history that I would urge you to be sensitive to and to help us build from there.

Mr. GREEN. Do the best we can but, again, some of us came not from the national governors conference, the national legislative conference in recognizing that.

One last question in the brief time I have. The five members representing business and industry, and I think that is good because I think all of us from States realize that you have to involve business and industry ultimately to be effective.

The concern I have was that sometimes we have seen testing industry people placed on there and with the conflict of interest that you all envision—I see you shaking your head, Mike, that's fine—we will actually have business leaders that, obviously, some might disagree with on many cases but I think our goal is adequate education without testing industry leaders.

Mr. RILEY. That's right.

Mr. GREEN. Thank goodness for all our staff. I understand. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. The Governor Romero-Barcelo. By the way, did you two serve in the governors conference at the same time?

Mr. RILEY. Yes, we sure did. He helped me through.

Chairman KILDEE. Very good.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary. I want to congratulate you and your staff and the people who work with you on the extraordinary job that you did in such a short time in putting together this Goals 2000 bill.

I would also like to recognize the fact that the dedication to education—I know it's been a while since we served together as governors in the southern governors conference. Because of your success in South Carolina I think that we are fortunate to have you as our Secretary of Education at these times when we need to make some significant inroads in early education.

However, when I was a child and teenager, to be educated in the United States was—none was better. I mean you couldn't get a better education and now all of a sudden we have fallen behind quite a few other developed countries throughout the world and, see, that is being addressed in these Goals 2000.

We want to not only have a good education in our Nation but also have the best education in the world as we did before. I think that if anybody can get us on the road to that, you will.

I wanted to make two points in this about the problem just—I see that they are addressed but I would like to see more concern with those two issues because whatever we do to improve education, whatever goals and standards set, they will never be reached unless we have good principals.

My experience as a governor is that the principal is the core, the most important thing that you can have in a school. Of course, the teachers are necessary and indispensable as they are the ones that teach the students directly, but the principal is the one that puts the school together where he establishes whether it is going to be a disciplined, orderly school, and whether there is going to be motivation throughout in the school.

And I have seen that in extraordinary examples of how a school that was—the name of the school is Republic of Colombia and it was at that time just like the Republic of Colombia with drug problems. There were drug problems, there had been shootings, and we identified one of the principals in Puerto Rico and we went into that school and in 2 years he did an incredible, extraordinary—he turned around that whole school and people were motivated, the parents were involved in the process, teachers, the students. I went to a graduation and I had the—saw the students giving diplomas to the parents.

I have seen that addressed and I see that in your section 306(C)(6) taking from the plans talk about the improvement for the teachers and the principals and also sometimes with the States also mentioned, but I would like to see a little bit more recognition so the principals themselves feel they recognize their importance and the whole system recognizes that importance because I feel that without a good principal no matter what we do we will not get anywhere.

The other issue that I see that you have addressed also, and I am very happy to see it, is a safe, disciplined, and drug-free school, which says you want a school free of drugs and violence and that it will offer a disciplined environment conducive to learning.

There is one problem in having a disciplined school and that is the attitude of some of the courts. Perhaps we need some kind of

right of students to learn and to a safe and quiet environment, something spelled out by law that will allow us to keep the court sometimes out of the disciplining process except in occasions where abuses are committed.

But when the principal dismisses a student because they are too disruptive and there is evidence about sometimes the school—the courts turn over that—those decisions and they intervene in the process and that immediately demoralizes the whole disciplining process in the school.

Unless we have that in the schools and in the inner city schools and the courts it will be impossible to have schools without discipline and without the proper environment. We should address that in the bill or in the—I don't know what your thoughts are about that and that is what I would like to hear.

Thank you.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you so much, Congressman. The issue of principals is exactly right and I was in Boston the other day at a small inner city school and a very, very competent principal and I went into a classroom that was integrated, in terms of levels of capacity of first and second grade level kids, and saw a teacher and an aide just in a masterful way working these kids and their education, with a little black boy helping a little disabled white girl with her work, and seeing the kind of things that happened.

But this umbrella that a principal developed was very, very impressive. And we do, as you point out, include principals in here as we talk about what the States and the local school districts should be dealing with and I would certainly pay close attention to what you say and we can take a look at further things such as safe schools and disciplined schools. As was said earlier, you just do not have good education if you do not have well-disciplined, safe schools free from drugs, and anything any of us can do to help that I would certainly be interested in it.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Just to give an example, one of the top preparatory schools in New England—I am not going to mention the school but I went to visit recently on alumni day. It used to be a boys-only school. Now it is co-ed and there is a headmistress and she was talking a lot about the drug problem and she said that if a student was caught with drugs he would be suspended and if after he went through the process of rehabilitation he would be open for admissions again.

But, however, there are other instances where a student has been caught—had been drinking and he had been boisterous with another group and thrown—somebody had thrown snow and broken a window, but those students were all dismissed and they would never consider taking them back.

I thought that the values were so turned around because the other thing is what students usually have gone through. Many people in this room have been involved in something like that and they were not really problem children. They just got carried away in the one instance; whereas, the drug user has the more serious problem.

I don't know how I can deal with these things but when you can tell the top schools are turning the values around like this and

sionally, there is something really wrong.

Mr. RILEY. Those are very, very difficult issues, the same kinds of issues that principals and school people have to deal with across the board and the courts. What is very serious to some person in one area is not that serious to another, but certain things we know are serious. We know violence is serious and we know drugs are serious and we cannot have them in the schools.

Mr. FORD. Would the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELO. Yes, of course.

Mr. FORD. What you have done is just put your finger right on one of the continuing irritations in this country. The people in my age group say, "By God, if a kid did the kind of things that kids are doing in school, in my day they would throw them out." And they are right and in those days we graduated 25 percent of the 18-year-olds in this country from high school.

We threw out all of the troublemakers before they got too far along, but we changed in this country. We came along and said you can't do that. You gave two examples there where arbitrarily a private school can decide to throw out one group and rehabilitate the other group.

That is the secret of the private school—that is how they maintain better discipline. That is how they maintain a more homogeneous population, other things of the kind which some people think are desirable.

That is the way the public schools in this country operated for many years, probably 200 years, but the courts in interpreting the Constitution have said now very clearly. I don't believe there is a State that would permit the public schools to throw either group that you were talking about permanently out of school. They wouldn't let them do it. The parents would walk right down the street to the Federal courthouse and there would be a Fourteenth Amendment case filed and they would be right back in school.

Things have changed and they never mentioned publicly the great secret that the private schools have is the ability to boot out their problems and send them back to the public schools.

Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Major Owens.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Secretary, I will try to be brief and I will try not to be redundant. I appreciate the fact that you have personally been involved in maximizing the dialogue with us on the preparation of this bill and you know my concerns about the school delivery standards or the opportunity to learn provisions in the bill.

I think the time has come for us to give you the opportunity to lead and you know how we feel about it. We have given our recommendations and now the buck stops with you. We will follow your lead.

I only just want a word of caution. The great emphasis here on the States and having reform come from the bottom up, I understand, and I think it should come primarily from the bottom up, but we need to make certain that the top is very active in this process because unlike any other industrialized nation and those that are competitive with us we leave already most of our education to the State and local level. The difference between the sys-

tems and the performance of the systems might have something to do with the fact that education in all the other industrialized societies is more centralized.

I do not want to go to the extremes that some of them go to, but I think we have to have a greater role for the Federal Government. It must not be a trivial role, it must not be an auxiliary role, it must be a serious role, which leads me to my question.

The States have gotten into a habit of not being—they have not been monitored the last 12 years. We had a government, an administration in place which felt defense was the only thing important and everything else—there was not much serious monitoring of what was going on.

If you ever get around to it and can get a handle on what is going on with Federal programs that are funded already, you will find that you won't recognize some of them and what the money is being spent for. You won't recognize the great amount of contempt there is out there for Federal laws and mandates.

There is a serious situation out there with respect to budget cuts. People are very cynical and we find situations and we have all been in bureaucracies. You find situations where the Federal reform money is coming in, and you might find a person who all his life has been working on school transportation and he is an expert in school transportation being put in charge of curriculum development because that is where the money is and he has the seniority and ridiculous things flow from that in terms of decision-making.

So my question is are we going to be able to really provide some reasonable monitoring of what is going on and see to it that this bill, provisions of the bill, are taken seriously by the States?

There have been cutbacks in your staff and I think some more predicted. Will you be able to provide the kind of coverage staff-wise to see to it that reasonable amounts of compliance are taking place?

I hate to use the word compliance because we are all in this together, but experience leads me to believe that unless there is some serious monitoring we are not going to recognize in 5 years what you are attempting to legislate today.

Mr. RILEY. Congressman, that is really a profound question about the cynicism out there, the strain on the budgets and how it is impacting different areas in different ways and causing some irrational decisions to be made that impact poorly on children.

And I would say that the cynicism has got to be dealt with in a real way. It is my feeling that the high standards and goals—where the public can look at them, see what they are, and see that we are moving things in that direction—we will begin to build up support among all people in a bipartisan way, a pro-children way, for getting children educated for the future.

I think that is going to happen and I think that in this bill we have attempted to. The President feels that with this kind of partnership with the States we are not trying in any way to federalize education or create a Federal curriculum. None of that is part of this.

It is a new role and it is going to be different for people to deal with. It is a partnership role. We think in terms of programmatic

involvement. We see a problem and we have a program to deal with the problem.

This is a partnership where the relationship will be ongoing. They will have in the various States a 1-year plan and then they will have a 2 or 3-year plan and all of that will be looked at to see that all children are being dealt with and how they are being dealt with and what is happening.

This relationship, I think, will work.

As you say, there is some risk in the President coming forward with this proposal. There has been a lot of work and a lot of talk in this same area but we think this is the way to go to get overall improvement.

Mr. OWENS. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Strickland.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Thank you for being here. I have a couple of concerns about assessments and I will talk to your staff about that in private. I am also concerned because I come from a large rural area and because those areas sometimes are underrepresented in Congress and in policy decisions, I would like to talk about those issues as well.

But what I would like to do is just make a statement and then ask you I think what may be a different kind of question than those that you have received thus far.

Since I have been in Congress, and I have been here 3½ months, I have noticed a real disconnect between rhetoric and action and I think that has certainly been true in this country in the area of education, and everyone is an education something—governor, president, congressman, whatever.

But it is my sense that at this time in this country there is a certain zeitgeist, there is a certain spirit of the times that is upon us that makes it possible to do something very significant.

And as I have listened to members of the other party as well as members of my own party address you personally, I perceive that there is a great deal of goodwill that is focused toward you and that you in some way represent perhaps an opportunity to bring this spirit of the times to fruition and that we can work together in a civilized manner to accomplish some good things.

On a personal level, the prison at Lucasville is 1 mile from my home. I can sit in my living room and look out the window. I knew inmates who were killed, I knew officers who were held hostage. And what does that have to do with education and what we are talking about? I will tell you what.

In the 6 years that I have worked there I don't know that I have met three or four inmates out of the hundreds that I have worked with who have had a healthy education, who had a healthy upbringing; many don't know how to read and write. Certainly they have no meaningful job skills.

They cannot effectively participate in society as you and I experience it and so I am concerned that the fabric of our society is disintegrating. I am glad the President is talking about an education ethic. I think that is incredibly important. I think it may be the hope of our survival.

Without trying to overstate the case, as you lead us and as you provide a model for the rest of us and as you listen to these ques-

tions from each of us, I am wondering in your heart of hearts, not in an academic sense but in your heart of hearts, what is of greatest concern to you as the Secretary of Education as you contemplate the task that lies before us?

Could you speak to that, please?

Mr. RILEY. Well, that would call for a question I had one time to deal with in a paper and for a presentation. A friend of mine who was a former chaplain at my university died, and there is a program that they have once a year. They invite somebody to speak to what really matters. It has to be the same topic every year and that doesn't sound too difficult but you start to write that down and it gets very, very difficult.

It would be my hope that we all, first of all, realize that every child in this country can learn—every child who has high expectations of themselves and who has high expectations from their parents, their people who are concerned about them, their friends, their teachers, their principal or superintendents, we have a great obligation in this country.

We have this federalism that makes it somewhat more difficult for us to grasp than it is in other countries and we have a very diverse population which is, I think, a blessing but which also makes it very difficult. You know, difficult things are often the better things.

I think that it is so terribly important for the future of our country that every single child have the very best opportunity to have a strong education with high standards, with this feeling of importance, with this feeling of I can do it, and with the parents, teachers and all working together with those of us in government providing every single opportunity that we can provide.

The President's concept of responsibility and opportunity, I think, is a great thing to ingrain upon the young people and those of us in the Federal Government that can provide leadership. We can provide direction, we can provide help and support for the States to see that these things come about.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much. Unless there is additional questions—yes, Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you very much, and I will try to be quick, Mr. Secretary. Actually, three questions in particular.

In last year's bill we included a provision which allowed one or more LEAs to go together and apply for the school reform money. I have a number of situations in my district where two or three schools within a county—they have recognized that they all literally serve and prepare people for the same workplace and they wanted to do their educational reform on a cooperative basis.

Would you have any objection to that kind of concept?

Mr. RILEY. I don't think I could think of any objection whatsoever, Congressman. I think that is a fine idea. We do have language in here that clearly encourages consortia working together in a number of areas but, as far as that is concerned, I think that would be totally consistent.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Good. As long as we're agreeing on things, I am going to bring up—

Mr. RILEY. Maybe we ought to stop. I don't know.

Mr. GUNDERSON. I want to bring up the issue of flexibility because, as you can imagine, to some of us on this side it is a very important issue.

On page 65 of the working draft, getting down to line 18, it says that the Secretary can approve requests for flexibility waivers if and only to the extent the Secretary determines that such requirement impedes the ability of the State or the LEA to carry out the State or local educational improvement plan.

The concern I have about that language is that you and I both know the majority of schools or LEAs in this country are going to be able to meet those State or national plans and those State or national improvement plans.

So you could make the case legally that you as the Secretary would have no ability to ever give any school a flexibility waiver because if the only basis is that it impedes the ability to carry out the improvement plan you could say, "Look, I have 2,000 other schools who are meeting the educational plan without flexibility waiver so there is no basis for which I can grant you that waiver." Would you be willing to work with us and get a little bit different language in that area?

Mr. RILEY. Well, I would certainly be more than willing to think about that. The waiver aspect, I think, is very important. It is a real good message, for one thing, that what we are interested in are things working well and not just programmatic categories that then make it difficult for a local school, and these would generally be local problems that they are trying to deal with.

And so we favor that, but we put the language in there to point back to the carrying out of the improvement plan; in other words, it has to be associated with the carrying out of the education improvement plan, and you know the language we would certainly be happy to look at in terms of that.

Mr. GUNDERSON. One final question. What, in your opinion, is the difference between national content standards and national curricula standards?

Mr. RILEY. My advisor tells me there are not national curriculum standards, but that wasn't the question.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Did you advise your advisor the other side of the question?

Mr. RILEY. He gave me a good answer but it was to the wrong question.

And I know what my concept of national content standards are and how they are arrived at. I know that curriculum then developed through frameworks on the State level would be driven hopefully by voluntary high national standards that the State could look to.

It is illegal for us to have a national curriculum, as you know, and we don't favor that. But we think it is very important to have world class national content standards. Curriculum is the course of study. Content, as I see it, is what a person should know and be able to do.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Perhaps what we need is a definition inserted within the language someplace of content standards. As I read that section, I don't think we defined national content standards any place and I think to your credit I think you are trying to make

sure nobody interprets that as curricula standards and I think the best way to do that is to positively define it for whatever it is.

Mr. RILEY. Well, we can certainly take a look at that.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you. Do you have any closing comments you would like to make, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. RILEY. Mr. Chairman, I don't think so. I thank you and the committee for the time and the interest and I really do think the questions and the comments were all of a high level and indicate to me that both sides of the aisle of your subcommittee clearly are interested in improving education and that is what we are interested in.

Chairman KILDEE. Well, I think you say it quite well. First of all, we want to thank you for appearing this morning. I think that you have helped draw members of this committee of both parties closer together. Some hearings are divisive and some have the opposite effect and I think you have been very helpful in drawing members of the committee, including members of both parties, closer together and that is a very significant contribution.

And I know on both sides of the aisle we look forward to working with you because we have some real needs in education in this country, and you are the number one Federal educator appointed by the President. We have two major bills this year we need to work on, this bill and the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

Hopefully, as we did so well 28 years ago, 1965, with the initial enactment of that bill that we will look forward 28 years now and see how we can really affect the quality of education in this country with both this reform bill and the ESEA bill.

Thank you very much for your appearance here this morning.

Mr. RILEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 12:20 p.m., the hearing was adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

[Additional material submitted for the record follows:]

STATEMENT OF HON. TIM ROEMER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF INDIANA

Mr. Chairman. Since I began my service in the House of Representatives, it has always been a pleasure and an honor to serve on your subcommittee. I am particularly pleased and excited to be here this morning as we welcome Secretary Riley to discuss "Goals 2000: Educate America," President Clinton's school reform bill.

Mr. Secretary, you demonstrated your expertise at reforming education during your tenure as Governor of South Carolina. You built coalitions to fight for education and insisted that schools set goals for students. You then set out to ensure that schools had the resources to help students meet those goals. We are all well aware of similar school reform efforts in Arkansas under the leadership of President Clinton. It is my hope that we, as Federal legislators, can mirror these efforts and prompt genuine reform within the other 48 States.

I view "Goals 2000" as the first shot across the bow in a battle for our Nation's schools. We have a unique and critical opportunity to establish a framework in which our Nation's students can thrive and truly be the best educated children in the world. I am confident that under your leadership "Goals 2000" will be the first of many steps in that direction.

I look forward to working with you and the President on this bill, as well as the Reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and other initiatives.

STATEMENT OF THOMAS J. O'TOOLE, EDD, PRESIDENT, THE AMERICAN SPEECH-LANGUAGE-HEARING ASSOCIATION

The American Speech-Language-Hearing Association [ASHA] represents over 70,000 speech-language pathologists and audiologists nationwide. Nearly half of ASHA's members are employed in educational settings and in large part serve students with communication impairments under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. ASHA members have a long and outstanding history of contributing in the areas of education and special education through services, research, training, and professional standards.

ASHA supports improving educational opportunities for all students, including students with disabilities through school reform efforts. Over the years, programs for students with disabilities have made significant gains in providing quality services in all schools, particularly in those programs that promote the provisions of the least restrictive environments. The inclusion of students with disabilities in Goals 2000: Educate America Act solidifies the statement that students with disabilities are an integral part of the entire educational community.

ASHA strongly supports the limitation of waivers contained in this bill. We do not feel that the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act as amended, or its accompanying regulations should be included in the waiver section, and we suggest the need for clearer construction language for this section.

We also recommend that the terms "related services" and "related service personnel" be included through the bill whenever the terms educator or teachers are used. Although these services providers are not teachers per se, they offer services that are critical for the quality education of all students, especially students with disabilities.

ASHA firmly believes that the National Education Goals relate to the needs of students with disabilities. Accommodations and adaptations for students with diverse learning needs must be included for all assessment systems and all content standards systems that are developed through the work of the National Goals Panel and the National Education Standards Improvement Council.

We hope that our recommendations are useful to you and we appreciate your consideration of our comments.

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL COALITION FOR ADVANCED MANUFACTURING

NACFAM, an industry-led, non-partisan organization, supports the creation of national voluntary skill standards promoted by the National Skill Standards Board, but only if industry plays a key role in determining those standards. While NACFAM believes industry should take the lead in this process, we fully recognize the importance of partnerships between States and Federal governments, industry, labor, and education.

We are submitting NACFAM's views on the skill standards issue for your review. We would like to bring to your attention Sec. 403(b) of H.R. 1804, which states, "With respect to each broadly based occupational cluster identified pursuant to subsection (a), the National Board shall encourage, promote, and assist in the voluntary development and adoption by the groups described in subsection (c)..."

To stress the importance of industry's involvement in the setting of skill standards, NACFAM proposes the following change:

"... the National Board shall encourage, promote and assist industry-led working groups whose duty it is to develop and adopt national voluntary skill standards. Each working group shall focus on a set of skills needed by industry and shall include all of those industries reliant on workers who possess those skills. Each working group comprised of organizations described in subsection (c) will develop..."

NACFAM will support the work of the Board as long as industry is well represented on the Board. In stressing this point, we make reference to the "Analysis of the Finding of the Public Dialogue on Voluntary, Industry-Based Skill Standards and Certification," which was included in an information packet released last October by the Departments of Education and Labor at a reception honoring the recipients of the Education and Labor skill standards grants. The analysis quoted a respondent as saying, "Industry has to take the lead in this process and be fully supported by labor, government and education. More specifically, industry-based trade associations or business groups should become the focal point for the development of standards."

NACFAM strongly believes that skill standards are necessary for the development of a high-performance workforce, which is crucial to America's economic competitiveness. NACFAM has 257 member organizations: 57 corporations (including several Fortune 500 companies); 175 centers of manufacturing technology extension, education, and research (making NACFAM the largest association of such centers); and 25 national and technical training associations (representing between them over 80,000 firms and 25,000 technical education and training institutions).

We would like to thank the Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education for keeping the record open for additional testimonies.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Statement by
Secretary of Education
Richard W. Riley

before the
House Subcommittee on
Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education

April 22, 1993

Chairman Kildee, Chairman Ford, Congressman Goodling, members of the committee: It is a pleasure to be with you today to discuss the President's education reform bill, the GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT.

Like each of you, I am deeply concerned about the quality of elementary and secondary education in America. We must improve our education system if we are to prosper as a democratic country and to build a high-skill high-wage economy. Education reform and improvement must be a high priority in all of our communities and states throughout this great country.

Unfortunately, too many of our students in America receive a watered down curriculum. And for far too many of our students, we have low expectations. Many other countries against which we compete for jobs expect all of their students to take challenging course work in a variety of academic areas, including especially students headed for the work place rather than a 4-year college.

As we approach the 21st Century, our prosperity and dreams hinge on education as never before. The global economy is characterized by an information-rich world, dependent on technology and filled with high skill, high-wage jobs. In this world, the work force, businesses, communities and countries that are the smartest and best educated will do the best. We cannot afford to leave any student behind. Students must know well a variety of subjects -- from chemistry and foreign languages to geometry and the arts and from English and geography to history. Many more students must be competent in both academic and occupational areas as the world becomes smaller and more immediate.

A strong education system is, of course, good for its own sake for an individual, but now it is a social imperative in an ever-changing democracy and an economic imperative in an international marketplace. If we do not meet the challenges, we face, as futurists say, an unacceptable future for many of today's children and their communities. The GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT is about taking a first step to an acceptable, brighter future for America's children and youth.

Two weeks ago, we released the math results from the 1992 National Assessment of Educational Progress. While progress was made from 1990 to 1992, far too few students reached the higher performance levels; and, the gap in performance between students of different racial/ethnic groups remains unacceptably large. It did appear, however, that students who took more difficult courses, did more homework and watched less television performed better on the NAEP exam. Early signs are that the more challenging math standards and curriculum recommended by the nation's math teachers will make a positive difference in student performance.

In a world in which what you can earn depends upon what you can learn, today's young people will be destined for a future of lower pay unless we can help many more of them take and master more challenging subject matter.

Therefore, we need to redouble our efforts to meet the National Education Goals, and to help all children, regardless of their circumstances, meet challenging standards. That's why putting the Goals and the bipartisan Goals Panel in formal Federal policy to report on progress is so important and is part of this GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT legislation. To achieve these goals will require a fundamental overhaul of our education system and new relationships and partnerships between our schools and parents, educators, community groups, social and health agencies, business, higher education and early childhood services.

At the Federal level, we can best help by supporting local and State reformers and motivating, leading and providing information and seed money for State and local communities that are looking for ways to improve. The GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT is about change. It is designed to expand the use of challenging curricula, instruction, and assessments geared to world-class standards ... and do that for all students.

The GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT will help to identify voluntary internationally competitive standards for what students should know and be able to do in each of the major subject areas and occupational areas. Students, teachers, parents, communities and States can use these voluntary standards developed by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council to judge their own performance. Studies now report that American students don't do as well as students in other industrialized countries. Yet, currently we have no way to provide educators, parents, students or policy makers throughout our nation with information about the content and rigor that students in other countries study and to match this information to our own American expectations for students. The GOALS 2000 process will identify and make such information available throughout America.

Similarly, we don't have information available about what constitutes internationally competitive opportunity-to-learn

standards. Through the GOALS 2000 ACT, voluntary exemplary opportunity-to-learn standards will be identified in essential areas related directly to teaching and learning such as the quality and availability of curricula and materials and professional development of teachers to deliver this higher content. This information will be made available by the National Education Standards and Improvement Council. Again, how can we compete internationally if we don't know what we are competing against? GOALS 2000 will give us that information.

The existence of standards will not change our schools. We need sustained, broad-based, grassroots efforts of parents, educators, business, labor, and citizens all to provide every student the opportunity to reach these standards. The GOALS 2000 legislation will challenge every State and community to develop comprehensive action plans to overhaul their schools so that every student and every school can reach these challenging standards. It will activate the forces of reform which must occur in classrooms, schools, school districts, colleges and local and State governments.

These changes should not be just for change's sake, but to achieve greater levels of skills and learning for all students ... levels that are internationally competitive in academic and occupational areas. Students and schools will work harder and smarter if they are given the challenge and the opportunity.

The GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT builds on lessons learned from local and State education reform efforts of the past 10-15 years. Unfortunately, these reform efforts have been disconnected and often not sustained. But, these efforts have taught us that education reforms are more likely to work if they:

- are comprehensive and systemic -- pieces fit together like a puzzle;
- focus on challenging curriculum and better instruction for all students, to help many more students to reach higher standards;
- provide teachers and principals with new professional development opportunities, to deliver the challenging content and work with diverse student populations;
- involve more educators, parents, communities and business with school improvement efforts;
- are long term -- phased in over 5-7 years;
- have State assistance to encourage bottom-up local classroom innovation and school site planning;

- have accountability based on results; and
- provide for greater flexibility to encourage innovation and new ways of organizing the school day and year.

The local and State improvement plans under GOALS 2000 will begin to address changes that best meet each school's, community's and State's unique circumstances. Almost 94% of the funds authorized for this Act in 1994 (\$393 of \$420 million) are dedicated to these purposes.

GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA is only a first step, but a critical first step to start America down the road to renewal in education. We need major new investments in early childhood and infant and national health as the President has proposed. The Elementary and Secondary Education Act and Office of Education Research and Improvement need to be reauthorized. We in the Department, like you, are reviewing and re-evaluating every part of the ESEA and OERI to revitalize these important programs to help disadvantaged schools reach challenging standards. We need to have a new school-to-work transition, youth apprenticeship program, building on the early successes of Tech-Prep and other similar initiatives.

In addition, this bill would establish a National Skill Standards Board. American workers, employers, training providers and educators must know what knowledge and skills are required. This part of the bill encourages the development and adoption of a voluntary national system of skill standards and certification. The United States -- unique among our competitors -- lacks a formal system for developing and disseminating occupational skill standards.

The challenge for us to lead and to act here in Washington is great. The challenge for educators, parents, students and the public all across America to revitalize and reinvent our schools is great. It has been ten years, almost to the day, since the report entitled A Nation At Risk was released. We have learned much about education reform since then. It is time to apply these new lessons across this land. The GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT will help do that.

Together we can be successful. The GOALS 2000: EDUCATE AMERICA ACT starts us on that high road to success. We need your help and support to pass it.

OVERSIGHT HEARING ON THE FEDERAL ROLE IN SYSTEMIC EDUCATION REFORM

TUESDAY, MAY 4, 1993

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY,
AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10 a.m., Room 2175, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Dale E. Kildee, Chairman, presiding.

Members present: Representatives Kildee, Miller of California, Sawyer, Unsoeld, Roemer, Mink, Engel, Green, Woolsey, English, Strickland, Payne, Ford, Goodling, Gunderson, and McKeon.

Staff present: Susan Wilhelm, staff director; Mary Gardner, professional staff member; Jack Jennings, education counsel; Diane Stark, legislative specialist; and Margaret Kajeckas, legislative associate.

Chairman KILDEE. The Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education convenes this morning to discuss several issues that will help shape the direction that education reform takes in this country in the months ahead, as we work through this bill.

Secretary Riley joined us week before last to discuss Goals 2000: Educate America Act, which is the administration's proposal to promote systemic reform in schools. Secretary Robert Reich, of the Department of Labor, joins us today to discuss Title IV of this bill, which is the first step in a comprehensive effort to prepare individuals for the workplace.

While we work toward better defining what a quality school looks like and what children should know, we must also give students the tools that will enable them to look at a prospective occupation and know what skills are required for it.

The representatives of the General Accounting Office and the National Science Foundation will discuss systemic reform efforts and possible ways that the Federal Government might encourage such efforts. We will also hear from Dr. Sam Meisels, regarding authentic performance assessments for young children, and Rob Hall will present the National Retail Federation's perspective on Title IV.

Before I introduce our witnesses, I would like to recognize my good friend and "Mr. Education" in the Congress here. I made a visit to his district this past Friday, and he came to my district on

Saturday, and we took testimony on the reauthorization of ESEA. My good friend, Bill Goodling.

Mr. GOODLING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Last week, we had the opportunity to hear from Secretary Riley, regarding the education titles of the administration's Goals 2000 legislation. Today, I would like to welcome Secretary Reich and Rob Hall, of the National Federation of Retailers, to discuss Title IV of the bill. I would like also to welcome all the other witnesses that will appear before us today.

With the growing realization that U.S. competitiveness is increasingly dependent on the skills of the American workforce, broad-based support has arisen for the development of national skill standards, and I strongly support the development of such a system in this country. I have, as a matter of fact, with Mr. Gunderson, introduced legislation that is somewhat similar to Title IV of H.R. 1804. My concern, however, was that it be a voluntary kind of thing and not something where there would be too much of a presence of the Federal Government involved.

Two years ago, the Departments of Labor and Education, engaged in efforts to facilitate and promote the voluntary development of industry-recognized skill standards through the issuance of grants to industry-led partnerships of business, labor, and experts in education and training. That seems to be moving along quite well. I believe there are those, who presently have those grants, who are concerned that perhaps Title IV may put too much of a role on the Federal Government and may drive the different partners away from their present development.

I had hoped that it would not become part of the education reform bill, because I thought the education reform bill was big enough, and the skill standards are big enough. The last I heard, we either have 120 some or 140 some programs throughout the Federal Government, dealing with training and retraining. I do not suppose you have found all of those as yet; I have not found them, and I have been here 18 years.

But I would hope that we would have a coordinated effort, and my hope was that we would do this separately so that we would not get involved with education reform. Since we have, I hope we can work together to take away some of the concerns I have in relationship to Title IV.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. I know the Secretary has a very busy schedule, so we will let him testify first and take questions from the members of the committee afterwards.

Mr. Secretary, you may proceed.

STATEMENT OF HON. ROBERT B. REICH, SECRETARY, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Mr. REICH. Thank you, Chairman Kildee, Representative Goodling, and members of the subcommittee. It is a pleasure to be here this morning to testify with regard to the need for high-wage jobs and also credentials to lead to high-wage jobs.

I am enormously encouraged at the bipartisan support that I have heard this morning but also have heard all along the way, since I have been here over the last—it seems like more than 100

days, Mr. Chairman—on issues of school to work and issues of credentialing, issues of making sure that people have avenues of upward mobility.

With the Chairman's permission, I would like to submit my testimony for the record.

Chairman KILDEE. Without objection, it will be included in the record.

Mr. REICH. Also with the Chairman's and the committee's permission, I would like to take a brief few minutes to go over the nature of the problem. Some of you were subjected to me talking about OSHA the other day, with regard to the nature of the problem.

I do not want to spend very much time on this, but I want to make sure that we all are at least somewhat in agreement about what we are trying to achieve and why. Otherwise, we sometimes go off in different directions, without agreeing to even the basic nature of the problem. So if you will tolerate just a couple of minutes of laying the groundwork, I would appreciate it.

Chairman KILDEE. As a former teacher, I like to see a teacher in action before this committee.

Mr. REICH. I try to avoid the temptation to go exactly 40 minutes.

Chairman KILDEE. I had told them that if you did not show up in 7 minutes, they could all leave.

Mr. REICH. There will be an exam, however.

There are two separate, distinguishable, but related problems the administration is trying to achieve and you have been working on with regard to skill standards and credentialing. I want to make sure that we understand that they are two separate problems, even though they are related.

The first chart here shows the percent distribution of increase in job losers during a recession. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, you can see that on the average for the four prior recessions, 44 percent of the people who were unemployed were going to be recalled. They expected recall, and they in fact did get recalled.

This is a typical cyclical recession in which you have a great number of people who are simply victims of the business cycle. They do not need retraining, they do not need to worry about anything, they will just get their job back.

The whole unemployment insurance system was premised on the notion that this was a very big portion. In fact, if we had done this years ago, there would have been an even larger one there. This is only for the last four recessions.

This recession, some would say, has ended; others would say it is a jobless recovery that is really not much of a recovery at all. You can see that there are only 14 percent of the people who have been unemployed who are getting their jobs back. My point here is that there is an enormous problem of structural unemployment in the economy right now, and that structural unemployment has many sources and many underpinnings.

One of them is that large companies are slimming down quite considerably. The restructurings that began in the 1980s are continuing with a vengeance. Number two, we have military downsizing, which is completely appropriate in a post-Cold War world.

Number three, advances in technology mean that entire industries are changing very rapidly. The computer mainframe industry is no longer what it was. In fact, some would say that it is only a small fraction of what it was. Number four, international trade and the winds of international trade.

All of this adds up to enormous structural changes. This means that people have to change jobs, more than ever before. Americans have to get new skills, more than ever before. They have to know how to get the skills, where to get the skills, where to go to get the skills, what skills they need, and where the jobs are. This is an information problem facing many Americans, really for the first time on this scale.

Next, I would like to show you the second aspect of the problem. It is not the same as the first. It is related indirectly to the first, but you have to keep in mind that it is a second and separate problem with regard to employment.

This is the real hourly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers on private non-farm payrolls. This is BLS Current Employer Statistics survey, 1992, and this is adjusted for 1992 dollars.

You can see that in 1977, real hourly earnings of production or nonsupervisory workers—everybody other than managerial, professional, and technical workers—were approaching \$12 per hour, on average. They have consistently deteriorated since 1977. This is adjusted for inflation.

You can see that in 1991, verging on 1992—and this is the latest data for which we have fairly confident numbers—they are, right now, just a little bit over \$10, but they are on a downward trajectory. Most American workers have seen their real inflation-adjusted earnings for their cohorts, for their age group, continue to decline, on average, since 1977.

Remember, the first chart was about the difficulty of finding new jobs and the structural adjustment problems we face. Even Americans who have jobs are seeing that it is getting harder and harder to get a job that pays well, that pays as well as the jobs we had before.

The Bureau of the Census tells us that between 1979 and 1991, we had what might be conventionally called the decline of the middle class. Americans at the top did better, and Americans at the bottom did worse. There has been a great deal of controversy as to why that has occurred. These are pre-tax dollars.

Let me show you what I think is perhaps the most interesting chart here. It is a little bit difficult to discern, but let me explain it. I think that this chart actually has an awful lot to do with the others. This is the income of college graduates relative to other education groups between 1972 and 1990.

You can see that the ratio, the income of college graduates relative to other education groups, has continued to increase. If you have less than high school, you are falling further and further behind college graduates, in terms of your real earnings. Less than high school, the ratio is over 2 percent. If you are a college graduate relative to high school, you are doing better and better; not quite as well, relative to non-high-school graduates, but you are doing much better than the high school graduate. If you have 1 to

3 years of college, relative to the college graduate, still you are doing substantially better.

The moral of the story is that much of the decline in nonsupervisory wages, I believe, can be attributed to educational deficiencies, simply not being ready for the new world of work.

This is different from the first chart, remember, which has to do with structural unemployment. These are the people who, because of all the changes in the American economy, cannot find a job that matches their skill. This includes the aerospace defense engineer who now cannot find a job. This is not an educational deficiency problem. This is an information problem, a mismatch between where people are, the skills they have, and where the jobs are. This, affecting most American workers, has to do with their preparation for all jobs, whatever jobs are out there.

They are two separate issues that are plaguing the American workforce, and there is no simple or easy solutions to either of them. This committee has been dealing with both of them for far longer than I have been dealing with them.

Occupational skill standards fits directly within the parameters of a solution or solutions to these problems. In the coming months, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Department of Labor and the administration will be talking with many of you and will be working with you in developing a more comprehensive approach to skills.

Reference was made to the fact that we have, in this country, an awful lot of separate and disparate training programs, not only at the Federal level but also at the State level. We have training programs that sometimes are relevant, sometimes are irrelevant. Many of them at the Federal Government level are categorical, so it is very hard for somebody to even know they are eligible and very hard for somebody to become eligible if they get laid off for purposes for which the categorical grant was not created.

We are going to be working with you. I look forward to talking with you about that concept and the design of that much more comprehensive program which will feature one-stop shopping. We will try to make it much easier for people who need to get some training to go to one place and get the training they need.

We have an additional problem in this country, and I will be talking with all of you about this. It is how to ease the adjustment from school to work for many of our young people who are not going on to college.

You saw that chart with regard to nonsupervisory workers. A lot of that is young people who, years ago, could simply graduate from high school, get a \$16-an-hour job in a factory. They cannot do that any longer because that \$16-an-hour job is not there any longer. We will be working with you on developing those designs and those programs.

Central to all of these training issues, central to the question of what jobs and where, is the issue of skill standards. When I go around the country and talk to people about getting more skills and better skills, upgrading themselves, the first question that people ask me is, "Training for what?"

There is nothing worse than asking somebody to get trained, or having somebody get trained, or being trained yourself, for a job or an industry which does not exist.

I was in Seattle, not long ago, talking to timber workers. We had a lot of discussions about "Training for what?" I have talked to defense workers, and I have talked to workers who were affected by international trade.

Even when I can give a satisfactory answer of what they can be trained for, the next question they ask very often is, "Once I am trained, how can I show any future employer that I indeed have the competencies and the training relative to that future employer? What is the credential I can show if I am not college educated? What can I use to prove that I indeed have that credential?"

In this country, we have a system that sorts the college educated and puts them on one track and everybody else on another track. The college degree is utilized by employers as a proxy to symbolize, "Here is somebody who went through 4 years. Here is somebody who has, obviously, a certain degree of skills and education."

I can tell you, as a former university teacher, the college degree does not have very much to do with actual skills on the job. It is simply an indication that here is somebody who, Mr. or Ms. Employer, you can invest in, confident that the person has at least the basics, the fundamentals.

Given the growing gap we have in this country between people who have a college degree and other people who do not have a college degree, we need to think imaginatively about how to provide other avenues of upward mobility for people who do not or cannot get a college degree. We cannot afford to degenerate into a two-tiered economy, a two-tiered society of the sort you saw when I presented those graphs to you. We have to explore how we can provide people with a credential that will get them a good job.

Remember the two questions that I keep hearing: "Training for what?" and "How can I prove that I actually do have the training, that I have the credentials?"

There is one question that a lot of business executives ask me: "How can I find the person I need if I am not going to rely solely on a 4-year college degree? How can I be sure that somebody has the skills that I need? I cannot simply rely on their representations. Or if they have training, I cannot simply rely upon the name of the training school or institute, because there are too many of them, and the training programs are fragmented."

There is an information problem here, on the supply side and on the demand side. On the supply side, it is an information problem because people do not know what to train for, and they do not know how to prove that they have a credential. On the demand side, a lot of employers do not know how to identify people, non-college-graduates, who in fact have the relevant training.

We have to get supply and demand together, both in order to overcome the structural unemployment that is growing in this country but also to provide avenues of upward mobility for kids who are not going to college.

Nationally recognized skill standards provide a place where supply and demand can come together. They provide answers to those three questions potentially: Training for what? How do I

show that I actually have the basic competencies? And for employers, How do I find the people I need, if I am not going to rely only on college degrees.

A great deal of work has already been done in this area. The Department of Education, the Department of Labor, many of you, and States and localities have been involved, and many industries and certainly labor unions have been involved in developing skill standards. There is a lot of positive work that has gone on.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide an added impetus and a framework for the work that is going on and to do so in a way that provides a national focus so that these skills are portable across boundaries. People are going to have to move a lot.

We want to make sure that the skill standards and the development of skill standards comport with six basic criteria. First of all, as I said, that they are nationally portable and that they are recognized nationally.

Second, that there is a kind of national clearinghouse with regard to supply and demand. A lot of these things are going on all over the country, but nobody knows about them. In Florida, they do not know about the skill standards being developed in Michigan. There ought to be a place where there can be knowledge and fertilization across boundaries.

Third, they have to be developed by business, labor, and educational institutions. This is the place where all of those communities meet. These skill standards are not going to be useful unless business needs them. They are not going to be useful unless educational institutions, short of the 4-year college—here I am talking about community colleges, technical colleges, and all kinds of educational institutions—utilize them. They are not going to be useful unless workers and labor unions have a voice in the sense of, "This is the frontline worker. This is what we need. This is our perspective." They are not going to be useful unless all of these communities come together. As we see around the country, where these skills are being developed and those communities are not coming together, they are less useful for the purposes I mentioned originally.

Fourth, credentialing ought to be based on assessments of performance and outcomes, not on tests, wherever possible. This is something I talked to Congresswoman Mink about last night. Tests often do not measure anything better or more profound than the ability to take a test. Again, I can put on my college teacher hat in attesting to the value of tests and measuring the ability to take tests. What we need is assessments based on performance and based on outcomes.

Fifth, free of bias. I and my staff have been talking in recent days with civil rights communities, here in Washington and others in the civil rights community. Obviously, there is a history to this. You do not want to create any kind of tests, any kinds of assessments, or any kind of standards which are biased in any way, which in any way violate or abrogate or in any way put in danger the principles of the Civil Rights Act of 1991.

Sixth, we should not have, and do not need, a big bureaucracy. This is why the idea is to have an independent board, a board that is not part of a government department, a board that can be a facilitator of all these groups coming together. A very small budget.

People on the board not paid full-time salaries. People on the board representing these very different communities that need to come together to provide some national coherence to the skill development and standards process.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I will look forward to getting into detail with you about this legislation, but let me wind up my prepared remarks by saying this. I view the skill standards as a unifying device. Reference was made to all the different training programs. We have a lot of different training programs—the government does and the private sector does.

We have a lot of confusion out there in the market as to, "What should I be trained for? How do I show that I have been trained?" and also by employers saying, "Where can I find the right people?" If skill standards are created appropriately and well, then there are answers to all three of those questions because you create the possibility.

There are new potential occupations out there. I have seen them. I have talked to people in them. They do not require a college degree. Computer aided drafting and design. There is a demand out there for people who can do computer aided drafting and design, but there is not a skill standard, and people do not know that there is a demand. The business community needs it, but there is no way of actually showing that you have that training.

Manufacturing specialists, who are able to use statistical process control, who can do basic computer programming, who can do work scheduling and cost accounting. These are the frontline workers of the future: independently self-managed teams. You go to the best factories in the United States and these are the people you see. These are the skills they need. There is no way of preparing for these jobs right now. You cannot get a certificate.

Environmental remediation. A big industry. It is going to be a bigger industry. You do not need a college degree to qualify as a specialist in environmental remediation, with regard to having the basic technical knowledge of contaminants or pollution reduction technologies. You should not have to have a college degree.

The former West Germany, with higher real wages of production workers than we have, has a much smaller proportion of its population going on to college. There are avenues of upward mobility, and there are ways of credentialing people there that provide those avenues of upward mobility. We do not have them here. We need them. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Hon. Robert B. Reich follows:]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT B. REICH
SECRETARY OF LABOR
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON
ELEMENTARY, SECONDARY, AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 4, 1993

Chairman Kildee, Representative Goodling, Members of the Subcommittee:

This Administration has made a commitment to bring America's workers and high-wage jobs back together again. I am pleased to have the opportunity today to emphasize for you the fundamental role of skill standards in realizing this commitment.

Our national economy is becoming, increasingly, a technological and global economy. To succeed in the new economy, our workers must be better-educated, highly-skilled, and adaptable — as well as trained to world-class standards. Developing and sustaining a globally-competitive workforce will require a significant, long-term commitment to improving education and training.

But increased funding for education and training alone will not suffice. We must be able to direct our training efforts toward creating higher-skill and higher-paying jobs. We need to make sure that our training programs effectively supply the skills employers demand — and that our programs open doors to opportunity and responsibility — not close or restrict them. And we need to ensure that students, employees, and job-seekers, whether seeking first jobs, better jobs, or new jobs — can be confident that they are getting top-quality training — and that their training efforts will culminate in a certificate of competency, recognized and respected by employers.

The experience of our competitors clearly demonstrates that certificates of competency and mastery provide industry with critical benchmarks and offer students, workers, and employers valuable, reliable information concerning occupational skill levels. However, the United States — unlike most major industrialized nations — has no formal system for developing and disseminating occupational skill standards.

Our nation does not lack models of effective education and training — but we are missing a comprehensive framework for the development, assessment, and certification of workforce skills.

The Goals 2000: Educate America Act (H.R. 1804) lays the cornerstone of the Administration's comprehensive strategy to create a system for developing the higher skills that lead to higher-paying jobs. The development of a well-educated, highly-skilled workforce requires high occupational skill standards, as well as high academic standards.

Skill standards provide a critical link between the education system and the labor market. Title IV of the bill would establish a National Skill Standards Board responsible for promoting the development and adoption of a voluntary, nation-wide system of skill standards assessment and certification.

Both H.R. 1804 and other legislation currently before you build on the wide-spread, bipartisan consensus that has developed – across different industries and among varied interest groups – that this nation needs a skill standards system. We are not starting from scratch: significant contributions to the development of such a system have already been made – by business, labor, educators, and the states – and with able leadership such as yours, Chairman Kildee. This work, and the efforts of the Labor and Education Departments, have provided important indications about the benefits of a voluntary skill standards system. With a system of skill standards in place:

- students in education and training programs can earn a credential that is portable and recognizable;
- job applicants – armed with a meaningful certification of their skill levels – can have fair access to employment opportunities;
- employers have reliable, performance-based information with which to evaluate workers' skill levels; and
- workers – thanks to a coherent, credible system of assessing and communicating skill levels – can certify that they have mastered the skills necessary for world-class productivity and can enhance their employment security with portable credentials and skills.

In addition, a voluntary skill standards system will benefit:

- industry, by giving training providers and prospective employees information concerning the skills needed for employment in specific occupations;
- training providers and educators, by establishing benchmarks for appropriate training services; and
- government, by promoting accountability among publicly-funded training programs and protecting the integrity and efficacy of public expenditures.

In concert with the Administration's other initiatives to develop our nation's human resources, such as the school-to-work and one-stop-shopping proposals, a voluntary skill standards system can provide a powerful means of ensuring our education and training programs work together.

But the tremendous scope of the task and the intrinsic importance of ensuring a comprehensive, national system militate against the ability of any one group to develop the system on its own. That is why the private sector has actively sought the Federal Government's assistance in bringing the necessary partners together.

Title IV of Goals 2000 takes us to this critical next step – by providing impetus and structure for the stakeholders to develop a skill standards system. The title establishes the National Skill Standards Board, with balanced representation from business and industry; organized labor; and educators, community-based organizations, and state and local governments – in addition to the Secretaries of Labor, Education, and Commerce, and the Chair of the National Education Standards and Improvement Council, also created in the Goals 2000 legislation.

The Federal role in this endeavor does not include top-down mandates or more bureaucracy. Rather, the Board's task is to help the major stakeholders to develop the system, by:

- identifying broad clusters of major occupations that involve one or more industries in the United States; and
- for each occupational cluster, promoting the development and adoption of skill standards, and the means of assessing and certifying the attainment of such standards.

The legislation ensures that the process of developing skill standards is inclusive and representative. It specifically requires the balanced participation of the key players in each industry or occupational cluster and provides for extensive opportunities for public participation and comment before the Board endorses any proposed skill standards.

It is time to take the next step. Our entire economy is suffering from the current mismatch between jobs and skills; our workers and our children deserve better. The development and adoption of a voluntary, national skill standards system will help make sure that Americans equipped with new economy skills are ready for new economy jobs.

Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I appreciate the work of your staff and the staff of this subcommittee, along with the work of the various civil rights groups in this country, responding to concerns as to civil rights in developing these skill standards. I think we have reached a consensus on that, and it has been very helpful.

As you know, Mr. Secretary, I am from Flint, Michigan, the birthplace of General Motors. At one time, we used to have about 80,000 General Motors employees there. Now, we have somewhere between 40,000 and 50,000, depending on sales out there in the market. Very often in this country, we find unemployment increasing or stabilizing, even in the midst of a recovery. We find, at the same time, productivity in this country going up.

What message should that send to our education and training people, the fact that we have a different situation out there: productivity increases and our unemployment stabilizes.

As a corollary to that question, how good, in general, is training in this country? I would like to ask you as a college professor, and you can decline if you want, if you were to give a grade to training in this country in general, would you give it an A, B, C, D, or F?

Mr. REICH. Mr. Chairman, in partial answer to your question, with regard to the labor market system that we have, the system we have in place for getting people from job to job or getting people ready for a job without a college degree, I would give the entire labor market system we have a D. It is not quite failing, but it is close to failing, and it is certainly failing many Americans.

The irony, of course, is that we have a public and private system in this country, rivaled by none, with regard to moving financial capital from place to place. We have laws, regulations, brokers, and commissions. We have a system of exchanges, one of the most elaborate and most successful systems in the world, for moving money to the highest and best use.

We do not have, as compared to other industrialized nations, a good system, a modern system, for helping people move from job to job, getting the training, the support, the counseling, the information they need. One of the things I am going to dedicate myself to, and again look forward to working with this committee on, is creating such a system. It is not going to happen overnight, but it is desperately needed by more and more Americans.

Chairman KILDEE. We have out there among our training mechanisms JTPA. I know that is not what you are here to testify on directly, but has that system worked as well as you would want it to work?

Mr. REICH. No, it has not. On the basis of information that I have gleaned, and I am reading all the studies I can and going out and watching and looking at all of the training centers I can possibly watch and look at, I think that JTPA is doing a fair job for some populations which it was intended to serve. It is not doing a very good job, and in fact some studies show that it is doing a very bad job, having a perverse effect on young people, particularly teenagers and particularly teenage boys, with regard to giving training.

One thing we know about training is, it has to be intense, and sometimes it has to be long. Short-term non-intense training does

not work. With regard to poverty populations, one of the most successful training programs we have is Job Corps. What is there about the Job Corps that characterizes it and makes it different from many of our other training programs? It is intense, it is long term, and it really changes people's lives. It is a very expensive program.

The needs of people in this country who have been unfortunate, who are living in places where there has been a breakdown of both the family and the economy, are enormous. We are also addressing today the needs of working class Americans, average Americans. They, too, now need a great deal of help finding new jobs, getting better jobs, getting employed.

Chairman KILDEE. I am the chief sponsor of a bill that would increase the number of Job Corps centers by 50. I have seen real training take place there for real jobs. I think we really have to proceed along that line to get training, particularly for our people who are disadvantaged and really can be lost. We have to address that, and I know the President is very concerned with improving that program.

One final question. You said, "Training for what? How do we prove we have the training?" And the employer may ask, "How do I know the person is trained?" Those three essential questions. After those questions are answered, what role does employer-provided training play in the scheme of things?

Mr. REICH. Employers around America are spending approximately \$30 billion a year training their employees. This is a good, hefty sum. Thirty billion dollars is about what the States and the Federal Government spend on unemployment insurance. It turns out, on closer inspection, that approximately two-thirds of this sum, about \$20 billion, is spent on employees who already have college degrees. The 75 percent of Americans without 4-year college degrees, who are in the most need and are most in danger of losing their way economically, are getting a relatively small portion of that \$30 billion package.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. Goodling? Mr. Gunderson?

Mr. GUNDERSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, welcome back. One of these days we will let you quit testifying and get some work done, but it is always enjoyable to hear your presentations.

You know that some of us are concerned about the board. I am sitting here trying to figure out if we are so much in agreement that we are focusing on the minute details or if the minute details are so much the foundation of what we are trying to do that unless we resolve this, nothing works. I have not figured out the answer to that yet.

Let me read to you what Mr. Hall, from the business community, is going to say later in his testimony. He said, "However, the fear in the business community is that the national board would divert the development of skill standards away from employers, employees, and training providers. For skill standards to work and to have real meaning, the individuals who will be using them—the employees, the employers, and the training providers—need to be involved at every stage of the process."

I will follow that up, if I might. We are not clear, very frankly, as we look at the legislation, whether you mean this as voluntary or mandatory. Let me just share the language that troubles us.

In section 403(b) of the bill, you say it is the intent to "encourage, promote, and assist in the voluntary development and adoption of skill standards." If you contrast that with section 403(a), it says, "The Board shall identify broad clusters of occupations..." and it goes on to say, "This shall be done" by, I think it is, 1995. You actually use the language on page 88 of the bill, where you say, "The National Board determines, after public review and comment, that these standards are appropriate for the industry or occupation."

That seems to tell every industry that you can develop any kind of voluntary skill standards you want, but this board—not you, the industry—is going to determine whether they are appropriate for your industry and for your occupation. How do you alleviate this concern that we are going to create an all-powerful board, as opposed to facilitating the development of voluntary skill standards within each respective industry?

Mr. REICH. Congressman, perhaps the word "board" semantically conjures up the wrong images. I envision a clearinghouse—a group of business, labor, and education people—who are able to identify, under section 403(a), broad clusters of major occupations where, as I have tried to identify just a moment ago, there seems to be some need.

Again, the business community is absolutely critical here and the education community is critical. This is a forum. It is a conversation where we say, "It looks like we do have a need here." If they are wrong, if there is not a need, those standards will never be used. This is why they are voluntary. If they are right, supply and demand come together.

In section 403(b), it says: "encourage, promote, assist in the voluntary development and adoption" by the groups of those standards.

Again, if the board is wrong, if there is no need, then those standards will not be used. They will be utilized only if those standards genuinely respond to the underlying questions: What should I be training for? How can I prove that I have that skill? And for the employer to say, Where can I find the people I need? This is all a matter of supply and demand.

Unfortunately, in legislative language, we talk about boards and we talk about "representatives." The minute we talk about representatives, we all get into the language of legislating. Let me again hasten to say and underscore, the purpose here is to answer the three questions and to bring supply and demand together.

We want to create a forum in which business, education, and labor have a better chance than they do now of identifying areas where skill standards would ease market adjustments, bring people and skills and areas of need together, and also provide some benchmarks for young people and others who want to get skills and community colleges and technical institutions who want to know what they should train people for.

Mr. GUNDERSON. How would you respond if, rather than a board, we created an advisory commission that had the advisory function but made it clear that it was not an all-powerful board?

Mr. REICH. Congressman, I would be pleased if you called it a banana. It does not matter. The semantics really do not matter. The function is the most important thing.

I did not mean to be flippant with you just now.

Mr. GUNDERSON. No, I am not offended.

Mr. REICH. To the extent that the semantics are getting in the way with regard to conjuring up images of regulatory authority, I would be very open to exploring different words that have less of that kind of effect.

Mr. GUNDERSON. The concern I have, and I think we agree, is that we are playing catch-up in this area. You are recommending a 28-member independent national board. You and I both know that you are going to have to develop the regulations to make sure the board is independent but not so independent that, very frankly, you and Secretary Riley cannot get done what needs to get done.

Then you are going to have to establish an appointment process. If I understand correctly, we are going to get three appointments from Bob Michel, three appointments from Tom Foley, and three appointments from Bob Dole, and three appointments from George Bush, and then the administration is going to figure out who they are, and they are going to have 12 of their own to counterbalance those congressional appointments. Then we are going to have these four official appointments being the Cabinet secretaries and the chair of NESC.

Then, all of a sudden, we are going to get this group together and they are going to say, "By God, we have an appointment, and we are going to do something to change the world." And you are going to say, "Wait a minute, guys. We have to get something done." I really worry.

That is why, in the bill that I and Congressman Goodling have introduced, we have said, frankly, we are Republicans, giving you, the Secretary of Labor and the Secretary of Education, the authority to put together a compact. If you want an advisory commission that helps you, that has involvement from the private sector, I am all for that.

I think we are going to spend more time creating and controlling this board than getting done the very mission that I think you and I, and I think most of us, seek to do on a bipartisan basis.

This seems to me, with the possible exception of this civil rights issue on disparate impact, to be the only two real stumbling blocks that we have to work out. Any help you can give us in that regard or willingness I would appreciate immensely.

Mr. REICH. Again, I am gratified—my staff has told me, and other staffs working here continue to work very closely together—that there is very strong bipartisan support with regard to dealing with the problem and also coming up with a solution along these principles.

As you said, we do not want a big bureaucracy that suddenly meets and says, "We are going to change the world, and we are going to mandate something that is not here." The proposed legislation gives them no power to mandate anything.

Again let me underscore. If this board fails to do what the market needs it to do, if it fails to identify areas where there really is a need for jobs, and where, if people were skilled appropriately, they would be able to fulfill that need. If the board fails to do that, which is its central function, overcoming that market imperfection, then the board becomes, very rapidly, useless. If it fails to do what it is supposed to do, it literally has no function.

What I hear you saying, and I understand exactly what you are saying, is that you do not want to create a large group of people who all feel that they are representatives of some other group of people, and that their entire purpose in being there is simply to represent their constituency. I understand that. That is why the word "representative" is an unfortunate word.

On the other hand, it is vitally important that if this board, or whatever you want to call it, is going to be able to identify areas of potential needs and potential skills and bridge that gap, there are people at that table from the business community, from the education community, from the labor community, because those are the communities that have the most information about how to bridge that gap.

I do not have any better idea about how to make sure that they are all around the table and how to also ensure that there is this kind of national clearinghouse.

Mr. GUNDERSON. Do you see this as primarily related to the youth apprenticeship programs or to our existing apprenticeship programs as they exist in the adult trades?

Mr. REICH. This board and the voluntary skill standards that emanate and are encouraged and facilitated by this board would help in every respect. It would help with regard to youth apprenticeship or school-to-work programs because it would provide information, answering those three questions that I presented.

It would help in people getting a new job, people who are dislocated workers who want training: Where do I train? What do I train for? Employers: Where do I look to get the people I need? It would help an aerospace technician. The engineer probably has a college degree, but let's take the aerospace engineer who wants to get some skills which might build on aerospace engineering. The aerospace engineer has no idea right now where there are jobs that build upon those skills.

This certification process and this board, if it works and functions as it should, will provide some answers to those questions.

Mr. GUNDERSON. The Chairman is ready to gavel me down, so let me make a closing comment here. I hope that our goal is to break the mold in designing new apprenticeship programs for the 21st century, in not establishing a national skill standard for industrial apprenticeship trades of the 1950s. We have to figure out how we can accomplish that. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Gunderson.

Mr. Ford?

Mr. FORD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Secretary's concerns triggered something familiar to me, and I started searching back through my computer for it. Then I had to consult with my colleague who came to this committee with me in

1965, Mrs. Mink. I said, "Who was that guy that Johnson had as Secretary of Labor, who came down and said what he is saying?"

It was Willard Wirtz. He used slightly different language to describe a set of concerns that you just described when you talked about putting supply and demand together.

There were members on both sides of the aisle who reacted like the gentleman from Wisconsin who said, "That sounds like a very complicated group of people to put together to do something." That was late 1965.

It was because the older members in my party and the other party could not conceptualize that we would ever be where we are in 1993, where there was not a single industrial job out there available to an illiterate worker, that was an unknown in those days. We could get jobs in the 1960s for people who could not read or write and who could not speak English, but we cannot today, not even at minimum wage, unless it is sweeping the floor or doing the most menial of service jobs.

Because this committee was unwilling to wrestle with a concept that was a little bit novel for the time, we have wasted 30 years to start talking again about what you are talking about here today. I want to tell you how grateful I am that somebody came along before I finished my career and picked up where Willard Wirtz left off, and I hope you have better luck with the Congress of 1993 than he had with the Congress of 1965 and 1966.

We were busy passing programs like they were going out of style. "What do we need business people to tell us what we ought to train people for?" Educators told us that. We have learned, some of us, over the ensuing years that neither business nor educators have the answer, when they are operating independently of each other.

As you said, we have some places in the country where we are already doing this. I keep talking about it, and I have talked to you about it. I want to get you out there. We are going to invite the members of the full committee out there, when Mr. Goodling and I get an itinerary, to look at some of the places where people are doing what we think is what ought to be done to get us through the end of this century.

Actual arrangements have been made by educators and trainers with industries, with a specific industry, where the industry says, "Let us help you develop a curriculum. If you train a person and say that they have capability A, before you teach them capability B, and then you teach them capability C, when they get to the point where they are proficient in capability D, we will hire them and teach them E, F, and G."

There is a school in my district that has been doing that for jobs that are not even in the same State with the school for 10 years. So we know it can work, if you have businessmen of good will and educators of good will, but more importantly if they will sit down and talk together. Sometimes you have to force them into it.

This committee, again going way back into the 1960s, was the first committee that said that vocational educators in this country had to have a business advisory committee. When we first did that, the traditionalists in vocational education said, "Oh, we are going to have a lot of messing around with businessmen."

In some places, the business advisory committee became the operator of the downtown dime store, whose idea of training was really very limited. We go nowhere with it for years. We are still arguing with people about whether or not, in vocational training, there is something for educators to learn from businesses about what they ought to be teaching in vocational education.

Now you are coming along with this. I know that Mr. Gunderson is going to be right at the front of the parade for something that really is kind of avant garde. It is *deja vue* all over again. Let us not have somebody sitting here, 30 years from now, saying, "Who was that Secretary of Labor who told us we ought to get off our duff and do something about this?"

We muffed it the last time. I was a very junior member, as was Mrs. Mink, of the committee then. We watched our elders, with their wisdom, sort of brush it off as a pie-in-the-sky idea. "Maybe the Japanese can do it, maybe the Germans can do it, but it is not for us." You have come along now, and you are talking to people who are not as hidebound by tradition as this committee was in 1965, and I wish you well.

The interesting thing about these provisions of Mr. Kildee's bill is that we have already had a flurry of concern by the civil rights groups, which I believe have been satisfied because we dealt with the same people we dealt with in writing the 1991 Act. I believe that everybody, on all sides, came to the table trusting each other. It was in relatively quick time for that kind of an issue to be worked out.

There are others who are saying, Mr. Secretary, that this part of the bill is really such a great idea, and it is so sexy, that we should not tangle it up with Secretary Riley's education bill. We ought to go with this all by itself, because this is going to make us all heroes if we pass it.

I do not know what that really means to us, but some people want to kill you with kindness, and some people want to kill you with misdirected concern about your zealously to get there by running over civil rights. We will work through this, and we will get it done, but it actually has to be.

Let me leave on this record one thing. You said it. One thing you do not emphasize hard enough, but you started it with me in the very first meetings we had. You said that Bill Clinton is very conscious of the fact that 75 percent of the kids in school now are not going to finish college. That is the flip side of saying that only 25 percent of our kids are graduating from college.

Everything you look at says: if you do not finish college in this country, you have a pretty rough chance of ever making it onto the lower rung. You and Secretary Riley as well, and others from the administration, have kept saying, "We want to concentrate on the people who get missed in the regular system with an opportunity for college."

That does not take anything away from what we are doing with the new loan program and public service and other things to encourage even more people to go to college.

Even while we encourage more people to go to college, we have to recognize that some of them are not, for a whole variety of reasons, going to go and also that only about one-half of the people

who start are finishing college today, and that the average time for a 4-year degree is 5 now, not 4 years.

These are realities. We did not wish for this, but that's the realities we live with. If we don't pay attention to people like you who are talking about that 75 percent, and what we could do for the top one-half—forget them all. Let's accept, going in, we have never been able to do anything and get them all.

If we could get the top one-half of that 75 percent, we can revolutionize the workforce and recapture a middle class working population in this country, which is disappearing, in my part of the country, before our eyes like sand going through an hourglass.

You referred to young people coming out of high school, getting \$16-an-hour jobs. In my part of the country, as long as you had not gone to jail by the time you were 18, Ford, General Motors, or Chrysler would hire you.

You did not start for \$16, but it did not take you very long to get there, and you had fully-paid health benefits, and you had vacations, and you had everything. In a couple of years, you could buy a new car and get married. In a couple more years, you were buying a new house in my congressional district. You did not have to know how to add two and two and get less than five.

The jobs that were then available do not exist any longer. The kid who falls through the cracks now is a guaranteed failure. For every person we have known in our lifetime, who made it without education, that leaves with us the impression that there is something wrong with people saying, "You have to have it, or you can't make it."

The truth of the matter is that the young people in my district know that they cannot get past the front door of an automobile factory if they are not computer literate, never mind able to read and write. They cannot get an interview for a job, for the lowest-paying job in the plant, if they are not computer literate.

That is revolutionary, and that is what I believe you are talking to us about here. I hope that we are able to retain this in the bill and get you started on that project. Thank you very much.

Chairman KILDEE. Mrs. Unsoeld?

Mrs. UNSOELD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The National Skill Standards Board has the power to certify skill standards and the assessment of workforce skills, but I am concerned that there is no one on the board who has that expertise in assessment. Does that bother you?

Mr. REICH. Congresswoman, the way the board is now structured would permit appointees who have that kind of expertise. There is nothing to—

Mrs. UNSOELD. Ensure it.

Mr. REICH. [continuing] ensure it, but it would permit it.

Again, it would seem to me, from the standpoint of Congress and the President, in putting the specific board together, if the board was going to have any positive effect whatsoever in identifying those skill shortages and also identifying areas to which the non-college graduate could aspire but also, for that matter, being a broker in a labor market system that increasingly needs that kind of brokerage function, the ability to undertake and the knowledge

of skill assessment would be a very important attribute in selecting those people. It would be one among many attributes.

Mrs. UNSOELD. As proposed in the bill, what do you see as the role of educators on the National Skill Standards Board and the institutions of higher education?

Mr. REICH. I see the role of educators as bringing to the table an understanding of how people learn, of what the educational institutions—not only colleges but community colleges, technical institutions, and others—are capable of doing, a deep understanding of how people learn how to learn.

Remember, what we are talking about in developing skill standards is not the capacity to suddenly go on the job and know everything forever that needs to be understood with regard to that job. There will be no such jobs in the future economy. You cannot ever stop learning in the future economy.

What you do need is to develop a tool kit which enables you to continuously learn on the job, and those tool kits come in many shapes and sizes. Educators are critical, in terms of understanding what the nature of what those tools may be.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Are you going to be able to ask for, or expect to get, additional appropriations for training and retraining?

Mr. REICH. Overall, with regard to training and retraining, the President has asked for an increase in fiscal year 1994 of over \$1 billion and, in fiscal year 1995, of slightly more.

In the great scheme of things, I do not think that is fully adequate to the task, but we want to start slowly and make sure that the program really does meet the needs of people who, in fact, are out there right now on their own without any knowledge or information or access to training.

The demand is huge, but we need to establish not only the skill standards, but also the one-stop shopping, places that are easily accessible in communities. Instead of getting your unemployment insurance over here, and checking with the employment service over here, and getting a training program there, and maybe just coming across a training program by accident over here, they all need to be integrated and consumer friendly.

Finally, the third piece is a school-to-work system in which business, labor, and educators are actually designing a curriculum for people, perhaps eleventh and twelfth grade, perhaps one additional grade, employing some education at the worksite, enabling people to achieve whatever occupational standards they may want.

In other words, what I wanted to sketch to you is, these are all pieces of a system which the United States does not have at all.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Very quickly, I have a question about the general applicability of the standards. If you have somebody who is meeting the standards and has been trained accordingly, but it turns out is in another skill line where there is a job availability, is there a general application of skills that can be made that will serve them in good stead, or are they going to have to go back through another retraining program?

Mr. REICH. They do not have to do anything. Again, let us take the case of the defense worker, the aerospace engineer who is very highly qualified and highly trained. That person would like to know and understand where those skills might be applicable and

also would like to understand what credentials might be useful for getting a new job that builds upon the skills that aerospace engineer has already.

It is perfectly possible, for example, that there is a skill standard, as I suggested by way of illustration, in environmental remediation, in which an aerospace engineer can bring the aerospace engineer's skills to bear, get a certificate or a credential in environmental remediation, and then be an engineer who can undertake environmental remediation. That person could do it anyway, but the credential provides the employer with a signal that this particular individual has mastered an area of competence.

Mrs. UNSOELD. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER of California. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, thank you for your explanations this morning. I am not quite clear. When we are done with developing these standards, they are to be used in what setting at that point?

Mr. REICH. The standards are used in two ways. They are used both at the supply side and on the demand side by a prospective employee who wants to show and signal to an employer that he or she has mastered a certain area of competence. They may have other ways of doing it as well. This is a supplement to, perhaps, other ways of showing it.

This is simply: "Mr. Employer or Ms. Employer, I have a certificate of competence. I have a particular occupational standard in X or Y." That improves the labor market in just the ways that I suggested.

It also works on the other side. The employer can be on the lookout for people who have a certificate of competence or mastery in X.

Mr. MILLER of California. The budget committee uses a term called "crosswalking." Do we take these standards and crosswalk them to vocational education programs or to employer/employee training programs? Where do we go with these standards? Does a community college redesign its program in hazardous waste to issue a series of certificates? That is what I do not quite understand.

Mr. REICH. Congressman, let me give you a specific example. Let us assume, for the sake of the argument, that the skill standards board had facilitated, urged the development, discovered actually, that industry needed and that there was a skill gap with regard to the upgrading of computer machinery.

We know, in the 1980s, a huge amount of information technologies were bought up by the private sector in the United States. I personally have reason to believe, on the basis of an awful lot of data I have uncovered, that American industry needs people to continuously maintain and upgrade those computers. Right now, a lot of American industry has to rely on people with college degrees or more. Many of those jobs, functionally, do not require college degrees.

Suppose there were a credential as computer maintenance specialist. Suppose that I never attended college, but I wanted to get a good job—

Mr. MILLER of California. I understand, but who issues that credential? Does the Iowa State college system have to go to the board to put forth a curriculum that will lead to the issuance of that credential?

Mr. REICH. No. No.

Mr. MILLER of California. Does the IBM Corporation go to the board or a technical school?

Mr. REICH. Not at all. Let us, once again, follow the illustration. Suppose that there were indeed a credential called a "Computer Maintenance Specialist." At that point, community colleges and technical colleges could decide for themselves, on the basis of their assessment of the market, whether they wanted to offer courses in computer maintenance and upgrading that would enable individuals to qualify for the credential developed through the system of which we speak.

The data they have now they did not have before. That is that the private sector has made a tentative decision that there are jobs out there because the private sector is part of this process. If the private sector were not part of this process, then the process would not have any validity nor any utility.

The fact that the private sector, entering this process, has indicated that it needs computer specialists who are able to maintain and upgrade is a very powerful signal to the educators.

Mr. MILLER of California. I agree with all that. Maybe I am not clear in my statement. I understand that.

My concern is, when the educators decide they are going to do this, who certifies that this is a program that leads you to that certificate?

Mr. REICH. The program itself does not have to be certified.

Mr. MILLER of California. But if I cannot go to the employer, and the employer has agreed—

Mr. REICH. You then have an assessment. You, the individual who wants to be, say, a computer maintenance specialist, would apply for an assessment. You would have an assessment, and the board would arrange for you to be assessed. Ideally, that is not a test, as we talked about before. It is more performance oriented.

The board would authorize assessments. The board would ensure that assessments follow a particular set of routes. The community college would not be involved, necessarily, in the assessments. It could be involved in the assessments, but the board would certify the assessment process through its endorsement function.

The only reason the community college would be offering these particular courses is, the community college senses that there is a demand out there, and graduates of that community college would be in a better position to get that certification than people who did not go to that community college.

Mr. MILLER of California. We are not going to settle this in 5 minutes, but I think there are some serious questions about this approach. One, the way you just explained it there, it sounds to me that, as opposed to giving people a broad range of skills that allow them to move from a job five times in their life or eight times in the coming generations, we are back into niches for people as computer specialists or environmental specialists.

Mr. REICH. Again, maybe computer specialist was an unfortunate illustration. A computer specialist, somebody who understands computers and can maintain and upgrade computers, is really a cross-section. It is a very large field of competence.

The purpose underlying here—and again, let me make this very clear, if I have not—is not to supplant the market. It is to improve the way the market is functioning, to get supply and demand together. That degree of structural unemployment, Congressman, that I talked about before is very much a function of people not having the right skills, at the right place, and at the right time, and not even knowing what skills they should get.

A system of broad skill competencies, voluntarily based, driven by the private sector but with educators involved, and also labor and others, provides a very powerful signaling device on both sides of the equation, both on the supply side and the demand side, as to what I need to get, what I could get, how I could signal that I have that particular training, and where the jobs are out there. It also helps employers have the same signal on the other side, in terms of where I can get the people I need.

Not long ago, I was talking to the president of a major computer company in the United States—and I do not want to overdo computers; this is not just futuristic. I asked him, "Where are the good jobs?"

In fact, it was much of the question that Chairman Ford asked a moment ago. If we are losing our middle class because the factory jobs are leaving, give me some examples of the kinds of jobs that a non-college graduate could do in your industry that would pay well, where there are shortages right now, and where there are jobs out there.

Without blinking an eye, this computer executive said, "We need people who are computer literate and are able to actually maintain and upgrade these machines. We also need a set of people who are able to provide customer service, which is very close to maintaining and upgrading. It is continuously offering advice and counseling to customers who buy these computer systems and need that kind of advice about how to utilize best those computer systems." He said to me, "You don't need a college degree to do this. Those people can be trained."

The market is failing precisely in the way that I have been talking about. There is no credential. There is no way that people who need employment can see that there is indeed a field out there, and there is no way that people who need employees, who have that training without a college degree, can actually find the employees they need.

So we are not supplanting the market. The idea here is to simply fill in the gaps, which are growing before our eyes, in the skills people have or fail to have and what the market actually requires.

Chairman KILDEE. I know Mr. Miller will want to pursue this question further at some other time.

Mr. Roemer?

Mr. ROEMER. Good morning, Mr. Secretary. It is nice to see you up here once again. I think you have been here twice in less than a week. If we are going to solve some of the problems with retraining our workforce and reinventing and reinvigorating our education

system, obviously you are going to be a big part of that. So I hope we see a lot more of you up here.

Just last week, you and I talked very briefly at a Democratic caucus about the historic opportunity that we have coming before us. We do not need to get too fragmented in our approach to coming up with a solution to the school-to-work bill that we will be working on.

Hopefully, we will not get too fragmented on national service, school-to-work, elementary/secondary reauthorization, and school reform, so we can get a major piece of legislation that addresses many of the problems that this committee has talked about today.

One of my concerns, Mr. Secretary, is when will this board that we are talking about make some of the recommendations on credentials? What is our timing? Then what is our timing on a school-to-work bill?

Mr. REICH. The reason, Congressman, that this piece of legislation is here now and the reason that we chose to connect it to the education bill is twofold. It is partly because education and work do need to be tied together, and it is completely appropriate conceptually.

It is also because this is such a basic piece of the rest of the package that once you have in place the capacity to generate skill standards and develop skill standards, everything else becomes much easier because then you can mobilize community colleges, technical institutes, proprietary institutes. An awful lot of your training then begins to be focused in areas where you do need training.

Again, we view this as a basic building block. Sequentially, ideally, this has to start before all the rest of the pieces of legislation.

What I would like to do with regard to the rest, Congressman, is be back before the full committee within the next 4 to 6 months—and again, before I do that, I look forward to working with your staff and with you and having a lot of discussions about these—but with an omnibus, a much more comprehensive workforce reinvestment system, comprising all of the elements that we talked about before.

That is, assistance for workers who are laid off, in terms of getting new jobs. That is not categorical assistance, not dependent on the reason they were laid off. Combining that assistance with job counseling and also, critically, information about where jobs exist.

Integrating unemployment insurance with this job skill system. I do not want to bore you, but I could go on into another little 40-minute lecture about how the unemployment insurance system is really becoming somewhat obsolete, in an economy which is moving from a cyclical unemployment problem to a structural unemployment problem.

Then also a school-to-work system, as we talked about just a moment ago, with one-stop shopping to integrate all of these services.

Those are all pieces. Ideally, we would like to come back with a piece of legislation that had all of these pieces in it so that Congress would have the entire view. But this particular piece of the puzzle, on creating occupational skill standards, I believe is important. It may not, to the average person as we talk about it, sound

so exciting, but it is very important with regard to laying the foundation for everything that follows.

Mr. ROEMER. Let me give you an example of something that, over the weekend, happened in my district. I visited an elementary school that is applying for a grant to keep their school open 5 days a week until 8 o'clock at night and 1 day over the weekend. If they can get enough money in this grant, they can work through the neighborhood in integrated services, health care, adult education, and so forth.

One of their main areas of focus is not, as you mentioned, on downsizing IBM or Boeing or new job creation. It is to hone in on one specific skill of an adult to help them get a job, whether that be a computer skill, whether that be a math skill, whether that be a language skill. Six hundred people have been signing up for adult education at this one elementary school.

Will you support programs which would give grants to schools to use them in more innovative ways, especially in neighborhoods and in inner cities? Do you think that this one-stop shopping at a school, because it is already a viable place and safe place in most neighborhoods, is something that we can look at for retraining as well?

Mr. REICH. Congressman, the way we are envisioning it, the one-stop shopping place that is a career center would be available to anybody who has either lost a job or actually would like to upgrade their skills. It would have all the information—

Mr. ROEMER. What if we do not have a career center, and the school is already there?

Mr. REICH. The point I was going to make is that this center would be a place where people could get information about the availability of those adult education courses. Absolutely. The short answer to your question is: of course.

We have, in this country, a very good adult education system. We have, in this country already, proprietary schools all over. Many Americans are spending billions of dollars at proprietary schools, which offer training—some of it good, much of it not so good. We have a Federal system. We have a State system. We have all kinds of opportunities.

Again, people are very confused: What should I train for? What do I need? What are even the fundamentals I need? How can I show that I indeed have the training? What jobs are actually out there?

We need to take advantage of the resources already out there. It is not so much that we do not have enough resources. We do not have enough resources in certain areas, but we also have to create an information system so people can find out about the adult education and they know what kind of adult education they need, in terms of that particular job down the road.

Mr. ROEMER. My point—and this is it, Mr. Chairman—is that these schools can serve as the clearinghouse, as I think you envision, for getting information out to people and serving as a place where we educate people in all four of the ways that you have elucidated: downsizing, helping people that have lost jobs in middle level positions, new job creation through our competitiveness bill that we are working on in Congress now, and combining health

care and adult education and some of the new things that you are talking about. Thank you, and I look forward to working with you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mrs. Mink?

Mrs. MINK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mr. Secretary.

I heartily agree with all of your comments on the importance of undertaking this activity. The tragedy is, really, that 75 percent of our young people do not know, upon graduation, what they are going to do, what kind of a job they are capable of winning, what they can look forward to in the future, except perhaps initially some dead-end job. Emphatically, the development with industry and with the labor people and educators, some definition of what job skills are required for the huge array of potential job opportunities in our market is critical.

My problem, I think, stems also from what Congressman Miller was saying. I find it difficult, with all the support that I feel for this legislation and its importance, to make the connection with the bill to which it is now attached, and that is the elementary and secondary education reform concept and the importance of providing quality education for our young people.

As I see the significance of your proposal, it is for those who are in the job market so that they can identify where it is their job potential is and what kind of training and education they need to have in order to get those job opportunities which are not dead-end but which have a potential for them to reach the top.

Putting this into this education/schools bill I find difficult, because there we are talking about what you ought to know in the third grade and sixth grade, and how we are going to measure the school's ability to deliver this educational content. When, in your title, you are talking about assessments and certification and all of that, it troubles me a great deal. I read into it and I connect those words with the other words that are in the primary legislation.

So I would like to ask, is the real effect of your proposal to stimulate the elementary and secondary schools to provide better education so that these young people not going on to college may prepare themselves better for such career opportunities which do not necessarily require a college education?

Having said that, if that is really the effect, then are we not saying to our elementary and secondary educators that they ought to find time for these skills development, and that the forum you are constructing, which is going to set up these skills, will have an impact on the kinds of educational programs that will be offered in elementary and secondary schools.

If they do not then, actually you are kicking the kids out of high school and saying, "Now you can look for the job category to which you are inclined. Now you must go on to higher education. Now you must go to a community college or a vocational college in order to get the credentialing so that you can qualify for a good job."

This is the confusion in our minds. How do you fit this in to an elementary and secondary school reform bill?

Mr. REICH. Congresswoman, let me just make two points. Hopefully, I can clear up some of the confusion.

First of all, the reason this is here is, we envision, as you and many others do, that in the new economy, education is a continu-

ous process. It must not and it cannot end at the age of 16 or 18 or 22. It is continuous. It is lifelong. That is simply the way the economy is now organized. People have to continuously re-skill, if not on the job then they have to have opportunities to re-skill and relearn outside the job.

Many people are going to be laid off, or they are going to lose their jobs, or they are going to change jobs. The average person will change jobs, six, eight, or 10 times.

Mrs. MINK. I have no problem with the retraining and the impact of that.

Mr. REICH. In terms of conceptually. That is why it is so closely tied in with the schools.

Point number two. Hopefully, these kinds of skill standards will provide an incentive and a stimulus—not only to schools but also to training institutes, to community colleges, to all institutions involved in developing learning—as to where are the jobs, what kinds of skills are necessary, in terms of fields of competence, that one must have.

Forty years ago or 30 years ago, it was possible to envision a career in either a factory or even a clerical career or typing. It did not pay very much, but it was a career. You could have, even in the high schools and training institutes, all over the Nation, courses in typing. In the new economy, typing has given way to word processing, and data processing has given way to the management of computer databanks.

In the old days, we simply knew that there was an occupation called typist or clerk/typist, and you either had the skill or did not have the skill. It was fairly easy to convey whether you had the skill or didn't have the skill. Now we are in a new economy in which it is much more difficult to convey whether you have a skill.

By having skill standards, you are indeed, as you said, providing a stimulus and a direction to all kinds of institutes as to what kinds of learning and competencies are useful, not specific competencies that are going to become obsolete but broad-based competencies that are going to be useful in the economy of the future.

Mrs. MINK. After this bill becomes law, what distinguishing features will a high school graduate have, in terms of his or her skills, that a high school graduate does not now generally have?

Mr. REICH. I would hope—and here, again, this is a matter of speculating on the kind of effect that this signal will have if we did have 15 or 20 broad areas of skill standards, areas of competency, that did indeed reflect where the economy was evolving and also the kinds of new jobs that were out there for people who did not or could not get a college degree, I would expect that high schools would begin to adapt their curricula in the following ways.

For one thing, I would expect that high schools would provide greater emphasis, particularly in the junior and senior years, on particular skills that undergird all of these new occupations. That is, number one, critical thinking, the ability to think and ask questions, how to solve problems and identify problems, work collectively in a group or work independently. All of these new skills are necessary as a baseline.

Second, I would expect and hope that high schools would begin to combine, in the eleventh and twelfth grade, opportunities for

young people to actually experience the world of work and provide a bridge, just the beginnings of a bridge, not only for those kids who are not going on to college but for all young people, a bridge which might even carry over to a thirteenth year, a bridge that would blend some work experience and some school experience.

Secretary Riley and I have talked a great deal about this. We still are not prepared to propose a particular apprenticeship or school-to-work curricular plan. We are working very closely with many groups on this subject. It is a very complicated subject. Hopefully, we will have something here soon.

The point that you are raising and the point that I want to respond to is the signaling effect that having skill standards might have, ideally, upon all kinds of institutions, signaling where those jobs are and what those skills might be.

Chairman KILDEE. The Chair is going to have to enforce the 5-minute rule, because there is a number of people here.

Mr. Goodling, do you have a question?

Mr. GOODLING. I will wait.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Green?

Mr. GREEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Like all my colleagues, Mr. Secretary, it is good to see you here again in a visit before the committee. I like the idea of the Department of Labor and the Secretary of Labor working with an education issue, because as you said, we hope it will carry forward to where we are training our young people for jobs that will be there.

I like the ideas of the bridge from school to work and the higher-order thinking. I know a lot of our elementary and secondary schools are going to that in curricula around the country, to actually teach problem-solving instead of just manual skills.

One of the concerns I have and the reason I am glad you are here is, sometimes in government, whether it be State or Federal Government, the right hand does not know what the left hand does. That is what is good about having education and labor actually sitting together and talking about those issues.

One of the concerns I have is, in speaking of that right hand over the left hand—and you will get a letter in the next few days—is that we found in Texas, and particularly in Houston, that the Department of Labor has listed some critical occupations that are allowing, for example, imported workers to come in. Yet, our Texas Employment Commission actually has applications on file for these particular ones. These are not semi-skilled or skilled jobs; these are college degrees.

A good example is, the Department of Labor shows a shortage in biologists, for example. Yet, in Houston, we have 23 applicants for biologists and 331 statewide. We still have lots of chemical engineers, because we are still having problems with placing some of the folks. We graduate a lot of chemical engineers, but the Department of Labor says there are not enough qualified, yet chemical engineering, design engineering, in Houston alone, we have 222 that have filed with the TEC, our Texas Employment Commission, and almost 400 statewide.

I think maybe we might look at these. These are high tech jobs. I hear, even in Houston, the number of people who are losing these jobs to imports, whether we are transferring those jobs overseas or

bringing foreign nationals here to work. It is so apropos that you are here today, when this has been an issue that has been discussed, at least in Houston in the media, for about the last 3 or 4 days. You will get more information on it.

I would like to see you here to talk about that, because we need to continue that effort. I also think that within the Department of Labor, we might need to look at what jobs we do not have people there now but there actually are. I am sure that could happen in any part of the country, much less Texas.

Mr. REICH. Thank you, Congressman. I will look into those specific examples you gave me. As you know, the Department of Labor indeed does certify, with regard to immigration, areas of labor shortages. It has been doing so for many years. It is authorized, indeed required, by law to do that. I will check in those particular areas.

Mr. GREEN. We will follow up to you with the information we have.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Sawyer?

Mr. SAWYER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I am glad you are here, and I am looking forward to being able to get you back to work in fairly short order.

The topics that you have talked about today are particularly telling when you talk about signaling, creating the market for skills. At almost every point, we talk about building linkages. In the first section of this title, particularly section 5 and section 9, 401(a)(5) and 401(a)(9), there is a discussion of one element of this undertaking that is of particular concern.

Even if we do an ideal job of education reform in the first 76 pages of this measure and prepare ourselves well from page 77 on, we will have somewhere between 75 and 80 percent of our workforce out there with skills that go uninventoried and uncertificated and for which there will be a very difficult market match as we see the economy shifting.

To give you one example, the kinds of skills it takes to weld nuclear propulsion systems for attack submarines, we may need one or two more of those but we are not going to need large numbers of them. Yet, those skills are extraordinary in their quality. Trying to build first a certification and a match between not just welding but welding of a very special character and the applications they may have throughout a complex economy, it seems to me to be one of the largest challenges that you face.

Do you have any thoughts about how the techniques that are described in Title IV can be applied to that 80 percent of the workforce for whom that credentialing and match process is perhaps more critical than anybody else in the labor force today?

Mr. REICH. Congressman, I take it you are referring to people who already have certain skills that are in demand?

Mr. SAWYER. Skills for which there is no inventory and for which there is no inventory of demand. There is probably a better inventory of demand than there is of existence.

Mr. REICH. I see no reason why the skills board could not, with regard to the encouragement and facilitation of all kinds of certification programs, encourage the certification of certain skills of the sort you referred to, which are not in great demand but necessary.

that people at least have a piece of paper and be able to show in their job application that they have a certain competence.

Mr. SAWYER. Perhaps I was too specialized in my description. One of the talking points in vocational education is that we are developing too many welders of the kind that we needed in the 1950s. That is probably true, but the fact of the matter is that welding of one kind is not the same kind as high-demand welding is today.

If I take another arena, the use of composites in airframes is a very high skilled, highly specialized kind of job. Its applicability in modern fighter aircraft may not have a great deal of use in the next 8 years, but in automobile frames, in lightweight mass transit systems, there is enormous applicability.

There is a range of evolving skills that are in the workplace today that it seems to me we are having difficulty identifying and applying, using the techniques that you have described here. I think the techniques are enormously applicable, but I do not think there is a way to address that within the structure of the legislation that we have.

Mr. REICH. As you pointed out, section 401(a)(5) does provide or at least indicates, and there are subsequent sections, that in which the purpose would be to help workers obtain certifications of their skills in just the manner you talked about, both to protect against dislocation but also to pursue career advancement. The implication clearly is the continuous upgrading of skills of all sorts.

I would not envision that the board, as part of its mandate to develop a relatively small number—15 or 20 basic, broad skills competencies—would get into quite the detail you talked about with regard to composite materials, but those kinds of certifications could be built upon the basics.

For example, someone who wanted to upgrade a set of skills with regard to composite materials or with regard to advanced welding certainly could get, I expect and hope, a certification of a broad sort which permitted that person to prove that the person had some underpinnings of understanding of an industrial process and then could go on to get an even more advanced and specialized certification, not through the board so much but which might be stimulated by the board.

Let me take one step back here. The advanced welders or the people involved in composite materials today need to have skills that are more than the specialized skills that they might have of an advanced technical nature. Most often, they need to know and understand the system in which they are working. That system understanding requires a set of fundamentals, which many American workers, for one reason or other, through no fault of their own, simply do not have.

I had the privilege yesterday afternoon of spending an hour with Edwards Demming, one of the great men of management theory and a constant critic of American companies, a man who, almost singlehandedly, put Japan on the route that Japan is now on. Dr. Demming is a very old man.

I asked him, "What is it that we need to teach American workers and American employers? What is the learning that they are having the hardest time getting?" He kept saying, "They have to understand that they are working in a system."

"We have to get away from specialized knowledge. Yes, we need specialized knowledge," and I cannot imitate his voice; it is a growling, wonderful voice. He said, "We have to understand that everybody is embedded in a system and has some responsibility for making the entire system work."

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Strickland?

Mr. STRICKLAND. Mr. Chairman and Mr. Secretary, thank you.

As I sat here this morning, my mind has literally been flooded with questions. I have had a lot of conflicting feelings because I see the very significant benefits of what is being attempted, and yet a lot of questions and potential problems concern me.

I am thinking about an effort to avoid a large bureaucracy, and yet I see, at least at this point, no way to avoid that. When I think of the assessment tools that must be developed, the repository of records, how to access those records on the part of those who would need them, the way the workforce changes, and the skills needed to do certain functions change, literally from month to month or year to year.

Part of my concern you just spoke to, when you were talking about your conversation with Dr. Demming. The skills we attempt to evaluate or test or assess or credential, in my mind, need to be somewhat general in nature because of the way the workforce needs to change so rapidly. I guess what I would like for you to speak to, if you could is, how do we avoid this bureaucratic structure that, at least where I am right now and listening to all this, I fear may be necessary in order to carry out this?

Mr. REICH. Congressman, the way we avoid it is to create a structure that actually enhances market forces, pushes the market in the direction that the market would eventually go anyway.

I keep referring back to supply and demand, market imperfections, people who need and want to get skills but do not know what skills to get, employers who need skilled people but do not know how to find them. This kind of a system, functioning as we think it would function, would link supply and demand without a bureaucracy. You do not need a bureaucracy to establish standards.

We have had, in this country, a history going back to the 1920s, of standards in industry which are simply there. They provide focal points, signals around which the private sector and other institutions rally. In fact, the beauty of a system like this is precisely that you do not need a bureaucracy.

What you have is a group of people, individuals, bringing to the table their respective insights and wisdom from business, labor, education, and so forth. They understand their mandate is to try to identify areas of potential skills, where people could get some broad areas of competence, where employers need a signal as to where they can get that area of competence.

That board would, in effect, allow and possibly provide some seed money for groups that are already developing these kinds of standards, these kinds of certifications and to other groups as well. This is going on all over the country already.

What this board does is, it ensures that everybody is at the table when these standards are being developed, and it ensures that the results are portable. You can move from State to State, and if you have that credential, you can show employers in the future that

you do have the credential. It would ensure that the assessments are not biased. It does not have to do the assessments themselves; it would simply endorse assessment processes as part of the overall skill standard system.

The beauty here is that this particular board has to do very little itself; it is simply giving an imprimatur, if you will, to a lot that is already underway and being done and encouraging the market to work in the way the market is already working. This is not a step in the direction of a bureaucracy.

There are only two alternatives to this. One is to do nothing and let the market function the way it is but, again, with higher and higher levels of structural unemployment and lower and lower levels of income for a lot of people who simply do not have the skills they need because they cannot get them, do not know where they can get them, or cannot afford a college education.

Alternative two is to establish a very complicated labor market system of the sort that you have in some countries, where you have government doing a lot of these things.

It seems to me that neither of those alternatives is one that we ought to choose. This is a minimalist approach. It sets a framework for the private sector, educators, and others to rally around.

Mr. STRICKLAND. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Payne?

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. It is always a pleasure to see you and listen to your theories. It is great to take your academic background and merge it here with the reality. Hopefully, it will all click.

I just have a concern about the opportunity to learn standards. I strongly support standards and goals. I think it makes a lot of sense to be able to have standards where certificates can be portable, as you mentioned, taken across State lines. I have seen education fail students, in particular in urban centers—cities like Newark, where I live and grew up.

When we then talk about statewide standards, we always find that the majority of the youngsters who are at the bottom of the standards or the tests are from those urban areas. Those who do well, of course, are from the Princeton and the far hills and those places in our State.

I just wonder how we are ever going to change these two societies that was talked about in the Kerner Commission report. How are we ever going to ensure that there is an opportunity to learn. The kids fail, but the schools fail the kids. The kids, of course, are the victims.

I know that you have set up a board of 20 people, but once again, you do have five set aside for public, parents, and civil rights people, but the other 15 are heavyweights: educators, bureaucrats, standards measurement experts, business people. You need that, but I see the advocate group being submerged because of the preponderance of others.

Be that as it may, I just wonder how we are ever going to be able to bring these two societies together and have some incentive for a society to attempt to provide for those in the inner cities in order to perform on standardized tests.

Mr. REICH. Congressman, as you are aware, better than I, we are developing a two-tiered economy right now. Our major cities are composed of two kinds of work, broadly speaking.

They are the people who work in the glass and steel towers downtown, including managerial, professional, and technical workers, most of them with college degrees. Then you have a very large number of service workers, who are either working in custodial occupations or clerical occupations in those glass and steel towers or working at street level, in retail, restaurants, hospital, and hotel occupations requiring very little skill.

The gap between the two populations, the college-educated managerial, professional, and technical and the non-college educated is growing sociologically and growing in terms of salary, wages, and compensation.

How are we going to overcome it? The first step, it seems to me, with regard to all of the topics we are talking about today, is to ensure that the schools available to inner city populations, schools available to the children of people who are disadvantaged, are good schools.

As the Secretary of Labor, there is not all that much I can do directly, but I have been working very closely with Secretary Riley, who is absolutely committed to this. The President is absolutely committed to this. We will work with you and do everything we possibly can do to ensure that all children have access to the best kind of education they possibly can.

Beyond primary and secondary school, we have to ensure that there are avenues of upward mobility for young people who cannot afford or otherwise will not go on to college. What worries me is that a 4-year college degree is becoming the parchment separating the two classes of our workforce.

One of the purposes of this kind of legislation is to create new avenues of upward mobility so that the non-college bound or the non-college graduate can aspire to gaining good skills for good jobs at good wages.

Mr. PAYNE. Thank you very much.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Engel?

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and welcome, Mr. Secretary. I agree with what you have said, in terms of skill standards. I think it is very important to have minimum standards in the labor force. I commend you on your work and leadership.

I can think of no two things that go better hand in hand than education and labor. Unfortunately, for far too long, we have overlooked this important connection.

I represent a combination of an inner city district and a middle class district in the Bronx, New York, which is located in New York City, and some of the suburbs to the north of the city. I was very disappointed that the Senate did not pass the President's stimulus package, because certainly the New York City economy desperately needs stimulus, with 10 percent unemployment and a lack of jobs for the people, especially for our youth.

I had an interesting conversation with President Clinton shortly after he was elected. I am a big believer in the fact that as we downsize our military, we have a number of people who could serve

as role models, to come into the inner cities and work with our youth and families.

I am wondering if you could comment. Have there been discussions on such a program? I think that using displaced defense and military personnel in this manner would be a wonderful program. As we are establishing national goals, I think that we should look at putting this in the program.

Mr. REICH. Yes, Congressman, there have been discussions. There is an enormous pool of talent out there. As you know, the military has served as one of our major training centers, avenues of upward mobility for many of the young people who otherwise would not have that kind of avenue of upward mobility.

Many of the military skills—unfortunately, not all, and perhaps not even a preponderance—are applicable in the civilian sector. There may be ways of utilizing those skills in our schools and also with regard to all kinds of publicly related needs, if those people cannot otherwise find jobs. I think that part of our military reinvestment strategy is looking at precisely that set of issues.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you.

Chairman KILDEE. Mr. Secretary, we deeply appreciate your testimony here today. We look forward to working with you on this and other matters pending before this committee. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. REICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman KILDEE. Our next panel consists of Mr. Rob Hall, Vice President, Government Affairs Council, National Retail Federation, Washington, DC; Dr. Sam Meisels, Associate Dean for Research and Professor, University of Michigan School of Education, my alma mater; Dr. Janice Earle, Office of Systemic Reform, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC; and Dr. Linda G. Morra, Director, Education and Employment Issues, General Accounting Office, Washington, DC.

If you will come forward, you may summarize your testimony, if you wish, and your full testimony will appear in the record.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Chairman, may I say that one of the important reasons for Mr. Hall being here is, he is with the National Retail Federation, and the industry has received a skill standard grant from the Department of Labor. That is why we think it is important that he talk about that.

Chairman KILDEE. We appreciate that, and we know several of our witnesses have very tight schedules. Feel free to vacate when you have finished your part, if you have to. We can submit questions to you in writing. We really appreciate your patience this morning. The Secretary was put on at the last moment, but in the nature of things here in Washington, that does happen. We appreciate your patience.

Mr. Hall?

STATEMENTS OF ROBERT HALL, VICE PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COUNCIL, NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION, WASHINGTON, DC; SAMUEL J. MEISELS, ASSOCIATE DEAN FOR RESEARCH AND PROFESSOR, UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN SCHOOL OF BUSINESS, ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN; JANICE EARLE, OFFICE OF SYSTEMIC REFORM, NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION, WASHINGTON, DC; AND LINDA G. MORRA, DIRECTOR, EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ISSUES, GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, DC

Mr. HALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Representative Goodling, and members of the subcommittee. On behalf of the National Retail Federation, I am pleased to have the opportunity today to speak to your committee about an area of increasing national importance in our schools, in our workplaces, and in the lives of the young men and women who are entering the workforce every day.

I am talking about skill standards. For far too long, educators and business people have scratched their heads and said, "What are we going to do about education? How are we going to better train our young people? How are we going to find better qualified applicants?"

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of voluntary industry-based skill standards will be a first step in the right direction—the right direction for the business community to communicate to our Nation's education and training systems what kind of skills we expect our applicants to have.

There are any number of ways you can go about developing skill standards. You can make it an academic exercise, you can impose standards from the top down, or you can go where skill standards will be used every day—the workplace.

Since December, the National Retail Federation has been working on a Department of Labor funded project to develop, implement, assess, and certify job skill standards. We believe that our approach is one that begins at the workplace, with retail employees as well as employers. Our Grant Management Committee is made up of retail employers, employees, union representatives, educators, and job training experts. I am pleased today to have with me Kathryn Mannes, the project's coordinator.

Our project puts educators and industry leaders at the table together, with both sides clearly listening. In fact, after this testimony, we will be leaving for our second Grant Management Committee meeting, which is hosted by DECA, the Distributive Education Clubs of America, as part of their annual conference. Prior to meeting on skill standards, the committee has been invited to observe the DECA competition for 10,000 marketing education students and to meet with the DECA National Advisory Board to identify skills most wanted in a retail employee.

A creative and comprehensive job/task analysis process has been designed to encourage as much industry participation as possible. The project crosses industry sectors and size barriers. Last week, retail workers from stores ranging from two to 2,000 employees participated in two full-day DACUM sessions to chart what they do in their jobs. Workers discovered major similarities, for example, in

how employees of a large department store are encouraged to mimic the autonomy of the small shopkeeper.

We expect to have preliminary job skill standards established for the "Career Sales Associate," the largest category of retail employees, by the end of this project year. Momentum and enthusiasm for the project are growing, and we are excited about the potential. But we are concerned about raising the expectations of the industry and making sure standards will be used. To guarantee that these standards will be implemented, industry must continue to take the lead in the assessment and certification phases of the process.

Our approach has been to collect data in a way that will be assessable and to prepare the industry for a continued commitment, not just to piloting the standards but to the education and training that will back them up. In essence, our goal is to have as much industry "buy in" as possible.

Now to the legislation that is at hand today. We support the proposed legislation as long as industries—and here I mean employers, employees, and their training providers—can continue to take the lead in developing their own voluntary standards.

There is much to praise in H.R. 1804. The purposes of the legislation are squarely on target. The legislation identifies all the appropriate stakeholders that should be involved in the development of skill standards. The idea of a national board is a good one in theory, so long as the board serves in a somewhat reactive mode and gives stamps of approval to those partnerships that have successfully developed skill standards. We envision a national board that would validate skill standards developed by industry partnerships of business, education, and labor.

While the retail industry is generally supportive of the goals and ideas of the proposed legislation, we continue to have some concerns about the potential problems H.R. 1804 could create for retail employers, employees, and others. Today, we are a committee of retailers, union representatives, job training experts, and educators, working together to develop and test voluntary industry-based skill standards.

Under the scheme outlined in H.R. 1804, a national board will endorse standards that industry and others determine through yet undefined broad clusters of major occupations. Would the retail industry be considered a cluster? Or would we have to redo our work with others in the service industry?

On the all-important subject of industry "buy in," we fear that the retailers we have brought to the table, and we now have over 25, would be less interested in a national skill standards project headquartered here in Washington, staffed with detailed employees from the departments of labor and education. The present role of the departments of education and labor, serving as industry catalysts and providing seed grant money, has been largely successful.

If that role could continue under the new board, then most of industry's concerns would be lessened. However, the fear in the business community—and this goes beyond the retail community—is that the national board would divert the development of skill standards away from employers, employees, and training providers. For skill standards to work and to have real meaning, the individ-

uals who will be using them—employers, employees, and training providers—need to be involved at every stage of the process.

Also from our reading of the legislation, there is still some lingering concern about the voluntary nature of the standards. We believe that can be cleared up with appropriate language and realize that the intention of the drafters is to make the skill standards voluntary.

In closing, I want to applaud the efforts of the departments of labor and education for their hard work on this legislation. I particularly want to mention Secretary Reich and his staff. They have reached out to the employer community and have already responded to a number of the concerns we have raised. We stand ready to work with him, the Department of Education, and members of this subcommittee in furthering the efforts of developing skill standards to assist the American workers of tomorrow reach their career potentials.

[The prepared statement of Robert Hall follows:]

STATEMENT OF ROBERT HALL, VICE PRESIDENT, GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS COUNSEL,
NATIONAL RETAIL FEDERATION

Mr. Chairman, Representative Goodling, and members of the committee, on behalf of the National Retail Federation, I am pleased to have the opportunity to speak to your committee about an area of increasing national importance in our schools, in our workplaces, and in the lives of the young men and women who are entering the workforce every day. I am talking about skill standards. For far too long, educators and business people have scratched their heads and said, "What are we going to do about education, how are we going to better train our young people, how are we going to find better qualified applicants?"

Mr. Chairman, the establishment of voluntary, industry-based skill standards will be a good first step in the right direction—the right direction for the business community to communicate to our Nation's education and training system what kind of skills we expect our applicants to have. There are any number of ways that you can go about developing skill standards. You can make it an academic exercise, you can impose standards from the top down, or you can go to where skill standards will be used every day—the workplace.

Since December, the National Retail Federation has been working on a Department of Labor funded project to develop, implement, assess, and certify job skill standards. We believe that our approach is one that begins at the workplace with retail employees as well as employers. Our Grant Management Committee is made up of retail employers, employees, union representatives, educators, and job training experts. I am pleased to have with me today Kathryn Mannes, the Project's Coordinator.

Our project puts educators and industry leaders at the table together, and both sides clearly listening. In fact, after this testimony, we will be leaving for our second Grant Management Committee meeting which is hosted by DECA, the Distributive Education Clubs of America, as part of their annual conference. Prior to meeting on skill standards, the committee has been invited to observe the DECA competition for 10,000 marketing education students, and to meet with the DECA National Advisory Board to identify skills most wanted in a retail employee.

A creative and comprehensive job/task analysis process has been designed to encourage as much industry participation as possible. The project crosses industry sectors and size barriers. Last week, retail workers from stores ranging from two to 2,000 employees participated in 2 full-day DACUM [Developing A CURriculum] sessions to chart what they do in their jobs. Workers discovered major similarities, for example, in how employees of a large department store are encouraged to mimic the autonomy of the small shopkeeper.

We expect to have preliminary job skill standards established for the "Career Sales Associate," the largest category of retail employees, by the end of this project year. Momentum and enthusiasm for the project are growing and we are excited about the potential. But we are concerned about raising the expectations of the industry and making sure standards will be used. To guarantee that these standards will be implemented, industry must continue to take the lead in the assessment and

certification phases of the process. Our approach has been to collect data in a way that will be assessable, and to prepare the industry for a continued commitment not just to piloting the standards, but to the education and training that will back them up. In essence, our goal is to have as much industry "buy in" as possible.

Turning to the legislation which is the subject of today's hearing, we support the proposed legislation as long as industries [employers, employees, and their training providers] can continue to take the lead in developing their own voluntary standards. There is much to praise in the current draft of H.R. 1804. The purposes of the legislation are squarely on target. The legislation identifies all of the appropriate stakeholders that should be involved in the development of skill standards. The idea of a national board is a good one in theory, so long as the board serves in a somewhat reactive mode and gives stamps of approval to those partnerships that have successfully developed skill standards. We envision a national board that would validate skill standards developed by industry partnerships consisting of business, labor and education leaders.

While the retail industry is generally supportive of the goals and ideas of the proposed legislation, we continue to have some concerns about the potential problems H.R. 1804 could create for retail employers, employees, and others. Today, we are a committee of retailers, union representatives, job training experts, and educators, working together in effort to develop and test voluntary industry-based skill standards. Under the scheme outlined in H.R. 1804, a national board will endorse standards that industry and others determine through yet undefined broad clusters of major occupations. Would the retail industry be considered a cluster? Or would we need to redo our work with others in the service industry?

On the subject of the all-important industry "buy in," we fear that the retailers we have brought to the table [and they now number over 25] would be less interested in a national skill standards project headquartered here in Washington, DC staffed with detailed employees from the Departments of Education and Labor. The present role of the Departments of Education and Labor serving as industry catalysts has been largely successful. If that role could continue under the new Board, then most of industry's concerns would be lessened. However, the fear in the business community, and this goes beyond the retail community, is that the national board would divert the development of skill standards away from employers, employees, and training providers. For skill standards to work and to have real meaning, the individuals who will be using them—employees, employers, and training providers—need to be involved at every stage of the process.

From our reading of the legislation, there is still some lingering concern about the voluntary nature of the standards. We believe that can be cleared up with appropriate language and realize that the intention of the drafters is to make the skill standards voluntary.

In closing, I want to applaud the efforts of the Departments of Labor and Education for their hard work on this legislation. I particularly want to mention Secretary Reich and his staff. They have reached out to the employer community and have already responded to a number of the concerns we have raised. We stand ready to work with him, the Department of Education, and members of this committee in furthering the efforts of developing skill standards to assist the American workers of tomorrow reach their career potentials.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you, Mr. Hall.

Dr. Meisels?

Dr. MEISELS. Chairman Kildee, Mr. Goodling, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for inviting me to speak with you today.

Without being overly dramatic, I want to begin by noting that we are poised at an important moment in history. Because of the attention devoted to readiness by the first national education goal, because of the renewed national commitment to helping young children begin school well, because of the need to find new ways of assessing young children due to the failure of past methods, we are in a position to alter the way that early childhood assessment takes place and to improve children's chances for school success.

I want to take a few minutes today to talk about what we mean by readiness and to relate this to issues of assessment as they fit into H.R. 1804.

Children are frequently described as ready or not ready, as if readiness were something within the child; something you can have, an entity of some sort. But readiness is not an ability, although it certainly reflects higher order mental activity. It is not a gene, a chromosome, or any other such thing.

In contrast to this approach, the view of readiness that I hold is that it is bidirectional: it focuses both on children's current skills, knowledge, and abilities and on the conditions in which they are reared and taught. Since different children are prepared for different experiences, and children respond differently to apparently similar environmental inputs, readiness must be seen as a relative term.

It can be applied to individual children, but it is not something in the child, and it is not something in the curriculum. It is a product of the interaction between children's prior experiences, their genetic endowment, their maturational status, and a whole range of environmental and cultural experiences that they encounter.

Not only is this a restatement of what we mean by readiness, it has some major implications for what we can do with early childhood assessment.

Readiness is usually measured by means of group administered, objectively scored, norm referenced paper and pencil tests. Millions of these tests are administered to young children every year. The content of these tests is unfamiliar or uncomfortable to many children. They are highly abstract. They are generally very verbal, and they have many biases against children who have not experienced these sorts of things before.

Children taking these tests are assessed on isolated skills, in settings devoid of context, rather than being evaluated on familiar tasks, in natural settings in which they are asked to use what they know and have had experience with previously.

There is an alternative to this. The alternative is performance assessment. Even though here I am talking about education at the outset of school, I was interested to hear Secretary Reich talk about performance assessment at the other end of the educational spectrum as well.

Performance assessments are methods that permit students to demonstrate their knowledge or skills through solving problems, doing mathematical computations, writing journal entries or essays, conducting experiments, presenting oral reports, or assembling a portfolio of representative work.

This form of assessment emphasizes recording children's classroom performance, documenting teachers' activities, and understanding and interpreting children's work. No other approach to measuring readiness can focus so clearly on what the child brings to the learning situation and what the learning situation brings to the child.

The technical advisory panel for the first national education goal cited four sources of information to be used as part of the assessment of progress toward this goal. These sources of information are consistent with the type of performance assessment I just described, and they include the following.

One, parent reports regarding health, child development, and child rearing practices. Two, teacher reports: that is, systematic in-

formation on child performance in the classroom. Three, a profile of children's skills that is an individually administered developmental inventory. Four, a performance profile of performance portfolio that represents a highly contextualized view of child activity.

These four sources are intended to tap five dimensions of learning and development, and I will just briefly mention them so you will see the breadth of this: Physical wellbeing and motor development, social and emotional development, approaches toward learning, language usage, cognition, and general knowledge.

Never before have we sought to assess children on as large a scale as this. Never before has the U.S. Government contemplated an assessment of early childhood development as multifaceted as this. Hence, our technical panel also recommended the establishment of an oversight group, a National Commission on Early Childhood Assessment.

The purpose of this commission would be threefold. One, to assist in tracking progress toward the accomplishment of the first national education goal; two, to oversee the development of an early childhood assessment system, consistent with the principles I have been articulating here; and three, to ensure that the assessment is used to improve practice so that more children are successful in school.

I urge you to give consideration both to the establishment of this commission and to endorsing the broad outlines of the assessment program I have suggested to you. Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Samuel J. Meisels follows:]

TESTIMONY

Provided to the

Subcommittee on Elementary and Secondary Education,
Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives

Samuel J. Meisels

Associate Dean and Professor

School of Education

University of Michigan

May 4, 1993

ASSESSING READINESS

Most readiness and early school achievement instruments are group-administered, objectively-scored, paper and pencil tests that are of limited educational value. Their content is generally abstract, verbally-mediated, and potentially biased against children unfamiliar or uncomfortable with middle class manners and mores. Children taking these tests are assessed on isolated skills in settings that are devoid of context, rather than being evaluated on tasks in natural settings in which they are asked to use what they know and have had experience with previously. The entire test-taking experience is dominated by "filling in bubbles, moving the marker, making sure that everyone is in the right place. These activities may be related to test taking, but they have very little to do with reading" or the skills that are supposedly being tested (Stallman & Pearson, 1990, p. 38).

Samuel J. Meisels
 Testimony -- May 4, 1993
 Page 2

Reading, mathematics, and language are not learned or assessed well in a decontextualized fashion. They are mastered in context. Yet, those who construct these tests persist in testing isolated skills out of context in part because of the belief that such tests are more "objective" than assessments that are situated in the lives of children's daily activities. How "objective" these tests are is highly questionable. Moreover, if one wishes to draw valid conclusions about a student's profile of strengths and difficulties, one would have difficulty using the data from these tests. They may inform us that a child does not have strong letter knowledge, but they cannot tell us which specific letter the child knows or does not know. They may tell us about a child's overall ability to recognize shapes, objects, or sound-symbol combinations, but they will not be able to tell us how children combine these elements into the intellectually more demanding tasks of reading. The justification for using standardized, group-administered achievement tests for children below Grade 3 is very dubious and questionable.

It is time for us to make a transition to an alternative paradigm:

Performance Assessment. Performance assessments are methods that permit students to demonstrate their knowledge or skills through solving problems, doing mathematical computations, writing journal entries or essays, conducting experiments, presenting oral reports, or assembling a portfolio of representative work. Nearly every state in the nation has begun to experiment with some form of performance assessment for obtaining achievement data in high school (U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment, 1992, p. 5), and some states (e.g., Michigan and Vermont) have mandated that some performance data be collected on all students at various points in their school careers.

Samuel J. Meisels
 Testimony -- May 4, 1993
 Page 3

Performance assessment, also known as "authentic assessment," is a method for documenting children's skills, knowledge, and behaviors using actual classroom-based experiences, activities, and products. Although uniformity concerning the principles of performance assessment does not exist, there are several features that are common to various approaches to performance assessment. First, performance assessment documents children's daily activities; it does not simply provide a "snapshot," or a discontinuous view of children's accomplishments. Second, it provides an integrated means for evaluating the quality of children's work. This work is collected in a manner that bridges and integrates the broad range of curriculum areas and engages children in the meta-cognitive task of evaluating their own learning. Third, performance assessment is flexible enough to reflect an individualized approach to academic achievement. Although performance assessments should be based on well-thought out values and systematic standards of knowledge and curriculum development, the actual implementation of these values and standards can be adjusted in relation to a specific classroom, teacher, and child. Finally, performance assessment is intended to evaluate those elements of learning and development that group-administered achievement tests do not capture very well: analysis, synthesis, evaluation, and interpretation of facts and ideas -- the so-called "higher order thinking skills" -- as well as student initiative and creativity.

Group-administered tests have been a part of the educational scene for nearly a century. Performance assessment can make no such boast. Indeed, relatively little evidence is available to demonstrate the effectiveness of performance assessment. However, performance assessment is particularly

Samuel J. Meisels
 Testimony - May 4, 1993
 Page 4

appropriate for use with preschool and early elementary school children. These children are in the midst of extraordinary shifts developmentally, shifts that are difficult or nearly impossible to capture adequately on one-dimensional assessments that offer few choices and that dictate both the method and the timing of response. Such essential elements of performance assessment as developmental continuity, expanding the repertoire of response, and assessing children directly within the context in which they are learning renders them particularly suitable for use with young children.

In particular, performance assessment provides us with an opportunity to understand more about children's readiness. At its heart, readiness is interactional, including a dual focus on the child's status and on the characteristics of the child's educational setting. These two foci are essential to performance assessment. Indeed, this form of assessment is based on using teachers' perceptions of their students in actual classroom situations while simultaneously informing, expanding, and structuring those perceptions; it involves students and parents in the learning and assessment process, instead of relying on measures that are external to the classroom and family context; and it provides for genuine accountability that systematically documents what children are learning and how teachers are teaching. Central to all of these elements is the emphasis on recording children's classroom performance, documenting teachers' activities, and understanding and interpreting children's work. No other approach to measuring readiness can focus so clearly on what the child brings to the learning situation and what the learning situation brings to the child. Where these two are joined, readiness can be studied, assessed, and nurtured, and the assessment process itself can contribute positively to children's development.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Doctor.
 Dr. Earle?

Dr. EARLE. Good morning, Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today regarding the National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiatives Program.

For about the last 2 years, the Foundation has been engaged in a major reform effort with States to improve mathematics, science, and technology education. The idea here is that the Foundation works in partnership with the States. We do not tell them what to do or how to do it. We are there to be a catalyst, with some dollars to start them up, and then to work closely with them over the 5 years that they have awards from the Foundation.

As of this moment in time, we are working with 20 States and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. Next week, we expect to make five more awards to five additional States so that we will end up working with about 26 in this program. States have about 5 years and roughly \$2 million per year to work with the Foundation in making the kinds of comprehensive reform changes we envision.

The Foundation uses a competitive, merit-based review system to decide which States get awards under this program. That has been a very interesting process for all of us.

What we found is that all 50 States have participated in some way with us in this program, either through submitting a preliminary proposal to us, submitting a full proposal to us, or in being selected for the last stage of the review process, which is a site visit, where teams of outside experts go onsite and take a really close look at what the States say they are going to do and try to figure out if that in fact is what they are going to do and whether they have the capacity to do it.

We have some criteria that we are very interested in, when we go out there and take a look at States and review their initiatives. It has to do with things like the degree to which they have some real commitment to reform mathematics and science education, to what degree are they willing to focus their resources, to what degree are they willing to come up with some new resources, to what degree are they willing to coordinate what they already have.

We are very interested in their vision of mathematics and science education reform. The National Science Foundation cares a great deal about content issues. We are very interested in States that want to implement national standards, and create State standards that reflect the national standards.

We are interested in States that develop assessment systems that are aligned with those standards and that are moving toward performance-based and less toward the multiple choice, fill-in-the-blanks kinds of tests. We are interested in States that can figure out how to address the equity issues, so that all kids have an opportunity to have the best kinds of content and curriculum and teaching available.

We are very interested in States' willingness to take a look at policy reform and to help school districts and schools figure out how to be more flexible so that the kind of teaching and learning we want to see is more likely to take place. We are interested in

the degree to which States have a strategic implementation plan that makes sense, given their culture and their context.

We have learned a lot of things in the last 2 years about this systemic reform business, I think. Let me just tick off a few of the things that I think we have so far.

The first has to do with phase-in. This takes a lot longer than we thought. We started out giving States full awards. I think we would do a planning or a phase-in period, if we had to do it over again. It takes a lot of time to get the right staff on board, to get the subcontracts operating, just to get the whole consensus process together, longer than we thought.

I think the flexibility in the way the National Science Foundation has worked has been a real advantage here. The governor's office decides who responds to our RFP, and we have had lots of different places in the education system take the lead. We have had State departments of education take the lead, we have had universities take the lead, we have had boards of regents, and we have independent councils or agencies, such as the Montana Council of Teachers of Mathematics. There is no set rule about where the energy or activity or ideas come from. We let the States figure that out and then tell us how they are going to put it together.

I think we have learned a lot about partnerships. Of course, they all say they have partnerships when they submit the proposals. But it is like marriage: it is easy to start up and hard to maintain.

One of the things I think we are really going to be looking at over the next couple of years is how you maintain these partnerships, keep them from drifting back off into the turf, and the rivalry we all know is there in every political system and at every level. We do not know how to do that, but I think we are going to keep an eye on it. We know we need to watch it.

The notion of focusing resources has been an interesting one. I think the foundation agrees that \$10 million, which is the total amount available through this program, in the large population States does not buy you a great deal. Yet, it is very interesting that these States have been anxious to compete for it.

I think the reason is that the money is flexible. They can spend it on teacher development, they can spend it on curriculum development, they can spend it on developing new assessment systems, and they can spend it on public information and public awareness. One of the reasons that this has been so successful is that it is very uncategorical in its approach to things.

One of the things we found out through this program is that the capacity and the infrastructure for the kind of reform in math and science education that we have been thinking about at the Foundation, the capacity is not really there in the way that we would like to see it. I think partly that is because of budget cuts, and staffs have really been stripped down.

I think one of the things we are doing through this program, and this is the result so far, is really creating new kinds of leadership. I think the program is creating new kinds of leadership, leadership that, hopefully, will last long after the funding is no longer there.

Let me make one final point here, and that has to do with the absolutely critical importance of providing technical assistance to the States in efforts of this kind. It has to do with the capacity

issue that I talked about a little bit before. Nobody knows how to do this exactly, including those of us at the Foundation and at other places at the national level and at the State level and at the district level.

I think the whole process is a learning experience. It is one in which we work together to try to figure out whether the systemic strategy idea, which seems to be a very powerful notion, can really result, in the long run, in better achievement of kids. Since we do not know exactly how to do it, I think it is very important to stay a little bit loose, until we know more than we know now about what works and what doesn't work and what combinations of things work.

There is a lot of technical assistance that has to go on with this kind of an effort. The National Science Foundation has a contract out for 5 years, which is a good part of the life of this program, which will be trying to get the best experts in the country and making them available to people in the States so that they can learn from each other about how to go about the system reform initiatives that we have going.

As a systemic effort designed to make fundamental reforms, this program is, understandably, a little bit high risk. Nevertheless, I think our preliminary evidence, based on the first 2 years, shows that we are getting the kind of participation in the States that we had hoped. It is resulting in the leveraging of resources. The NSF dollars in fact are attracting other State and local dollars out there. As a group, I think that these projects will provide us with a great deal of information about systemic reform for the whole country.

Thank you so much for letting me describe our systemic effort, which is targeted at improving mathematics and science education. I will be glad to answer any questions you may have.

[The prepared statement of Janice Earle follows:]

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION
1800 G STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20550

Testimony of
Dr. Janice Earle
Office of Systemic Reform
National Science Foundation
before the

Subcommittee on Elementary, Secondary, and Vocational Education
Committee on Education and Human Resources
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, D.C. 20515

May 4, 1993

Mr. Chairman, and members of the subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify before you today regarding the National Science Foundation's Statewide Systemic Initiatives Program.

The Statewide Systemic Initiatives (SSI) Program is a major effort by the National Science Foundation (NSF) to encourage improvements in science, mathematics, and engineering education through comprehensive systemic changes in the education systems of the states.

Working with states on issues related to K-12 education represents a new strategy for NSF. Traditionally the Foundation has worked with university-based researchers through grant awards. The SSI program, however, is one where the Foundation works in partnership with states to implement reforms so that the elements of the system operate in a more coherent and productive fashion. Through a competitive, merit-based review process, states are eligible to receive up to 10 million dollars over five years. It is expected that through the policy-making process, state leaders will create and modify laws and regulations that promote programs leading to scientific literacy for all.

Statewide Systemic Initiatives must be built on solid models of change, provide new directions for mathematics and science education, demonstrate broad involvement and commitment from all important partners, and make maximum use of state and local resources in the context of a sustained statewide initiative.

CURRENT STATUS OF THE PROGRAM

Twenty states and one commonwealth (Puerto Rico) were awarded cooperative agreements under this program during the first two funding cycles. States that have awards are: Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Louisiana, Montana, Nebraska, North Carolina, Ohio, Rhode Island, South Dakota, California, Georgia, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Mexico, Texas, Vermont, and Virginia (Attached to this testimony are summaries of our current SSI awards). In FY 1993 thirty states submitted preliminary proposals and 28 states submitted full proposals for the third

round of funding. Eleven were selected for site visits, and five are being recommended for funding for FY 1993. We do not expect to make new awards under this program during FY 1994.

Progress in each state is regularly monitored and an annual review of progress is conducted. During the third year of operation, each state will participate in a comprehensive review of progress to date.

THE REVIEW PROCESS

The review process begins with required preliminary proposals that are received three months prior to the deadline for full proposals and are reviewed by NSF staff members. Principal investigators are then sent extensive advisory comments.

The SSI Program uses a two-stage review process for full proposals: panel reviews and site visits.

Full proposals are first reviewed independently by scientists, mathematicians, science educators, mathematics educators, policy analysts, and assessment experts. After panel discussion, each panel rates the proposals as: (1) highly competitive and worthy of a site visit; (2) competitive and worthy of a site visit if funds permit; and (3) definitely not worthy of a site visit.

Site visits are critical for identifying states with programs that are likely to succeed. SSI programs are complicated and complex, involving multiple institutions and partners. There is a need for strong ties to policymakers, business leaders, and the community, as well as to educators. It is not possible, within the limitations of a proposal, to fully describe all aspects of a project. Site visits provide opportunities for verification and clarification regarding the quality of relationships among the partners, and the degree to which commitments and points of view are shared.

Three weeks before the site visit, the PI receives a set of questions requesting clarification on the issues raised in the initial panel review. Responses to these questions are made available to the site visit team upon arrival. Following the site visit, the PI has an additional two weeks to respond in writing to questions generated by the site visit.

Site visit teams consist of four external reviewers, an SSI program officer and, occasionally, another NSF staff member. Each on-site visit lasts two days and consists of intensive meetings with the PIs and key policymakers such as governors, legislative education chairs, state board of education members, and chief state school officers. Small group sessions are held with teachers, administrators, scientists and mathematicians, parents, representatives from business and industry,

representatives from higher education, and state education agency staff members. These sessions are highly interactive, and give site visit team members a chance to probe issues not explicitly addressed by the review panels.

Team members develop a report that includes a recommendation for funding based on their assessment of the individual reviews, panel reviews and findings, from the site visit.

REVIEW CRITERIA

Team members use the following criteria as guidelines for evaluating the quality of state SSI projects:

1. **State commitment.** Do states exhibit a commitment to fundamental reform of mathematics and science education? Are the changes they propose pervasive? Do they identify local resources which will be used to support NSF funds and focus discretionary resources on their mathematics and science education reform (e.g., Eisenhower, Chapter 1, Chapter 2, Vocational Education, and funds from other sources)?
2. **The state's vision for mathematics and science education.** Does the vision include appropriate new directions and approaches with regard to curriculum goals, changes in school structure and decision-making, equity, teacher preservice and inservice, assessment and accountability, and articulation within the system? Is the vision understood and shared by project partners?
3. **Consensus on the current status of science and mathematics education and on identification of the most serious problems that need to be addressed.** Are the problems identified as the key concerns to be addressed in the proposal shared by project partners?
4. **Partnerships that enable the effort to succeed.** Are educators at all levels, scientists, mathematicians, the business community, parents, and science and technology centers all involved? Are key policymakers (governors, legislators, state and local boards and departments of education, and boards for higher education) working collaboratively with the project? Are strategies proposed that will result in significant and sustained changes in schools?
5. **Implementation plan to provide management and oversight of the project.** Does the state have the capacity to effectively organize, implement, and monitor this project? Are proposed key staff able to assure successful accomplishment of the project?

6. Evaluation plan. Will data be used for mid-course corrections, as well as outcomes? Is evaluation integrated into the management plan?

Following receipt of site visit reports and follow-up responses, SSI staff analyzes all materials and makes recommendations to the Assistant Director for Education and Human Resources (EHR), who then forwards them to the National Science Board for action.

PROGRAM MANAGEMENT AND OVERSIGHT

As part of this program, NSF provides advice to all states through meetings with program officers and feedback during the review process. In addition, representatives from funded states have opportunities to attend PI meetings and special conferences.

Principal Investigators or Project Directors (PIs/PDs) attend two meetings a year convened by the NSF to address issues concerning both the national SSI Program and their individual states. These meetings have created a national network, provided opportunities for PIs and PDs to focus on common issues, and helped them identify available resources.

NSF began a technical assistance program in April 1992 to assist SSI states on-site with issues such as strategic planning, curriculum development, equity, staff development, assessment, project evaluation, and public awareness campaigns. This effort resulted in an electronic network to facilitate communication among all states; biannual PI meetings; and forums for discussion of important issues such as managing systemic reform.

NSF believes that technical assistance is a critical component of this program. For example, budget cuts in recent years have left states and districts without an "infrastructure" that builds capacity for and can support reform. Intensive leadership experiences for state, district, and school staff about content issues, pedagogy, and reform strategies are needed.

In addition, ongoing monitoring of SSI initiatives is provided by the EHR Division of Research, Evaluation, and Dissemination. Regular written reports are submitted to NSF and distributed to the evaluation and technical assistance contractors, and the PI.

States conduct their own evaluations and the changes in implementation plans resulting from that study are negotiated during annual program reviews. This permits a thorough assessment of a state's progress and facilitates appropriate shifts in project direction.

PROGRAM EVALUATION

NSF also has in place a process for a multi-year evaluation of the SSI Program. The evaluation will determine the effectiveness of strategies for change, the extent to which significant policy changes occur, the achievement of students, and the improvement of teachers and schools. Five interrelated data collection activities will be used in the analysis: case studies of 9 states; documentation via telephone and periodic visits to all states; statistical indicator data from various third-party sources; pilot teacher surveys; and data obtained from state evaluators and NSF monitors.

LESSONS LEARNED

- Use of a competitive review process has been essential. The process is developmental and permits states to take advantage of new learning at each stage. In addition, holding multiple competitions over three years, has resulted in improvements in the quality of proposals.
- NSF is not directive regarding who should respond to the RFP, and the governor's office in each state was able to determine who should reply. This results in broad-based coalitions led by interested and knowledgeable partners. State Departments of Education, Boards of Higher Education, universities, and independent entities (e.g., the Montana Council for Teachers of Mathematics) have all provided leadership.
- It takes states longer to begin implementation of systemic reform (e.g., hiring staff, finding office space, contracting) than was originally anticipated by either the Foundation or the states. A phase-in of funds in the beginning of an initiative would be more effective.
- The flexibility of the program encourages states to focus initially on areas of greatest need, and respond to demographics, culture, and context. However, states are also developing strategies about how they will achieve statewide impact.
- The SSI program has stimulated partnership development in the states. One theme that we hear repeatedly is that the process of developing an SSI proposal is, in and of itself, a valuable activity for states. The implementation process results in serious partnerships between K-12 and higher education, schools and mathematicians and scientists, education and business and industry, among the SSI and other NSF initiatives

in the state, and between the SSI and other comprehensive state reform initiatives.

- SSI initiatives have been remarkably successful in obtaining other funding. Key examples are the Department of Education's curriculum framework grants and other NSF funded initiatives such as the teacher collaboratives and teacher enhancement grants. The SSI has also been a catalyst that has focussed resources in states. SSI initiatives have focussed resources such as higher education and state Eisenhower funds, Chapter 2, and foundation grants. Some states are beginning to coordinate with Chapter 1 funds.
- SSI has heightened awareness of mathematics and science education reform. In all SSI states there are serious discussions underway about the importance of mathematics and science education, and the need for state curriculum frameworks that reflect the national standards. States are developing recommendations about the kinds of curriculum materials that need to be in classrooms. In the New England states, the discussion has spilled over state boundaries and they are now participating in regional meetings around areas of common concern.
- The SSI is focussing on teacher development. All SSI states are engaged in substantive teacher enhancement activities that incorporate programs that are tied to national and state standards, are of significant duration, and include follow-up support. States are providing leadership in developing new approaches in curriculum, instruction, and classroom assessment.
- Many SSI states are identifying changes in teacher preparation and certification policies that reflect direction set by new state goals and frameworks.
- SSI states are addressing how to rebuild the education infrastructure in education, science, and mathematics through programs aimed at creating new state leadership in mathematics and science education, identifying regional specialists who will work with schools, and training lead teachers.
- Many states have a significant amount of reform activity underway. They have to identify strategies for how to integrate the SSI into other ongoing, large scale efforts.

CONCLUSION

The SSI Program offers states a unique opportunity to work cooperatively with the National Science Foundation on projects that are designed to fundamentally reform science and mathematics teaching and learning. Although there are significant differences among the states--in culture, wealth, and demographics--over the past three years, the SSI program staff has worked with all 50 states in some capacity, either by responding to preliminary proposals or reviewing formal proposals. A key feature of the program is a technical assistance model that anticipates problems and provides SSI states with access to expertise. SSI is truly a national program representing states with a wide variety of characteristics and approaches to reform.

As a comprehensive and systemic effort designed to enable fundamental reform of science and mathematics education, the SSI Program is understandably high-risk. Nevertheless, preliminary evidence supports the view that this comprehensive effort is engaging the appropriate participation of the key decision-makers and performers at the state level. It is also resulting in substantial leveraging of resources in excess of the 10 million dollars each state may receive from NSF. Moreover, the SSI projects as a group are providing a knowledge-base on systemic reform to the Nation.

Thank you for this opportunity to describe our systemic reform effort, targeted at improving mathematics and science education. I would be pleased to answer any questions you may have.

CALIFORNIA

Governor: Pete Wilson
Principal Investigator: Bill Honig
State Superintendent of Schools
California Department of Education
721 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814
(916) 657-2914

Five-Year Award: \$10,000,000

The California Advocacy for Mathematics and Science (CAMS) Initiative will bring together top-level leadership from the State Superintendent of Public Instruction and the Governor's Office of Child Development and Education in support of improving mathematics and science education with an emphasis on full participation for underrepresented groups. The CAMS initiative addresses several barriers to the improvement of K-6 science and middle grades mathematics programs in the State.

The program has three objectives:

1. Galvanizing public support for improving mathematics and science education.
2. Developing and promoting elementary science instruction.
3. Replacing the usual curriculum and instructional features of middle grades mathematics instruction with materials and activities consistent with NCTM standards.

The CAMS Initiative will make use of special meetings with policymakers, business and community leaders, and educators to heighten public awareness of the importance of science and mathematics education. Professional development and support will provide the basis for improved science instruction in the elementary grades and mathematics instruction in the middle grades.

**DELAWARE**

Governor: Michael Castle
Principal Investigator: Helen Foss
Delaware Department of Public Instruction
P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903
(302) 739-6700

Five-Year Award: \$4,841,221

The overall mission of the project is to contribute to the national agenda to improve mathematics, science, and computer education by building on a commitment to systemic change made through participation in the national "Re-Learning" project and State reform efforts. This will be accomplished through a long-term statewide effort reaching all of the citizenry, particularly reaching out to traditionally underserved populations.

The specific goals of the project are to--

1. Promote rigorous science and mathematics content and pedagogy. Specific activities will (a) review and revise State curriculum goals in mathematics and science; (b) establish a Center for science and mathematics education at Delaware State University that will sponsor teacher training workshops and design efforts to improve minority participation in mathematics and science education; (c) establish selection criteria and identify schools that will participate in Project 21 (six Re-Learning schools and three non-Re-Learning schools in the first year); and (d) initiate a science and mathematics needs assessment at each participating school that identifies goals, learning outcomes, and staff development activities.
2. Promote continued culture change in schools and the community. Specific activities will (a) identify major community segments that are part of participating schools' communities and develop strategies to persuade the various segments to become involved in the reform effort; (b) initiate a science and mathematics seminar series for teachers and the public; (c) prepare a science and mathematics newsletter for parents; and (d) conduct extracurricular science and mathematics activities in Project 21 schools.
3. Develop student performance assessment instruments. Specific activities will (a) inventory proven measures for student performance in mathematics and science; (b) collect baseline data on student knowledge and community values about science and mathematics education; (c) initiate a qualitative study of school progress in science and mathematics education reform; and (d) develop classroom performance measures aligned with curriculum development activities.

CONNECTICUT

Governor: Lowell Weicker
Principal Investigator: Judy Caron
Education Consultant
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 2219
Hartford, CT 06145
(203) 566-2931

Five-Year Award: \$7,868,725

The overall mission of the project is to meet the National Educational Goal of mathematics and science achievement for all Connecticut K-12 students, with a particular focus on underserved and underrepresented youth, through a long-term statewide effort reaching all of the citizenry.

The specific goals of the project are to--

1. Establish by legislative action The Connecticut Academy for Education in Mathematics, Science, and Technology, which will serve as the vehicle for long-term systemic change through advocating reform, setting of educational standards, and providing technical assistance to school districts.
2. Reform K-12 mathematics and science learning through district-level curricular reform and enhancement, and assessment of student access and performance.
3. Create higher education partnerships for K-12 education through dialogues between Institutes of Higher Education (IHE) and other groups, collaboration of IHE's with local schools and other organizations, and restructuring of teacher preparation curricula.
4. Create a climate for change through minority access, parent involvement, and school/business collaborations.
5. Implement a campaign for public understanding through cooperative activities between The Connecticut Academy, the Connecticut Business Roundtable, the Connecticut Public Television, and various other corporate and media partners.



1991 Grantee

FLORIDA

Governor: Lawton Chiles

Principal Investigator: Jack Lappert

Florida Department of Education
525 West Gaines Street, Suite 344
Tallahassee, FL 32399-0400
(904) 922-4207

Five-Year Award: \$7,913,882

The goals of the project are grouped under three initiatives:

Initiative 1. Restructuring K-8 Science Education using "Florida's fragile environment" as a theme.

- ☐ Develop Florida's *Fragile Environment Source Book*, which provide suggestions for instructional materials, alternative assessment strategies, available resources, networks, databases, and state-of-the-art technology.
- ☐ Expand partnerships and use Florida's science-rich institutions and natural and human resources as part of curriculum guide implementation.
- ☐ Have every elementary and middle school conduct a significant project to study and improve Florida's environment.

Initiative 2. Restructure the education of science teachers.

- ☐ Develop new approaches to teaching science at the postsecondary level.
- ☐ Restructure elementary and middle school teacher preparation programs.
- ☐ Revise teacher certification and recertification requirements to include Florida's new environmental theme courses.

Initiative 3. Develop teacher and community support for systemic change.

- ☐ Provide teachers with resources, training, and support through a comprehensive leadership model.
- ☐ Establish a statewide interactive communications network to guide and support restructuring K-8 science education.
- ☐ Build broad-based community understanding and support for restructuring efforts to assure continuation of this systemic initiative project.

1992 Grantee

GEORGIA

Governor: Zell Miller

Principal Investigator: Michael Padilla

University of Georgia
Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center
University of Georgia
Athens, GA 30602
(706) 542-1763

Five-Year Award: \$10,000,000

The Georgia Initiative in Mathematics and Science (Project GIMS) focuses on teacher education, adopts improved curricular materials and instructional techniques, and uses appropriate assessment techniques. Five university-based regional centers, geographically located throughout the State, will link schools with university faculty, current instructional material, new pedagogies, and other resources to support Georgia's vision of science and mathematics education. In addition, policy revisions, public awareness, and parent support will be developed to support the following goals:

1. To increase the successful participation of underrepresented groups in mathematics and science.
2. To develop teachers with strong content and pedagogical foundations in mathematics and science.
3. To recruit and retain the highest quality teaching force.
4. To develop and implement curriculum based on a set of comprehensive principles that is application-based, interdisciplinary in nature, and requires active learning participation.
5. To design innovative assessment techniques that reflect curriculum goals and instructional strategies appropriate to mathematics and science.
6. To initiate fundamental changes in the State educational structure that will empower students, teachers, parents, administrators, and the community to achieve greater scientific literacy.

1992 Grantee

**KENTUCKY**

Governor: Wallace Wilkinson
 Project Director: Michael Howard
 Kentucky Science and Technology Council
 P.O. Box 1049
 Lexington, KY 40588-1049
 (609) 233-3502

Five-Year Award: \$9,672,300

The joint venture between the Department of Education and the Kentucky Science and Technology Council, Inc.—Partnership for Reform Initiatives in Science and Mathematics (PRISM)—builds upon the Kentucky Education Reform Act (KERA) to address specific needs and barriers that hinder the restructuring of science and mathematics education in the State.

The project has three goals:

1. To enable Kentucky students to acquire the conceptual knowledge, process skills, thinking skills, and habits of mind that characterize scientific literacy.
2. To encourage more Kentucky students, especially those from underrepresented groups, to follow program leading to science, mathematics, and technology-related careers, including teaching.
3. To make the general public and opinion leaders in Kentucky aware of the value of knowledge and skills in mathematics, science, and technology as important outcomes of education.

To achieve these goals, PRISM will coordinate mathematics and science initiatives in developing teacher-specialists to support change in classroom practices, altering teacher preservice programs, developing and implementing a plan to foster participation by underrepresented groups, and establishing policy to enhance awareness and value of mathematics and science education.

1991 Grantee

LOUISIANA

Governor: Edwin Edwards
 Principal Investigator: Kerry Davidson
 Deputy Commissioner
 Academic Affairs and Research
 Louisiana Board of Regents
 150 Riverside Mall, Suite 129
 Baton Rouge, LA 70801-1589
 (504) 342-4253

Five-Year Award: \$10,000,000

Louisiana's SSI program is administered by the Louisiana Systemic Initiative Program Council (LaSIP), an interagency council created by the Governor.

LaSIP is implementing six initiatives:

1. Preservice—A statewide review of preservice mathematics and science programs is being conducted and making recommendations for change to the Board of Regents.
2. Inservice—Twenty projects have been selected for implementation. These projects are being conducted by colleges and universities (systemic sites) in cooperation with local education agencies.
3. Teacher Certification—Recommended modification of certification for elementary and middle grades are being developed and submitted to the Board of Elementary and Secondary Education for action.
4. Curriculum and Materials—Mathematics and science curriculum frameworks (K-12) are being developed.
5. Educational Technology—Current uses will be expanded, and new uses will be evaluated and employed.
6. Professional Partners—Practitioners are making students aware of the role of mathematics and science in careers. They are involved in inservice, preservice, and systemic site activities.



1992 Grantee

MAINE

Governor: John McKernan
Principal Investigator: Jacqueline Mitchell
Maine Department of Education
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 287-5925

Five-Year Award: \$10,000,000

"Maine: A Community of Discovery" will fundamentally change the opportunities, performances, and aspirations in mathematics and science for all of Maine's students, preschool through college. Educational, political, business, and community leaders joined in the initiative to coordinate changes in—

1. Curriculum.
2. Teacher preparation programs.
3. Teacher enhancement programs.
4. Alignment of curricular goals with assessment.

The vehicles for change will include Beacon Schools—schools selected to be laboratories for testing new curriculum materials and teaching methods and that will later serve as models and dissemination centers for all schools in Maine. Fourteen mathematics and science facilitators will be responsible for dissemination of the instructional materials, methods, and technology developed at the Beacon Schools. At the postsecondary level, Maine will establish a Beacon College, a consortium of institutions of higher education that will reform their teacher preparation programs consistent with the Beacon Schools' needs. In addition, the State will mount community awareness programs, progressive institutes and workshops for teachers, and efforts to increase the use of technology. Mathematicians and scientists will participate throughout the project's components.

1992 Grantee

MASSACHUSETTS

Governor: William Weld
Principal Investigator: Susan Tave Zelman
Massachusetts Department of Education
1385 Hancock Street
Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 770-7505

Five-Year Award: \$10,000,000

Partnerships Advancing Learning of Mathematics and Science (Project PALMS) seeks to improve science and mathematics educational opportunity and outcomes through policy, curricular, leadership, and partnership initiatives. Program components include the following:

1. Producing the first-ever State curriculum framework for Massachusetts.
2. Hiring science and mathematics specialists by the Department of Education.
3. Implementing a new science and mathematics Master Teacher certification standard.
4. Using the State curriculum framework to develop curriculum alterations that will be activity-based, with great potential for incorporating educational telecommunications networks and other technologies into the classroom.
5. Developing linkages between schools and colleges to align preservice and inservice curriculum with the State's framework.

To support school-based change, leadership academies for teachers and administrators will focus on structural and organizational alterations that will foster continued educational reform at the school site. Partnerships with the media, informal education centers, business and industry, and community groups will coordinate a public awareness campaign on the importance of mathematics and science literacy.

MICHIGAN

Governor: John Engler

Principal Investigator: Sharif Shakarani

Michigan Department of Education

P.O. Box 30008

Lansing, MI 48909

(517) 373-7248

Five-Year Award: \$3,980,970

The Michigan Statewide Systemic Initiative in Mathematics and Science (MSSI) will implement a comprehensive transformation of science and mathematics education by coordinating policy initiatives already in place with curricular, leadership, and partnership initiatives to support school-based change in science and mathematics education.

Michigan plans five connective interventions:

1. Develop a *State vision* statement for mathematics and science education, circulate it widely, revise it, and obtain endorsements from the MSSI Steering Committee, the State Board of Education, and a range of stakeholder groups.
2. Design and carry out a systematic review of existing legislation and State policies, programs, and regulations that strengthen or impede the vision. The review will be widely shared with key policymakers, and recommendations will be reviewed annually to determine the extent of implementation.
3. Create *Models of Effective Learning* in 25-50 targeted school districts. This initiative will focus on economically disadvantaged urban and extreme rural districts, along with other districts interested in reform in mathematics and science education. The Models will generate new knowledge about creating successful community coalitions to reform mathematics and science education.
4. Reform *teacher education* programs to bring them into line with the State's vision for mathematics and science education.
5. Develop and coordinate *State-level staff development* to support mathematics and science education reform consistent with the vision statement.
6. Create an *evaluation plan* that will determine the success of the project's proposed outcomes as well as the success of other State-level activities to reform mathematics and science education.

MONTANA

Governor: Marc Radtke

Principal Investigator: Johnny Lott

Department of Mathematical Science

University of Montana

Missoula, MT 59812

(406) 243-2696

Five-Year Award: \$8,842,175

The goals of the project are to—

1. Redesign the grades 9-12 mathematics curriculum using an integrated interdisciplinary approach for all students.
2. Develop and publish curriculum and assessment materials for grades 9-16.
3. Incorporate the use of technology in all facets and at all levels of mathematics education.
4. Increase the participation of females and Native Americans in mathematics and science and increase the number of females and Native American teachers in these areas.
5. Establish new certification and recertification standards for teachers.
6. Using an integrated interdisciplinary approach, prepare new teachers to incorporate the new curriculum and materials into their teaching.
7. Prepare inservice teachers in grades 9-16 to implement integrated mathematics programs.
8. Advise, inform, and influence the legislature, the general public, and other public and private sectors of the State to support implementation of the new programs.



1991 Grantee

NORTH CAROLINA

Governor: James Hunt

Principal Investigator: Denis DuBay, Director

North Carolina Science and Mathematics Alliance
410 Oberlin Road, Suite 506
Raleigh, NC 27605
(919) 733-9161

Five-Year Award: \$7,856,588

The goals of the project are to establish 10 regional partnerships to catalyze local resources to:

1. Provide the training, resources, support, and incentives for teachers and schools to transform science and mathematics instruction into a participatory, hands-on exploration of the everyday workings of technology and the natural world.
2. Develop school and community-based initiatives that increase opportunities for women and minorities in science, mathematics, and technology.
3. Involve students, parents, practicing scientists and engineers, and community and educational leaders in improving science and mathematics education through local and statewide efforts.

The 10 regional partnerships include scientists, engineers, health and other technical professions with educators, parents, and students. Their activities include Science-Teacher exchanges that involve scientists and teachers working together to plan and implement classroom support activities and summer industry and university internships. In addition, support teams of university educators, future teachers, parents, and industry professionals compile and distribute resource materials for classroom and school use. Tech-Prep programs support curricula that offer high school students the opportunity to connect their high school mathematics and science courses to degree programs in technical colleges.

1991 Grantee

OHIO

Governor: George Voinovich

Principal Investigator: Jane Butler Kahle

Condit Professor of Science Education
Miami University
Oxford, OH 45056
(513) 529-1686

Five-Year Award: \$2,645,000

The Ohio Mathematics and Science Discovery Project is a statewide effort to improve educational outcomes in mathematics and science by building consensus for educational goals, improving preservice education, and creating professional development opportunities for middle school and junior high school mathematics and science teachers.

The goals of the project are to—

1. Establish 10 regional centers staffed by teams that include mathematician and scientist/educators and teacher-leaders and that emphasize problem solving and inquiry-based instruction.
2. Use research strategies that assess changes in student learning.
3. Perform additional research to focus on the adaption or creation of new inquiry-based instructional materials.
4. Provide ongoing support to practicing teachers and develop a leadership core that can introduce new approaches to the learning of mathematics and science. The new approaches will include increased use of technology and the implementation of evaluation and assessment strategies that complement inquiry-based instruction.



1992 Grantee

PUERTO RICO

Governor: Pedro Rosello
Principal Investigator: Manuel Gomez
University of Puerto Rico
P.O. Box 364984
University Station
San Juan, PR 00936-4984
(809) 764-8369

Five-Year Award: \$10,000,000

The Puerto Rico Statewide Systemic Initiative in Science and Mathematics Education is a joint venture between the Puerto Rico Department of Education, the Resource Center for Science and Engineering, and the Puerto Rico General Council of Education to revise its science and mathematics curriculum in grades K-12. This collaboration provides a method to link expertise in science and mathematics education, institutions of higher education, and policy initiatives to systemically alter Puerto Rico's educational system.

The project will—

1. Revise the science and mathematics curriculum, with a focus on students' cognitive skills and depth of scientific understanding.
2. Revise the teacher preparation curriculum to upgrade subject matter understanding and instructional methods.
3. Promote parent and community involvement in school improvement efforts.
4. Develop, pilot, and adopt new assessment methods consistent with revised curriculum materials and instructional practices.
5. Establish and measure islandwide standards of excellence in science and mathematics education.

Twenty-one model schools (one elementary, middle, and secondary school in each of the Commonwealth's seven geographic regions) will be the vehicles for testing and disseminating the reforms. They will serve as regional centers for 10 additional schools. By the year 2000, all 1,600 schools in Puerto Rico will have restructured their science and mathematics education programs.

1991 Grantee

RHODE ISLAND

Governor: Bruce Sundtun
Principal Investigator: Kenneth DiPietro
Rhode Island Department of Elementary and
Secondary Education
22 Hayes Street, Room 201
Providence, RI 02908
(401) 377-2821

Five-Year Award: \$8,351,040

Rhode Island's project is focused on changes in science and mathematics education reform for K-8, incorporating the reforms into the statewide master plan for science and mathematics education K-16. The goals of the Rhode Island Statewide Systemic Initiative Program are to—

1. Establish a leadership team at the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.
2. Work with the special legislative commission to develop a master plan for mathematics and science education K-16.
3. Establish resource specialists in five sites throughout the State and develop teacher training centers to enhance science and mathematics education.
4. Develop statewide K-8 science and mathematics frameworks.
5. Disseminate statewide frameworks and provide districts an opportunity to review their existing curricula to determine how to incorporate the frameworks.
6. Establish leadership teams at the school level to review and implement frameworks.
7. Work with private sector through Rhode Island Mathematics and Science Education Collaborative, which will establish a clearinghouse for all schools.
8. Identify a task force on underrepresented populations that will identify national programs that work with these populations.
9. Develop performance-based assessment strategies for mathematics and science.
10. Create a liaison with higher education to work with college and university teacher preparation.



1992 Grantee

VERMONT

Governor: Howard Dean
Principal Investigator: Bruce Richardson
Vermont Department of Education
120 State Street
Montpelier, VT 05620
(802) 828-5121

Five-Year Award: \$9,695,922

The Vermont Statewide Systemic Initiative in Science, Math and Technology is a collaborative project between five sectors—education, business, higher education, government, and the community at large—to increase the mathematics, science, and technology performance of all students. To carry out this project, the Vermont State Board of Education and the Agency for Development and Community Affairs will jointly establish the Vermont Institute for Mathematics, Science and Technology.

A two-pronged approach will couple school-based change efforts with State policy initiatives. Major components include the following:

1. Creating a statewide Science/Mathematics/Technology (S/M/T) working curriculum framework to guide local curriculum development, professional development, and assessment.
2. Providing intensive professional development programs for teachers through summer institutes, year-round support, and a variety of other professional development strategies.
3. Redesigning college science, mathematics and technology courses to strengthen practical training for new teachers, and developing alternative pathways for second career S/M/T teachers.
4. Developing a statewide, integrated strategy for Science/Mathematics/Technology performance assessments that build on Vermont's existing assessment of student work through mathematics and writing portfolios.
5. Creating a statewide S/M/T telecomputing network that links schools with representatives from business and higher education.

1992 Grantee

VIRGINIA

Governor: L. Douglas Wilder
Principal Investigator: Joseph Ezline
Virginia Department of Education
101 N. 14th Street
James Monroe Building
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 225-2876

Five-Year Award: \$8,615,914

The Virginia Quality Education in Science and Technology (V-QUEST) will extend two major State efforts already under way—the Department of Education's "World Class Education," an ambitious 10-year plan to define learning outcomes for all students; and "Workforce 2000," a blue-ribbon panel report to the Governor that calls for a scientific and technologically literate citizenry.

The project will focus on improving mathematics and science education in grades K-8. Virginia conducted an extensive needs assessment, and from this developed the seven following components of V-QUEST:

1. Creating a school-based mathematics and science lead teachers initiative.
2. Developing new preservice and inservice models for teachers.
3. Tying selection criteria for instructional materials and assessment reform to the effort.
4. Developing a leadership component for school and district administrators.
5. Conducting a community action campaign.
6. Supporting mathematics and science education through the State's telecommunications system (V-PEN).
7. Improving student assessment.

The PI will work with 7 component coordinators, a State Action Council, and 10 Local Action Councils to create a management structure that links content (through the components) with a process (State and Local Action Councils) for local involvement.

Chairman KILDEE. Thank you very much, Dr. Earle.

Dr. Morra?

Dr. MORRA. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, Representative Goodling, and members of the subcommittee, I am pleased to be here today to discuss our report on systemwide education reform.

My testimony today will focus on four districts that have had many years of experience with systemwide reform. They differ in size, spending level, poverty level, and approach, yet their experiences offer insight into the potential Federal role in systemwide reform. In these districts, systemwide reform has been a long-term, ongoing process that requires substantial commitment and effort.

Systemwide reform includes five key, interrelated system components: one, goals or standards expected of all students; two, curricula linked directly to those standards; three, high-quality instructional materials appropriate to the curricula; four, professional development to enable teachers and other educators to understand the curricula and the most effective instructional approaches; and five, student assessment systems that are based directly on the curricula.

The standards are the driving force in these reforms. They define what students should know and be able to do, and they apply to all students. A growing consensus exists that high standards, incorporating higher-order skills related to complex reasoning and problem solving, should be set. Efforts are underway on a variety of fronts to develop high standards.

The districts we visited had developed standards for all students at each grade level. These standards included a vision of the types of knowledge, skills, and abilities students need when they graduate. This provided a focus for decisions about all other elements of the system: curriculum and instruction, professional development, and assessment.

Three of the districts began reform in the 1970s or early 1980s and established standards related primarily to basic skills and raising achievement test scores. Each district had been working for several years, however, to incorporate high standards into its system in key subject areas, such as math and reading. The standards issues in 1989 by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics were being used extensively in three of the districts.

Student assessments related to the district's curricula were a key part of the instructional reform. Student progress in achieving the standards was monitored frequently.

In one district, for example, students were assessed four to six times a year on tests designed to monitor progress toward the district's standards. Results were provided quickly so that teachers could follow up with individual students, as necessary. This focus on student achievement also led to a change in the role of principals, who focused more on helping teachers teach and students learn and less on their more traditional role of administrators.

The experiences in these districts provided several key insights into the process of systemwide reform. First, systemwide reform was a long-term process, requiring vision and commitment. In each case, as reform unfolded, all system components, including standards and assessments, were changed, sometimes annually, as the districts acquired more experience and monitored their success.

In these districts, the superintendent was a key force for the reform. Each provided the vision and leadership to develop and maintain consensus in support of reform. A key factor in their success was their longevity in the district.

Second, technical assistance was important. Technical assistance was ongoing as the reforms evolved, and districts saw it as essential. The districts hired private or university consultants to help, in areas such as conducting needs assessments, setting standards, writing curricula, and developing assessment tools. In one case, the district used State-developed curriculum frameworks as a starting point for developing its own standards and assessments.

Third, teacher support was critical. The districts obtained teacher support by training the teachers about the need for and the process of reform, involving them in writing the new standards, curricula, and assessments and providing training in various instructional approaches.

The four districts used a variety of methods to provide professional development, such as staff retreats, summer workshops, and training during school hours for which substitute teachers were provided.

Two districts established teacher centers. For example, one established three teacher centers that provided intensive training over a period of 5 to 8 weeks in instructional practices and other aspects of reform. The difficulty in maintaining professional development efforts was also demonstrated. For example, one district recently had to close its teacher centers because of budget constraints.

Fourth, assessing overall progress toward high standards may be difficult. Districts are likely to have more difficulty in measuring overall success as they incorporate new, higher standards. Districts track the progress of reform efforts through the use of norm-referenced standardized achievement tests. Such tests, though not directly linked to the district's curricula and standards, are a recognized measure of student achievement in basic skills.

To measure student progress toward new, higher standards, districts will need a broader range of assessment instruments, such as portfolios and demonstrations. The districts we visited were developing and training teachers to use these relatively new types of assessment, but aggregating results of these tests to measure progress is more difficult than using norm-referenced tests.

Fifth, current Federal programs may not support systemwide reform. Existing Federal categorical programs, such as Chapter 1, played little part in these districts' reforms. District officials said that Federal categorical programs targeted to specific groups of at-risk students, such as the disadvantaged or those with disabilities, were not supportive of reforms directed to improving achievement of all students. On the other hand, Federal programs did not seem to significantly hinder reform activities.

The districts' use of federally-funded technical assistance was mixed. The two larger districts had obtained some assistance from federally-assisted centers. The two smaller districts, on the other hand, did not seek such help. One superintendent pointed out that his district needed onsite consultation and support and that the nearest Federal lab was too far away to make that practical.

We did not assess the extent to which federally-funded research and technical assistance efforts currently support systemwide reform or the extent to which they could do so. However, we noted some potential limitations. For example, many of the Federal technical assistance centers target specific programs, such as Chapter 1 or bilingual education programs.

Mr. Chairman, systemwide reform holds promise for improving student learning, but in the absence of State and Federal actions, maintaining commitment and finding resources for systemwide reform may be difficult for many districts. Systemwide reform is slow, it is evolutionary, and it is continuous. It demands a great deal of time, commitment, and flexibility from its participants.

Continuing reform over the years may be difficult for many districts. Frequent changes in leadership make commitment harder to maintain. Yet, we know that nationally, superintendent turnover is quite high, especially in large urban districts where the average tenure is only 2 years. Also, many districts are facing significant financial difficulties. Finding funding and energy for reform, while trying to adjust to reductions in State and local funding, may make undertaking systemwide reform a more difficult task in the mid 1990s.

The Congress could take a variety of actions if it wishes to encourage district level systemwide reform. For example, Congress could support efforts to develop voluntary high national and State content standards and support the development of exemplary assessment methods appropriate to those standards.

The Congress could ensure the availability of technical assistance and professional development to districts implementing or seeking to implement systemwide reform.

The Congress could make existing Federal categorical programs more conducive to systemwide reform by, for example, giving priority for grants to applicants serving targeted groups in the context of systemwide reform. However, in making these types of changes, provision should be made to ensure the needs of at-risk students are met.

Congress could also direct the Secretary of Education to take steps to disseminate information about successful reform efforts and to review the scope and functions of the Federal research centers, labs, and technical assistance centers to determine the extent to which they could assist in systemwide reform efforts.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my testimony. I would be glad to answer any questions that you or other members might have.

[The prepared statement of Linda G. Morra follows:]

SUMMARY OF TESTIMONY BY LINDA G. MORRA
SYSTEMWIDE EDUCATION REFORM
FEDERAL LEADERSHIP COULD FACILITATE
DISTRICT-LEVEL EFFORTS

Even after a decade of reform, our schools still need help. Many educators and policymakers now believe that to significantly improve student learning the education system as a whole must be changed. Systemwide reform includes five key components: (1) goals or standards for all students, (2) curricula tied to those goals, (3) high-quality instructional materials, (4) professional development, and (5) student assessments tied to the curricula. Attention is also being focused on setting high standards, including such skills as complex reasoning and problem solving. Efforts are underway at the national and state levels to develop voluntary standards and related assessment systems. Systemwide reform can be a long-term process requiring substantial commitment and effort. We believe that Congress could facilitate district efforts to undertake such reforms.

DISTRICTS WE VISITED HAD UNDERTAKEN SYSTEMWIDE REFORM. The four districts had developed standards for all students at each grade level that included a vision of what students needed to know when they graduated. These standards provided a focus for decisions about all other elements of the system. Student assessments related to the district curricula were a key part of the instructional reform. When evidence showed progress was not sufficient, districts made changes to improve learning.

COMMON THEMES IN REFORM IMPLEMENTATION. The experiences in these districts provided several key insights into the process of systemwide reform. First, systemwide reform was a long-term process, requiring vision and commitment. Second, technical assistance was important in developing and carrying out the reforms. Third, teacher support was critical. Fourth, assessing overall progress toward high standards may be difficult. Finally, current federal programs may not support systemwide reform.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FEDERAL ROLE IN FOSTERING SYSTEMWIDE REFORM. Having key components of the education system linked together promotes monitoring of student achievement to ensure that progress continues and enables all school personnel to work together to improve student performance. However, without state and federal actions, maintaining commitment and finding resources for systemwide reform may be difficult for many districts. Voluntary national standards could provide a starting place and direction for districts undertaking reform. But national standards and assessments alone are not likely to ensure widespread reform. Congress could take a variety of steps--in addition to supporting voluntary national standards--if it wishes to encourage districts to undertake systemwide reform. Among other things, Congress could help ensure that districts are aware of promising reforms, can provide sufficient professional development, and have the assistance they need to develop and implement reforms.

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Subcommittee:

We are pleased to be here today to discuss our report on systemwide education reform requested by the full committee and this subcommittee. Even after a decade of reforms, our schools still need help. Twenty years of data from the National Assessment of Educational Progress show that our present education performance is low and not improving. For example, less than 10 percent of 17 year olds demonstrate the skills associated with the ability to function in more demanding jobs or to do college work, such as carrying out multiple-step problems, synthesizing information, and drawing conclusions. Also, gaps in achievement between minority and nonminority students are still wide.¹

The 1980s saw a host of education reforms. But those reforms largely addressed individual parts of the system, such as merit pay for teachers, smaller class sizes, and an increased number of academic credits for graduation. Many educators and policymakers now believe that to improve student learning the education system as a whole must be changed. Attention is being focused on change designed to improve student outcomes by determining what students should know and be able to do, and ensuring that all the key components of the educational system are directed to achieving those outcomes.

My testimony today will focus on four districts that have had many years of experience with systemwide reform. They differ in size, spending level, poverty level, and approach, yet their experiences offer insight into the potential federal role in systemwide reform.

¹Systemwide Education Reform: Federal Leadership Could Facilitate District-Level Efforts (GAO/HRD-93-97, April 30, 1993).

²Ina V.S. Mullis, Eugene H. Owen, and Gary W. Phillips, America's Challenge: Accelerating Academic Achievement, Educational Testing Service (Sept. 1990).

In these districts, systemwide reform has been a long-term, ongoing process that requires substantial commitment and effort. We believe there are steps Congress can take if it wishes to encourage the nation's 15,000 school districts to undertake systemwide reform. Let me expand on these findings.

BACKGROUND

Systemwide reform includes five key, interrelated system components: (1) goals or standards expected of all students, (2) curricula linked directly to those standards, (3) high-quality instructional materials appropriate to the curricula, (4) professional development to enable teachers and other educators to understand the curricula and the most effective instructional approaches, and (5) student assessment systems that are based directly on the curricula.¹

The standards are the driving force in these reforms. They define what students should know and be able to do, and they apply to all students. A growing consensus exists that high standards, incorporating "higher order" skills related to complex reasoning and problem solving, should be set. Efforts are under way on a variety of fronts to develop high national standards. The mathematics standards issued by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics in 1989 have become a model for other efforts, such as those sponsored by the Department of Education and professional organizations such as the National Council of Teachers of English. Many states are also working to develop these types of standards.

¹These components of "systemwide" reform are often discussed in the literature in the context of "systemic" reform, which addresses an even broader view of the education system. See, for example, Marshall S. Smith and Jennifer O'Day, "Systemic School Reform," Politics of Education Association Yearbook 1990, p. 233-267.

These state and national standards, and related assessment systems, are meant to encourage reform and provide a direction for it. They will present broad frameworks of what students should know in specific subjects. Local educators would have considerable flexibility in using the standards, for example, in adding content to reflect local needs and in detailing curricula. Proposed legislation, among other things, includes provisions for developing national standards for what students should know and be able to do.

THE DISTRICTS WE VISITED HAD UNDERTAKEN SYSTEMWIDE REFORM

The districts we visited had developed standards for all students at each grade level that included a vision of the types of knowledge, skills, and abilities students need when they graduate. This provided a focus for decisions about all other elements of the system: curriculum and instruction, professional development, and assessment. We saw in these districts a clear focus on learning and a willingness to make changes, either in individual teacher approaches or in district policies, to help students achieve.

Three of the districts began reform in the 1970s or early 1980s and established standards related primarily to basic skills and raising achievement test scores. Each district had been working for several years, however, to incorporate high standards into its system in key subject areas, such as mathematics and reading. The standards issued by the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics were being used extensively in three districts.

Student assessments related to the districts' curricula were a key part of the instructional reform. Student progress in achieving the standards was monitored frequently. In one district, for example, students were assessed four to six times a year on tests designed to monitor progress toward the district standards; these tests supplemented other information teachers used to make

judgments about each student's progress. The purpose of these tests was to focus attention on students who needed assistance. Results were provided quickly so that teachers could follow up with individual students as necessary. This focus on student achievement also led to a change in the role of the principals, who became "instructional leaders." They focused more on helping teachers teach and students learn and less on their more traditional role of administrator.

When test scores or other indicators showed progress was not sufficient, districts made changes in curricula and instruction. For example, after several years, one district recognized that students' scores in math and science were not rising to the extent anticipated. Officials revamped their curricula and assessments and put an emphasis on math and science districtwide.

COMMON THEMES IN REFORM IMPLEMENTATION

The experiences in these districts provided several key insights into the process of systemwide reform.

First, Systemwide Reform Was a Long-Term Process Requiring Vision and Commitment.

Reform in these districts was a long-term and continuing effort. Three of the districts had been in the process of reforming for over a decade; the fourth had begun in the mid-1980s. In each case, as reform unfolded, all system components, including standards and assessments, were changed as the districts acquired more experience and monitored their success. In these districts, the superintendent was a pivotal force for the reform. Each brought considerable expertise and experience to the district and provided the vision and leadership to develop and maintain consensus in support of reform. A key factor in their success was

their longevity in the district. Each began reform within a few years of coming to the district and stayed for many years.

Second, Technical Assistance Was Important.

Technical assistance was ongoing as the reforms evolved, and districts saw it as essential because of lack of time and experience among district staff. The districts hired private or university consultants to help in areas such as conducting needs assessments, setting standards, writing curricula, and developing assessment tools. Districts varied in the extent of outside assistance obtained. For example, two districts developed long-term relationships with consultants who were directly involved in many aspects of the reform. In contrast, another relied heavily on research by district personnel but also obtained assistance from a variety of sources, mostly on a short-term basis, to provide guidance on reform and training in a variety of instructional approaches. In one case, the district used state developed curriculum frameworks, which are nationally recognized, as a starting point for developing its own standards and assessments.

Third, Teacher Support Was Critical.

Administrators saw teacher support as critical to successfully implementing reform. The districts obtained teacher support by training the teachers about the need for and process of reform; involving them in writing the new standards, curricula, and assessments; and providing training in various instructional approaches. Yet, providing necessary staff development, training, and time to work on the standards may be one of the most difficult implementation issues for reform. The districts we visited devoted considerable energy to these purposes. The four districts also used a variety of methods to provide professional development, such as staff retreats, summer workshops, and training during school hours--for which substitutes were provided to free teachers for

training. Two districts established teacher centers. For example, one district established three teacher centers that provided intensive training, over a period of 5 to 8 weeks, in instructional practices and other aspects of reform. This is in marked contrast to the short-term in-service training teachers often receive.

The difficulty in maintaining professional development efforts was demonstrated in at least two districts where, as district funds became more constrained, funding for professional development was reduced. For example, one district recently had to close its teacher centers because of budget constraints, even though many teachers had not yet attended.

Fourth, Assessing Overall Progress Toward High Standards May Be Difficult.

Districts tracked the progress of reform efforts through the results of norm-referenced, standardized achievement tests. Such tests, though not directly linked to the districts' curricula and standards, are a recognized measure of student achievement in basic skills, and low scores on such tests were usually one reason reform was undertaken. Although we cannot make a causal link to the reform--because many factors affect students' test scores--students in these districts made substantial achievement gains as measured by these tests, and officials pointed to those gains as evidence of reform success.

Districts are likely to have more difficulty in measuring overall success as they incorporate new, higher standards. To measure student progress toward these new standards, districts will need a broader range of assessment instruments, such as portfolios and demonstrations. The districts we visited were developing--and training teachers to use--these relatively new types of assessments. But aggregating results of these tests to measure progress is more difficult than using norm-referenced tests.